

*Alfons Bruening*

## «Voevodych zemli moldavskoi»... Peter Mohyla's Youth and Political Heritage

Literature on Metropolitan Peter Mohyla and his reforms tends to fill libraries. Yet in all the many works, articles and studies little space is being devoted to his early years, provenience and youth. Influences, which possibly might have left their impact on his character and aims are being named and described only superficially. Most data on his experiences between his birth and his election as archimandrite of the Kievan Cave's monastery are tainted with doubts or even are contradictory. The still most comprising biography on Mohyla, S.T. Golubev's voluminous study of the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, devotes only about 50 pages (in large print) of the first volume to the first 30 years of the Metropolitan, who only reached 50 years of age at all<sup>1</sup>. Not so much has changed since then. In majority younger biographers only sporadically are able to add new information, and mostly rely on those given by Golubev, despite their age<sup>2</sup>. Rumanian and Moldavian historians sporadically have added details during the recent years<sup>3</sup>, but little use of those data has been made in more recent biographies<sup>4</sup>.

So which were the influences of his early time as son of Moldavian hospodars? Which heritage did he take from there? Where – a question mostly speculated about – did he get his education? What was his position before becoming the

famous churchman? And, mostly discussed in nearly any work on him, which was the significance of Western influences on his personality? There is a lot of uncertain, unclear data in this sketch, giving space to speculation and interpretation – due to an often mentioned lack of sources for the period in question.

Yet in fact this gap is not so great and empty as it seemed, even on the base of already published material. Much errors and speculation still widespread in literature can easily be cleared up, putting together various pieces out of the library already filled with studies on Mohyla. Two aspects often neglected up to now can help for a better perspective: Most important in this respect is it to have in mind his political position and involvement in the events around the Polish-Ottoman border. Narrowly linked with this position is his Byzantine heritage, which was that of the Moldavian hospodars in general. Additionally, and more practically, many information on Mohyla's early years are still hidden between the lines of documents already examined, and a closer look can make it possible to find them.

One of the best examples in this request is simultaneously telling much basic on Mohyla's personality. It is the admonition written in 1631 at the address of his younger brother Moise Movila,

<sup>1</sup> Golubev S.T. Petr Mogila i ego spodvizhniki. – Kiev, 1883/1898. A bit more on Mohyla's family can be found in the Rumanian work of Gh. Ennaceanu, Petru Movila mitropolitul Kievului, Bucarest 1886. Yet this work is a bibliographical rarity and nearly never quoted or referred to.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Zhukovs'kyj A. Petro Mohyla i pytannja jednosti cerkov, (1) – Paris, 1969; (2) Kiev 1996; Ionesco T. La vie et l'oeuvre de Pierre Movila. – Paris, 1944.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. M. Cazacu, Pierre Mohyla (Petru Movila) et la Roumanie: Essai historique et bibliographique, in HUS 8, 1984. – P. 188–221.

<sup>4</sup> A good example is the second edition of A. Zhukovs'kyj's work (see fn. 2) in Kiev in 1996, which, although enlarged by illustrations and appendices, on its introductory pages doesn't differ significantly from the precedent edition. See also the different articles in encyclopedias published since then, as e.g. W. Heller, Mogila, Petr in Bio-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon. – Vol. 6, Herzberg 1993. – P. 18–21; F. von Lilienfeld, Petrus Mogila, in Theologische Realenzyklopädie. – Vol. 26. – P. 303–307; Planck P. Mogila Petr, in Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). – Vol. 7, 1998, col. 372; Hauptmann P. Mogila Petr in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. – Vol. 5, 2002, col. 1392.

who by then had just become hospodar in Moldavia. The metropolitan there depicts in summarizing terms the duties and obligations of an ideal worldly ruler of an Orthodox country. A special accent is laid, no wonder in case of a churchman, on duties against the church. According to Mohyla's sentences the duke, emperor, or hospodar should care for a good shape of this church, its buildings, institutions and its wealth. Even more he has to supervise the fostering and spreading of the right, pure Orthodox faith, and on this behalf to provide the church with good schools, books and learning. Mohyla introduces his address with quite significant words: «Although I'm convinced, that you are aware of all these your obligations, for you have been taught them from childhood on, I present them to you once again in short, in brotherly love»<sup>5</sup>. Here one only has to remember, that Peter Mohyla, himself son of Moldavian hospodars, writes this to his younger brother, posed behind him once on the hereditary order. So it is easy to conclude, that Mohyla tells here implicitly, what he himself was taught during his youth<sup>6</sup>. And obviously he remained faithful to these early lessons. Caring for the right faith, for its deepening and spreading by books and school teaching, caring also for buildings, institutions, material welfare – in any respect this is what Mohyla did later, in his Kievan period.

