

JOLANTA KLIMEK-GRĄDZKA  
The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin  
jolanta.klimek-gradzka@kul.pl

*LISTY SWIĘTE<sup>O</sup> OYCA PARTHENIUSZA [...] DO PIOTRA MOHILY* [LETTERS BY HOLY FATHER PARTHENIUS [...] TO PETER MOHYLA] (1643) – AN HISTORICAL AND LINGUISTIC CONTEXT OF AN ANATHEMA

The year 1643 saw the publication of *Listy święte<sup>O</sup> oycy Partheniusza do Piotra Mohily*, which came out of the printing press of the Polish-language department of the Kyiv Lavra. In the *Letters* Parthenius – a relatively unknown patriarch of Constantinople – discusses *Confessio Fidei* – a succinct confession of faith published in Geneva in 1629 under the name of Cyril Lucaris – an Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and opponent of the union. As *Confessio* is clearly Calvinist in spirit, Parthenius refutes Lucaris' authorship and imposes an anathema on the genuine author of *Confessio* and its propagators. The recipient and a probable translator of *Letters* is Peter Mohyla – a distinguished Metropolitan of Kyiv, author of the first Orthodox catechism and founder of the Mohyla Collegium. The paper addresses the issue of the *Letters*, in particular their Polish translation and the identity of the translator but does so against the broader background of the circumstances occasioned by the emergence of the contentious *Confessio* and the Orthodox Church's ultimate reaction to its emergence.

Keywords: *epistolography, translation, religion, pragmatics, history*

## 1. Introduction

17<sup>th</sup>-century Kyiv was a city whose significance could not be underestimated either by the Latin West or the Orthodox East. Situated at the crossroads of languages, cultures and confessions, the metropolis developed rapidly. It became an academic centre which wielded its religious and political influence over the vast territories of Ukraine. This supreme position of Kyiv was further confirmed

and fostered by the fact it had a printing house at the Pechersk Lavra. The house opened in 1616 and printed liturgical books of key importance to Orthodox spiritual formation. Marek Melnyk claims that “in the entire Orthodox world, only the Kyiv metropolis was capable of publishing theological syntheses, polemical works, and reformed liturgical books”<sup>1</sup> (2008: 105; 2009: 228). All these outstanding achievements were thanks to one man: Metropolitan Peter Mohyla. In 1632, he decided to open a printing department publishing works in Polish (see Klimek 2009 for details), thanks to which the importance of Kyiv rose even more. In addition to theological and polemical treatises of great significance for the Orthodox Church (*Lithos, to iest kamień z procy prawdy* [Lithos, i.e. a stone thrown from the catapult of the truth] by P. Mohyla, *Rozmowa białocerkiewska* [A Bila Tserkva Conversation] and *Messiasz prawdziwy* [The True Messiah] by J. Galatovsky), hagiographies (including *Paterykon* [The Lives of Saint Fathers] by S. Kossov and *Apollo chrześcijański* [The Christian Apollo] by L. Baranovich), books of miracles (*Parergon cudów* [The Book of Miracles] by I. Denisovich and *Teratourgima* [The Book of Incredible Miracles] by A. Kalnofoysky), the Lavra printing house published occasional sermons and speeches, as well as other Polish, Latin and Polish-Latin collections of poetic texts, composed by students and clergymen associated with the Kyiv Collegium (now the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy), e.g. S. Javorsky and F. Orlyk. One of the better-recognized and currently accessible printed works from the Lavra library is *Listy święte<sup>o</sup> oyca Partheniusza do Piotra Mohyły* (1643). The text is preserved and stored in the Ossolineum Library, bound together with the Orthodox writings of Patriarchs Jeremiah I and Jeremiah II (catalogue number XVII-3757-II).

The print, which is less than seven pages long, contains, apart from the introductory poem *Na potwarcę* [On the Slanderer] and *Przedmowa do czytelnika* [Preface (to the Reader)], the Polish version of two letters written by Parthenius I to Peter Mohyla. The full title of the text reads as follows:

LISTY święte<sup>o</sup> Oyca Partheniusza z miłosierdzia bozego arhipiskopa konstantinopolskiego nowego rzymu y æcumenici patriarchæ pisane do iasnie przewielebnego w bogu ie<sup>o</sup> meci oyca Piotra Mohyły, W KTORYCH znośisie potwarz włożoną przedkilką lat ná Cerkiew S. Wschodnią przez wydrukowanie Xiążki Kalwinskicy nauki pod imieniem S. pamięci Nieboszczyká Oyca Cyrilla Pátriarchi Konstántinopolskiego  
[LETTERS by the Holy Father Parthenius – by Divine Mercy Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch, written to the Most Reverend

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the paper I quote historical Polish data and modern authors writing in Polish. The former are quoted both in the original and translated to English, for the latter only English translations are provided. All translations are mine.

Father Peter Mohyla, IN WHICH he denounces the slander imposed some years ago on the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church by printing the Book of Calvin's teachings under the name of the late Father Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople]<sup>2</sup>.

The title itself provides information on the pragmatic aspects of the text. Thus, the genre – a letter – is overtly indicated. The sender presents himself unambiguously – Parthenius I, Archbishop and Ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople, and the recipient of the letters is mentioned directly – Father Peter Mohyla. Finally, the purpose of the letters is explicated: the denunciation of the “Calvinist book”, published some time prior to the letters, authored by the Patriarch of Constantinople, the late Cyril Lucaris. The text referred to here is *Confessio fidei* published in Geneva in 1629 under the name of Cyril Lucaris – an Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople – which were clearly Calvinist in spirit and in view of its author generated strong controversy.

This paper undertakes to examine the Polish text of the *Letters* from a (socio)linguistic point of view against the backdrop of the lives of the three people interconnected by the *Letters* and the broader context in which they were composed. This is done with a view to establishing the motivations behind translating the *Letters* to Polish and discovering the identity of the translator. *Confessio Fidei* – itself constituting *raison d'être* of the *Letters* – whether an exposition of heresy or an act of forgery – seems to have inspired the formalized confession of faith of the Orthodox Church and led to the emergence of a unified catechism.

## 2. Cyril Lucaris

Cyril Lucaris, who is mentioned at the end of the title of the *Letters*, and who is the genuine reason for Parthenius' composing the text, was an extremely intriguing character. As will turn out in the course of this paper, he was also the reason for a relationship that obtained between Parthenius I and Peter Mohyla, and which came into being not only because of the *Letters*.

Lucaris was born in 1572 in Heraklion, Crete, into the family of a wealthy butcher. He changed his baptismal name from Constantine to Cyril after his first holy orders in 1595. Like any Cretan dreaming of taking up education, he took up his studies at the Greek school in Venice (1584–1588), and continued in Padua (1589–1593). Afterwards, under the influence of a relative (an uncle or cousin – sources differ on that), he decided to become a priest. This relative, Meletius

---

<sup>2</sup> All quotations after the first edition published in Kyiv in 1643. (I retain the spelling of the original, only simplifying the spelling of *s* and *f*).

Pegas (1549–1601) became Patriarch of Alexandria and ordained Cyril a deacon in 1593, then a presbyter, and finally appointed him his protosyncellus (deputy).

In 1594 or 1596, Cyril went on a long trip to Poland, but there is no consensus among historians as to the reasons for this trip. Cyril, accompanied by Nicephorus (Calian 1992: 29) – or travelling alone (Kempa 2007: 89) – came to Poland to support the Orthodox Church (see Kempa 2007 for a detailed discussion of the issue), with a mission to prevent the Union of Brest (see Hodona 2008: 69, Hryniewicz 1979: 707, or Likowski 1907: 147) or – as suggested in alternative accounts – to participate in the Synod of Brest (Kruk 2009). Whatever the reasons, Lucaris won friends and fame during his stay. He established contacts with, among others, Prince Ostrogski, M. Smotrytsky and P. Mohyla. He lectured at the Ostrog Academy, was rector of the Academy in Vilnius, and most likely also in Ostrog (Kempa 2007, Kruk 2009, Zhukov'skij 1996). When the posts of Orthodox exarchs became vacant after the conclusion of the Union of Brest, together with Balaban and Ostrogsky, Lucaris was to be ordained to this post, but he left Poland before that could happen (Kempa 2007: 95). He returned as early as 1600 “with an attempt to establish close political cooperation, and in the future, perhaps a religious union between the Orthodox and the Protestants (...) in the Polish-Lithuanian state” (Kempa 2007: 95). The correspondence between the Orthodox and the Protestants with Pegas, which involved Lucaris, troubled the Uniate clergy. Using their influence on Sigismund III Vasa, on the Apostolic Nuncio, and even on the Roman Curia, they tried to have Lucaris arrested and expelled from Poland. Although Lucaris finally managed to gain the trust of the Uniates, the protection granted him by the court and the patronage of the Ostrogskis' family were not enough.

