

ARTYKUŁY

Klio. Czasopismo poświęcone dziejom Polski i powszechnym
PL ISSN 1643-8191, t. 44 (1)/2018, s. 41–55



<http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/KLIO.2018.003>

WIOLETTA ZIELECKA-MIKOŁAJCZYK*

The Activity of the Orthodox Nobility from the Eparchy of Przemyśl on Behalf of the Orthodox Church in the 17th Century

Działalność prawosławnej szlachty z eparchii przemyskiej na rzecz Cerkwi w XVII wieku

Streszczenie. Ogłoszenie unii Kościoła wschodniego z Kościołem katolickim w Rzeczypospolitej pogrążyło diecezję przemyską w konflikcie wyznaniowym na niemal całe XVII stulecie. Jego częścią stały się zabiegi o posiadanie świątyń i materialne zabezpieczenie Cerkwi. W wyniku działalności fundacyjnej szlachty przemyskiej powstały trzy monaster: w Topolnicy (1616), ufundowany przez Turzańskich; monaster hruszowski (1621) założony przez ród Lityńskich oraz monaster w Bilinie Wielkiej (1669). Fundatorzy należeli do najaktywniejszych przeciwników wprowadzenia unii w diecezji. Monasterzy wspomagali również członkowie innych ortodoksyjnych rodzin. Na mecenat szlachecki złożyła

* Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, Instytut Historii i Archiwistyki, ul. Bojar-
skiego 1, 87-100 Toruń, zielecka@umk.pl.

się także dbałość o położone w rodzimych dobrach cerkwie, które należało odbudowywać po zniszczeniach najazdów tatarskich w XVII wieku.

Abstract. Establishing the union of the Orthodox Church with the Catholic Church in Commonwealth of Poland caused a religious conflict in a whole Diocese of Przemyśl lasting almost entire 17th century. The conflict included attempts to obtain churches and material allotments for particular Orthodox church. As a result of foundations established by nobles from Przemyśl area, three monasteries were built: in Topolnica (1616) founded by Turzański Family; in Hruszów (1621) founded by Lityński Family, and monastery in Bilina Wielka (1669). These benefactors were among the most active opponents of introduction of the Union in the Diocese. Allowances for those monasteries were paid by members of other Orthodox families. Local nobility took also care about Orthodox churches from their estates; those buildings very often had been demolished during Tatars' forays in 17th century and their refurbishment was necessary. The article presents this attempts focusing on their effects.

Słowa kluczowe: Diecezja przemyska; Cerkiew prawosławna; fundacje; monasterium.

Keywords: Przemyśl diocese; Orthodox Church; patronage; monasteries.

The Przemyśl diocese was the most Western eparchy of the Eastern Church in the old Commonwealth. Its territory extended to Przemyśl Land and Sanok Land, included eastern fragments of Lwów Land, the Lubaczów precinct of the Belz Voivodeship, Sącz and Biecz Counties of the Kraków voivodeship, the Spisz district, as well as the north-eastern territory of the Sandomierz voivodeship¹. In the East, the Przemyśl diocese bordered the Lwów diocese, and in the Northeast, the Chełm eparchy. From the South, its borders extended to the diocese of Mukachevo which at the same time constituted the borders of the Polish-Lithuanian State. The territory of the Przemyśl diocese, in terms of matters of faith, co-existed with the Latin diocese of Przemyśl, whose faithful were in the majority in the West. In the East, they were outnumbered by Ruthenians/Eastern Orthodox populace.

¹ S. Nabywaniec, *Diecezja przemyska greckokatolicka w latach 1772–1795*, "Premislia Christiana" 1992/1993, t. 5, s. 31; B. Lorens, *Bractwa cerkiewne w eparchii przemyskiej w XVII i XVIII wieku*, Rzeszów 2005, p. 18.

