

# THE INSTITUTE OF THE PATRIARCHAL EMISSARY IN THE METROPOLITANATE OF KYIV AT THE END OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY BASED ON THE ACTIVITY OF ARCHDEACON CYPRIAN OSTROGSKI

Andrzej Borkowski

DOI: 10.17846/CL.2023.16.2.82-90

**Abstract:** BORKOWSKI, Andrzej. *The Institute of the Patriarchal Emissary in the Metropolitanate of Kyiv at the End of the Sixteenth Century Based on the Activity of Archdeacon Cyprian Ostrogski*. The patriarchal emissary's role in the Metropolitanate of Kyiv at the end of the 16th century consisted of informing the patriarchate about the church's situation, promoting education and undertaking translation activities. Their intellectual and spiritual formation took place under the careful supervision of the patriarchate, initially at the Greek school in Venice and later at the University in Padua. Patriarchal emissary Archdeacon Cyprian Ostrogski maintained close contact with the patriarchal exarchs in the Commonwealth and the main representatives of the Orthodox nobles. He had excellent knowledge of the Greek language, culture and philosophy and was the main receiver and translator of Patriarch Meletius Pegas's writings. As a translator from Greek, he actively participated in the anti-union Orthodox synod in Brest in 1596. Thanks to the information he received from Cyprian, the Patriarch was fully aware of the potential the educated teaching staff could have and about the situation in the Metropolitanate of Kyiv.

**Keywords:** *Orthodox Church, Patriarchal Emissary, Archdeacon Cyprian, Meletius Pegas, Metropolitanate of Kiev*

Until now, separate studies and articles that analyse the institution of patriarchal emissaries (πατριαρχικῶν ἀπεσταλμένων) in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the end of the 16th century have not been presented in literature on church history, with the exception of the institution of patriarchal exarchs (Borkowski 2014, 103-120). When exploring the activity of the emissary of the locum tenens to the throne of the Ecumenical Patriarch Meletius I Pegas, Archdeacon Cyprian Ostrogski, the most important research problems should be outlined. How might the relations between the King of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Patriarch of Constantinople at the end of the 16th century be characterized? What exactly was the role of the patriarchal emissary? What was involved in the process of his intellectual and spiritual formation? What competencies did he possess, and what were his responsibilities towards their spiritual authorities? With whom did he maintain close contact in the ecclesiastical circles of the Commonwealth and the Patriarchates of the East? This article is innovative in nature. For the first time, patriarchal emissary has become the subject of a separate study (Jasinovs'kij<sup>1</sup> 2015, 298-300). The specific nature of this area of research required the use of source materials. The source materials used for writing this article include Meletius Pegas's published correspondence referring to the activity of his emissary, Archdeacon Cyprian, in the Metropolitanate of Kyiv. His epistolography found in the Patmian Codex 396 and

---

<sup>1</sup> The articles listed above do not comprehensively cover the topic.

a collection of patriarchal letters proved to be particularly useful (Legrand 1902; Methodios 1970 – 1975; Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1915, 500-518).

Patriarchal emissary, Archdeacon Cyprian Ostrogski, was active in the period of Sigismund III, King of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Roman Catholic Church's intensive proselytism. The state's strategy based on political violence and the intrigues of the Jesuits resulted in the Union of Brest. The activity of the anti-union circles was, in fact, limited to showing, as best as possible, the differences between the teachings and traditions of both churches in order to prevent undesired influences. The destructive activity of the apostate bishops gave rise to controversy and concern among the faithful of the Orthodox Church, who turned to the Patriarchates of the East for immediate assistance. As a result of violating canon law and church discipline on the part of some of the Orthodox hierarchs of the Metropolitanate of Kyiv, the Eastern Church decided to part ways with it. The Patriarch of Constantinople confirmed the resolutions of the local anti-union synod in Brest by endorsing them in an opinion sent in 1597 (Methodios 1975, 190, n. u. 241). Later, Patriarch Meletius Pegas<sup>2</sup> appointed patriarchal exarchs to function as overseers in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on behalf of the Ecumenical Throne. Prince Konstanty Ostrogski, Gedeon Balaban, the Orthodox Bishop of Lviv, and Protodyngellos and Archimandrite of the Patriarchate of Alexandria, Cyril Lucaris, were chosen (Methodios 1974, 539, n. u. 180; DPIR XIII 1909, 429-433, n. u. 18/16; Malyševskij 1872, 44-48, n. u. 17). The Patriarch granted them the right to exercise temporary administration of the Metropolitanate of Kyiv until worthy archpastors were consecrated to serve in the place of the apostate bishops (Bulgakov 1996, 150, 161-162; Zaikin 1930, 83-84; Chodynicky 2006, 347-348; Mironowicz 2006, 253). Furthermore, he also advised them to cooperate with Patriarch Jeremias's exarch, Archdeacon Nikephoros, with the goal of preserving the purity of the Eastern Church's dogmas and traditions, sanctioned by the ecumenical councils and local synods (Methodios 1975, 190, n. u. 241; MCSL I 1895, 509-512, n. u. 308; Welykyj 1970, 27-30, n. u. 13).