Sure, he meanwhile did it in a different position, as a churchman. But several historians gave

expression to the fact, that the former «*voevodych zemli moldavskoj*»<sup>7</sup>, even after entering clerical rank has kept up most of the characteristics of a mighty prince, used to give commands and to expect obedience<sup>8</sup>. As it seems, there are basic elements of continuity in his career, which on the other hand had its turnings and breaks, making a servant of the church out of the former son of princes. What may have been these elements of continuity?

Peter Mohyla's date of birth most probably was December 21<sup>st</sup>, 1596 (December 31<sup>st</sup> in new style)<sup>9</sup>. The place of birth is still not sure, but it might have been Moldavian Suceava, where his uncle Jeremia Movila, and his father Simion, stayed at this time. Jeremia Movila then reigned Moldavia as hospodar for about one year. In 1595 he was lifted to the throne with help from the Polish Chancellor Jan Zamoyski<sup>10</sup>. These two parts, the tradition and self-understanding of Moldavian hospodars one the one hand, and the cooperation with the powerful and influential Polish Chancellor and his collaborators, on the other, where decisive for the milieu, in which young Peter Mohyla, together with his five brothers<sup>11</sup>, grew up.

As for the first: Tradition and self-understanding of the Moldavian hospodars in many respects referred to Byzantine Emperors. Soon after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 several states in South Eastern Europe claimed for them-

<sup>5</sup> The text together with a french translation is published by D.P. Bogdan. Les Enseignements de Pierre Movila à son frère Moise Movila, in: *Cyrrilomethodianum* 1, 1971, see esp. p. 22 (French translation p. 25). See also F. I. Titov (ed.). *Materialy dla istoriji knyzhnoji spravy*. – Kiev, 1924. – No. 38.

<sup>6</sup> Of course, Mohyla did not only refer to lessons taught by any simple teacher, but as much to Byzantine mirrors of princes, which where as much widespread in Moldavia. One exemple well known is that of the Hospodar Neagoe Basarab (reigned 1512–1521), written for his son. Bogdan Cf. *Les Enseignements* (fn.6 above). – P. 1–4. As it seems, Jeremia Movila also has left instructions to his heirs, insisting that they should at first strengthen the church, on behalf of the salvation of their souls. Ionesco Cf. *La vie et l'oeuvre de Pierre Movila* (fn. 2). – P. 19. Mohyla later edited another famous mirror of princes, at the beginning of his period as archimandrite of the Lavra: *Ljubomudrejshago kyr Agapita Diakona ... Glavizny Pouchitelny ...* – Kiev, 1628. Cf. also Jakovenko N. *Paralel'nyj svit. Doslidzhennja z istoriji ujavlen' ta idej v Ukajini XVI–XVII st.* – Kiev, 2002. – P. 321. It is likely that Mohyla knew this widespread work since his Moldavian youth.

<sup>7</sup> Mohyla used the title in Lavra publications at least until 1632, see e.g. Titov. *Materialy* (as in fn. 6). – No. 30–38.

<sup>8</sup> See e.g. Florovsky G. *Puti russkago bogoslovija*. – Paris, 1937 (Reprint New York 1983). – P. 44; Hauptmann P. *Petrus Mogilas // Fries H. G. Kretschmar* (eds.). *Klassiker der Theologie*. – Vol. 1. – Munich, 1981. – P. 383; recently also Jakovenko N. *Paralel'nyj svit* (as fn.7). – P. 319 ff. (on the base of the contemporary chronicle of Joakim Jerlicz).

<sup>9</sup> In this case the date already given by Golubev S. *Petr Mogila* (fn. 1). – P. 6–8 (in old style) is accurate. See Semchyns'ky. *Do dyskussiji* (as in fn. 5), *passim*.

