

CHRISTINA DIETL, KHRYSTYNA FOSTYAK,
THOMAS SCHULTE-UMBERG, OLHA UHRYN,
NOREEN VAN ELK (EDS.)

WAR IN UKRAINE

THEOLOGICAL, ETHICAL AND HISTORICAL REFLECTIONS

Aschendorff Verlag

Christina Dietl – Khrystyna Fostyak – Thomas Schulte-Umberg –
Olha Uhryn – Noreen van Elk (Eds.)
War in Ukraine.
Theological, Ethical and Historical Reflections

War in Ukraine

Theological, Ethical and Historical Reflections

Christina Dietl – Khrystyna Fostyak –
Thomas Schulte-Umberg – Olha Uhryn –
Noreen van Elk (Eds.)

Aschendorff Verlag

Münster
2025







Cover:
Aschendorff Verlag GmbH & Co. KG

Text:
© Christina Dietl, Khrystyna Fostyak, Thomas Schulte-Umberg, Olha Uhryn, Noreen van Elk

Publiziert von
Aschendorff Verlag GmbH & Co. KG
Soester Straße 13
D-48155 Münster

E-Mail: buchverlag@aschendorff-buchverlag.de
www.aschendorff-buchverlag.de

ISBN 978-3-402-25096-9 (Print)
ISBN 978-3-402-25097-6 (E-Book PDF)
DOI https://doi.org/10.17438/978-3-402-25097-6



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No-Derivatives 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND) which means that the text may be used for non-commercial purposes, provided credit is given to the author. For details go to http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
To create an adaptation, translation, or derivative of the original work and for commercial use, further permission is required.
Creative Commons license terms for re-use do not apply to any content (such as graphs, figures, photos, excerpts, etc.) not original to the Open Access publication and further permission may be required from the rights holder.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 7
Christina Dietl, Khrystyna Fostyak, Thomas Schulte-Umberg, Olha Uhryn and Noreen van Elk (Eds.)
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25100-3

A Logical Experiment in Politics: Second Scholasticism in Creating Russian Imperialism 13
Volodymyr Shelukhin
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25101-0

The Tools of Modern Russian Colonization: The Case of the Bakhchysarai Khan's Palace 30
Elmira Ablialimova-Chyihoz
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25102-7

Central and Eastern Europe in the Age of the First World War: Revolution, Counter-Revolution, Containment 44
Dmytro Bondarenko
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25103-4

The Idea of a Federation of Poland and Ukraine in the Light of the Correspondence of the Greek Catholic Priest Prelate Tyt Voinarovsky with the Polish Diplomat Jan Stanisław Łoś 58
Paulina Byzdra-Kusz
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25104-1

The Gender Aspect of Political Rhetoric and its Origins: The Case of Ukraine 71
Mariana Myrosh
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25105-8

New Icons of War: Religious Motifs in Ukrainian Digital Popular Art During the Russo-Ukrainian War 89
Alina Mozolevska
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25106-5

Religion as a Key Front of Russian Aggression Against Ukraine 110
Maksym Vasin
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25107-2

Muslims in the Struggle for the Ukrainian Cause and Statehood 128
Andrii Zhyvachivskyi
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25108-9

Certain Aspects of Church-State Dynamics: Legal Naming Issues within Ukrainian Orthodoxy in the Context of the Russian-Ukrainian War 148
Mechyslav Yanauer
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25109-6

Patriarch Bartholomew's Position Towards the War Against Ukraine 164
Patrice Hrimle
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25110-2

The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the Russo-Ukrainian War 175
Kateryna Budz
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25111-9

Europeans Lost in Translation 189
Roman Sigov
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25112-6

Friends or Foes? Religious Organizations and European Institutions in the Face of Russia's War on Ukraine 200
Iuliia Korniichuk
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25113-3

Punish Russian War Crimes Already Now! 213
Oleksandra Matviichuk
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25118-8

List of Contributors 216
List of Editors 219

War in Ukraine
DOI 10.17438/978-3-402-25101-0

A Logical Experiment in Politics: Second Scholasticism in Creating Russian Imperialism

Volodymyr Shelukhin

The research paper reveals a possible source of influence from scholastic logic on the creation of the myth of ethnic unity between Ukrainians and Muscovites in the second half of the 17th century. The politicization of this myth occurred in the context of the Ruin period, when the Hetmanate (Cossack state) was in a complex geopolitical situation, and an alliance with Muscovy seemed suitable to some of the clergy's own interests. This case demonstrates the unexpected combination of a genealogical myth, based on the mythologization of specific passages of the Bible, with modern cultural forms, which scholastic logic was for 17th century Ukrainian philosophy.

1. Introduction

Generally, researchers agree that Ukrainian scribes, clerics and intellectuals were an important force in modernizing Moscovia and creating contemporary Russia through educational and cultural activities in the second half of the 17th and 18th centuries[1]. The presence of ethnic Ukrainians in the culture of the Russian Empire was so significant that in the mid-18th century there was even an attempt to bureaucratically restrict the appointment of ethnic Ukrainians

1 Cf. Olena Dziuba, Українці в культурному житті Росії (XVIII ст.): причини міграції [Ukrainians in the Cultural Life of Russia (18th Century): Causes of Migration], in: Alexei Miller/ Vladimir Reprintsev/ Boris Floria (eds.), Россия-Украина: история взаимоотношений [Russia-Ukraine: History of Relations], Москва 1997, 115–124; Iaroslav Isaievych, Early Modern Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine: Culture and Cultural Relations, in: Journal of Ukrainian Studies 17 (1992) 17–28; David Saunders, The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture, 1750–1850, Edmonton 1985.

to influential positions in the Church[2]. I would like to clarify the mechanism of involvement in these activities and the paradoxical role of Western ideas in creating pseudo-traditional Russian imperial narratives, with a focus on scholasticism and Aristotle's ontology.