The main recipient of Patriarch Meletius's letters was his trusted emissary, Archdeacon Cyprian of Ostrog, who had an excellent knowledge of the Greek language, culture and philosophy. Moreover, he proved to be extraordinarily useful as a translator (Broniewski 1995, 37, 52; BH IV 1896, 217-220, n. u. 40, 41, 45-48; Haralampovič 1898, 274-275). Thanks to Prince Konstanty Ostrogski's efforts, Archdeacon Cyprian was initially sent to the Greek school in Venice, and after graduating, he entered the University of Padua. As a Greek translator, he actively participated in the Orthodox anti-union synod in Brest in 1596, during which he acted as a translator for the Bishop of Lviv, Gedeon, and the Igumen of the Kievan Monastery, Nikephoros. He served as

---

<sup>2</sup> After the death of Jeremias Tranos, Meletius Pegas was chosen to be the next Patriarch of Constantinople (locum tenens of the Patriarch of Constantinople between 1596-1598, Pope-Patriarch of Alexandria between 1590-1601). He never accepted this position. In a second vote, the synod appointed Mathew II to the Ecumenical Throne (January-February 1596). At the end of March, Gabriel I was proclaimed Patriarch (March-beginning of June 1596), who, despite his sincere desire, was unable to cope with the overwhelming difficulties he faced and tragically died at the end of June 1596. The Metropolitan of Athens, Theophanes Karykes, served as locum tenens for a short period from June to December 1596. Meletius was nominated once again; and this time, he accepted and served as locum tenens from December 1596 to February 1597. Finally, the Metropolitan of Athens, Theophanes Karykes was chosen (end of February to 26 March 1597), who died after two months of holding the office of patriarch. In response to the earnest pleas made by the members of synod, at the end of March 1597, Meletius agreed to assume the role of temporary administrator of the Ecumenical Throne, while still remaining on the Alexandrian Throne (Gedeon 1885 – 1890, 536-541; Paraskeuaidis 1971, 153). He secretly hoped that he could finally incline Gabriel Severos or Maximos Margunios to become patriarch. However, they refused. As a result, Meletius had no choice but to administer the Patriarchal Throne until April 1598.

archdeacon to the Protopapas and Chorepiscopus of Ostrog, Ignatius,<sup>3</sup> which we may conclude on the basis of a phrase used by Meletius Pegas in his letter addressed to him (Methodios 1974, 513-514, n. u. 160; DPIR XIII 1909, 419-420, n. u. 18/9). Being addressed by the Patriarch as protothron and chorepiscopus may indicate that he had been chosen at a synod in Constantinople to serve as bishop in Ostrog. In another letter from 1598, Meletius exhorted Cyprian to persist in his efforts for the good of Christianity and to follow spiritual principles that would assist him in resisting the attacks of the demons (Methodios 1975, 175-176, n. u. 219).

The Patriarch was keenly interested in the ecclesiastical matters of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; therefore, he requested that Cyprian inform him about the developing situation more frequently. He instructed Symeon, who arrived in the Commonwealth, to remind him of the promises he had made and the scope of competencies expected of patriarchal emissaries. He also referred to books, unknown to us today, sent by a certain Kavvak and also those sent by Cyprian, which brought comfort in times of despondency. Meletius thanked him for his letters filled with Greek erudition (Methodios 1975, 183-184, n. u. 233). He was particularly impressed with the progress Cyprian was making in his studies and ensured him of his fatherly affection. Thanks to the information that Cyprian sent regularly, Meletius was perfectly aware of the potential of the Metropolitanate of Kyiv's teaching staff, whom he encouraged by means of his letters to intensify their educational work among Orthodox Christians. With this in mind, he wrote a letter dated 6 June 1597 to the Protopapas and Chorepiscopus of Ostrog, Ignatius, in which he commended him for his zealous faith and education, called him a wise and enlightened teacher and encouraged him to combat the erroneous system of scholastic knowledge in Latin theology (Methodios 1974, 513-514, n. u. 160; Chodynicki 2006, 327).<sup>4</sup>