He left Poland in January 1601 (Kempa 2007: 100), and in the autumn of 1601 – when he was 30 – he was appointed to the patriarchal seat in Alexandria, following the death of Meletius Pegas. He took the name Cyril III and ruled until 1620. In his letter to Sigismund III, Hipatius Pocij (Uniate Metropolitan of Kyiv-Halych) called him “a worthy man and a great friend of the Catholic Church”. He encouraged the king to engage in correspondence with the patriarch (Kempa 2007: 101).

Cyril Lucaris sought supporters and assistance from everyone he could find at the time: from the English ambassadors to the Sublime Porte, who saw his role in their plans for a Russian-Turkish alliance against Poland in 1621 (Dąbrowska 2017: 24; also see Likowski 1907: 201, 300); from Pope Paul V, to whom he sent a letter in 1608, in which he “indirectly expressed his subordination” (Kempa 2007: 102); from the Anglicans and Protestants, who saw their own benefits in Cyril's reign (Calian 1992: 32), and finally, from the English king James I. As a token of gratitude for royal support, in 1624, Lucaris presented the king with the *Codex Regius (Alexandrinus)*, which he had brought from Alexandria (cf. Khokhar 2015: 10).

On 4 November 1620, the Holy Synod of Constantinople appointed Lucaris for the first time<sup>3</sup> to the dignity of the universal (ecumenical) patriarch – Cyril I. His conflict with the Catholic Church aggravated and contributed to the general contention between the Orthodox hierarchs and the lay faithful, who disapproved of the jurisdictional changes and restrictions on stauropagic privileges (Hodana 2008: 88). Lucaris sought all kind of support among various political and denominational circles, including Dutch Calvinists, to serve the interests of the Orthodox Church and to resist the Jesuits, whom Lucaris apparently feared (see Hryniewicz 1979, Calian 1992). For this reason, among others, he found himself at the centre of a sharp dispute between the Papacy and the Reformation. The Roman *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* launched a campaign to discredit the patriarch, along with the clergy and laity who counted among his supporters. They spread a rumour that Lucaris was a Calvinist. And this opinion did not change in its essence despite the passage of time. E. Likowski describes Lucaris as a “Crypto-Calvinist” (1907: 144), yet later in the same work, he makes an overt claim that: “we can see in his [Ostrogski’s] entourage enemies of the Church far worse than Cyril Lucaris, a Calvinist” (1907: 188). E. Nicolaidis *et al.* argues that “Lucaris was perhaps the theologian in the Orthodox world who was most influenced by Calvinism. Many of his treatises were seen by his contemporaries as Calvinist, and his views quickly alarmed other Orthodox theologians, who regarded Calvinism as one more expression of Western “heretic” theology” (2016: 555). Both George A. Hadjiantoniou – who saw Cyril as a “great Greek, one of the greatest in modern Greek history” (1948), as well as Steven Runciman – who calls Lucaris “the most remarkable of all Greek ecclesiastics” (1968: 258) – tend to regard the patriarch as a Protestant, showing that the Protestants’ attitude to Lucaris were positive.

In the light of the virtually unequivocal opinion of the Catholics about the “heretical” Patriarch of Constantinople, the role attributed to him in the conversion of Meletius Smotrytsky (c. 1577–1633), the Orthodox Archbishop of Polotsk, Archimandrite of the Derman Monastery, comes as no surprise. Ivan Dubovich relates that Smotrytsky, seeing the confusion of the Orthodox and Protestant teaching in Russia (including Calvinism and Lutheranism), decided to go to Constantinople to learn “to believe firmly in the old Christian way” under the guidance of his teacher from the Ostrog Academy – Cyril. The plan failed when Smotrytsky realised that the patriarch was a Calvinist (“a wolf, not a shepherd”), which ultimately led him to conversion and joining the Uniate Church (Dubovich 1644: 109–110; also see Hodana 2008: 113). Invaluable

---

<sup>3</sup> Cyril I was appointed to and removed from the patriarchal seat of Constantinople five times (1620–23, 1623–33, 1633–34, 1634–35, 1637–38), and was also chosen an ecumenical patriarch in the years 1601–1620 (Grumel 1958: 438).

information on the issue can be inferred from M. Smotrytsky's own account concerning his stay at Lucaris' in 1624. This account is to be found in the foreword to his treatise *Exethesis abo Expostulatia, toiest rosprawa między Apologią y Antidotem o ostanek błędow haerezy i kłamstw Zyzaniowych, Philaletowych, Orthologowych i Klerykowych uczyniona* [Exethesis or Expostulatia, i.e. an Apology and a Counterargument against the Claim about Heresy as well as other Accusations in the Matters of Denomination, Religious Orientation, Orthodoxy and Clergy] (Lviv 1629), addressed to Aleksander Zaslovsky, Voivode of Kyiv. During his stay, Smotrytsky met and talked with Lucaris many times, and read him his catechism or catechisms:<sup>4</sup> "catechisms in simple Greek and full of Lutheran and Calvinist heresies". He even heard the patriarch preach heresies from the pulpit (Smotrytsky 1629: 3).

## 2.1. Confesio Fidei – its allegations, implications, and consequences

The number of witnesses confirming Cyril I Lucaris' Protestant sympathies grew after the publication of his *Confessio Fidei Reverendissimi Domini Cyrilli Patriarchae...* (hereinafter: *CF*), which took place in Geneva in 1629. The news started spreading across Christian Europe about a patriarch who "in 1629 published a catechism full of Calvinist errors. From that time onwards, he zealously promoted Protestantism, encouraged by the Genevan Protestant pastor Anthon Leger" (Onoszko 1931: 31). The same year, the Confession of Faith was translated and published in other languages: Greek, German, French and English (Michaelides 1943: 118, Ladouceur 2019: 18). Smotrytsky's account needs to be recalled here. The preface to the treatise mentioned above, in which he tells us that he read the heretical catechism authored by Lucaris and published in Constantinople, is dated as of 3 April 1269 (sic!), while the imprimatur for the treatise was issued on 10 June 1629. Whereas the Geneva *CF* contains the note "Data in Constantinopoli in Patriarchatu, mense Martij, 1629" (*CF* 1629: 7). However, the *Exethesis...* contains no trace of the fact that Smotrytsky was already familiar with the *CF* published in Geneva.

Although as early as 1631, a dementi was published in Rome by Mathaios Johannes Karyofyllis, entitled *Censura confessionis fidei, seu potius perfidia Caluinianæ, quæ nomine Cyrilli patriarchæ Constantinopolitani edita circumfertur*, the *CF* was incorporated into the Geneva-based *Corpus et Sentagma Confessionum Fidei* in 1654 (Jaskóła 2011: 243). However, the Orthodox clergy did not stop categorically denouncing Lucaris' authorship of the *CF*, considering

---

<sup>4</sup> It is not quite clear whether Smotrytski refers to one catechism or more, as he himself speaks either of his catechism or catechisms.

it a forgery, and a Protestant or Jesuit attack on the Orthodox Church. The text kept being condemned at a number of synods.<sup>5</sup>

Entangled in religious<sup>6</sup> and political disputes, Cyril I Lucaris eventually fell victim to Sultan Murad IV, who accused the patriarch of fuelling the Cossacks' rebellion and sentenced him to death. Some commentators pinpoint the Jesuits' and papal agents' influences behind this act: "Through the machinations of the Jesuits and other anti-Orthodox agents in Constantinople, the Papists were finally able, through the Austrian Embassy, to bribe the Turks to condemn and kill Patriarch Kyrillos in 1638, and thus to silence him" (Chrysostom); "the Jesuits persecuted him by all means and slandered him before the Turkish Sultan for so long that the Sultan ordered him to be strangled as a traitor to the state" (Pindór 1883: 123). Others attribute the rumour of papal involvement in the assassination attempt on Lucaris to Huguenots and Greeks (Pastor 1938: 240). The execution probably took place on 27 June 1638 (according to *Encyclopedia Britannica*, in 1637), carried out by Janissaries on board of a ship on the Bosphorus. Cyril Lucaris' body was thrown into the sea, to be found and buried with honours by his friends, with Parthenius I among them (*Encyclopedia Britannica*). In 2009, the Patriarch of Constantinople elevated Cyril I Lucaris to the dignity of saint as a martyr and defender of the faith.