As a central point, the traditional Russian imperialist position alleged that Ukrainians and Russians are the same and denied the existence of Ukraine by claiming that Ukrainians are a subgroup of Russians. My article is dedicated to the origins of this concept that are rooted in the ideas introduced by the Kyivan Synopsis[3] (1674) which was published in Church Slavonic with the blessing of Inokentii Gizel, Archimandrite of Pechersk Lavra (monastery) in Kyiv and republished with additional content in 1678, 1680/1681. The authorship of the text is disputed; the most reliable candidate is Panteleimon Kokhanovsky[4], who was a provisor of the Lavra and close confidant of Gizel. I based my research on the interpretative paradigm in sociology with a strong reliance on the interdisciplinary approach (history and cultural studies).

Before becoming the archimandrite, Gizel was a professor of philosophy, theology and logic at Kyiv Mohyla Academy. He continuously attempted to introduce Aristotle's philosophy into Orthodox theology. He was a prominent figure of the second wave of scholasticism in Ukraine as well as among Orthodox clerics – a new stage in the history of scholastic thinking in the 16th and 17th centuries, which began to develop in Ukraine in the 1620s. His lecture series *Opus totius philosophiae*[5], which he delivered at the Kyiv Academy in 1645–1647, was the most comprehensive philosophy course in Ukraine at that time. It includes an important logical *tractatus* which discusses issues such as categories, differentiation, logical operations etc. These two dimensions of Gizel's work (as editor of a pseudo-historical book and a scholastic philosopher

2 Cf. Myroslav Popovych, Нарис історії культури України [Essay on the History of Ukrainian Culture], Київ 1998, 258–259.

3 The Kyivan Synopsis was compiled and adapted into Ukrainian by Iryna Zhylenko, Синопсис Київський. Лаврський альманах [The Synopsis of Kyiv: Lavra Almanac], Київ 2002.

4 Cf. Yurii Mytsyk, Київський "Синопсис" як підручник з історії Русі-України [Kyivan Synopsis as a "Textbook" on the History of Rus-Ukraine], in: Проблеми дидактики історії: збірник наукових праць [Problems of Didactics of History: Scientific Works] 2 (2010) 75–78.

5 The complete text of Gizel's *Opus* remains unpublished. The most important parts of the course relevant to our topic were published in the second volume of his selected works in three volumes by Larysa Dovha and Mykola Symchych, see: Inokentii Gizel, Вибрані твори у трьох томах, Том 2 [Selected Works in Three Volumes, Volume 2], Львів-Київ 2011, 83–102, 167–193.

with attention to logics) can be perceived as a paradox. However, we should not forget that his work was part of a Baroque culture characterized by strange combinations and mannerist paradoxes. Instead, this paradox is vital to understanding this topic.

2. 'Rossia': In Search of the Holy Land and its Protectors

This section describes the essential context needed to understand this period. The term "Rossia" is a Hellenized form of "Rus", a Greek equivalent that in the 17th century referred to the territories under the jurisdiction of the Kyivan Metropolis which were ethnic Ukrainian and Belarusian lands, not Moscovian[6]. At the end of the 16th century, hellenized terminology began to be widely used in Ukraine. It was a reaction to the Latin Counter-Reformation movement within the Catholic Church and an attempt to re-emphasize the Greek origins of Christianity in Ukraine and Belarus. Even protestant authors of the late 16th and 17th centuries, both Calvinist and Unitarian, those who cooperated or counted on cooperation with the Orthodox camp, used Hellenic terms in their book titles ("Apocrisis" by Christopher Filaletusor, "Antapologia" by Eustachius Gizel). It is very likely that the use of the terms "Rossia" and "Rus" in the early 17th century was influenced by that cultural context[7].

As a result of the Church Union of 1596 – an attempt to unify the Orthodox and Catholic Churches in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth – Ukraine and Belarus (Rossia) lost their noble 'rossian' families, according to the account of Meletii Smotrytsky – philologist, theologian, and writer – in 1610[8]. Since the Medieval Ages, the status of the Church was influenced by the support of the Orthodox aristocracy and monarchs (Grand Princes of Kyiv or later Kings of the Rus as well as regional dukes). For instance, the father of Meletii Smotrytsky was a court poet and educator of the Prince of Ostrog. Smotrytsky's statement was exaggeratory but it was also close to the truth, especially when the House of Ostrog became extinct. An extremely important role in the de-

6 Cf. Serhii Plokhy, The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus, Cambridge 2006, 266–267.

7 Cf. Serhii Plokhy, Reconstractive Forgery: The Hadiach Agreement (1658) in the 'History of Rus', in: Journal of Ukrainian Studies 35–36 (2010–2011) 37–49, 37.