<sup>10</sup> See E. de Hurmuzaki (ed.) *Documente privitoare la istoria Romanilor*. – Vol. IV, 1. – Bucarest, 1882. – No. 169, 172; Iorga N. *Histoire des Roumains et de la Romanité orientale*. – Vol. V. – Bucarest, 1940. – P. 374 f.; see also the article on Mohila Jeremiasz // *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*. – T. XXI. – Warszawa, 1976. – S. 565; Miculescu-Prajescu I. *New data regarding the installation of the Movila princes*, in: *Slavic and East European Review* 49, 1971. – P. 214–234.

<sup>11</sup> Six sons of Simion Movila can be traced in the sources at all, but sources and literature still differ. See e.g. the article on Mohila, Szymon, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*. – Vol. XXI. –Warsaw, 1976. – P. 574; Golubev S. *Petr Mogila*. – Vol. 1. – P. 6; Hurmuzaki. *Documente* (as in fn. 11). – No. 339. – P. 397.

selves the ideal of orthodox states, reigned by orthodox rulers who regarded themselves as successors of the Emperors of Byzantium. The story behind these claims was, that Christian Byzantium in an idealistic manner should have survived, should not have been destroyed, but translated to other rulers and territories to be kept there for re-birth. Mainly the Rumanian hospodars of the states of Walachia and Moldavia put themselves in this tradition of «Byzance après Byzance», as the Rumanian scholar Nicolae Iorga has named it<sup>12</sup>. Since the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, Rumanian princes used the title of «Car», and referred genealogically to Byzantine Emperor families as their ancestors. Especially Moldavia, the state, and the Moldavian church with the Metropolitan of Suceava at its head, was regarded, and regarded itself as a «bulwark of Orthodoxy»<sup>13</sup>. A high ideal of responsibility for faith and church, and of personal integrity and virtue in the light of the Orthodox faith was connected with this tradition on the part of the hospodars.

Orga had outlined his observations on Rumania in a very general sense<sup>14</sup>, and in his opinion the Movila princes, as friends of the Poles and with alleged sympathies for Catholicism, were an exception from these traditions<sup>15</sup>. Yet this statement was hasty and not accurate. Any of the attributes ascribed to the ideal Orthodox ruler after 1453 can be found in case of the Movila family as well – be it Byzantine ancestors back to Roman times<sup>16</sup>, be it the image and ideal of the ruler against the back of imperial heritage<sup>17</sup>. Peter Mohyla's allusion in the already mentioned address to

his younger brother therefore refers to traditions of his house, his ancestors, in which he grew up himself. A strong, even severe religiosity, and piety, with a developed sense of obligation, obedience and devotion to God's will had been part of this<sup>18</sup>.

On the other hand the cooperation of the Movila princes with Poland-Lithuania, and of Ieremia Movila in particular, was not so much a question of sympathy or cultural adherence to Western or Polish patterns<sup>19</sup>, but one of political strategy in a quite complicated constellation. In their case, the main protector in fact was in Poland – not the king, but the Crown Chancellor Jan Zamoyski, whose political aims and interests in this region were of a special, singular character. Zamoyski's course was mainly anti-Habsburg, while searching for peaceful agreements with the Ottoman neighbour. Personal links of the Movila brothers Ieremia and Simion to Zamoyski dated from the late 1580's; a short term later they received the Polish *indigenat* (a sort of noble citizenship, connected with the right to possess land in the Commonwealth and take part in local diets together with other members of the *szlachta*) out of the hands of the Chancellor<sup>20</sup>.

Much of the scenery changed in the middle of the first decade of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Chancellor Zamoyski died in 1605. Ieremia Movila died in June 1606<sup>21</sup>, leaving the throne to struggles among his relatives. Peter Mohyla's father Simion at the end was successful to succeed his brother, but could make use of his power only about a year. He died already at the end of 1607 – rumors spread in diplomatic circles in Ottoman Constantinople said, he

<sup>12</sup> Iorga N. Byzance après Byzance. Continuation de l'histoire de la vie Byzantine. – Bucarest, 1935 (Reprint Paris 1992). See also D. Nastas. L'idée impériale dans les pays roumains et le «crypto-empire chrétien» sous la domination ottomane, in: Symmeikta kentru byzantion ereunon, 4, 1981. – P. 201–250; Nasturel P. Considerations sur l'idée impériale chez les Roumains // Byzantina 5, 1973. – P. 397–411.

<sup>13</sup> Völkl Cf. E. Das Fürstentum Moldau und die Ostslaven im 15. bis 17. – Jahrhundert, Wiesbaden, 1975. – P. 26–32.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. in Iorga's work (fn. 13) esp. p. 130–205.