Meletius reminded Cyprian of his commitment to dealing with the crucial issue of educating the Orthodox community, which would bring tangible benefits to the Metropolitanate of Kyiv and enrich his personal experience and knowledge. Therefore, this task was to conscientiously carry out the Patriarch's orders if he truly cherished teaching, even more so, because he was sent from Constantinople to Ostrog to assist the Orthodox community with the knowledge he possessed. The Patriarch was particularly disturbed by the faithful's low level of religiosity, which could be improved by means of education. He noticed a temporary improvement in the situation as a result of his letters and the intervention of Prince of Ostrog, which convinced him all the more of the purpose of his correspondence aimed at strengthening the Church and increasing the faithful's religious devotion (Methodios 1975, 183-184, n. u. 233).

Archdeacon Cyprian combined the extremely responsible functions of emissary and translator on behalf of the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Alexandria. The correspondence between Lucaris and Archdeacon Cyprian, who most probably met while still in Constantinople or during their studies in Venice or Padua, is an extraordinarily valuable source of information on the situation of Orthodoxy in the Commonwealth. Thanks to the letters of his friends and co-workers, the exarch was informed about the actions taken by the Latin propagandists. Thanks to

<sup>3</sup> Protopapas, Protothron and Chorepiscopus of Ostrog, Ignatius. He initially served as deacon in Busk near Lviv. Around 1587, the Lviv Brotherhood employed him as a school teacher. As a result of a conflict with the local bishop, he transferred to a school in Vilnius. In June the following year, he returned to Busk, and in 1594, he was appointed parish priest of the Castle Church in Ostrog and regional preacher. He actively participated in the anti-union synod in Brest in 1596, for which he earned the particular respect of Patriarch Meletius Pegas (Mic'ko 1990, 91-92, 95, 122, 124).

<sup>4</sup> Ignatius is presumed to be the author of two polemic works published in connection with the discussions held between the centre in Ostrog and Uniate bishop, Hypatius Pocij. Historians have long tried to establish who stands behind the pseudonym "the cleric of Ostrog." Naumow 2002, 35, 235-239, 249, 250, 279, 284, 286, 287; Stradomski 2003, 35, 47, 170-173, 177-179, 183, 270.

the committed translator, Archdeacon Cyprian, Lucaris remained in constant contact with people from the cities he had previously visited, including Zviahel (Σβιάλιον),<sup>5</sup> Dubno and Ostrog. The preserved correspondence between them, starting with a letter Cyprian sent on 15 January 1596 from Lviv, clearly shows the difficult and hostile atmosphere in which they conducted their mission. The author explained that he had become the subject of unfair accusations made by representatives of the Commonwealth, which he had no intention of answering. This fact proved how demoralized was the society in which Cyprian had to live and work for the sake of his ecclesiastical authorities. Lucaris immediately sent a letter of recommendation addressed to the Patriarch to the archdeacon delegated by the centre in Ostrog to Constantinople through someone named Joasaf. They both counted on the Patriarch to make a visit (BH IV 1896, 218, n. u. 41).

After receiving an invitation from Konstanty Ostrogski, Lucaris left Konstantynów<sup>6</sup> on 19 July 1596 (BH IV 1896, 219, n. u. 44). Three days later, he reached Zviahel, where he informed the prince in a letter dated 22 July 1596 that he had arrived at the designated place. At an important meeting, the assistance of a seasoned translator was necessary. For this reason, he did not fail to mention that he had brought Cyprian, “a diligent student”, who knew Greek perfectly and was useful during common discussions (BH IV 1896, 219, n. u. 45). Lucaris also sent a separate letter to Cyprian in this matter (BH IV 1896, 220, n. u. 46), informing him that he had received two letters from the Prince of Ostrog written by him. These letters caused him great joy because they showed that they both were not only zealous confessors of the true faith but that they also had a great love for Greek culture and philology. At the same time, he ordered him to come immediately.