After the Eastern Church of the Commonwealth formed a union with Rome, the Eastern Orthodox bishop of Przemyśl, Michał Kopysteński, together with the Lwów bishop, Gedeon Bałaban, remained with Eastern Orthodoxy. Until his death in 1609, Kopysteński maintained his position at the Przemyśl Cathedral. The King's will was such that his successor be Atanazy Krupecki of the Uniate Church. His appearance in Przemyśl spurred a nearly 100 year dispute over the diocese between adherents of the Orthodox and Uniate faiths. This has already been described in detail by Antoni Prochaska, among others, who showed the impulsivity of the Przemyśl nobility as well as the scrupulousness of the Przemyśl hierarchs, bringing the competition for the bishopric to the local conflict over Orthodox benefices². This topic was then taken up by Marian Bendza (in very one-sided papers, nearly passing over archival sources, dedicated to the history of the Przemyśl diocese)³. New light was shed on the lives of Przemyśl's Eastern Orthodox adherents by Jarosław Isajewycz and Beata Lorens, who documented the activity of the Orthodox Brotherhoods in defense of Eastern Orthodoxy⁴. Jurij Stecyk then examined the role and material status of Basilian monks in the Przemyśl diocese⁵. This research showed that the conflict in the Przemyśl eparchy was not only an armed conflict over the bishopric, but was additionally one of a few areas of activity taken up by members of the Orthodox Church in defense of their faith. In reference to the determinations of the aforementioned scholars, I would like to more closely examine the nobiliary foundations on the territory of the Przemyśl eparchy from the end of the 16th century to 1691, when Innocenty Win-

² A. Prochaska, *Władcyka Krupecki w walce z dyzunią*, "Przegląd Powszechny" 1918, R. 35, s. 734–752.

³ M. Bendza, *Prawosławna diecezja przemyska w latach 1596–1681*, Warszawa 1982.

⁴ Â. Isaëvič, *Bratstva ta jih rol'v rozvitku ukrajins'koi kul'turi XVII-XVIII stolittâ*, Kiev 1966, s. 71–127; B. Lorens, *Bractwa cerkiewne w eparchii przemyskiej w XVII i XVIII wieku*, Rzeszów 2005, s. 40–63.

⁵ Ū. Stecyk, *Šlâhets'ki monastir'ski fundaciji u peremišl'skoi êparbiji (XVII–XVIII cm.)*, "Drogobickij kraëznävčij zbirnik" 2006, t. 10, s. 252–262; idem, *Vasilians'ki monastiri peremišl'skoi êparbiji: institucijnij rozvitok, ekonomične stanoviše ta religijna diâl'nist' (kinec' XVII–XVIII st.)*, Drohobycz 2005, s. 24–42 (typescript).

nicki, who officially led the union into the eparchy, became the bishop of Przemyśl.

The position and effectiveness of the Orthodox nobility's efforts to defend Orthodoxy was greatly influenced by their weak material situation. These were primarily one or two-village noblemen, far from the political elite of the region, such as the Krasicki, Herburt, and Drohojowski Catholics, the Stadnicki Catholics and Protestants, the Latin archbishop of Lwów (who, as it turns out, had an enormous influence on the Orthodox-related politics of the region), or the Latin bishops of Przemyśl. The weak position of the Orthodox nobility of Przemyśl was also visible at the diet of Sądowa Wisznia, where Catholics and Protestants were usually selected as political representatives.

The only meaningful representative of the Orthodox nobility was the Wołyń province governor Aleksander Ostrogski, son of Konstanty Ostrogski, an anchor of Orthodoxy in the Commonwealth. Together with his father, he took part in the synod of Brest and stood on the side of those who opposed the union. In the following years he was active in carrying out his father's politics in defense of Orthodoxy⁶. In the years 1597 and 1598, he took part in the diet of Sądowa Wisznia, and it is likely thanks to him that postulates related to the defense of Orthodoxy rights were supported there. In 1601 in the diet, Aleksander Ostrogski was the only individual among the Orthodox senators who disputed faith-related matters during the senate's council with the archbishop of Gniezno, not agreeing to postpone the matter of appeasing the Greek religion until the next diet. He defended Orthodoxy at the 1603 sejm diet as well⁷.

Married in 1592 to Anna of Kostków, a devout Catholic and later a proponent of the union, Ostrogski was supposedly a man interested in interfaith dialogue, which manifested itself in his visits to the Jarosław Jesuits and in their debates about religion. He frequented the Orthodox church with his wife. As a ktitor of the Orthodox church he changed the erection

⁶ T. Kempa, *Wobec kontrreformacji: protestanci i prawosławni w obronie swobód wyznaniowych w Rzeczypospolitej w końcu XVI i w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku*, Toruń 2007, s. 141.