<sup>15</sup> Iorga. Byzance après Byzance. – P. 157; see also Nastas. L'idée impériale (fn. 13). – P. 205f.

<sup>16</sup> Rumors sometimes referred to the Flavia house of Constantinople as to ancestors of the Movila family, see. e.g. Miculescu-Prajescu. New data (fn. 11). – P. 221. Others felt able to pretend, the Movila had been relatives of the Byzantine families Dukas, Palaiologos, Kantakuzenos – see e.g. K. Niesiecki. Herbarz Polski. – Vol. VI. – Leipzig, 1841. – P. 449.

<sup>17</sup> See esp. the depiction of Ieremia Movila in the chronicle of Miron Costin: – «Grausame Zeiten in der Moldau» – Die Moldauische Chronik des Miron Costin (1593–1661), transl. and comm. Armbruster A. Graz/Cologne/Vienna 1980. – P. 73; Miculescu-Prajescu. New data (fn. 11). – P. 218–220.

<sup>18</sup> This impression e.g. can be taken from Peter Mohyla's own notes, and in particular from the few stories he tells from his youth, see e.g. Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii. – Vol. 7, 1. – Kiev, 1886. – P. 79–81; p. 84f.; Kievskie Eparkhialnye Vedomosti. – 1862. – No. 3. – P. 80–82.

<sup>19</sup> Polish language and culture in fact was of a certain influence in Moldavia then, not only in case of the Movila house. Chancellery documents in majority were written either in Slavonic (Ruthenian), or, increasingly, in Polish. Cf. E. Linta. Documentele in limba polona emise de cancelariile domnilor romani, in Romanoslavica 13. – 1966. – P. 169–187.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. C. Rezachevici. Privilegiu de indigenat polon acordate locuitorilor din tarile romane // Revista de Istorie, 28. – 1975. – P. 1096f.

<sup>21</sup> Cazacu M. Pierre Mohyla (fn. 3). – P. 204; art. Mohila Jeremiasz (fn. 11). – P. 568.

was poisoned by Jeremia's envious widow Elizaveta<sup>22</sup>. The remaining family, consisting of his mother Margareta-Melania Movila<sup>23</sup>, and his five brothers, had to flight from Moldavia to Poland<sup>24</sup>. They found asylum in Dziadżyłow (Djadyliv), one of the possessions of Stanisław Żółkiewski, then one of the leading figures of the Zamoyski party after the death of the Chancellor<sup>25</sup>. Here they staid for the following years.

Concerning the young Movila princes, it was not only charity that led Żółkiewski to offer them home on his goods. During the period then to come he slowly but surely rose to the rank of Crown Chancellor and Crown hetman of Poland, taking on himself the political role, the great Chancellor Zamoyski once had played. And his route and strategy were similar, when he tried hard to keep peace at the Polish-Ottoman border, and to sustain his favourites on the Moldavian throne on this purpose. In connection with his aims the Movila princes, potential heirs of the hospodar title and loyal to Poland, were kept as a sort of hostages. Young Peter was one of them<sup>26</sup>.

The years spent in Poland simultaneously were those of Mohyla's education. As far as we can see today, different elements contributed to the development of his thoughts and adherences during these years. It is most likely, however, that he already had received basic lessons on Orthodox faith, when he entered Poland at the age of about 10 or 11 years. Some time ago testimony has been detected, that he was taught them by an Orthodox

pope, named Chrystofor Volkovyc'kyj<sup>27</sup>. This may have taken place still in Moldavia. One can learn from his own notes, that he had his first and impressive experiences concerning the value and strength of the faith, when still being at the court in Moldavia, in the land of his forefathers<sup>28</sup>. In Poland, education on this base continued, now enriching the thinking of the young prince by impressions of the Polish *szlachta* milieu. The L'viv brotherhood school however, often given as the basic institution of learning in Mohyla's case, most likely was not visited by him, despite the links of his family with the brotherhood<sup>29</sup>. The first of the different impressions came from the Żółkiewski court. Staying at a noble court in Poland at those times in fact meant an experience of education. Mohyla, together with a numerous staff of other noble sons and lower rank members of the *szlachta*, was part of the clientele of the influential and powerful hetman Żółkiewski. To keep the chance and once be lifted to higher dignities by the grace of the magnate, any of these members made efforts to learn whatever necessary for a Polish nobleman<sup>30</sup>. Military abilities certainly belonged to the qualities needed, and most likely the youth was trained in things like fighting and riding at such courts<sup>31</sup>. Yet the lessons were not limited to this. Public opinion in Poland much agreed, that a noble court could not deserve higher praise than being a «school in politics» for the youth. In particular instruction was received from taking part in the political life. Observing the processes of deci-

<sup>22</sup> According to the relation of Miron Costin (as fn. 18), p. 62; see also Hurmuzaki. Documente (as fn. 11). – Vol. IV, 2. – No. 284. – P. 291.