Despite his numerous pastoral and diplomatic responsibilities, Lucaris did not neglect his commitments to education and teaching theology. In a letter dated 12 August 1596, he requested Cyprian to send the writings of the Byzantine historian Cedron and Thomas Aquinas (BH IV 1896, 220, n. u. 47). Several months later, on 2 December 1596, he was forced to cancel his trip to Ostrog due to various circumstances. As a result, he sent Cyprian the necessary books. He asked him to come to the prince's residence, where he was staying, despite the fact that he intended to leave shortly afterwards (BH IV 1896, 220, n. u. 48). In all likelihood, this last known letter of Lucaris heralded his departure from the Commonwealth as his stay there was becoming more and more dangerous.<sup>7</sup>

With the assistance of his experienced emissary Cyprian, Patriarch Meletius commended the Bishop of Lviv, Gedeon, for his zeal in struggling against the bishops causing upheaval and scandal in the Orthodox Church (Methodios 1974, 519, n. u. 168; DPIR XIII 1909, 420, n. u. 18/11). In a letter addressed to Gedeon in 1597, we learn about his steadfast faith in contrast to those who had renounced their unity with Christ for human glory. With regards to Gedeon's questions, he referred him to his previous and new letters sent through Cyprian, who was on his way to the Commonwealth. Moreover, he advised him to maintain proper relations with the brotherhood, show respect for the stauropegion and prayerfully commemorate the patriarch. In response to Gedeon's questions and others Archdeacon Cyprian had previously informed him about, the Patriarch sent a detailed clarification through Symeon (Methodios 1974, 577-578, n. u. 204; DPIR XIII 1909, 435, n. u. 18/19). At the beginning, he urged him to translate his writings into the Old East Slavic language and then publish them with the Greek originals to equip the Orthodox Church in the Commonwealth with more arguments to use in their polemics with the Latinists. In response to Gedeon's request to fill the abandoned positions in the diocese with worthy clergy

<sup>5</sup> In 1795, the city was renamed Novohrad-Volynskyi.

<sup>6</sup> Currently, Starokonstantynów is a city in the Khmelnytskyi Oblast in Ukraine.

<sup>7</sup> Another patriarchal exarch, Archdeacon Nikephorus Parasches-Kantakuzen paid for his further stay in the Commonwealth with a martyr's death.

sent from the Patriarchate, Meletius ensured him that the ecumenical throne intended to do so, but due to the crisis and extraordinarily difficult situation in the East, he was unable to carry out his plan at that time (Methodios 1974, 577-578, n. u. 204).

In one of his letters addressed to Cyprian, Meletius referred to his correspondence with the Bishop of Lviv, in which he mentioned the real causes of the scandals, both those experienced at that time and previously. Therefore, he advised Gedeon to act wisely and avoid scandalous behaviour in relation to the Orthodox Christians and to abstain from fierce reactions to the apostate bishops. Gedeon explained his actions by claiming to be unaware of the Patriarch's position, and the contents of the letter addressed to the King (Methodios 1975, 184, n. u. 233). Meletius's correspondence with the Bishop of Lviv brought the desired effects. It appears that it also led to reaching an agreement with the brotherhood because the Patriarch expressed satisfaction for that reason. He praised Gedeon and the faithful for not only remaining steadfast in the faith but also for defending it. We learn about this in the Patriarch's letter delivered by Hieromonk Isaac from Alexandria in 1599 (Methodios 1975, 179-180, n. u. 227).

Acting as *locum tenens* of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Meletius sent a letter dated 4 April 1597 to Prince Konstanty Ostrogski and the faithful in the Commonwealth. He informed of his protégé Archdeacon Cyprian's arrival at the Patriarchate's headquarters to give valuable information about the Orthodox Church's situation in the Commonwealth and receive spiritual guidance (Methodios 1974, 500-501, n. u. 144; AJZR II 1865, 195, n. u. 162; Malyševskij 1872, 68-70, n. u. 19; MCSL I 1895, 794-796, n. u. 452). Due to the extremely unfavourable religious situation in which the Orthodox Christians found themselves, the Patriarch asked the prince to seek the intervention of King Sigismund III, the state authorities, and the Sejm. The state was obliged to ensure its citizens with equal rights and religious freedom. In addition, he instructed the faithful not to accept any innovations or to exceed the boundaries set by the Holy Fathers. On another occasion, the Patriarch commended the prince for his bravery shown in defending Orthodoxy (Methodios 1974, 503-504, n. u. 148; Malyševskij 1872, 73-74, n. u. 21), and simultaneously described the difficulties faced by the Great Church of Christ in Constantinople, which was experiencing an internal crisis.