⁷ *Ibidem*, s. 186.

of the orthodox temple in Jarosław in 1596 and supported the brotherhood associated with it⁸. He founded orthodox temple in Kańczuga on July 19th, 1600, transferring there 400 zl which had been noted earlier by his priest in Wola Posańska. He exempted this temple from duties toward the court and maintained the hospital in its vicinity⁹. In 1601, for a sum of 100 grzywna, he gave Popovtsy Leonty the church in Zaleska Wola, along with benefits, exempting it from all duties toward the court¹⁰. In January of 1602, for the sum of 300 zl he gave the Orthodox church in Grzańska to the priest Symeon, later designating this sum for this church¹¹.

During the time of his connection with the territories forming the Przemyśl diocese no significant foundation related to the duke arose. Unfortunately, more precise research regarding Aleksander Ostrogski's foundation activity is impossible due to a lack of sources. Undoubtedly, his marriage with Anna Kostkowna influenced his actions. Perhaps he did not want to create conflict in his private life with undue commitment to the Jarosław Orthodoxy. Most evidently, however, he curbed the efforts of his spouse, who, only after his death, constructed a residence hall next to the Ruthenian gate in Jarosław for Jesuit pupils and then openly supported Atanazy Krupecki in his efforts to take over the Przemyśl bishopric. Additionally, it bears noting that the Volyn voivode died at the young age of 33. Nevertheless, after the death of Aleksander Ostrogski, the members of Przemyśl's Orthodox Church were minor noblemen.

The weak material status of the members of Przemyśl's Orthodox community certainly had an impact on the dimensions of their founda-

⁸ Biblioteka Jagiellońska, rkps 6071 I, s. 373; K. Gottfried, *Anna Ostrogska wojewodzina wołyńska*, Jarosław 1939, s. 19–25.

⁹ Nacional'nij muzej u L'vovi im. Andreâ Šeptic'kogo (further: MNL), P_{KA}-2205, k. 222; ibidem, P_{KA}-2207, k. 644–645.

¹⁰ Archiwum Państwowe w Przemyślu (further: APP), Archiwum Biskupstwa Greckokatolickiego (further: ABGK), nr 70 D; MNL, P_{KA}-2207, k. 285.

¹¹ Central'nij deržavnij istoričnij arhiv Ukraini m. L'viv (further: CDIAUL), f. 129, op. 3, nr 42, k. 1; Wasyl Uljanowski, when quoting this document, noticed only that A. Ostrogski sold the priest land, omitting information about money intended for an orthodox church, V. Ul'ánov's'kij, *Knáz' Vasil' Kostântin Ostroz'kij: istoričnij portret u galereji predkiv ta našadkiv*, Kiev 2012, s. 1262.

tional activity. Interestingly, from the end of the 15th century to the final years of the 16th century, there were formed five monastic centers on the territory of Przemyśl (Dereżyce, Nahujowice, in Przemyśl in the year 1500 arose the monastery of the Dormition of the Mother of God, in 1563, the Cathedral of the Mother of God, and in 1570 in Ulucz the monastery of The Raised Cross)¹². However, during the battle period against the union in the 17th century, there arose as many as 23 monasteries. The majority of these were located in royal lands. The king, by possessing the right of patronage over the churches in his kingdom, decided about the construction of new temples and monasteries. It should be noted that the first of the Przemyśl monasteries, as in Dobromil, was built thanks to the initiative of the Catholic Jan Szczęsny, who authored “Discourse on the Ruthenian Nation” [polish: Mowy o narodzie ruskim]. Minor records for this monastery were kept by the Orthodox nobility throughout the entire 17th century. These noble families included the Ustrzyckis, the Drewnickis of Boberka, the Kropiwnickis, the Jaworskis, the Rogozińskis, the Krolickis, the Oleksiczów, the Petranowskis, and the Romanowskis¹³.