<sup>23</sup> On Peter Mohyla's mother Margarita-Melania Hara see Cazacu. Pierre Mohyla (fn. 3). – P. 199–201.

<sup>24</sup> This date is the most propable among the different versions on the flight of the Movila family to Poland. Some versions postpone this flight up to 1612, see e.g. Ennaceanu. Petru Movila (as in fn. 1). – P. 156f.; F. von Lilienfeld. Petrus Mogilas (as fn. 4). – P. 303.

<sup>25</sup> Zolkiewski might have been a relative of Mohyla's mother, but this link is not yet clear. See e.g. Cazacu. Pierre Mohyla (fn. 3). – P. 206; Rezakevych K. Zv'iazky kyivs'koho arkhiepyskopa Petra Mohyly z moldavs'kymy kniazivstvamy // Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal'. – 1996. – No. 3. – P. 78. On Zolkiewski in general see Prochaska A. Stanisław Zolkiewski. – Warsaw, 1929; Nagielski M. Stanisław Zolkiewski // Hetmani Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodow. – Warsaw, 1995. – P. 129–140.

<sup>26</sup> Rezakevych. Z'viazky (as fn. 26). – P. 78; Cazacu. Pierre Mohyla (fn. 3). – P. 207.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Ja. D. Isaevych. Preemniki Pervopecthatnika. – Moscow, 1981. – P. 61–63.

<sup>28</sup> See fn. 19, above.

<sup>29</sup> The L'viv brotherhood school as source of Mohyla's education once again is given by Golubev S. Petr Mogila. – Vol. 1. – P. 16. Golubev gives no evidence in sources in his hypothesis, and nothing in favour of it has been found since then. See also the remarks of Hrushevs'kyi M. Istoria Ukrains'koi literatury. – Vol. VI, 2. – Kiev, 1996. – P. 160. The only hint of contact between the L'viv teachers and the Movila princes in Poland is a short letter written in 1614 by Margarita-Melania Movila to the brotherhood (from Diadyliv). See Hurmuzaki. Documente (fn. 11). Suppl. II, 2. – No. 198. – P. 387f.; also in Monumenta Ucrainae Historica. – Vol. I. – No. 494. – P. 320f. Besides, the letter could hardly refer to Peter, who nearly had 18 years of age at this time.

<sup>30</sup> On the milieu of a magnate's court see Mączak A. Klientela. Nieformalne systemy władzy w Polsce i Europie XVI–XVIII wieków. – Warszawa, 1994. – S. 284–298.

<sup>31</sup> On Mohyla's experiences in this context see already Ennaceanu. Petru Movila. – P. 158f.

sion, discussion, organizing majorities, gathering groups, all this was a heady experience for many of the young, which were allowed access to the diets sessions<sup>32</sup>. In case of Mohyla, many events of his future life show, that he had become sufficiently familiar with usages of Polish political life.

However, these experiences could not provide him with the higher education, the later Metropolitan of Kiev obviously had. So is it true, that during these years Mohyla took upon himself a long journey throughout Europe, with studies either in Paris, or in Oxford, or in Holland, or even in Rome? Did he somewhere in the West receive his knowledge of Latin, his familiarity with Western literature, and theological patterns? To say it in short, the often repeated hypothesis about such a *peregrinatio academica* through the west has not any base in the sources, and its quite more likely, that it never took place, for a number of reasons. Firstly, Mohyla may have been an educated man, as many of the Polish and Ruthenian nobles around him were, but his education was not so illustrious, as often pointed out. An evaluation of Mohyla's own writings, in any case, does not show an erudition, which he could not have taken in Poland. There is to be noted a good familiarity with Holy Scripture and with traditional teachings of Orthodoxy, and Mohyla seems to have liked some writing of the Old Testament in particular. Additionally his Polish obviously was better than his Ruthenian, and his Latin much more developed than his Greek. His writings, even the Ruthenian ones, are interspersed with Polish leanings and Latin sequences – a habit quite widespread among Polish and Ruthenian noblemen in this time<sup>33</sup>. Secondly, Mohyla at the court of Żół-