8 Cf. Meletii Smotrysky, Тренос [Trenos], in: Vasyl Yaremenko/ Valerii Shevchuk (eds.), Слово многоцінне: хрестоматія української літератури, створеної різними мовами в епоху Ренесансу та Бароко XV-XVIII століть, Книга 1 [The Priceless Word: Anthology of Ukrainian Literature Created in Various Languages during the Renaissance and Baroque Era, 15th-18th Centuries, Book 1], Київ 2006, 545–554, 552–553.

fense of Orthodox liberties was played by Orthodox brotherhoods. They might be the oldest civil organizations in early modern Ukraine that equally included aristocrats ("schliakhta") and commoners. Burgesses played a vital role in activities of brotherhoods in cities like Lviv, Kyiv, Lutsk (masters of guilds, merchants, craftsmen and free intellectuals). Some brotherhoods, especially the Lviv Brotherhood, were already very influential in the mid-16th century. Sovereigns, such as Moldavian rulers, sought to establish strong relations with them[9]. After the Church Union of 1596, which was supported by the majority of the Orthodox episcopate (including the Metropolitan of Kyiv) with the exception of the bishops of Lviv and Przemyśl, the Orthodox Church of Ukraine lost most of its episcopate. Under these circumstances, the brotherhoods concentrated significant power in their hands, including the ability to elect priests and suspend them from their duties[10]. The Eastern Orthodox patriarchs were inclined to accommodate to the brotherhoods, considering them a more reliable support for the faith than the episcopate, which consisted mainly of nobles and could be tempted by the privileges of the position. Therefore, the Antiochian Patriarch Joachim, during his visit to Lviv in 1586, granted the city's brotherhood the status of a stavropegion, which meant direct subordination to the patriarch rather than the local bishop[11]. In practice, due to the lack of regular contact with the patriarch, this status implied legal and canonical independence.

The situation also improved when the Cossacks, under the leadership of Hetman Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny became deeply involved in Church affairs in the 1620s. The Cossacks were trying to acquire cultural legitimacy to claim the liberties and privileges of the nobility. As a member of the nobility, the hetman extrapolated a typical pattern of supportive actions to a 'new' emerging social group – the Cossacks. The term "Cossack" is of Turkic origin and was integrated into the Ukrainian language in the late Middle Ages to describe a much older phenomenon known as "ukhodnytstvo" (escaping)[12].

9 Cf. Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Історія України-Руси, Том VI [History of Ukraine-Rus, Volume VI], Київ 1995, 509.

10 Cf. Popovych, Нарис, 176–177.

11 Cf. Hrushevsky, Історія, VI, 513–514.

12 Cf. Summary of the presentation of Omeljan Pritsak, Етимологія та зміст назви "козак" [Etymology and Content of the Term "Cossack"] by: Vasyl Omelchenko, Четверта конференція українських істориків УВАН: резюме доповідей [The Fourth Conference of Ukrainian Historians of UVAN: Summary of the Presentations], in: Український історик [The Ukrainian Historian], 3–4 (7–8) II (1965) 75–78, here: 76–78.

"Ukhodnytstvo" was a way of life adopted by various social groups who lived in areas free from legal regulations[13]. This lifestyle involved activities such as hunting, adventure, travelling, and trade. In previous centuries, there were other groups of people in Ukraine who practiced a similar lifestyle but were known by other names. The attempt of aristocrats, and later the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, to incorporate the Cossacks into official military service, led to them becoming a socially differentiated and institutionally organized group by the second half of the 16th century. The hetman was an administrative and military leader of the Cossacks and later, after the success of Khmelnytsky's uprising, the head of the government in the Cossack state (originally called "Zaporozhian Host" and historically "the Hetmanate").

The Zaporozhian Host wanted to be a supporter and protector of the Church[14]. During the passage of Patriarch Theophanes III of Jerusalem through Ukraine in 1620, the hetman provided him with armed protection, allowing for the consecration of new bishops, including Metropolitan Yov Boretsky (formerly a Brotherhood *didaskalos* in Latin and Greek, meaning a teacher)[15]. This ensured the continuity of the church hierarchy in Ukraine and Belarus. The Sejm of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth legally recognized the existence of the Orthodox Church and its episcopate in 1633, demanding the armed support of the Cossacks in a potential war against the Ottoman empire. In addition, at the hetman's decree, every Zaporozhian Cossack joined the Kyiv Brotherhood.

Notably, it was Patriarch Theophanes III himself who insisted in his instructions that the Cossacks should not take part in military campaigns against Moscovia, because he perceived Moscovia as a potential ally for the Orthodox Church in Ukraine[16]. It is unknown whether he sincerely considered this view

13 Cf. Hrushevsky, Історія, VII, 53–55.

14 Even after the restoration of the Orthodox ecclesiastical hierarchy in Ukraine and Belarus, largely thanks to the Zaporozhian Host, Orthodox bishops were attempting to distance themselves from the Cossacks. This intention could be seen in the protestation through the manifest in defense of the Orthodox Church addressed to the king (1621). See, adapted to modern Ukrainian language: Yov Boretsky: Протестація [Protestation], in: Volodymyr Shynkaruk/ Valeria Nichyk/ Andrey Sukhov (eds.), Пам'ятки братських шкіл на Україні: Тексти і дослідження [Memorials of Brotherhood Schools in Ukraine: Texts and Studies], Київ 1988, 313–327, here: 323.

15 Cf. Hrushevsky, Історія, VII, 411.

16 Cf. Serhii Savchenko, Московія очима України-Русі XVI–XVII ст. [Moscovia through the Eyes of Ukraine-Rus in the 16th-17th Centuries], in: Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність [Ukraine: Cultural Heritage, National Consciousness, Statehood] 15 (2006–2007) 282–297, here: 286.

to be true or whether he adopted it opportunistically because he received an instruction during his previous stay in Moscow. However, it coincided with one of the two positions that crystallized among the Orthodox clergy in Ukraine, primarily in the Pechersk Monastery, at the beginning of the 17th century. This alignment focused on external power or solidarity within the community and strengthened itself through internal mobilization and cooperation between estates (primarily the nobility, bourgeoisie, clergy and Cossacks, even though relations between them were not always smooth).