The foundations of the Orthodox nobility amounted to three monasteries. The Dobromil monastery as well as others that were formed in the first half of the 17th century were a reaction of the Przemyśl Orthodoxy to the efforts of the first Uniate vładyk of Przemyśl, Atanazy Krupecki, who was appointed to this position in 1610 by Zygmunt III against the will of the local nobility. Despite the fact that the bishop, by power of royal decree, was installed in the bishopric in January of 1612, conflicts between him and the Orthodox nobility did not end. Later on, his authority was not recognized by the parish clergy, who relentlessly brought matters to court obtaining sentences ordering financial punishments and banishments. In accordance with the installation documents, the bishop came into possession of the monastery of the Holy Savior in Stary Sambor, the monastery of Saint Onuphrius in Nanczułka, the monastery in Smolnica, as well as

¹² CDIAUL, f. 201, op. 46, nr 1917, k. 587; Ū. Stecik, *Vasilians'ki monastiri*, s. 219 (typescript).

¹³ Naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanika NAN Ukraini, Lviv, f. 3 (MB), sygn. 1261, k. 3v.

the monastery of Saint Ivan in Nahujowice¹⁴. It is clear that in reality the monastery of the Holy Savior in Stary Sambor remained in the hands of the Uniates, as the brother of bishop Krupecki, Józef, became the abbot¹⁵. It was likely feared that other monasteries would fall into the bishop's hands.

In response to the efforts of the Uniates, an Orthodox monastery in Topolnica was founded on April 4th of 1616 and was funded by Grzegorz Turzański, relative of Theodore Turzański, one of the leading opponents of Krupecki, and by Anastasia of the Wysoczańskis¹⁶. It bears noting that a document was created not long after the diet of Sądowa Wisznia, March 12th of 1616, in which the necessity to meet the demands of the members of the Orthodox Church was clearly raised, which included the liquidation of processes set forth by Krupecki against the Orthodox clergy who did not acknowledge the 1596 union of Brest¹⁷.

A monastic center was formed on the Dymidek near the orthodox church of Saint Nicholas, which had earlier been funded by Grzegorz Turzański. Turzański endowed the monastery with half of his wealth inherited and bought in the village of Topolnica. As ktitor and in accordance with the right of patronage, he reserved for himself the privilege of designating the abbot of the monastery with the requirement that he always be a godly person, educated, well-versed in Holy Scripture, and necessarily, Orthodox. He designated the Basilian Antony as the first hegumen. Heirs

¹⁴ APP, ABGK, supl. 47, s. 209–214; A. Prochaska, *Władysław Krupecki*, s. 734–735; J. Krochmal, *Unia kościelna w eparchii przemyskiej*, "Premisla Christiana" 1997, t. 7, s. 80.

¹⁵ M. Bendza, *Prawosławna diecezja*, s. 133.

¹⁶ NML, РКЛ-2204, к. 683–686; CDIAUL, f. 684, op. 1, nr 3016, k. 1–2v; ibidem, f. 201, op. 4b, nr 1917, k. 336; APP, ABGK, supl. 47, s. 170–172.

¹⁷ „Bracia nasi religiej greckiej wnoszą na zjeździech naszych i na terażniejszym sejmiku wnieśli urazy swe, odzywając się do praw i przywilejów swoich dawnych i do konstytucyj im na religią i prawa ich służących; zalecamy posłom naszym, aby pilnie instancją i starania takie na sejmie przyszłym czynili, jakoby do uspokojenia przyszło i prawa ich wcale zachowane były, a procesy, które przeciwko popom od księdza Krupeckiego otrzymane są, aby penitus zniesione były. Ich Mć różnej religiej bracia nasi szukają także i żądają uspokojenia swego, starać się będą pp. posłowie nasi, jakoby pokój prawem Ich Mciom był warowany, prawom Kościoła rzymskiego katolickiego w niczem nie derogując, a proces utriusque parti serviens żeby był namówiony”, Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej (further: AGZ), t. 20: Akta sejmikowe wiszeńskie 1572–1648, t. 1, Lwów 1931, nr 105, s. 155.

of the advowson were ordered to respect these principles when appointing the monastery's hegumen. When selecting a superior, they were supposed to consult with the monastery's settled monks. It bears noting that Aleksander Szeptycki, Teodor Winnicki, and Roman Popiel were made ktitors by Turzański. The first two belonged to the active opponents of Atanazy Krupecki. Turzański obliged the monks to be guided both by the resolutions of the Fathers of the Church and by the rules of the monastery, as a means to maintain a clean conscience, and above all, the monks were obliged to remain faithful to the Orthodox faith and to the patriarch of Constantinople. If any of the monks were to abandon the faith, they would face anathema¹⁸.