### 3. Parthenius I

The most mysterious of the three figures intertwined in the story behind the source text is the sender of the letters. Little is known about him apart from the fact that he occupied the seat of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople for five years (1639–1644). It is difficult to find references in the relevant literature that would allow us to discuss the patriarch's activity in more detail. What is symptomatic, however, is that almost all available information links Parthenius with Cyril I Lucaris, and with Peter Mohyla – the latter mentioned in passing.

---

<sup>5</sup> Starting with the Synod of Constantinople in 1638, through the Synod of Kyiv in 1640, convened by Peter Mohyla, the Synod of Jassy in 1642 convened by Parthenius I, to the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672, which condemned Calvinism in general.

<sup>6</sup> For the sake of completeness of the patriarch's profile, it is worth adding here that the polarized opinions on Lucaris were not only due to the fact that the *CF* was attributed to him. He was equally opposed in his intentions to translate the New Testament into modern Greek. Nevertheless, this resistance did not hinder his endeavours. He also translated parts of the Old Testament and sent them to England and Sweden (Khokhar 2015). What is more, Oscar de la Cruz Palma published in 2006 a Latin translation of the Qur'an attributed to Lucaris. For more details, see Loop (2013: 159), Cruz Palma and Starczewska (2011: 18). According to Starczewska (2012: XVIII), the translation is attributed to Lucaris "because of an interpretation of the dedication which is preserved in one of the manuscripts; it can be deduced from the same fragment that it was a translation prepared on his demand".

There is a general agreement among the researchers that the most important achievement of Parthenius I's patriarchate was the convening of the Synod of Jassy in 1642. This synod witnessed the decisions that led to the emergence of the text discussed in the letters. The main goal of the synod was to develop solutions to the problems caused by the *Confessio Fidei*, as well as to analyse the catechism composed by Peter Mohyla, containing the Orthodox confession of faith (Melnyk 2008: 110). Marek Melnyk writes that “[t]here is even a hypothesis that Mohyla’s catechism and the Jassy synod were part of an anti-Protestant campaign that involved close cooperation between Constantinople and Kyiv in denouncing Lucaris’ Calvinist views” (2008: 110).

As noted above, little is known about the initiator of the Synod of Jassy, and the existing accounts are highly diversified. A strong negative view about the author of the letters is formulated by Ivan Dubovich, a contemporary of Parthenius, religious polemicist, and a supporter of the Uniate Church. In his opinion, based on the reports from Orthodox clergymen, the patriarch, like his predecessors, is an *ignoramus*, even illiterate (Dubovich 1644: 113). An opposite opinion about the patriarch was formulated by Steven Runcimen, according to whom he was “a man of broad sympathies who was desperately trying to restore peace to the Church after the disputes that had arisen out of Cyril Lucaris’s career” (1973: 341).

### 3.1. The letters – a linguistic approach to the composition

The Synod of Jassy took place from 15 September to 30 October 1642, that is several months after the writing of the letters under analysis, which were written in Constantinople dated 10 May 1642. There are three fragments in the text that inform the reader about why the Patriarch of Constantinople writes the two letters: the title page, the *Preface (to the reader)*, and finally Parthenius’ first letter. In all these three fragments, the author uses distinctly evaluative lexemes in relation to the confession of faith attributed to Lucaris: *falszerz* – *forger*, *potwarz* – *slander*, *paszkwil* – *pasquinade*, *capita Hæretika*. Each emotionally charged notion reveals the intention of the patriarch’s letters and classifies them within the poetics of the 17<sup>th</sup>-century religious disputes conducted on the territory of Rus. Dictionaries of the Polish language of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries unanimously list the entries *potwarz* ‘false accusation, slander, insult, calumny, libel’ (SXVI, 28: 483) and *paszkwil* ‘mocking, defamatory writing’ (SXVI, 23: 278), which Parthenius uses to deprecate the validity of the attribution of the *CF* to Cyril I Lucaris. The same purpose is served by the use of the lexeme *falszerz* – *forger* in two meanings: the neological one, not recorded in dictionaries: ‘a document forged, deceitfully attributed to someone else’, and the agentive one, well-known in the 16<sup>th</sup> century: ‘one who forges, counterfeits, lies, cheats,

a slanderer' (SXVI, 7: 14). The term *capita haeretika* as opposed to *capita orthodoxa* also serves to unambiguously depreciate the *Confessio fidei*. In the 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> centuries, the noun *heretic* (and the expressive forms founded on it) unambiguously referred to the confessional context: 'a creator or follower of religious claims derived from Christianity, but incompatible with the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church' (SXVI, 8: 328). The word was a repetitive element in polemical discourse, including the Orthodox-Catholic disputes. Notwithstanding the above, one needs to note that in other Kyivan religious polemical treatises of the time one can easily find forms parallel to the ones extracted from the *Letters...*, e.g.: *kłamca* (*liar*), *potwarca* (*slanderer*), *falszysky podmiot* (*forgerer*), *bezbożnik* (*ungodly*), *matacz* (*prevaricator*), *kazista/skazista* (1. 'person who breaks the law', 2. 'destroyer, spoiler, wrong-doer, also one who hurts bodily'), *bezmózgi potwarca* (*foolish slanderer*), *niewstydliva wszeteczna gęba* (*mouth with no moral restraint*). It is possible to claim, therefore, that, on the one hand, the *Letters* represent the classical poetics of the denominational disputes of the time. On the other hand, one can observe that they are devoid of strongly derogatory emotional vocabulary, intended to insult the adversary. In fact, depreciatory lexemes are rather scarce in the text. The reason for this is that the main line of criticism expressed in the text is addressed to third parties, and not to either the sender or the recipient.

Parthenius I wrote two letters, both dated the same day: 10 May 1642. The first one is addressed directly to Peter Mohyla, Metropolitan of Kyiv, Halych and the whole Rus, an Exarch and Archimandrite of the Pechersk Lavra. Further unnamed recipients of the letter are included in the final formula of the blessing: "łaska, pokoy, miłość od Boga, Páná nášzego iesusá Chrustusá, modlitwa y Błogosławieństwo pokorności nászey niecháy będzie" [grace, peace, love from God, our Lord Jesus Christ, prayer and our humble Blessing be with you"]. The address included the clergy of the Orthodox Church: bishops, clerics, archimandrites, hegumen and priests, as well as the lay faithful: princes, voivodes, lords, noblemen, members of the Orthodox church fraternities, and finally all the Orthodox Ruthenian Christians. This narrative solution makes Parthenius' first letter a *de facto* pastoral letter addressed not exclusively to Mohyla – even though he is most often referred to by name – but to a wider circle of recipients. This interpretation can be further supported by the formulations found in the letters disclosing the reason for writing them. The patriarch apparently writes in response to Mohyla's demand for help (*pious desideria*) in informing the faithful about Lucaris' confession of faith. Thus, he speaks of *honourable exarchs* – Parthenius' envoys to Rus – who were representatives of the patriarch's views and were to bring consolation to the Orthodox faithful.

Because of the issues raised in the letter, I consider it a kind of introduction or a reader's guide to the second letter – which is discussed in the latter part of this section. In my opinion, the "guiding" character of the first letter is indicated

by the statements justifying the correspondence. Although, as he claims, his wit is not on a par with St. Paul's, Parthenius discerns with a painful heart *zamieszanie i rostyryki* ('dispute, conflict, discord, quarrel, strife; also difference of opinion', SXVI, 36: 525) in the Church and wishes to put them down. However, the distance between Constantinople and Kyiv, as well as his advanced age and his duties of utmost importance concerning the universal Church do not allow him to appear in Kyiv in person. Nevertheless, this does not prevent him from addressing in writing the defamation that the Orthodox Church should adopt any heretical (Protestant) teachings.