kiewski was not a simple rank and file noble son, but a potential heir of the Moldavian throne, and a hostage at the disposal of the Chancellor and Hetman. Żółkiewski, as can be proved<sup>34</sup>, did not recommend such study tours abroad in general, differing in his opinion from many of his contemporaries. Additionally, even less he would have appreciated this in case of his hostage and protégé, the Moldavian prince, whose presence in Poland was well known in Constantinople<sup>35</sup>. A tour of this potential heir of the Moldavian throne throughout Europe always threatened to generate that sort of diplomatic confusions, the Great hetman tried hard to avoid. So the simple fact that the name of Mohyla does not appear in any of the lists and registers to be examined, neither in Paris nor in Rome nor in Oxford<sup>36</sup>, can here be best explained by realizing, that he simply has never been there.

Instead, the remaining traces very much show unto a place of typical education for a nobleman of the Polish Commonwealth. Most of the paths lead to the academy of Zamość, once in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century founded by Zamoyski, the former important protector of the Movila family. Żółkiewski, himself an adherent of the ideals of the old «*trybun szlachecki*», for his own son recommended learning at this place<sup>37</sup>. This academy is the only institution of higher learning to be named expressively in Mohyla's own writings – it is not clear, however, whether these sequences refer to his own stay there, but they can be read like this<sup>38</sup>. Sure, Mohyla was also not officially enrolled in Zamość. The recently published *matricula* of the Academy do not have his name, as they have them for a great amount of other Ruthenian and Orthodox noblemen<sup>39</sup>. Nevertheless, in this case Mohyla might

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Zoładz. D. Ideały edukacyjne doby staropolskiej. Stanowe modele i potrzeby edukacyjne szesnastego i siedemnastego wieku. – Warszawa-Poznań, 1990. – S. 56–62. On the diets see Włodarczyk J. Sejmiki jako szkoła wychowania obywatelskiego (na przykładzie sejmików sieradzkiego i łeczyckiego) // J. A. Gierowski (ed.) Dzieje kultury politycznej w Polsce. – Warszawa, 1977. – S. 69–86.

<sup>33</sup> A good example is Mohyla's dedication of the polemical work: *Lithos, albo kamien...*, Kiev, 1644, see *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*. – Vol. I, 9. – P. 1.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *Pisma Stanisława Żółkiewskiego*, ed. A. Bielowski. – L'viv, 1861. – P. 171f.; see also Golubev S. *Petr Mogila*. – Vol. I. – P. 49.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Hurmuzaki, *Documente* (as fn. 11), Suppl. I, 1. – No. 244. – P. 168f. (report on Simions sons in Poland, June 1613).

<sup>36</sup> I have examined esp. Błazhejovs'kyj D. *Byzantine Kyivan rite students in pontifical colleges and in seminaries, universities and institutes of Central and Western Europe (1576–1983)*. – Rome, 1984; *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford 1500–1714, their parentage, birthplace and years of birth, with a record of their degrees, being – The Matriculation Register of the University*. – Vol. III, (Reprint) Neudeln/Liechtenstein, 1968. On the Sorbonne in Paris see already Malvy A., Viller M. *La confession orthodoxe de Pierre Mogila, métropolitte de Kiev*. – Paris, 1927, introduction p. IX and fn. 2 (no entrance of Mohyla's name in any possible variation found in the lists of the university).

<sup>37</sup> See fn. 35 above.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Mohyla's dedication of the *Triodion cvetny* of 1631 to Tomasz Zamoyski, see Titov. *Materialy* (as in fn. 6). – No. 36. – P. 243.