In the following years, the Turzański family confirmed the bequests for the monastery, and three years after the fund Jacko Turzański – Litowicz bequeathed unto the monastery the services of two peasants. Later donors were the Kopysteńskis, the collateral line of this house related to the bishop Michał, such as Andrzej and Aleksander Kopysteński¹⁹.

The next monastery foundation comes from 1621 and should be treated as a consequence of the change in the Orthodox situation after the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophanes, renewed the church hierarchy in October of 1620 as he returned from Moscow after the ordination of the Philaret. At that time, Izajasz Kopiński, hegumen of the Międzygórze Transfiguration Monastery and alumnus of the stauropegion school of the Lwów brotherhood, was consecrated as Bishop of Przemyśl²⁰. The second

¹⁸ „W czym oni powinność swoje wiedząc mają za to sumieniem swym czystym dosić czynić podług ustaw Ojców Świętych i Monasterzów Świętych około tego postanowionych, które są pod postuszeństwem i władzą Cerkwie Świętej wschodniej i świętobliwch Patriarchów tamecznych a nie inszych, gdysz strzeż Panie Boże Wszchemogący, (iako to już najdują się ludzie niestateczni i bezbożni) żeby, który Iumen albo czerniec do inszego postuszeństwa cerkwie albo Kościoła kędykolwiek na potym pomknął się, tedy zarazem od tego Monasterza i cerkwie świętej Trójce wyżej mianowanej na wieki odpada i miejsca mieszkania przy tym monasterzu mieć nie ma pod przeklęstwem i wyklienstwem Anatemy i Maranafty”, MNL, РКА-2204, k. 683; CDIAUL, f. 684, op. 1, nr 3016, k. 1v–2; Ū. Stecik, *Šláhets'ki monastirs'ki fundaciji*, s. 253.

¹⁹ CDIAUL, f. 201, op. 46, nr 1917, k. 587.

²⁰ M. Bendza, *Prawosławna diecezja*, s. 133; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w dziejach dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, Białystok 2001, s. 81.

important event for the Orthodox community was the letter of Cyryl Lukarys, Patriarch of Alexandria, to the Przemyśl brotherhood, in which he wrote about the oppression of Orthodox believers and brought them words of consolation portending better times for the Orthodox Church. At the same time he called for steadfast Orthodox faith despite the actions of the those supporting the Pope, those who strove for fundamental changes of the rights of old Eastern Orthodoxy²¹.

As a consequence of these events, in 1621, the Hruszowa heirs of nine Lityński noblemen: Adam, Mikołaj, Michał, Bazyli, Daniel, Filip, Wasyl, Samuel, and Xenofont funded a monastery in the Hruszowski forest known as Bór on the River Czarniawka, where there once stood a permanent, wooden tserkva and monastic cell. The work “A history of the Szczepłocki monastery of the holy order of Saint Basil the Great of the Ruthenian province,” written in 1771 by the Dobromil curate Innocenty Matkowski, provided information that those funding the monastery were brothers²². This information was accepted by Jurij Stecyk in his research²³. However, in the foundation documentation, these so-called brothers referred to themselves as “noblemen” and Hruszowa heirs²⁴. In light of this, it seems that they were merely related to each other. The fact that in this act there appear two people with the same name – Wasyl in the Ruthenian version and Basil in the Latin one – speaks in favor of this interpretation. The Lityńskis belonged to the most significant Orthodox nobility in the territory of the Przemyśl diocese. Family ties connected them with the Przemyśl orthodox bishop Michał Kopysteński. His wife, Anna, was the daughter of one of the founders, Adam Lityński, who was with Kopysteński at the Brest synod. In turn, after the death of the bishop Michał, he condemned the giving of the Przemyśl bishopric to the Uniate Krupecki. Adam Lityński together with four of the founders – Mikołaj, Michał, Samuel, and Wasyl, took part in attacks on the Uniate bishop Krupecki at the diet of Sądowa

²¹ APP, ABGK, supl. 28, s. 16–18.

²² Naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanika NAN Ukraini, L'viv, f. 3 (MB), sygn. 608, k. 2.