In the further – entirely factual – part of the letter, Parthenius provides arguments against the false accusation that Lucaris was author of the *CF*. Two major types of evidence are evoked by the author: (i) arguments from Parthenius' metropolitan authority and his credit for Cyril Lucaris; and (ii) arguments from Lucaris' life, justifying the rejection of the claim of his authorship of the *CF*. Thus, the patriarch mentions his personal acquaintance with Lucaris, common celebration of liturgy, Lucaris' doctrinal purity of which he is convinced from his personal experience (revealed both in his sermons and in private conversations), Lucaris was to display aversion to the Reformation trends, zeal in prayer, respect for holy images, which manifested itself by his kissing them, pious and customary attitude to the Holy Sacraments (Eucharist and Chirotony). This enumeration of Cyril Lucaris' spiritual virtues culminates in a highly illustrative metaphor: "iako dobre Pásterz áby kákoľe Hæretickiego blluznierstwa, wczystey wheatce Chrystusaowey y Apostolskiej náuki w Cherkwie S. Wschodniey nie rzkiłyysie, ále áni pokazały" [like a good Shepherd, he took care that the tares of heretical blasphemy in the pure wheat of the teachings of Christ and the Apostles preached by St. Cyril Lucaris were not bred, and that it did not even spring from its seed], which evokes the biblical antinomy of wheat and tares.

Parthenius' letters reveal diverse communication settings of the two texts. Even though their subject matter in fact stays the same, the different recipients that the author intends to address make him change his creative repertoire. In both texts, Parthenius I writes from the position of the head of the Orthodox Church, as can be inferred from the signature: BY DIVINE MERCY ARCHBISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE, THE NEW ROME AND THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH [Z MIŁOSIĘRZDZIA BOZEG° ARCHIEPISKOP KONSTANTINOPOLSKI, NOWEGO RZYMU Y ÆCUMENICUS PATRI-ARCHA]. However, in his writing to Peter Mohyla, the author does not adopt the *ex-cathedra* position. This is evidenced by the opening and closing politeness formulas of the letters, in which, in accordance with the requirements of etiquette, Mohyla is called *highly enlightened, highly learned, beloved brother and fellow, most reverend* [*przeoświecony, wysoce uczony miły brat i współpracownik, przewielebność*]. In his express and wholehearted wish to support Mohyla in the fight against harmful propaganda, the patriarch would like to act as

a father, taking off Mohyla's annoyances and worries. The first letter contains numerous declarations of the purity of the doctrine proclaimed by the Church: "The Eastern Orthodox Church, our mother, does not engage in novelties: and even if an angel from heaven should come and say something different from what the seven universal Synods proclaimed, the Church will not believe it". The letter emphasises the irreconcilable differences between Calvinism and Orthodoxy: "as sunrise is distant from sunset, so are these arguments distant from the teachings of the Eastern Orthodox Church". Announcing an anathema, Parthenius regards the actual author of the *Confessio* to be a devil's son [*klámca z oycem swym Diabłem*], similar to Arius, Sabellius, Nestorius, Dioscurus or Manichaeus, who were already condemned by the Church.

In the narrative of his second letter, Parthenius embraces the authority of a Church leader and addresses the faithful in a much less emotional way. There is no sign here of the previous symmetry of roles between the sender and the recipient. The second letter, devoid of forms of address, begins with an exposition of the circumstances in which the synod investigated the case of Lucaris' *Confessio Fidei*. Imitating the biblical style, Parthenius uses repetitions to strengthen the meaning and the appeal of his message. He repeatedly relies on words such as *good and proper, consider and pay attention, get to know and assess* [*dobrze i porządnie, roztrząsnąć i uważać, poznać i osądzić*]. He finally concludes that the Geneva publication is a *heretical matter and a slander*. Significantly enough, Parthenius considers the forgery in terms of an attack mounted against not only Cyril I, who died years ago, but also against the entire Orthodox Church.

The text of Geneva *CF* consisted of 18 points. In his second letter, Parthenius raises objections to seventeen points, claiming that they contain "specific elements of Calvinist teaching". This introduction is followed by a point-by-point citation of articles from the *CF* attributed to Lucaris, along with the assessment of their veracity. For the clarity of the argument, this part of the letter is structured like a bulleted list, which is reflected in the syntactic parallelisms: *in the first article..., in the eighth..., in the twelfth...* This polemical-informative part of the letter uses rather short, simple reports regarding the content of the points and the reasons for their rejection. Parthenius includes statements clarifying that this or that point of the *CF* contradicts the teaching of the Orthodox Church, and that the Church believes differently from what is written in the *CF*, that the statement contained in the *CF* is the most impious possible, that the Church's teaching has been misinterpreted in a *perverse fashion* [*przewrotna*], or that this or other view is a *great absurdity* [*wielki absurd*]. With regard to points twelve, fifteen, sixteen and seventeen (the last three are approached collectively) the judgments are somewhat more elaborated and reinforced by a broader interpretation. These latter points refer to the key issues in the Orthodox doctrine, and at the same time, they mark the points of the greatest opposition of Orthodoxy to

Protestantism: the recognition of the doctrine of the Church (as opposed to *sola scriptura*), the seven holy sacraments (as opposed to two in Protestantism) and the transubstantiation of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist (in opposition to Protestant memorialism).

As marked directly by Parthenius himself in the first part of the letter, the only point whose doctrinal status he does not deny is point seven in the *CF*, which concerns the origin, incarnation, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ:

Credimus Filium Dei Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum se exinanisse, hoc est in sua hypostal humavam assumpsille naturam, Spiritu sancto conceptum, factúmque hominem in ventre semper Virginis Mariæ, natúmque, passum, sepultum, & resurrectione glorificatum, salutem & gloriam omnibus fidelibus peperisse, quem expectamus venturum vivos & mortuos iudicare (*Confessio* 1629: 3).

Parthenius' second letter culminates in a performative message, fully in keeping with the patriarch's institutional competence.<sup>7</sup> Convinced of the forgery of the *Confessio Fidei*, Parthenius imposes a multifaceted canonical punishment. The actual author of the text is declared a heretic, on whom Parthenius imposes an anathema until he converts. By this act, the faithful who acknowledge the truthfulness and conformity to the Orthodox doctrine of this compromised confession of faith, and who defend it in speech and writing are removed from the community of believers and excommunicated. The sanction extends to eternal life – the anathema is to remain in force forever. The patriarch anathemises those who believe in the false text: they cannot benefit from the remission of sins, await the encounter with the Trinity, or experience resurrection after the Last Judgement. Attention is drawn here to the use of lexemes denoting punishment – *excommunication* [*ekskomunika*] and *anathema* [*anatema*]. The dictionary of the 16<sup>th</sup>-century Polish language lists these lexemes together with *interdict* [*interdykt*] as synonyms of *curse* [*klątwa*] in the sense of 'exclusion from religious society' (SXVI, 10: 344). *Anathema* is defined in a virtually identical

<sup>7</sup> The Council of Trent equipped the Church hierarchs with appropriate instruments of punishment: "And if the faithful should happen to sin because of human weakness, the bishops should observe the Apostolic imperative to persuade, implore and reprove them in all kindness and patience, for it is often that 'kindness works more strongly on the admonished than severity, more encouragement than threat, more love than power.' If, on the other hand, because of the gravity of the offense, the rod of correction should be used, then severity should be applied with graciousness, judgment with mercy, severity with gentleness, so that the people may be preserved in a salutary and necessary discipline without harshness, so that those who will be punished may correct themselves, and if they would not repent, then let others, following the salutary example of punishment, keep away from vice. It is the duty of shepherds, who are both caring and pious, to apply mild remedies to the illnesses of the sheep at first, and then, when the severity of the illness demands it, to reach for harsher and heavier remedies" (after Mikołajczuk 2016: 82).

way: ‘an ecclesiastical curse, exclusion from the Christian community’ (SXVI, 1: 152). Parthenius, however, leaves no illusion: anathema excludes from the community of the saved to eternal life, not only symbolically from the community of believers.

The second letter bears the signature of Parthenius I, followed by letters from twelve archbishops and eighteen clerics. According to Ivan Dubovich, these signatures were to give credence to the *Letters* among the Orthodox faithful (1644: 110). The printed letters end with the prayer: “Spes nostra unica. Christus Iesus cui sit Honor & Gloria cum Patre & Spiritu Sancto in secula seculorum Amen”.

#### 4. Peter Mohyla

When Parthenius wrote his letters in 1642, Peter Mohyla (1596–1647) – even today counted among the most eminent representatives of the Orthodox Church (Melnyk 1997: 131) and canonised in 1996 – was celebrating the tenth anniversary of his reign of the Kyiv metropolis. He was elevated to the metropolitan seat by Cyril I Lucaris, who also bestowed upon him the dignity of exarch and granted him extensive powers (Zhukov’skij 1996: 10). Mohyla won fame as the founder of the Orthodox collegium, but above all as a theologian, a reformer of the Eastern Church and a supporter of the denominational agreement. He worked out a compromise between the Orthodox and the Uniates. He turned Kyiv metropolis into the centre of Orthodox spirituality (Melnyk 1997: 131), and the university he founded became a major academic and religious institution. Adhering to a western (Jesuit) style of education brought him as many supporters as opponents.