Patriarch Meletius openly expressed his reasons for writing another letter to the prince. According to him, appreciating the merits of noble men was always advisable and favourable, and he always commended him for his devotion and noble deeds (Methodios 1974, 517, n. u. 165; Malyševskij 1872, 74-75, n. u. 22; DPIR XIII 1909, 420, n. u. 18/10).<sup>8</sup> He sent another letter to the prince through his beloved spiritual child, Archdeacon Cyprian, in which he encouraged him to remain steadfast in the faith of the Holy Fathers of the Eastern and Western Churches based on the resolutions of the seven ecumenical councils. The Patriarch wrote that since these great lanterns of the Church stood their ground in preserving the purity of the faith, we are also obliged to become the Church's worthy soldiers. He realized that his visit to the Commonwealth was necessary, even more so because both he and the Prince of Ostrog desired it. However, the time was not appropriate due to the outbreak of war in the Middle East. As a result, he could not step foot outside of his own home.<sup>9</sup> In this situation, he sent the synod resolutions through Cyprian. We know that Meletius, based on information obtained from Cyprian, sent a letter in 1597 to Prince Konstanty's treasurer, Gleb, commending him for his virtuous life, zealous faith, devotion to the Orthodox Church and respect for the Patriarch (Methodios 1974, 517, n. u. 169;

<sup>8</sup> Although the letter does not mention the date and location in which it was written, it can be assumed that it was written, as was the case with previous letters, in 1597 in Constantinople.

<sup>9</sup> Patriarch Meletius was most likely referring to Sultan Mehmed III's war against Austria in 1595 – 1596.

Malyševskij 1872, 75-76, n. u. 23; DPIR XIII 1909, 421, n. u. 18/12). In addition, he requested once again that he not delay in setting up a school and printing house.

Cyprian encountered several difficulties in sending and delivering correspondence. In 1599, Meletius provided information about the fate of lost letters sent from Ostrog to Constantinople by Archdeacon Cyprian. Some of the letters were found in Thrace, while others made their way with a book to Alexandria through the English ambassador. After receiving the letters, which included a letter from the Prince of Ostrog's son, Meletius sent Hierodeacon Gregory from Alexandria to Constantinople. The remaining letters and books were delivered by Archdeacon Maximos. Due to the importance of these works, one of which was written in the Old East Slavic language, the Patriarch thought it would be advisable that both of them be translated into Greek and Latin, presumably by Cyprian (Methodios 1975, 183, n. u. 233). The significance the translation and publication of these books had for Meletius can be seen in a subsequent letter in which he hastened Cyprian (Methodios 1975, 602-603, n. u. 262).

After returning from Constantinople to the Alexandrian cathedral, Meletius informed the new Ecumenical Patriarch, Mathew II (1598 – 1601), of his decision to re-send Lucaris to the Commonwealth, who in October 1599 departed on the long journey accompanied by Hieromonk Sophronios to strengthen Orthodoxy in the distant metropolitanate (Methodios 1975, 603-604, n. u. 264). Meletius also informed Prince Alexander Ostrogski about delegating Lucaris, who was fully authorized to represent the Eastern Church (Methodios 1975, 634, n. u. 308). He requested that he be shown hospitality and care throughout his stay in the Commonwealth (Methodios 1975, 607-608, n. u. 270). Cyprian was perfectly aware of the Orthodox Church's geopolitical situation and realized the threats associated with the activities undertaken in defence of Orthodoxy not only in the Commonwealth but also in the Middle East and in the Balkans because he had spent time with Meletius for a period of time in Constantinople. The Patriarch praised him for conscientiously fulfilling the responsibilities of emissary and translator (Methodios 1975, 602-603, n. u. 262), which consisted in mediating the Patriarch's written correspondence with the Protothron of Ostrog, Ignatius, in order to support the Orthodox faithful and publicly condemn the apostates' actions. Meletius entrusted Cyprian with taking care of exarch Cyril Lucaris (Kempa 2007, 87-103; Borkowski 2015, 140-155; Olar 2019, 71-73), who had arrived in the Commonwealth for the second time with the Patriarch's writings, one of which contained a lecture on the Orthodox faith (Methodios 1975, 602-603, n. u. 262). In addition, in a letter to Archdeacon Cyprian, he encouraged him to win the favour of the nobilities for Lucaris, appealing for their help in carrying out his mission. According to Meletius, the success of the mission, i.e., the common good for the Orthodox faithful, directly depended on their individual involvement. He also obliged Cyprian to accompany the exarch and assist him throughout his stay in Commonwealth (Methodios 1975, 602-603, n. u. 262). During his stay in the Commonwealth, Lucaris avoided openly fighting the Union for the sake of his personal safety. Nevertheless, it is known that he called the members of the Lviv Brotherhood to defend Orthodoxy while simultaneously attempting to overcome their long-lasting conflict with their diocesan bishop.