²³ Ū. Stecik, *Šláhets'ki monastirs'ki fundaciji*, s. 254.

²⁴ MNL, PKA-2207, k. 359.

Wisznia in 1610, for which afterwards they, along with 20 other people, were brought before the diet court²⁵. Lityński was involved in the political life of the Ruthenian nobility. In the years 1624, 1628, and 1629, he represented Przemyśl in the diet, the only such Orthodox representative²⁶.

The Lityńskis foundation predicted the formation of cells for monks and the monastery temple on “new roots.” Construction of the church and monastery were to be carried out by the Basilian Antoni, who was designated the first abbot. Ktitors recommended choosing the next hegumens of the entire monastery community. In exchange, they demanded that church services be held for their souls and for “Orthodox Christians.” They obliged the monks to obedience towards the patriarch of Constantinople and to allegiance to the resolutions of the seven Ecumenical Councils. The ktitors placed a duty on the monks: *“Above all do not change or reduce, nor anything new contribute in the confession of true faith, as worship in all church ceremonies, and in the calendar do not change times nor the holy days, but as the true Ruthenian Christians took from their the forefathers, do continue eternally without violation, the people of Orthodox Christianity, asking the Lord God to confirm their spiritual duty”*²⁷. From the last words it can be gleaned that the founders gave the monks the task of strengthening Orthodoxy before the Basilians. It was much the same in different territories of the Commonwealth. In 1626, Adam Lityński expanded the monastery fund to include the village Szczepłoty, conferring the monks the right to fish freely in the Hudownicze and Wtręt River, as well as conferring them the rights to the

²⁵ APP, ABGK, supl. 47, s. 170–172; CDIAUL, f. 15, op. 1, nr 143, s. 279; AGZ, t. 20, nr 93, s. 136; B. Lorens, *Prawosławie i unia w eparchii przemyskiej na forum sejmiku wiszeńskiego w XVII wieku*, [w:] *Śladami unii brzeskiej*, red. R. Dobrowolski, M. Zemło, Lublin–Supraśl 2010, s. 41.

²⁶ K. Przyboś, *Reprezentacja sejmowa ziemi przemyskiej w latach 1573–1695*, “Rocznik Przemyski” 1998, t. 4, z. 4, s. 28.

²⁷ „Nad to już nic nie odmieniać ani umniejszać, ani co nowego przyczyniać tak w wyznaniu prawdziwej wiary, jako nabożeństwo y w wszystkich ceremoniach cerkiewnych y w kalendarzu ani czasów, ani świąt odmieniać, ale tak jakośmy Ruś prawdziwi chrześcijanie z przodków swych przyjęli, nienaruszenie wiecznie trzymać mają, y ludzi prawosławnych chrześcijan Pana Boga prosząc, utwierdzać wedle powinności swej duchowney mają”, MNL, РкЛ-2207, k. 360.

fields, garden, mill, and pastures²⁸. In the following years, he supported the monastery with donations for prayers for the dead, which was noted in the intentional prayer books of the monastery. Among the donors to the monastery we find Alexander Kopysteński of house Ustrzycki, as well as Orthodox adherents not coming from the Przemyśl diocese, including the very metropolitan Peter Mogiła, Warłam Jasiński, Bohdan Hulewicz, the deputy cup-bearer of Wołyń, and Anna Mohylanka, the wife of the Sandomierz voivode²⁹.

In the following years, up until the beginning of Władysław IV Vasa's reign, there was no monastery foundation in the territory of the Przemyśl diocese. A change on the throne and the passing of "resolutions to appease the Greek religion" were, for Przemyśl's Orthodox inhabitants, an impulse to vie for the granting of the bishopric to an Orthodox bishop. Władysław IV accepted the will of the nobles and agreed to grant the Przemyśl bishopric to Jan Chłopecki, who soon thereafter died. In his place, the king designated Jan Popiel, who was also a local nobleman. Because the candidate was married, the metropolitan Peter Mogiła refused to anoint him bishop. In the end, the nobility chose Szymon Hulewicz Wojutyński as Przemyśl bishop. From the year 1609 this was the first lasting success of Przemyśl's Orthodox community (not counting the case of Kopiński, who fought for the Przemyśl bishopric and lost).