The second strategy did not preclude the preservation of political and legal loyalty to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, provided it recognized the rights and liberties of the Orthodox estates. Pro-Moscow sentiments among the clergy intensified in the early 1620s when it became clear that the canonical restoration of the Orthodox hierarchy would not receive legal approval due to the religious fanaticism of the king. Evidence of these sentiments is the polemical treatise "Palinode, or the Book of Defense" by Metropolitan Zakhariya Kopystensky[17]. The first attempt at a union between Orthodoxy and Catholicism in the region in the 15th century failed, primarily due to the imprisonment of a crucial advocate for the movement, Metropolitan Isidore of Kyiv (an ethnic Greek), by the Moscovites[18]. For Zakhariya Kopystensky, in the context of the new resistance to the union, this page of the past was inspiring and evoked sympathy for Moscow[19].

Researchers have pointed out the ideological resonances between "Palinode" and the "Synopsis"[20]. However, we should mention the key difference between the political theology of Kopystensky and the author of the "Synopsis".

17 Cf. Savchenko, Московія, 288–290. "Palinode" was not published during Kopystensky's time (1620s) and circulated in manuscripts. The text was first published in 1878, see: Zakhariya Kopystensky, Палинодія [Palinode], in: Памятники полемической литературы въ Западной Руси, Книга 1 [Monuments of Polemical Literature in Western Rus, Book 1] (Русская историческая библиотека 4), Санкт-Петербург 1878, 313–1200. I used the old Ukrainian text with modernised orthography according to: Zakhariya Kopystenky, Палінодія [Palinode], in: Oleksa Myshanych (ed.), Українська література XVII ст. [Ukrainian Literature in the 17th Century], Київ 1987, 93–107.

18 Cf. Marios Philippides/ Walter K. Hanak, Cardinal Isidore (c. 1390–1462): A Late Byzantine Scholar, Warlord, and Prelate, London – New York 2018, 79–113.

19 Cf. Kopystenky, Палінодія, 99. See an analysis in: Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Історія української літератури, Том 6 [The History of Ukrainian Literature, Volume 6], Київ 1995, 66–105.

20 Cf. Natalia Yakovenko, Паралельний світ: дослідження з історії уявлень та ідей в Україні XVI-XVII ст. [Parallel World: Studies in the History of Beliefs and Ideas in Ukraine in the 16th-17th Centuries], Київ 2002, 296–332.

The first author remained an aristocratic republican, rejecting the Catholic model of papal dominance within the hierarchy in favor of the collective rulership of bishops similar to senators, while the "Synopsis" presented a strict monarchist historiosophy. The first author focused on the Church, the second author focused on a political entity. This difference corresponds to the different political contexts in the 1620s and 1670 to 1680s. The same was true regarding the pro-Moscow sentiment. During the time of "Palinode", Ukraine, a religiously rebellious country, remained a part of the victorious Polish Crown where the Orthodox Church was legally unrecognized (after the Church Union of 1596). During the time of the "Synopsis", the Orthodox Church dominated the weak Cossack state that was divided and the treatment by Ottoman infidels was visible. The "Synopsis", in many ways, developed the historiosophy of "Palinode", which, in turn, emerged in a particularly dramatic moment when the Orthodox Church was threatened due to its semi-legal status. In other words, in the context of geopolitical uncertainty, the Pechersk clergy returned to the model tested half a century earlier. Just as before, the pro-Moscow sentiment in the 17th century was tactical.

The conservative Orthodox episcopate was skeptical about the inclusion of new secular social groups in church affairs, such as brotherhoods, commoners and Cossacks. The most striking example was the long-term conflict between the Orthodox bishop Gedeon Balaban of Lviv with the powerful Lviv Brotherhood of Dormition of the Holy Virgin. The Balaban family of Galician "schliakhta" had controlled the Lviv episcopal see for many generations as their own possession. They were strongly dissatisfied with the brotherhood's independence and claims to control the bishops according to the conciliarity principle ("sobornist") – the collective rule within the Church[21]. An additional factor was the Protestant expansion; it reinforced the anti-egalitarian attitude of the Orthodox Church. The two most powerful Protestant denominations in Ukraine, Calvinist and Unitarian, had Presbyterian constitutions with a strong collective rule. During the early period of the Orthodox resurrection, Orthodox scribes and intellectuals preferred Protestant innovations. Later, especially under the Metropolitan of Kyiv Petro Mohyla, the Orthodox Church introduced its own Orthodox version of the Counter-Reformation and integrated Catholic post-Trent patterns of innovations into the Orthodox community, which was due to the Metropolitan's high aristocratic status and political loyalty to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

21 Cf. Hrushevsky, Історія, VI, 523.

Petro Mohyla, the Metropolitan of Kyiv from 1633 to 1647, was a key figure in the Orthodox revival of the second quarter of 17th century in Ukraine and Belarus. His institutional activities and moral inspiration were crucial in this process. Petro Mohyla, a member of the Moldavian princely dynasty who was known for his elitist attitude toward church renewal, periodically faced negative reactions among the common people[22]. Weak Orthodox bishops after 1620 were frightened by the prospect of a decreased role in the church. Working models of institutional renewal during the Catholic Counter-Reformation and the challenge created by the development of Protestantism were supplemented with a new political reality after the Ruin period ("Ruina"). The Ruin period is characterized by great political challenges in Ukraine, approximately from 1663 to 1687, such as state fragmentation, a series of revolts and foreign invasions, along with the increasing influence of Moscovia in Ukraine.