Mohyla owed his power and position to his family background and to his strong connections with Poland. He grew up at the court of Hetman S. Żółkiewski, and he fought as a soldier during the battles of Khotyn (Chocim) and Cecora. He became Archimandrite of the Kyiv Lavra under the approval of King Sigismund III. His elevation to the position of metropolitan took place when King Ladislav IV removed Isaiah Kopinsky from this dignity. In fact, the entire Mohyla dynasty had strong links with Poland. The Mohylas took the Wallachian throne in 1595 and the Moldavian one in 1606. Deposed from Moldavian throne in 1634, Peter’s brother, Moses, took refuge in Poland. Moldavia went under the rule of Basil Lupul (Vasile Lupu), related by his daughter to Bohdan Khmelnytsky. Lupul is also mentioned in Parthenius’ first letter, as he was the one to inform the patriarch about the news spreading around the Orthodox Church about the *Confessio*. The intention behind Lupul’s letter is thought-provoking in the light of the accounts that “[H]is chief religious adviser was Cyril Lucaris’ opponent, Meletius Syrigos, who prejudiced him against Lucaris.

So, till Lucaris's death, he would not help the Church of Constantinople, though he gave lavish presents to the Eastern Patriarchates. But since 1638 he had not only paid off all the debts of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate but had reorganised the management of its finances. He saw himself now as the chief lay patron of Orthodoxy and even dreamed of reviving Byzantium" (Runciman 1968: 341–342). Lupul was also closely related to Peter Mohyla as the latter asked the *hospodar* (king) for help in obtaining a patriarchal *approbatio* for an Orthodox confession of faith of his own authorship, and the *hospodar* hosted the Synod of Jassy in 1642. Later on, the metropolitan of Kyiv led the wedding ceremony of Basil's second daughter, Maria, and Hetman Janusz Radziwill, which took place at the Jassy Cathedral in 1645. Soon afterwards, he published an occasional sermon in its Polish version in the Lavra's printing house, entitled *Mowa duchowna przy szlubię* [*A spiritual speech at the wedding*].

#### 4.1. The *Letters* as a translation

The *Letters* published in 1643 never mention what their original language was. As we can learn from the title page, the letters were translated into Polish and published as a way of warning to the faithful obliged to obey the Patriarch of Constantinople. There is no doubt that Parthenius' letters must have been translated into Polish by someone closely related to the Kyiv Lavra. Was it Mohyla himself who translated the letters? This hypothesis can get support from a handful of facts: Mohyla's linguistic competence (he was fluent in Latin and Greek, as well as in other languages); his desire to seek conciliation between Rome and Constantinople; his concern for the purity of the Orthodox doctrine; and finally, his efforts at enforcing the Orthodox confession of faith of his own authorship<sup>8</sup> (Korzo 2002: 143). This last motif is discussed in the later part of this article.

The literature on the subject does not provide much information about the *Letters*,<sup>9</sup> even though they function in scholarly circulation, also thanks to a transliteration published by S. Golubiev in 1898. I managed to find a reference to the *Letters* included in Ivan Dubovich's treatise of 1644 mentioned above. His voice is of significant interest as the polemicist almost overtly states that the *Letters* were written by "Kyivan schismatics", who published a small booklet and "gave them the name of" Parthenius' letters addressed to Mohyla so as to make

<sup>8</sup> It was published in the Polish version under the title *Zebranie krotkiew nauki o artikulach wiary prawoslawna katolickiej chrzescianskiej* [*Collected Teachings on the Articles of the Orthodox-Catholic Christian Faith*] and in its Ruthenian version in 1645. Historians even assume that the Ruthenian version is derivative of the Polish one (it is a translation).

<sup>9</sup> Klimek's (2010a), (2010b), and (2013b) investigations concerning the 17<sup>th</sup>-century Kyivan Polish, discusses the linguistic features of *Letters*.

the forged text credible in the eyes of the faithful (“disguising a wolf in a precious costume”; Dubovich 1644: 110).

In my opinion, the claim that Mohyla translated the letters addressed to him by the Patriarch of Constantinople can be backed by fragments of another text published in Kyiv: the polemical treatise *Lithos* by Eusebi Pimin [Peter Mohyla]. This latter text discusses the genesis of the anathema that Parthenius was threatening with in his second letter and its translations. The author of the polemical writes about the curse pronounced by the Patriarch of Constantinople at the initiative of the Orthodox Church on the heretical confession of faith “issued with deceitful intentions (...) to mislead the faithful Sons of God” (Pimin 1644: 381). Pimin reports that the decision concerning the anathema first reached Peter Mohyla, then was published in Greek in the printing house of the Moldavian *hospodar* in Jassy, and finally, on Mohyla’s initiative, was translated into Polish and published. So there is much to suggest that this is how the Polish translation of Parthenius’ letters published in 1643 came into being.

Another argument in favour of Mohyla’s authorship of the *Letters* can be sought in the poem that opens the text, entitled *Na potwarce* [On the Slanderer]. It has a regular 11-syllable (5+6) structure, paired *aabb* rhyming, and is built on the conceptual opposition between light (Church) and darkness (slander). The poem’s structure represents a well-recognized pattern of Uniate religious polemical texts – *prosimetrum*. It contains a poem embedded in a prosaic scaffolding (Suhareva 2013). An identical stylistic device can be found in Mohyla’s *Lithos*. The latter text contains a component entitled *Elogium*, addressed to Mohyla’s polemical adversary Cassian Sakovich. This parallelism cannot be arbitrary since *prosimetrum* used in polemical texts published in Kyiv will become a regular practice no sooner than the time of Lazar Baranovych – a continuator of Mohyla’s literary and polemical legacy (Suhareva 2013: 98).

#### 4.2. Sociolinguistic implications of the Polish translation of the *Letters*

An issue that needs to be addressed now is why the letters concerning the Orthodox confession of faith, addressed by the Patriarch of Constantinople to the Metropolitan of Kyiv, should be published in Polish, and not in the original (if they were originally composed in Church Slavonic), or in a translation into Church-Slavonic (if they were formulated in Latin or Greek), common among the clergy and the faithful of the Orthodox rite as “Práwosławnych synow w Duchu S. nám naymiłszych Cerkwie Rossyskiy” [(language) of the orthodox sons in the Holy Spirit of the Holy Ruthenian Church]? The potential answer that resounds in the text accompanying the *Letters* – in the *Preface (to the reader)*, unsigned, but most likely penned by Mohyla – may be the existence of a Polish printed version of Lucaris’ *CF*. Nevertheless, I have not been able to confirm this

information either in bibliographies or in the literature of the subject: no mentions of a translation into Polish are to be found, unlike translations into Greek, English, French or German, which are not only mentioned in compendia or studies, but are available for research.

The answer to the question articulated at the outset of this section can be found in *Lithos*, where Pimin states overtly that “W daniu sprawy o Artikułach Wiary po Słowiensku ani po Graecku pytájącemu po Łácinie álbo po Polsku z mieszáną Łáciną odpowiedzieć potrzebá ale tákowymże ięzykiem iakowym go pytáią odpowiedzieć powinien” [When explaining the Articles of Faith, answers should not be given in Church-Slavonic, Greek, Latin or in Polish with Latin elements, but one should answer in a language in which the questions are posed] (1644: 375). The same argument appeared in the preface to the reader of the Ukrainian translation of *Zebranie krótkiej nauki o artykułach wiary prawosławno-katolickiej chrześcijańskiej* [*Concise Collected Teachings on the Articles of the Orthodox-Catholic Christian Faith*]. Mohyla reveals that one of the main reasons for publishing the catechism first in Polish was a desire to “shut the mouth of shameless liars; those who, being the main enemies of the Eastern Orthodox Church, dared to slander and defame the Orthodox Catholic Church with various heresies” (*Catechism* 1996: 54–56). This tallies with the significance of Polish as a language of polemical disputes held in the Ukrainian territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which is frequently pointed to in the literature, and Parthenius’ letters are often quoted in evidence. An obvious example is Witold Doroszewski’s position on the issue. According to this researcher, Polish took over the role of the Church-Slavonic language and became “almost an exclusive language of religious conflicts waged in defence of Orthodoxy” (1938/1939: 100). Doroszewski’s view is shared among others by Giovanna Brogi Bercoff – an expert in multilingual Ruthenian (Ukrainian) literature. According to her, “[P]olish was not only an instrument of disseminating knowledge about Ruthenian laws and traditions in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and in the Catholic parts of Europe. It was also a prestigious and sophisticated means of expressing highly exalted topics in religious polemics. As such, it was also of use to royal and church powers to stimulate intellectual life, which to a large extent influenced the process of transmitting the Western erudition-based culture to the East through the medium of Polish culture” (Brogi-Bercoff 2014: 330). This mediation is also referred to by Agnieszka Mielczarek and Bogdan Walczak, who state directly that the Polish language was regarded as the “high-culture language” in the Ruthenian, Muscovite and Romanian territories, and that it was fashionable enough to be learned by individuals and taught at schools (Walczak and Mielczarek 2017: 261).