In the area of political transformations Władysław IV Ksenofont Lityński bequeathed unto the Hruszewski monastery quarter of the field around Piotrkowski stream in 1634. In the following years, the monastery was supported by relatives of the bishop Hulewicz-Wojutyński and heirs of the monastery's founders. In 1643, Michał Strybut and Anna Lityńska, daughter of Adam Lityński, and together, Hruszowa heirs, bequeathed fields and a plot of land unto the monastery on which the monastery miller lived. In 1660, Paweł of Wojutyn Hulewicz Wojutyński – the deputy cup-holder of Wołyń, as owner of a part of Hruszów, bequeathed unto the mon-

²⁸ Naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanika NAN Ukraini, L'viv, f. 3 (MB), sygn. 608, k. 2.

²⁹ Naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanika NAN Ukraini, L'viv, f. 3 (MB), sygn. 386, op. 1, nr 411, k. 5v, 46–48v.

astery the land “Xenofolański,” on which the monastery apiary stood. On September 1 of 1663, Wacław of Ochłopów Hulewicz bequeathed a field. In 1661, the owner Jan Wyszotrawski bequeathed unto the monastery three pieces of land, which would stay in the monastery’s possession until accumulating a profit of 400 zł. In exchange for the land the court paid the monks cash. For another sum of 300 zł bequeathed unto the monastery by Wyszotrawski’s widow, a funeral was conducted for him on the field by the monks. The endowments bequeathed unto the monastery by the first three donors were taken away pursuant to the constitution of 1635, which banned the bequeathing of real-estate unto the Church³⁰.

The last nobilial foundation in the 17th century was the monastery in Bilina Wielka in 1669. It was constructed pursuant to the will of Katarzyna Skarżewska from House Żeliborska³¹. The bequest was related to the miraculous appearance of the Mother of God and the expansion of the cult of her miraculous image³².

In the 17th century, during the invasions by Tatars, Kozaks, and Swedes, at least 350 of the over one thousand churches were destroyed. A small part of them – in comparison with the royal possessions or with that of the clergy or the wealth of the Catholic nobility – were located in the estates of the Orthodox families of the Winnickis, Stupnickis, Tustanowskis, Bilińskis, Kalnofojskis, Chłopeckis, Hortynskis, Hordynskis Ortyńskis, and Błażowskis³³. In the year 1620, 20 temples were destroyed: in Winniki, belonging to Prokop Popiel; in Borysław, belonging to Roman Popiel; in Popielach, belonging to Jan Kołodrub Popiel and Hryčka Popiel; in Uniatycze, belonging to Iwan Trecki and Mychajła Winnicki³⁴. In the year 1621: in Uherce Wieniawskie, belonging to Piotr Szeptycki; in Błażów, two belonging to Stefan, Anna, Andrzej, and Jan Błażowski; in Łąka near Sambor, belonging to Piotr Hermanowicz and Waśek Hoyczkowic-

³⁰ Naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanika NAN Ukraini, L’viv, f. 3 (MB), sygn. 608, k. 2–2v.

³¹ Ū. Stecik, *Šlábetski monastirski fundaciji*, s. 255.

³² Idem, *Vasilianski monastiri*, s. 34 (typescript).

³³ A. Gliwa, *Kraina upartych niepogód, Zniszczenia wojenne na obszarze ziemi przemyskiej w XVII wieku*, Przemyśl 2013, s. 673–1008.

³⁴ CDIAUL, f. 13, op. 1, nr 339, s. 305, 307–308, 214–215.

za; in Nowoszczycze, belonging to the Horodyńskis (1621); in Ortyńce, in Dobrowlany near Stryj, belonging to Hryćka Dubrowlański; in Monasterzec, belonging to Wasiek Wysoczański; in Uhercy Zapłatyńskie, belonging to Ihnat Radyłowski (1624) Hordynia (1626) and Mikołaj Horodyński (1626); in Nowoszyce, belonging to Iwan Horodyński; in Siekierczyce belonging to the Hordyńskis; in Stupnica, belonging to the Stupnickis; later, in Bereźnica, belonging to Basil Ustrzycki (1648); and in Chłopczyce, belonging to Paweł Chłopecki (1656) and Szeptyce³⁵.