An important prerequisite for the Mohylan revival, which did not allow pro-Moscow sympathies to develop into a coherent political program within the religious community, was the reconciliation with the Kyivan Brotherhood. Initially, there was tension between the Archimandrite of the Pechersk Lavra and the Kyivan Brotherhood. The symbol of this reconciliation was the establishment of the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium through the merger of the Lavra's monastic school with the Brotherhood.

While the Cossack's political and legal tradition developed a republican and contractual approach to state power, the church largely was oriented by monarchist nostalgia that was rooted in the historisophy of the heroic past. Monarchist and theocratic historiosophy of Orthodox Kyivan scribes is represented in literature as well. The reign of Grand Prince Volodymyr the Great was seen by Orthodox clerics as the highest point in the development of Christian Rus/Ukraine. This medieval topos was reinvigorated in the 16th century when the powerful Ukrainian orthodox aristocracy protected the Orthodox Church. We encounter this in the poetry of Herasym Smotrytsky in the 16th century, who was the court poet of the Prince of Ostrog and who was compared to Prince Volodymyr[23] in the preface to the first full Slavonic translation of the Bible (Ostrog Bible, 1581), with whom the princes of Ostrog claimed kinship, as well

22 Cf. Ihor Ševčenko, Україна між Сходом і Заходом [Ukraine Between East and West], Львів 2001, 178.

23 Cf. Herasym Smotrytsky, Всякого стану православний читачу [For the Orthodox Reader of Every Status], in: Острозька Біблія. Опрацював та приготовив до друку єрмн. архимандрит др. Рафаїл (Роман Торконяк) за виданням Біблії 1581 р. [The Ostrog Bible. Edited and Prepared for Publication by Archimandrite Dr. Raphail (Roman Torkoniak) Based on the 1581 Edition of the Bible], Львів 2006, 19–21, 20–21.

as the status of defenders of the Orthodox faith. Later, it became entrenched in literature and was also adopted by religious authors. This comparison was part of an effort to create an ideal role model for the Orthodox aristocracy[24].

The model produced a widespread literary topos in the 17th and early 18th centuries when rulers of Ukraine were compared to Grand Prince Volodymyr. For example, an anonymous author of mid-17th century poetry glorified Hetman Bohnad Khmelnytsky because "Rossia", a clerical term used for Ukraine, "grew" under his reign, like in the times of Volodymyr the Great[25]. We find the same motive many years later in Theophanes Procopowicz's speech dedicated to the birthday of the Russian emperor Peter I. The speaker said that the Emperor raised Rossia as Volodymyr did. A few decades earlier, Procopowicz – who was a Ukrainian-born philosopher, theologian and writer who wielded significant political influence in the Tsar's court during the first third of the 18th century – used this topos in the traditional Ukrainian way in his 1705 historical play "Владимир" to glorify Hetman Ivan Mazepa, who was at the peak of his power at that time. After the fall of Ivan Mazepa, the term "Rossia" was not used for Ukraine but for Moscovia as a whole empire[26]. After Hetman Mazepa's defeat, he changed his political orientation and influenced the ideological agenda of the emerging Russian empire, drawing upon traditional cultural and ideological tools from Ukraine that had emerged within the Ukrainian clerical communities. Interestingly, today's Kremlin propaganda uses the same motive for the glorification of Putin, a person who, according to their views, "raised Russia from its knees".

24 On the social function of Smotrytsky's poetry see: Viktoria Kolosova, Функції віршів в українських стародруках кінця XVI – першої половини XVII ст. [Functions of Verses in Ukrainian Early Prints from the Late 16th to the First Half of the 17th Century], in: Українське літературне барокко: збірник наукових праць [Ukrainian Literary Baroque: Collection of Scholarly Works], Київ 1987, 144–155, 147–148.

25 Cf. Чтиридесять тисяч Богдан войська споряжает [Bohdan Equips Forty Thousand Troops], in: Viktoria Kolosova/ Volodymyr Krekoten/ Mykola Sulyma (eds.), Українська поезія кінець XVI – середина XVII ст. [Ukrainian Poetry from the Late 16th to Mid-17th Century], Київ 1992, 101–104, 103–104.

26 Cf. Theophanes Procopowicz, Володимир [Volodymyr], in: Vasyl Yaremenko/ Valerii Shevchuk (eds.), Слово многоцінне: хрестоматія української літератури, створеної різними мовами в епоху Ренесансу та Бароко XV–XVIII століть, Книга 4 [The Priceless Word: Anthology of Ukrainian Literature Created in Various Languages During the Renaissance and Baroque Era, 15th-18th Centuries, Book 4], Київ 2006, 36–92, 36; Theophanes Procopowicz, Сочинения [Collected Works], Ленинград 1961, 38–48, 42.