One has to keep in mind that Polish in the 17<sup>th</sup>-century Kiyv did not have the status of a foreign language, nor was its use confined to religious or literary texts. Conversely, one can quote R. Radyszewskij’s claim that “[P]olish was widely

used in management and government practices. (...) It was frequent in socio-political life. It was the language of education, science and literature, which related to the Latin-Polish model of education, promoted in the territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Attending schools, the Ruthenians found themselves under its influence and began to use Polish in everyday communication. It was also used as a means of communication by educated classes, depending on the communicative situation and the addressee” (Radyszewskyj 1996: 9–11).

#### 4.3. The Polish of the *Letters*

The Polish of the *Letters* unveils its characteristic qualities at all the language strata. As regards phonetics, these defining features include contrast between raised *á* and non-raised *a* (*ále, zasłonioná, chmurá, za, światłem*), distribution of nasal vowels (*potempieni, przeklientego*), denasalisation of nasal vowels (*szate, minelo, przyieli*), secondary nasalisation of vowels (*uczęśnicy, nąki, więzząc*), secondary anticipatory nasalisation (*przekłęstw*), raised *é* realized as {i} (*namniy*), redundant palatalization (*cechi, Patriarchi, przychilność*), disturbed palatalization (*przewelebnym, utrapeniem, fałszyrsky*), disturbed alternation between *l* and *ł* (e.g. *zakroczyli, lecz, stolice, kłamiwy, pelne, blogostawiony*), depalatalization of *-l’-* (*przeklientego, oddaliony*), or marking palatalization with a palatalized consonant instead of a consonant followed by *i* (*pożyću, światłośćą*). Morphological features worth noting include coexisting (free) variants of superlative prefixes (*naymilszym, naswiętszego, preoświeconemu, przewielebnieysz*), past and conditional verb forms with the element *-ch-* (*odprawowalichmy, zyczylibychmy*), passive participles in simple declension (*iest podano y stwierdzono*), masculine plural instrumental case marker *-emi* (*przewielebnieyszemi, przerzeczonemi*), feminine plural genitive and locative marker *-e* (*Cerkwie, krwie, w pszenice*) and the reduced variant of the inflectional ending for first person plural (*poddaiem*). Syntactic distinctiveness is marked by the use of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction (*osqđzil one byđż iedneyże cechi; samą figure byđż powiadaiaq*), causative genitive with the preposition *od* (*nie uczoną od ludzi, ále od Duchá S.*), and the modified agreement in prepositional constructions (*czyniac stáránie o wszystkich Cerkwiách*). All these language features constitute in part typical manifestations of the normalizing processes in the 17<sup>th</sup>-century Polish. In part, they reveal regional traits, which allow interpreting the text under analysis as representative to the variety Polish that is subject to my research and which I name Kyivan Polish. Under my definition, Kyivan Polish is a ‘territorial variety of the Polish literary language – functioning in the 17<sup>th</sup>-century circles of the Polish and Ruthenian intelligentsia, gathered around Kyiv-Mohyla Academy – with its

physical, textual realization in the prints produced by the Pechersk Lavra printing office' (Klimek 2010c: 188–189).

Both the originally Polish introductory poem as well as the author's foreword and the Polish translations of the *Letters* unveil a noticeable number of language interferences. Both Latin and Church-Slavonic intrusions are to be found in all the parts of the printed text. Latin interferences are more frequent and more diverse – from single lexemes, phrases to biblical quotes<sup>10</sup>: *blasphemia, capita, de foris, intercessia, primo & perse, providentia, praesupponiue, nie immediate aē mediate, tota pulchra est & maculam non habet*. The Church-Slavonic intrusions are scarcer, and what is particularly noteworthy, each case is a lexical item ending already in Polish inflectional suffixes, e.g.: *Sosłużytelami, sosłużyteley, ihumenami, archiepiskopami, exarsze, archimandryta*. The scarcity of the Church-Slavonic interferences – which seem naturally related to the denominational environment in which *Letters* were composed – can be surprising at first sight. Yet, this state of affairs matches in full the regular practices of the time. As I was able to determine working on a corpus of 17 texts in Kyivan Polish, the Church-Slavonic lexical interferences are confined solely to the domain of the sacred: biblical quotes, prayers and church vocabulary (including titles of Orthodox hierarchs). Latin interferences also predominantly pertain to the area of religious topics, with the leading position of biblical quotes, followed by citations from conciliar and synodal documents, patristic texts as well as other religious and philosophical terms (Klimek 2013a).

## 5. From heresy/forgery to catechism

Although even before Lucaris' death the originality of the Calvinist *Confessio* was questioned, and at subsequent Orthodox councils and synods the theses contained therein were rejected, Lucaris himself neither orally nor in writing ever denounced his participation in the creation of the disputed *CF* (as pointed out, among others, by the Catholic polemicist Ivan Dubovich 1644: 116). This is one of the reasons why opinions on Lucaris and his authorship of the *CF* remain divided until this day. Tomasz Kempa claims that "the publications devoted to Lucaris published so far are full of (...) errors, and perhaps also deliberately false accounts" (Kempa 2007: 87), while Paul Ladouceur admits that there is a lack of evidence necessary for a conclusive decision concerning either the authorship or the forgery:

<sup>10</sup> The poem *Na potwarce* [On the Slanderer] is preceded by a quote from the Ecclesiastes (4,1), and followed by a quote from Psalm 7 (7,15–17). The *Foreword...* is followed by a quote from Psalm 91 (91,13), erroneously marked as 9. All these quotes stay in direct connection with the content of the *Letters* and their historical and religious context.

Supporters of Cyril point to the Orthodoxy of his other writings, to his denials of authorship of the Confession and to his steadfast opposition to Roman influence, especially in Eastern Europe. They also argue that Cyril was caught in the crossfire between Catholic and Protestant European countries, recognizing that he did indeed turn to the embassies of the Protestant powers for support against the intrigues of the Jesuits and the Catholic ambassadors at Constantinople against him. Those who think that the Confession truly reflects Cyril's views cite evidence of Calvinism in certain letters and the fact that Cyril never issued a public denunciation of the Confession (2019: 18).

Ukrainian researchers unanimously claim that the *CF* attributed to Lucaris is a forgery which caused confusion among the Orthodox faithful (Zhukov'skij 1996: 9). Chrysostom (Archbishop of Etna, Exarch of America) also definitely states that both the Latin and Greek versions of Lucaris' *CF* are forged texts. He claims that although the Latin publication of Orthodox doctrinal texts in Geneva was not unheard of in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the arguments for the forgery are to be sought in the linguistic layer of the *Confession* and in Lucaris' steadfast and unnegotiated doctrinal views. According to the exarch:

Patriarch Kyrillos could not have produced a polished text such as that of the original Latin "Confession". Indeed, many Greek scholars even dispute the claim that the Greek text, which appeared together with the Latin text four years later, was the work of Lucaris. Rather, it is argued by most Greek scholars that the text was essentially the work of Calvinist scholars with whom Cyril communicated on a regular basis and who condensed many of his letters and exchanges into a conveniently Calvinistic confession that ignored the Patriarch's Orthodox understanding and grasp of reformed theology (Chrysostom).