Cyprian's fate after the Patriarch's death remains unknown. Presumably, he left for Mount Athos after the death of Patriarch Meletius († 1601) and Chorepiscopus Ignatius († after 10 March 1603), with whom he served as archdeacon. The name Cyprian Rusin appears in the catalogue of igumens of the Monastery of St. Panteleimon. The act of a meeting the elders of Mount Athos held in November 1619 to address the violation of property rights of the Dochiariou Monastery by monks from the neighbouring Xenophontos Monastery has also been preserved. The document was signed by the igumens of 14 monasteries on Mount Athos, among which Cyprian Rusin, mentioned above, was found (Ktenas 1929, 280-281; Šumilo 2016, 59-61). Cyprian was also mentioned in *Советовании о благочестии* (Advice on Piety), edited by Metropolitan of Kyiv, Job Borecki. After

the victory in the Battle of Khotyn, he called a synod at which he conferred, in particular, about defending the purity of faith and the dogmas of the Eastern Church in the Commonwealth. For this purpose, 24 principles were prepared in a document entitled *Советование о благочестии*. One of the principles indicated the need to turn to the Patriarch of Constantinople for his blessing, assistance and guidance in bringing over the “pious monks”, i.e., blessed Cyprian and John, known as Wiszeński, and others, living in godliness. It was also decided to send pious Ruthenians to the school of spirituality on Mount Athos (Borecki 1845, 247-248, n. u. 32). Moreover, he was characterized by Zacharias Kopystensky as a devout cleric, fluent in Greek, who had studied in Venice and Padua, and was living on Mount Athos (Titov 1924, 57, n. u. 13). Cyprian’s translations from Greek to into Slavonic of the following texts have been preserved *Беседы Макария Египетского* (Conversations of Macarius of Egypt) (1598), a collection of aphorisms (1599), *Синтагматсион о семи святых таинствах* (Syntagmaton on the seven holy sacraments) (1603) and *Беседы Иоанна Златоустого на Евангелие от Иоанна* (Conversations of John Chrysostom on the Gospel of John) (1605) (Jasinovs’kij 2015, 298-300).

The development of the institution of the patriarchal emissary in the Metropolitanate of Kyiv at the end of the 16th century coincided with a period of intensified proselytizing activity on the part of King Sigismund III and the Roman Catholic Church, which resulted in the Union of Brest in 1596. The patriarchal emissary’s role consisted of informing the patriarchate about the church’s situation, promoting education and undertaking translation activities. Their intellectual and spiritual formation took place under the careful supervision of the patriarchate, initially at the Greek school in Venice and later at the University in Padua. Patriarchal emissary Archdeacon Cyprian Ostrogski maintained close contact with the patriarchal exarchs in the Commonwealth and the main representatives of the Orthodox nobles. He had excellent knowledge of the Greek language, culture and philosophy and was the main receiver and translator of Patriarch Meletius Pegas’s writings. As a translator from Greek, he actively participated in the anti-union Orthodox synod in Brest in 1596. Thanks to the information he received from Cyprian, the Patriarch was fully aware of the potential the educated teaching staff could have and about the situation in the Metropolitanate of Kyiv. The duties entrusted to the patriarchal emissary included educating the Orthodox community and providing assistance to the exarch sent from the Patriarchate to the Commonwealth, Cyril Lucaris. In addition, he combined the functions of messenger and translator, winning the favour of the Orthodox nobility in terms of exarch Lucaris’s mission. His strategy was based on intense educational activities, which helped prevent the faithful from leaving the Orthodox Church. Their educational activities were mainly concentrated in centres around Ostrog and Lviv. Even if the patriarchal emissaries were unable to change the state authorities’ pro-union policy towards the Orthodox Church, their experience was drawn on in the future by the Orthodox hierarchy reactivated by the Patriarch of Jerusalem Theophanes in 1620, and later by Metropolitan Petro Mohyla when establishing the Academy of Kyiv, which became the most important Orthodox intellectual centre radiating throughout Eastern Europe.