The process of ethnically defining Russia was active during the 18th and 19th centuries. The Russian term "otechestvo" (fatherland) was elaborated by Ukrainian-born intellectuals according to the Cossack model of identity[27]. The title of 'autocrat/samoderzhets of Great, Little and White Rus' used by Moscovian tsars after the 1654 treaty was just a dynastic claim – the same as we find in titles of the Polish kings (Grand Dukes of Lithuania, Ruthenia, Prussia etc.). It did not mean that Lithuanians, Ruthenians and Prussians were the same people. Even in the early 19th century, Russians did not view Ukrainians as the same people. This is evident when we consider travel notes of the time[28]. Ukrainian intellectuals pushed the process of redefining Moscovia as not just a territory under the sovereign rule, but as people with a particular cultural identity and for that reason they used confessional language, the only clear language at that time in Moscovia. The idea of confessional unity[29] was reinforced with the genealogical myth of ethnicities.

3. Synopsis's Myth: Unexpected Consequence

According to this myth, the Moscovitians were proclaimed as successors of Noah's grandson Meshech and depicted as the ancestors of all Ruthenian and Slavic peoples. In Ukrainian tradition, the Hebrew name, according to the Ostrog Bible – the first full text of the Scripture in Ukraine –, was transliterated as Mosoch (Mocox). The Normans were defined as a Slavic population as well. This was important because of the monarchist historical views of Kyivan scribes. They believed that the House of Romanovs was a direct descendant of the House of Riuryk (historically, this was not true)[30].

From the perspective of its narrative structure, the "Synopsis" appears somewhat archaic compared to other contemporary Ukrainian historical

27 Cf. Frank Sysyn, The Persistence of the Little Rossian Fatherland in the Russian Empire: The Evidence from "The History of the Rus, or of Little Rossia" ("Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii"), in: Guido Hausmann/ Angela Rustemeyer (eds.), Imperienvergleich: Beispiele und Ansätze aus osteuropäischer Perspektive. Festschrift für Andreas Kappeler (Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte, Band 75), Wiesbaden 2009, 39–49, 41.

28 Cf. Valentyna Shandra/ Olena Arkusha, Україна в XIX столітті: людність та імперії [Ukraine in the 19th Century: Population and Empires], Київ 2022, 52.

29 The idea of confessional unity was also a project, not only because of the ecclesiastic independence of Kyiv from Moscow until 1685, but because the Moscovitian Church perceived Ukrainians and Belarusians as heretics rather than brothers in faith (for a long time in the 17th century the Church of Moscow did not recognize baptism in the Orthodox Church of the Kyivan Metropolis due to Moscovitian isolationism).

30 Cf. Zhylenko, Синопсис, 75–76.

works[31], which suggests that the text was narratively adapted for Moscovia. Furthermore, it was likely written opportunistically at a time when there was a high probability of Kyiv separating from the rest of the Zaporozhian host's territories and a real risk that it would be occupied by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth[32].

The consonance between the words "Moscovitians" and "Mosoch" was used in creating mythological etymology. At the time, Ukrainian society sought legitimacy from the past and searched for the roots of Ukrainian culture by using written laws, historical sources and crown privileges. During the Catholic Counter Reformation at the turn of the 17th centuries, the principle of "Ad fontes" spread in the intense struggle for traditional liberties and the status of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine. However, even Russian historians recognize that the genealogical myth represented in the Synopsis was not a creative invention, but rather a tactical step in search of financial support from the tsar, not a consistent ideological agenda. This conception about Mosoch as the progenitor of the Slavs was created in the 16th century by the Lithuanian chronicler Maciej Stryjkowski[33]. His chronicle was popular in the early 17th century and was included in historical discussions initiated by both the original text and Ukrainian translations[34]. Due to its widespread circulation in 18th century Russia, the role of the Synopsis in creating the myth of the "unified Rossia" is well-documented among historians[35]. Gizel, who was a supporter

31 Cf. Frank Sysyn, Поняття нації в українській історіографії 1620–1690 рр. [The Notion of Nation in Ukrainian Historiography 1620–1690], in: Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність [Ukraine: Cultural Heritage, National Consciousness, Statehood] 1 (1992) 49–79, here: 65–66, 71–74; Zenon Kohut, Витоки парадигми єдності: Україна та створення російської національної історії (1620–1860-ті роки) [Origins of the Unity Paradigm: Ukraine and the Creation of Russian National History, 1620–1860s], in: Схід-Захід: історико-культурологічний збірник [East-West: A Historical and Cultural Anthology] 5 (2001) 7–17, here: 14.

32 Cf. Plokhy, Origins, 260.

33 Cf. Maciej Stryjkowski, Літопис польський, литовський, жмудський і всієї Русі [Polish, Lithuanian, Samogitian, and All Ruthenian Chronicle], Львів 2011 [1846], 76.

34 Cf. Christine Watson, Tradition and Translation: Maciej Stryjkowski's Polish Chronicle in Seventeenth-Century Russian Manuscripts, Uppsala 2012, 55–56.