Chrysostom attributes the occurrence of both the false *Confessio* and the "legend of the Protestant patriarch" to the Papacy and the Roman Church. He also puts the blame on the papacy for Lucaris' death – as discussed above. In his view, "his [Lucaris'] so-called 'Confession', whatever its true source, is a mere footnote to his struggle against Papism. It was THIS anti-Latin Lucaris who supported Protestant opposition to Papism, who perhaps allowed his views to be restated and published by his Calvinist contacts in Geneva, and who earned the enduring hatred of the Papacy" (Chrysostom). Interestingly enough, Stephanie Falkowski adopts a view contrary to Chrysostom of Etna's. In her take, the linguistic analysis of the *CF* provides major evidence for the actual Lucaris' authorship of the *CF*. Referring to textological data, Falkowski writes: "[t]here is an extant manuscript that is clearly in Lucaris' handwriting. The language used echoes that of his other writings. We have multiple records of him having admitted it to be his, and none of his denial of it, nor of any effort to counter it" (2018: 48). According to Antony J. Khokhar, the argument that tips the scales of

the dispute in favour of Lucaris' authorship is the fact that he signed the Greek translation of the Geneve *CF* (2015: 5).

In his monographic article on *Oktoich*, Mirosław Kruk mentions a Parthenius' decree contained in the second of the letters analysed in the present article, and assesses the authenticity of the *CF*. He does so in a more indirect way than the other scholars quoted above. He uses the phrase "catechism 'erroneously' attributed to Cyril Lucaris" (Kruk 2009), and the inverted commas do not seem to be either accidental or mistaken. The opinion issued on the topic by the Byzantinist Steven Runciman is far more definitive. He does not only assert Lucaris' authorship of the *CF*, but even sees it as a manifesto of the patriarch's personal convictions: "Cyril Lucaris's Confession, issued some thirty years later, was intended to cover the whole range of his belief. But, though Cyril hoped for its acceptance by the Church, it was a personal statement, unlike Jeremias's, which had been issued with the concurrence of the Holy Synod; and its Calvinistic tendencies of the 'Confession' raised such a storm that an authoritative Confession seemed more than ever necessary" (Runciman 1968: 339–340). And this is where the fates of the three dignitaries are intertwined again.

Unlike the Roman Church, which from the earliest centuries used the Trinitarian creed, which over time became instrumental in control of doctrinal purity, Orthodoxy had no creed of a similar status. The Latin text of *Confessio Fidei Orthodoxae* published in Geneva in 1629 as Lucaris' text became a milestone for the systematisation of the doctrine. How is it possible that until that time the Orthodox Church had not worked out either a confession of faith or a catechism? Marek Melnyk writes that "in Mohyla's time, the function of authoritative dogmatic statement that could be recognized and pursued by the Orthodox Church in general was realized by the correspondence of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah II (...) with the Evangelical theologians of the University of Tübingen. They are an excellent example of the fact that Orthodox theologians did not feel a need for a textual formulation of the teaching of the fundamental truths of faith, and if they did, it was due to the influence of Latin theology, as if in response to the questions that arose as a result of the theological controversies in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries within Latin Christianity, which ultimately led to the split in the Catholic Church and the emergence of Evangelical Churches in Western Europe" (Melnyk 2009: 222). The situation changed in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and the Orthodox Church lived to see its formalized confession of faith as a unified catechism. Its author was no one else than Peter Mohyla. In 1640, he called a synod in Kyiv, where he wanted to present his proposal of the *Orthodoxa Confessio Fidei*, originally written in Latin. This effort was unsuccessful because the synod participants, fearing doctrinal errors, agreed only to the provisional introduction of the confession of faith, and decided to present the whole text to the Patriarch of Constantinople,

Parthenius I.<sup>11</sup> The latter dignitary withheld the approval of the new confession of faith until the Synod of Kyiv officially condemned the Calvinist traces in the *CF* by Lucaris. Then Mohyla turned for help to Basil Lupul, who, using his strong position in the Orthodox Church, led to the convening of the Synod of Jassy in autumn 1642, and got Mohyla's *Creed* approved with alterations (Kania 2000–2001). Yet, Mohyla resigned from the publication of the full text of his *Creed*, and decided to unveil its abbreviated version to the public, with its prior approval from the Synod of Kyiv of 1640. This abbreviated catechism is contained in the aforementioned text of *Zebranie krótkiej nauki o artykułach wiary prawosławnokatolickiej chrześcijańskiej* [*Concise Collected Teachings on the Articles of the Orthodox-Catholic Christian Faith*], which was published in 1645 by the Pechersk Lavra printing house. For reasons explained above, the publication was first issued in Polish and then in its Ruthenian translation. The full Greek version of the catechism appeared in 1667 in Amsterdam (Melnyk 2008: 111), having previously received the approval from the Patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius and the Patriarchate of Constantinople (Runciman 1968: 344).

## 6. Concluding remarks

Irrespective of how difficult (if possible at all) it is to exhaustively settle the issue of the authorial status of *Confessio Fidei*, the two letters under discussion published by the Polish section of the printing house at the Kyiv Lavra mark the point of encounter for three leading figures of the 17<sup>th</sup>-century Orthodox Church. The first was Cyril I Lucaris, notorious for his scandalous pro-Protestant claims, a many-time Patriarch of Constantinople and a supposed author of a heretical confession of faith, a saint and a martyr. The second was Parthenius I – a persistent defender of Lucaris, propagator of the thesis of the false authorship attribution, reaching for the heaviest canonical weapons in defence of his predecessor's name. The third person was Peter Mohyla – creator of the first Orthodox catechism (which remains the fundamental exposition of Orthodox spirituality today) and an Orthodox saint.

On the basis of both linguistic and extralinguistic evidence it has been argued in the course of the paper that Mohyla was most likely the translator of

---

<sup>11</sup> It was impossible to avoid juxtaposing two *creeds*, written at more or less the same time: Lucaris' and Mohyla's. Georgy Florovsky calls Mohyla a crypto-Catholic and states that "the Confession was more closely linked to the Roman Catholic literature of its day than to either traditional or contemporary spiritual life in the Eastern Church" (*The Ways of Russian Theology*, online; cf. Korzo 2002: 142–143). K. Onoszko believes that Mohyla's catechism was meant to correct the errors committed in the *CF* (1931). Runciman, in turn, claims that "[a]s in the case of Cyril Lucaris and his Confession, attempts have been made show that it was not his own work" (Runciman 1968: 340).

Parthenius' letters. Even though this fact is hard to infer from the *Letters* and their textological scaffolding, the use of Polish that harmonises with what Mohyla thought about its instrumentality in polemical use, the embedded polemical panegyric and the strictly grammatical traits leave no doubt – at least in my view – as for the authorship of the analysed text. The article also brought confirmation for the essential position of the 17<sup>th</sup>-century Polish language, which turns out to be influential not only among the Catholic community of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but also among the entire educated population of the multinational state, as confirmed by its role in the denominational doctrinal disputes covering the Eastern territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

## References

- Brogi Bercoff, G. 2014. Ruś, Ukraina, *Ruthenia*, Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie, Rzeczpospolita, Moskwa, Rosja, Europa Środkowo-Wschodnia: o wielowarstwowości i polifunkcjonalizmie kulturowym. In Alberti A., M. Garzaniti, S. Garzonio (eds.), *Contributi italiani al XIII Congresso internazionale degli slavisti*, 325–387. Firenze: Firenze University Press.
- Chrysostomos. *The Myth of the „Calvinist Patriarch”*. (online: [http://orthodoxinfo.com/inquirers/ca4\\_loukaris.aspx](http://orthodoxinfo.com/inquirers/ca4_loukaris.aspx); 10.11.2018)
- Calian, C.S. 1992. *Theology without Boundaries: Encounters of Eastern Orthodoxy and Western Tradition*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Confessio fidei reverendissimi domini Cyrilli patriarchae*. 1629. (online: [https://books.google.pl/books?id=UoQtaxuxy5AC&printsec=frontcover&source=gb\\_s\\_atb&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.pl/books?id=UoQtaxuxy5AC&printsec=frontcover&source=gb_s_atb&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false); 10.03.2021)
- Cruz Palma, O. de la and Starczewska, K.K. 2011. O tłumaczeniach Koranu na łacinę. *Przegląd Tatarski* 1: 18–21. (online: [http://bibliotekatararska.pl/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/pt09\\_srodek.pdf](http://bibliotekatararska.pl/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/pt09_srodek.pdf); 10.03.2021)
- Cruz Palma, O. de la. 2006. *La traducción latina del Coran atribuida al patriarca de Constantinopla Cirilo Lucaris (1572–1638)*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Dąbrowska, M. 2017. Trame controluce. Il patriarca „protestante” Cirillo Loukaris. Backlighting Plots. The „Protestant” Patriarch Cyril Loukaris.... *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* LXI: 319–325.
- Doroszewski, W. 1938/1939. Z dziejów języka polskiego na ziemiach wschodnich. *Poradnik Językowy* 6: 96–100.
- Dubowicz, J. 1644. *Hierarchia abo o Zwierzchności w Cerkwi Bożej*. Lwów: Drukarnia Jezuitów.
- Encyclopedia Britannica* (online: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Cyril-Lu-caris>; 20.11.2018)