## REFERENCES

- AJZR II. 1865.* Kostomarov, Nikolaj (ed.). Акты, относящиеся к истории Южной и Западной России, собранные и изданные Археографическою Комиссиею [Acts relating to the history of Southern and Western Russia, collected and published by the Archaeographic Commission]. Т. II. Sankt-Petersburg.
- BH IV. 1896.* Legrand, Émile (ed.). Bibliographie Hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par der Grecs au dix-septieme siècle, T. IV. Paris.

- Borecki, Iov.* 1845. Совѣтованіе о благочестіи [Advice on Piety]. In Čehovič, Venedikt (ed.). Памятники, изданные Временною комиссіею для разбора древних актов, Высочайше учреждѣнною при Киевском военном, Подольском и Волынском генерал-губернаторе [Monuments published by the Temporary Commission for the Analysis of Ancient Acts, Established by the Highest under the Kiev Military, Podolsky and Volyn Governor-General]. Т. 1. Kiev.
- Borkowski, Andrzej.* 2014. Wysłannicy patriarchy konstantynopolitańskiego na soborach I Rzeczypospolitej. In Kuczyńska, Marzanna – Pawluczuk, Urszula (eds.). Latopisy Akademii Supraskiej. T. 5. Synody Cerkwi prawosławnej w I Rzeczypospolitej. Białystok, 103-120.
- Borkowski, Andrzej.* 2015. Cyril Lucaris in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (1595-1597). In Zaridze, Gennadiy (ed.). Orthodox scientist in modern world. Values of orthodox world and contemporary society. Materials of the IVth international conference. Part 2. Salonika, Greece, September 25-26, 2015. Voronezh, 140-155.
- Broniewski, Marcin.* 1995. Ekthesis, abo krótkie zebranie spraw, które się działy na partykularnym, to jest pomiastnym Synodzie w Brześciu Litewskim. In Byliński, Janusz – Długosz, Józef (eds.). Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, n. u. 1698. Wrocław.
- Bulgakov, Makarij.* 1996. История Русской Церкви. Т. 6. Moskva.
- Chodyncki, Kazimierz.* 2006. Kościół prawosławny a Rzeczpospolita polska. Zarys historyczny 1370-1632, Warszawa 1934.
- DPIR XIII.* 1909. Hurmuzaki, Eudoxiu – Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Athanasios (eds.). Documente privitoare la istoria românilor. T. XIII. Buçuresti.
- Gedeon, Manouil.* 1885-1890. Πατριαρχικοί πίνακες. Ειδήσεις ιστορικά βιογραφικά περί των Πατριαρχών Κωνσταντινουπόλεως από Ανδρέου του Πρωτοκλήτου μέχρις Ιωακείμ Γ' του από Θεσσαλονίκης, 36-1884 [Patriarchal paintings. Historical biographical news about the Patriarchs of Constantinople from Andrew Protocletos to Joachim III of Thessaloniki, 36-1884]. En Konstantinoupolei.
- Haralampovič, Konstantin.* 1898. Западнорусские православные школы XVI в. и начала XVII в., отношение их к инославным, религиозное обучение в них и заслуги их в деле защиты веры и церкви [Western Russian Orthodox schools of the 16th century. and the beginning of the 17th century, their attitude towards the heterodox, religious education in them and their merits in the defense of faith and the church]. Kazan.
- Jasinov'skij, Andrij.* 2015. Між Афоном та Венецією: інтелектуальний профіль ранньомодерного руського інтелектуала (приклад Кипріяна Острожанина) [Between Mount Athos and Venice: an intellectual profile of an early modern Russian intellectual (the example of Cyprian Ostrozhanin)]. In Šumilo, Sergij (ed.). Афонское наследие: Научный альманах [The Athonite Heritage: Scholar's Anthology]. Т. 1-2. Материалы международной научной конференции „Русь и Афон: тысячелетие духовно-культурных связей”, Чернигов, 28-29 ноября 2014 г. [The Athonite Heritage: Scientific Anthology. Т. 1-2. Materials of the international scientific conference „Rus and Athos: a millennium of spiritual and cultural ties”, Černigov, November 28-29, 2014]. Kiev – Černigov 2015, 298-300.
- Kempa, Tomasz.* 2007. Wizyta protosyngla Cyryla Lukarysa w Rzeczypospolitej. In Mironowicz, Antoni et al. (eds.). The Orthodox Church in the Balkans and Poland. Connections and Common Tradition. Białystok.
- Ktenas, Christoforos.* 1929. Ο Πρώτος του Αγίου Όρους Άθω και η «μεγάλη μέση» ή «Σύναξις» [The First of Mount Athos and the “great middle” or “Synaxis”]. In Ελετερίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών [Yearbook of the Society of Byzantine Studies] 6, 233-281.
- Legrand, Émile.* 1902. Lettres de Mélétius Pigas antérieures à sa promotion au patriarcat (publiées d'après les minutes autographes). Paris.