<sup>39</sup> *Album studentów Akademii Zamoyskiej 1595–1781* / Wyd. H. Gmiterek. – Warszawa, 1994, esp. p. 20f.

have heard lessons here. A vivid and active Orthodox parish was placed near Zamość, provided with privileges from the part of the Zamoyskis. The brotherhood there, shaped and built according to the image of that of L'viv, also sustained a school<sup>40</sup>. Many of the teachers and students also visited lessons in Zamość. This for example can be taken for sure in case of Kassian Sakovych or Sylvestr Kosiv, Mohyla's later Kievan collaborators<sup>41</sup>. Learning at academies or even universities in Early Modern times in general was not necessarily connected with being enrolled and achieving academic degrees. In fact it very often was not. In Zamość it was not either. In sum, in spite of missing testimony in any of the so far examined listings of students, the most paths and hints on Mohyla's education seem to lead to the Zamość academy. Not the least among them is the shape of his education, as it can be reconstructed out of his writings. It includes especially elements of a Polish-Lithuanian nobleman, with high estimation of Latin and rhetorics, as it was required at the diets – this in fact was the main scheme behind the lessons in Zamość, aimed to make ideal members of the Republic of Nobles out of the pupils<sup>42</sup>.

After all this, Mohyla was well prepared to take his part in his homeland, as Moldavian hospodar, when he newly entered the political scene in 1621. To be sure, his time wasn't yet to come in the battle at the little river of Cecora a year earlier, when in fights against Ottoman troupes and Tatars his protector Zolkiewski lost his life. The Polish candidate for the Moldavian throne then was the

Albanian Gaspar Gratiani, while Peter Mohyla wasn't yet mentioned, and remained behind the stage<sup>43</sup>. A year later, when the army of the Ottomans and the Polish companies and Cossacks met at Chotyn', at the Polish-Moldavian frontier, Mohyla in the ranks of the Poles fought bravely and jealously, hoping to regain at this moment the throne of his ancestors<sup>44</sup>. But the battle ended in a draw, peace negotiations and diplomatic haggling about the Moldavian case began. The peace contract signed after all in 1624 did not mention Mohyla any more. The complete decline in status, the ambitious son of a princely family of Orthodox rulers must have feared then, could not easily be exaggerated. Several entrances on the diets at Vyšnia in the Galician region, where he owned goods and was therefore a legal member of the local *szlachta*, testify his efforts during the following years to regain sustain from official side and the king in particular<sup>45</sup>.

Yet somewhere in the middle of the 1620's Mohyla began to put up with the loss of his ancient perspective. Although still a layman<sup>46</sup>, he obviously oriented himself to the Kievan Church<sup>47</sup>. In the capital of Polish-Lithuanian Orthodoxy there were mainly three persons, whose interests slowly opened another way for the son of Moldavian hospodars. One was Metropolitan Iov Borec'kyj, former teacher of the L'viv brotherhood school and therefore quite aware of the reputation of the Movila house in favour of the Orthodox church, and of Mohyla's devotion to faith<sup>48</sup>. The second one was the Ruthenian magnate Adam Kysil, by then ad-

40 Cf. Budilovich. A. Russkaia pravoslavnaia starina v Zamost'e. // Cholmsko-Varshavskii eparkhial'nyi Vestnik, 1885. – No. 10. – P. 137–142; No. 11. – P. 155–157; No. 13. – P. 184–191; No. 14. – P. 203–208.

41 See on these persons e.g. L.E. Makhnovets. Ukrain's'ki pysmennyky. – Vol. I. – Kiev, 1960. – P. 511 (Sakovych) and p. 565 (Kosiv).

42 On the program in Zamosc see St. Lempicki. Działalność J. Zamoyskiego na polu szkolnictwa. // Mecenat Wielkiego Kanclerza. – Warszawa, 1980. – S. 237–278; Witusik A. O Zamoyskich, Zamościu i Akademii Zamoyskiej. – Lublin, 1978. – S. 48–68.

43 On the battle near the Cecora river see Costin M. Moldauiische Chronik (as fn. 18). – P. 80–90; see also Iorga. Histoire des Roumains (as in fn. 11). – Vol. V. – P. 510–512.

44 On reports on Mohyla's participation in Chotyn see e.g. Hurmuzaki. Documente, Suppl. II, 2. – P. 467, 469; Sobieski Jakob. Commentariorum Chotiniensis belli libri tres. – Gdańsk, 1645. – P. 32; see also Golubev S. Petr Mogila. – Vol. I. – P. 54; Hrushevs'kyj M. Istoriia Ukrain's'koi Literatury. – Vol. VI, 2. – P. 161; Cazacu. Pierre Mohyla. – P. 208.

45 Cf. Akty grodzkie i ziemskie. – T. XX – Lauda wiszeńskie 1572–1648 r. – Lwów, 1909. – No. 147. – P. 217 (1624), No. 149. – P. 225 (December 1625). On Mohyla's domains in the region see his testament, in Pamiatniki, izdannye vremennoiu komissieiu... – Vol. 2. – Kiev, 1846, otd. 1, No. 12. – P. 165.