- Falkowski, S. 2018. *Not Quite Calvinist: Cyril Lucaris a Reconsideration of His Life and Beliefs*. School of Theology and Seminary Graduate Papers/Theses. (online: [https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/sot\\_papers/1916](https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/sot_papers/1916); 18.03.2021)
- Golubev, S.T. 1898. *Kyevskiy mitropolit Petr Mogila i yego spodvizhniki* vol. 2. Kiev: Typohrafiya H. T. Korchak'-Novytskago.
- Grumel, V. 1958. *Traité d'études byzantines. I, La chronologie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Hadjiantoniou, G.A. 1948. Cyril Lucaris: his life and work. Typescript. (online: <https://era.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/10292>; 9.03.2021)
- Hryniewicz, W. 1979. Cyryl Lukaris. *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, vol. III. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Hodana, T. 2008. *Między królem a carem. Moskwa w oczach prawosławnych Rusinów – obywateli Rzeczypospolitej (na podstawie piśmiennictwa końca XVI–połowy XVII stulecia)*. Kraków: Scriptum.
- Jaskóła, P. 2011. Małżeństwo w nauce pism wyznaniowych kościołów reformowanych, *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego* 31: 243–250. (online: [http://www.rtso.uni.opole.pl/pdf/31%20\(2011\)/2011\\_13-Jask%C3%B3%C5%82a.pdf](http://www.rtso.uni.opole.pl/pdf/31%20(2011)/2011_13-Jask%C3%B3%C5%82a.pdf); 10.06.2018)
- Kania, J. 2000–2001. Doktrynalne uwarunkowania tożsamości Kościoła prawosławnego w Polsce międzywojennej. *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 7: 237–248.
- Katehizys Petra Mogily*. 1996. V. Shevchuk (trans.). Kiev-Parizh: Vidavnicvo "Voskresinnya".
- Kempa, T. 2007. Wizyty protosyngła Cyryla Lukarysa w Rzeczypospolitej. In A. Mironowicz, U. Pawluczuk and W. Walczak (eds.), *The Orthodox Church in the Balkans and Poland. Connections and Common Tradition*, 87–103. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
- Khokhar, A.J. 2015. The 'Calvinist Patriarch' Cyril Lucaris and his Bible Translations. *Scriptura* 114: 1–15 (online: <http://www.scielo.org.za/pdf/scriptur/v114/21.pdf>; 10.03.2021)
- Klimek, J. 2009. Prolegomena do poloników kijowskich z XVII wieku. In W. Książek-Bryłowa, H. Duda and M. Nowak (eds.), *Język polski. Współczesność. Historia*, vol. 7, 189–203. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Klimek, J. 2010a. Formy aorystyczne w XVII-wiecznych polonikach kijowskich. *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 6: 29–40.
- Klimek, J. 2010b. Konstrukcja accusativus cum infinitivo w XVII-wiecznych polonikach kijowskich. *Poznańskie Spotkania Językoznawcze* 21: 61–75.
- Klimek, J. 2010c. Status polszczyzny kijowskiej w świetle granic i zasięgu polszczyzny kresowej. In M. Kuźmicki and M. Osiewicz (eds.), *Żywe problemy historii języka*, 179–191. Poznań: Wydawnictwo PTPN.
- Klimek, J. 2013a. Barbaryzmy w polskich drukach kijowskich (1633–1698). In Ch. Zaremba, and I. Kor Chachine (eds.), *Travaux de slavistique: actes du VIe Congrès de la Slavic Linguistics Society*, 49–61. Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence.

- Klimek, J. 2013b. Z fonetyki “Listów Święte<sup>o</sup> Oycy Partheniusza” (1643). *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 37: 575–584.
- Korzo, M. 2002. Prawosławne wyznanie wiary Piotra Mohyły. *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* XLVI: 141–149.
- Kruk, M.P. 2009. Oktoich lwowski z 1630 r. Historyczne i kulturowe związki między Rzeczpospolitą, Mołdawią i Księstwem Moskiewskim. *Porta Aurea* 7/8: 45–108.
- Ladouceur, P. 2019. *Modern Orthodox Theology: Behold, I Make All Things New*. London: T&T Clark.
- Likowski, E. 1907. *Unia brzeska (1596 r.)*. Warszawa: Skład główny w Księgarni Gebethnera i Wolffa.
- Loop, J. 2013. *Johann Heinrich Hottinger: Arabic and Islamic Studies in the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Melnyk, M. 1997. Memoriał unijny Piotra Mohyły z lat 1644–1645. *Nasza Przyszłość* 88: 181–201.
- Melnyk, M. 2008. Św. Piotr Mohyla – reformator prawosławia w Rzeczypospolitej. *Ethos* 1: 99–116.
- Melnyk, M. 2009. Geneza pierwszego prawosławnego katechizmu z 1645 r. In J. Gwioździk, (ed.) *Ars Educandi, Źródła*, vol. 1, 219–232. Myslowice: Górnośląska Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna.
- Michaelides, G.P. 1943. The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lucaris. *Church History* vol. 12(2): 118–129.
- Mikołajczuk, K. 2016. Pojęcie i cel kary w Kościele. Rys historyczno-prawny. *Studia Prawnicze KUL* 1: 81–106.
- Nicolaidis, E. 2016. Western Influences on Greek Scholars. The scientific education of Greek Orthodox during the seventeenth century. In Y. Fehige (ed.), *Science and Religion: East and West*, 214–226. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Nicolaidis, E., and E. Delli, N. Livanos, K. Tampakis, G. Vlahakis. 2016. Science and Orthodox Christianity: An Overview. *Isis* vol. 107, 3: 542–566. (<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.1086/688704>)
- Onoszko, K. 1931. *Nauka Piotra Mohyły o Kościele i jego hierarchji*. Lwów: Towarzystwo „Biblioteka Religijna”.
- [Partheniusz] 1645. *Listy święte<sup>o</sup> Oycy Partheniusza...* Kijów: Z drukarnie Pieczarskiego Monastera.
- Pastor, von L. 1938. *The History of the Popes. From the Close of the Middle Ages*. D.E. Graf (trans.). London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
- [Pimin] 1644. *Lithos to iest Kamień z procy prawdy...* Kijów: Z drukarnie Pieczarskiego Monastera.
- Pindór, J. 1883. *Krótką historia kościoła chrześcijańskiego*. Cieszyn: Ewangelickie Towarzystwo oświaty ludowej w Cieszynie.
- Radyszewski, R. 1996. *Polskojęzyczna poezja ukraińska od końca XVI do początku XVIII wieku. Cz. 1. Monografia*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Oddziału Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

- Runciman, S. 1968. *The Great Church in Captivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smotrycki, M. 1629. *Exethesis abo abo Expostulatia, to iest rozprawa między Apologią y Antidotem o ostanek błędów haerezy i kłamstw Zyzaniowych, Philaletowych, Orthologowych i Klerykowych uczyniona*. Lwów: Drukarnia Jana Szteligi.
- Starczewska, K.K. 2012. *Latin Translation of the Qur'ān (1518/1621). Commissioned by Egidio da Viterbo. Critical Edition and Case Study*. Doctoral Thesis supervised by Dr Óscar de la Cruz Palma (online: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/78530936.pdf>; 30.03.2021)
- Suhareva, S.V. 2013. *Prosimetrum w polskojęzycznej polemice na Ukrainie po Unii Brzeskiej*. *Religious and Sacred Poetry: An International Quarterly of Religion, Culture and Education* 1: 91–104.
- [SXVI] Urbańczyk, S. and M.R. Mayenowa (eds.). 1966-. *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. Wrocław–Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Walczak, B., and A. Mielczarek 2017. Prolegomena historyczne – wielojęzyczność w Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów. *Białostockie Archiwum Językowe* 17: 255–268.
- Zhukov'skij, A. 1996. *Katehizis Petra Mogyly*. In *Katehizis Petra Mogyly*. V. Shevchuk (trans.) 5–32. Kiev and Paris: Vidavnictvo "Voskresinnya".