35 Cf. Zenon Kohut, Від Яфета до Москви: створення і перетворення біблійного родоводу слов'яну польській, українській та російській історіографії [From Japheth to Moscow: The Creation and Transformation of the Biblical Genealogy of the Slavs in Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian Historiography], in: Схід-Захід: історико-культурологічний збірник [East-West: A Historical and Cultural Collection] 9–10 (2008) 6–22; Alexei Miller, Украинский вопрос в Российской империи [The Ukrainian Question in the Russian Empire], Киев 2013, 39–41.

of the Synopsis, like the clergy of the Kyiv Metropolis in general, was not unequivocally pro-Moscow, as seen in the historical evidence[36]. Perceiving the "Synopsis" as a fundamentally pro-Moscovian text hindered researchers from recognizing its thinly veiled critique of Moscow. In the section "On Ruthenian, or Rossian people …," there is a reminiscence from the prophetic book of Ezekiel (chapters 38–39), where Meshech is the title of Gog, the personification of the apocalyptic ("Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal", Ezek. 38:3) infernal people bringing destruction against which the Son of Man will stand. According to the canonical interpretation, he is understood as Christ. In the 38th chapter, Prince Meshech ascends and arrives at the "unwalled villages," where he finds those "dwelling without walls" and brings ruin. In the 39th chapter, he is given as food to "the ravenous birds of every sort". This resembles the paradoxical wit that was a typical characteristic of Baroque literature, in which apocalyptic criticism is hidden under the guise of panegyric.

The evidence confirms the hypothesis that the "Synopsis" reflected the position of the clergy, specifically the Lavra, at a particularly dramatic geopolitical moment with a relatively short-term horizon. Paradoxically, this baroque wit, which combined mythological genealogy with scholastic dialectics, had a far-reaching political influence due to the subsequent widespread circulation.

4. Form and Matter: Between Scholastic Explanation and its Political Implications

What was the role of logics, metaphysics and scholasticism? Ukraine is a country of the victorious Counter-Reformation, its Orthodox version. The Ortho-

36 He, among others, did not swear allegiance to the Ukrainian-Moscovite agreement of 1654. After the entry of Moscovitian 'streltsy' (musketeers) into Kyiv, he sent complaints to the tsar about their lawlessness in the city. He publicly refused to raise his glass in honor of the Muscovite voivode Sheremetiev and the pro-Moscow hetman Ivan Briukhovetsky, who supposedly, during his visit to Moscow, promised, contrary to the canonical subordination of the Kyiv Metropolis to Constantinople, to subordinate it to the Moscow Patriarchate and subsequently appoint a Moscovite as the next Metropolitan. Cf. Zhylenko, Синопсис, 19–20; Olha Krainia, Вплив мілітаризації суспільства на життя Церкви в Україні (аналіз документів з історії Києво-Печерської лаври 2-ї половини XVII-XVIII ст.) [The Influence of Militarization of Society on the Life of the Church in Ukraine (Analysis of Documents from the History of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra in the Second Half of the 17th-18th Century)], in: Церква-наука-суспільство: питання взаємодії. Матеріали XV міжнародної наукової конференції [Church-Science-Society: An Issue of Interaction. Proceedings of the 15th International Scientific Conference], Київ 2017, 16–25, here: 18.

dox Church in Ukraine faced many challenges to its social status and cultural identity in the 16th and 17th centuries. As a part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after the Union of Lublin in 1569, Ukraine and its Orthodox population became part of the Catholic polity. Protestantism, especially the most radical branches that were more widespread in Ukraine than in other countries, challenged the prominence of the Orthodox Church and its irrational attitude towards faith. The attempt to solve a deep institutional crisis of the Church through the interdenominational Union of Berestia (Brest) in 1596 provoked additional division between the Greek Catholic (Union) Church and the Orthodox (Disunion) Church[37]. Despite that, the Orthodox Church in Ukraine accepted the Catholic Counter-Reformation model of cultural and institutional renovation, especially when Petro Mohyla was elected as Metropolitan of Kyiv.

Inokentii Gizel was a part of his circle and attempted to integrate Western philosophy into Orthodox tradition. Importantly, Gizel attempted to create a strict approach to looking at faith and dogma using logical thinking and categorizing. Inokentii Gizel rationalized moral thought of the Orthodox tradition as well ("Миръ съ Бгомъ Члвѣку"/"Peace with God for Man", 1669). Gizel widely used a categorical way of thinking that he borrowed from a Western philosophy of logic and adapted to moral issues. The strict interrelation of morals and politics was important in the Church's anti-Machiavellianist attitude. Thanks to Max Weber we know that theology is a form of religious rationalization. Therefore, it is not a coincidence that "Peace with God for Man" was written during the "Ruina" (Ruin). It was a strict theological attempt to rationalize morality and to provide systematic moral guidelines[38]. At the same time, Giovanna Brogi Bercoff analyzed the symbolic dimension of the *tractatus*. "Peace with God for Man" provided an implicit critique of tactical political and military alliances with infidels[39]. In the case of Gizel, though, we found

37 For example, the main reason of Khmelnytsky's uprising was often explained by contemporaries in terms of religious persecutions caused by the Union, see: Serhii Plokhy, The Cossacks and Religion in early Modern Ukraine, Oxford 2001, 176.

38 Gizel provided a systematic categorization of the sins of various social groups. This approach illustrated very clearly the roots of his moral philosophy in scholastic logics. Chapter 10 in his *tractatus* was dedicated to this matter. Cf. Inokentii Gizel, Мир з Богом чоловіку [Peace with God for Man], in: idem, Вибрані твори у трьох томах, Том 1, Книга 1 [Selected Works in Three Volumes, Volume 1, Book 1], Київ-Львів 2009, 302–331.