Accurately describing the degree to which these houses cared for the orthodox churches is difficult due to the fragmented nature of available sources (usually tax-related). We often have information about the estates of the nobility, but it is not clear if the temples were part of them. Conversely, we have data about the church, but it is not clear if they were, in a given period, in the hands of Orthodox individuals. One must also take into consideration the loss of members from this faith-environment to the union and then to Roman-Catholicism.

The orthodox temple in Popiele belonging to the Kołodrub Popiel family was quickly rebuilt after having been destroyed in 1620, because no later than in 1621 the Tatars burnt it down again³⁶. At the end of the 17th century, Alexander and Basil Kopysteński were the tserkva's interpolators³⁷. Just as with the church in Borysław belonging to Roman Popiel, it was destroyed by the Tatars and rebuilt in 1621, and then burnt down again in 1624³⁸. Between 1624 and 1626, a new tserkva was built in Błazów which belonged to Andrzej Błazowski and which stood, with certainty, until the end of the 1620s. Ignacy Radyłowski rebuilt the temple in Uherce Zapłatyńskie before the end of the 1630s³⁹. The Hordyńskis probably rebuilt the orthodox church in Hordynia, which was destroyed by the Tatars in 1626. A Ruthenian parish district existed there until 1692, though it is not clear to whom it belonged⁴⁰. The reconstruction of these buildings was

³⁵ Ibidem, nr 340, s. 82, 98–99, s. 205–206; A. Gliwa, *Kraina*, s. 688, 692.

³⁶ CDIAUL, f. 13, op. 1, nr 1072, s. 39–40; A. Gliwa, *Kraina*, s. 695.

³⁷ A. Gliwa, *Kraina*, s. 1008.

³⁸ Ibidem, s. 730.

³⁹ Ibidem, s. 728.

⁴⁰ CDIAUL, f. 13, op. 1, nr 456, s. 1559–1561; A. Gliwa, *Kraina*, s. 745.

not so much an element of struggle against the union as simply an act of meeting the need of the faithful to possess their own sanctuaries. To the first group belonged the place of worship foundation of St. Michael in Bojary formed in 1606 by Fedor Bojarski. When establishing this foundation he decreed that “old fashion” masses be conducted according to the resolutions of the seven Ecumenical Councils⁴¹. Interestingly, this foundation certificate was placed into the municipal records of Przemyśl only in 1613, during intense disputes between members of the Orthodox and Uniate churches and the efforts of the bishop Krupecki for his sovereignty to be recognized by the secular clergy.

Wills, which usually carry much information about the religious attitudes of the testators, in this case confirm only that the Orthodox nobility did not go beyond standard bequests for “prayers for the dead.” Out of 20 wills composed by Orthodox nobility with which I am familiar, only in two are there bequests going beyond requests for prayers for the deceased’s soul in the nearest orthodox church. The first is the will of a certain Rozłucki from the year 1655 in which he passes on 30 zł to the monastery of Spaski, 30 zł to Krechów, and 10 zł to the monastery of Topolnicki⁴². The second is the will of Prokop Ilnicki Jaroszewicz of impoverished nobility, who, in his testament of 1683, bequeathed 60 zł in debt to the monastery in Ławrów and recommended the financing of some instruments for the temple in Łosińska. He bequeathed the priest thereof a sheepskin coat⁴³.

The Orthodox nobilial foundations were of modest size. In the case of these monastery foundations, one can clearly see the interest given towards the future longevity of Orthodoxy. Such funds were mainly created by opponents of the union in the Przemyśl diocese and of Krupecki. The monasteries that were formed supported their descendants and other representatives of Orthodoxy. Similarly, in the case of the churches, it is possible to determine at least a few families, in whose estates destroyed temples were rebuilt. What was important for the size of the bequests unto the churches was the material position of the Orthodox nobility and the tumultuous

⁴¹ CDIAUL, f. 13, op. 1, nr 329, s. 611.

⁴² Ibidem, nr 382, s. 1982–1983.

⁴³ Ibidem, nr 437, s. 490–492.

events of the region in the 17th century. The number of bequests made by the faithful for monastic centers increased only in the 18th century, when there were fewer wars and elementary disasters, and the very diocese was already Uniate. With regard to the church foundations, the lack of sources constitutes a serious limitation.

Translated by
Daniel Jozeph Karczynski