46 At the end of 1626 the L'viv brotherhood noted having sold a book «Petraškovy, hospodarchykovy voloshkomu», which most probably is Mohyla, cf. Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii, I. – Vol. 11. – P. 369; see also Isaevych. Preemniki Pervopechatnika (as fn. 29). – P. 22.

47 Mohyla has visited Kiev with the famous Cave's Monastery regularly once a year since 1622. Cf. his note on this in Arkhiv Iugo Zapadnoi Rossii, I. – Vol. 7. – P. 85; see also Golubev S. Petr Mogila. – Vol. I. – P. 55; Ennaceanu. Petru Movila (as fn. 1). – P. 162; Hrushevs'kyi M. Istoria Ukrain's'koi Literatury. – Vol. VI, 2. – P. 161f.

48 On Borec'kyi see e.g. Makhnovets. Ukrain's'ki pysmennyky (as fn. 42). – P. 216–221; Chodynicky K. Borecki Jan // Polski Słownik Biograficzny. – T. 1–2, 1935/36. – S. 315–317.

vancing already into the role of the leading figure of the Ruthenian Orthodox camp in the Republic<sup>49</sup>. The third one was Tomasz Zamoyski, son of the late Great Chancellor, then Voevod of Kiev, leader of the political scene and executor of the Polish interests in the region<sup>50</sup>. Zamoyski, as well as Kysil might have known Mohyla already from their common time in Zamość several years earlier, and thus have had a strong idea of his loyalty to the Polish state, despite his Orthodox orientation. So when in spring 1627 the influential see of the archimandrite of the Cave's Monastery became vacant through the death of Zacharij Kopystens'kyj, Mohyla was their favourite among the number of different candidates. Consequently, although not without several struggles and conflicts before, he was elected archimandrite in August 1627. Mohyla was not only the candidate of the church or the monks. The decisive word came from the local nobility, with personalities like Zamoyski and Kysil at its head. It was the diet of the Kiev region, together with the monks of the monastery and Kievan burghers, which made this election, according to pri-

vileges existing since the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>51</sup>. Soon afterwards Mohyla's election was confirmed by the king<sup>52</sup>. Mohyla quite certainly was elected still being a layman<sup>53</sup> – his ordination took place later, presumably in December 1627<sup>54</sup>.

Numerous tasks were waiting for him. The way he took upon himself the burden of reforming the church, in many ways told about his former life and career. The high estimation he gave to education and book printing was to a high degree due to his experiences with the Polish nobility. With them he shared his appreciation especially of rhetorics and Latin, and of the ability to dispute and convince. Not by chance his founding of the Kievan College gave prevalence to these factors. On the other hand, the above mentioned impressions of historians, naming him still a ruler and prince, only in Episcopal habit, were true as well. Mohyla did not only lead the Kievan church, he reigned it. In a way, he did not leave the path once shown him by his ancestors, when he now governed the Byzantium which had ideally survived the fall of Constantinople – the Orthodox church.

<sup>49</sup> On Adam Kysil see Frank E. Sysyn. *Between Poland and the Ukraine. The Dilemma of Adam Kysil*. – Cambridge/Mass., 1985.

<sup>50</sup> On Tomasz Zamoyski and his role see Jarmański L. *Tomasz Zamoyski wobec spraw publicznych i wyznaniowych // Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*. – T. 25. – 1981. – S. 113–138.

<sup>51</sup> The privilege of king Sigismund I from the year 1522, granting autonomy to the local population in electing the Cave's Monastery archimandrite, is // *Arkhiv Zapadnoi Rossii*. – Vol. II. – No. 112. On Mohyla's election see *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, I. – Vol. 6. – P. 585–589; see also Isaevych. *Preemniki* (as in fn. 28). – P. 61.

<sup>52</sup> Golubev S. *Petr Mogila*. – Vol. I, prilozhenia No. 51. – P. 296f.

<sup>53</sup> Former authors often pretend Mohyla having entered monastic life already in 1624 or 1625. In fact, the bishop M. Smotryc'kyi has pointed out in a later report, that Peter Mohyla had still been a layman when in August 1627 he participated in a convention in Kiev. See already Golubev S. *Petr Mogila*. – Vol. I, prilozhenia No. 57. – P. 327.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.* – P. 79.