- Malyševskij, Ivan.* 1872. Александрийский патриарх Мелетий Пигас и его участие в делах русской церкви [Patriarch of Alexandria Meletius Pigas and his participation in the affairs of the Russian Church]. Т. 2/1. Kiev.
- MCSL I.* 1895. Milkowicz, Wladimirus (ed.). Monumenta Confraternitatis Stauropigiante Leopoliensis. Т. I. Leopoli.
- Methodios, Axomes.* 1970 – 1975. Μελετίου Πηγά Πάπα και Πατριάρχου Αλεξανδρείας επιστολαί. Εκδιδόμενοι εκ του υπ' αριθ. 296 Χειρογράφου της Πατριαρχικής Βιβλιοθήκης Αλεξανδρείας [Epistles of Meletius Pigas Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. Issued from the no. 296 Manuscript of the Patriarchal Library of Alexandria]. Εκκλησιαστικός Φάρος [Ecclesiastical Lighthouse] 52, 217-236; 53, 174-181, 588-611; 54, 76-96, 350-384; 55, 555-576; 56, 195-237, 497-588; 57, 174-217, 591-639.
- Mic'ko, Igor.* 1990. Острозька слов'яно-греко-латинська академія (1576 – 1636) [Ostrog Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy (1576 – 1636)]. Kiiv.
- Mironowicz, Antoni.* 2006. Kościół prawosławny w Polsce. Białystok.
- Naumow, Aleksander.* 2002. Domus divisa: Studia nad literaturą ruską w I Rzeczypospolitej. Kraków.
- Olar, Ovidiu.* 2019. La boutique de Théophile. Les relations du patriarche de Constantinople Kyrillos Loukaris (1570 – 1638) avec la Réforme. Paris.
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Athanasios.* 1915. Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ βιβλιοθήκη, ἤτοι κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἀποστολικοῦ τε καὶ καθολικοῦ ὀρθοδόξου πατριαρχικοῦ θρόνου τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ πάσης Παλαιστίνης ἀποκεκμημένων ἑλληνικῶν κωδίκων [Jerusalem library, i.e. a list of the Greek codices preserved in the library of the Holiness Apostolic and Catholic Orthodox Patriarchal Throne of Jerusalem and all Palestine]. Т. 5. En Petroupolei.
- Paraskeuaidis, Christodoulos.* 1971. Μελέτιος Πηγάς [Meletios Pigas]. Athenai.
- Stradomski, Jan.* 2003. Spory o „wiarę grecką” w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej. Kraków.
- Šumilo, Sergej.* 2016. Старец Иоанн Вишенский: афонский подвижник и православный писатель-полемист. Материалы к жизнеописанию блаженной памяти великого старца Иоанна Вишенского Святогорца [Elder John Vishensky: Athos ascetic and Orthodox polemical writer. Materials for the biography of the blessed memory of the great elder John of Vishensky the Holy Mountaineer]. Kiev.
- Titov, Hvedor.* 1924. Матеріяли для історії книжної справи на Україні в XVI-XVIII вв. Всебірка передмов до українських стародруків [Materials for the history of the book development in Ukraine in the 16th-18th centuries. A complete collection of prefaces to Ukrainian old prints]. Kyiv.
- Welykyj, Athanasius.* 1970. Documenta Unionis Berestensis eiusque auctorum (1590 – 1600). Romae
- Zaikin, V'acheslav.* 1930. Участие светского элемента в церковном управлении, выборное начало и „соборность” в Киевской митрополии в XVI и XVII вв. [The participation of the secular element in church administration, the elective principle and “catholicity” in the Kyiv Metropolis in the 16th and 17th centuries.]. Varšava.

Dr hab. Andrzej Borkowski, prof. ChAT  
 Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw (ChAT)  
 Faculty of Theology  
 ul. Broniewskiego 48  
 01-771 Warsaw  
 Poland  
 a.borkowski@chat.edu.pl  
 ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6431-9932