39 Cf. Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, "Мир з Богом чоловіку" як система моральної філософії ["Peace with God for Man" as a System of Moral Philosophy], in: Inokentii

interdependence, or 'logic-moral-politics'. Every entity was understood as a unity of form (*εἶδος, forma*) and matter (*ὕλη, materia*) which were inextricably connected. Two components, form and matter, were incomplete (*substantia incompleta*) by itself. Matter and form are something interdependent. Matter is potential existence. Form shapes it. Form transforms matter from potential into real existence. Although form is fundamentally there first, this does not mean that it is pre-existent[40]. Form could not exist without matter as well[41]. That ontological conception had to be attractive,[42] especially for Orthodox clerics, because it was in agreement with Orthodox Christology. Jesus Christ was a human being and God at the same time. He had a human and divine will at the same time. Additionally, the search for a new wave of religious restoration in the Orthodox Church of Ukraine in the late 16th and first half of the 17th centuries was motivated by resistance to Socinian Unitarianism that was still widespread in Ukraine before the Bohdan Khmelnytsky Uprising.

The same approach was relevant to Aristotle and his followers. Aristotle's view on the interrelation between matter and form was a key epistemological framework in many areas of his study, including social and political theory[43].

Gizel, Вибрані твори у трьох томах, Том 3 [Selected Works in Three Volumes, Volume 3], Київ-Львів 2011, 103–132, here: 112–114.

40 Cf. Olexii Panych, Аристотелева "усія": між субстанцією, сутністю і неперекладністю [Aristotle's "οὐσία" between Substance, Essence, and Untranslatability], in: Філософська думка [Philosophical Thought] 5 (2016) 33–49, here: 36.

41 Cf. Met. 7, 1032b. I used the Ukrainian translation of Aristotle's "Metaphysics" by Oleksii Panych and the English translation by Hugh Tredennick that is available online. Cf. Aristotle, Метафізика [Metaphysics], Київ 2022, 447–448; Aristotle, Metaphysics, translated by Hugh Tredennick. URL: https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0086.tlg025.perseus-eng1:7.1032b [accessed: 24 October 2023].

42 This conception was relevant for the Ukrainian academic philosophy until the 18th century. "Form is not emerging by itself, but emerging with matter for creating something complex," wrote Theophanes Procopowicz (my translation – V. S.). Cf. Theophanes Procopowicz, Логіка. Натурфілософія, або фізика. Етика [Logic. Natural Philosophy or Physics. Ethics], in: Theophanes Procopowicz, Філософські твори у трьох томах, Том 2 [Philosophical Works in Three Volumes, Volume 2], Київ 1980, 116–191, 138.

43 For example, in his *Politics*, Aristotle defined different political orders and explained the role of citizens under different systems. The order seems to be a form of constitution: monarchy, aristocracy and *politeia* with some variations like democracy or tyranny. These forms shape the context for the lawmaking process and create the exact way in which every order manifests itself. Epistemologically, he viewed the political order within the framework of matter/ form interrelation with political order as 'form' and citizens and laws as 'matter' of the state. This becomes evident when he explains that political order could be implemented only through the citizens' ability to deal with it

Generally, Second Scholasticism was guided by that landmark as an analytical tool. The key idea was that logic provides a general way of looking at every field of reality.

Metaphysics follows this ontology as well. A human being was understood as the unity of soul (form) and body (matter)[44]. If we do not take into account some political challenges of the first third of the 17th century, the Orthodox view on the nature of Christ was the main cultural precondition for why scholastic ontology was successfully implemented in Orthodox theology in Ukraine. The personality of Christ was an intellectual prototype for that kind of thinking, for the idea of the unbreakable link between two essences[45]. Gizel provided a 'physical' interpretation of form and soul as a principle by which we live[46], move and exist (*principium, quo vivimus, movemur et sumus*). Matter is just a potential existence. When it is shaped by form, it could be totally real and alive. To be more specific, the metaphysical idea was introduced in politics with the same pattern as it was introduced to the problem of soul and body: Kyiv (Church resurrection and culture) was a soul for Moscow (state and power) as a body.

Therefore, we may separate this conceptualization into two dimensions: a metaphysical and a political one. The metaphysical dimension suggests that Moscow was a matter, a potential existence that should be reconsidered ac-

---

and follow it (cf. Pol. 4, 1289a). Cf. Aristotle, Politics, translated by H. Rackham, London 1932, 281–283.

44 Cf. Roland Pietsch, "Tractatus de Anima" Інокентія Ґізеля в контексті антропологічних ідей Аристотеля та його схоластичних інтерпретаторів ["Tractatus de Anima" by Inokentii Gizel in the Context of Aristotle's Anthropological Ideas and His Scholastic Interpreters], in: Gizel, Вибрані твори 3, 31–50, here: 33–35, 50.

45 It seems this literary topos (in terms of Ernst Robert Curtius) was commonplace for Ukrainian Baroque literature from the early 17th century. "[...] [A] Hetman is glorious not through himself, but due to his military. And the military is glorious through the Hetman [...]" said Kasian Sakovych who was the first to introduce the scholastic way of thinking to Orthodox Ukraine before Gizel in his *tractatus* published in 1620 (my prose translation – V. S.). Cf. Kasian Sakovych, Вірші на жалосний погреб зацного рицера Петра Конашевича Сагайдачного [Verses for the Lamentable Funeral of the Distinguished Knight Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny], in: Myshanych (ed.), Українська література, 220–238, 222; Ernst Robert Curtius, Європейська література і латинське Середньовіччя [European Literature and Latin Middle Ages], translated by Anatolii Onyshko, Львів 2007, 93–123.

46 Cf. Yaroslava Stratii, Інтерпретація проблеми сутності душі та її здатностей у "Трактаті про душу" Інокентія Ґізеля [Interpretation of the Problem of the Essence of the Soul and Its Capabilities in Inokentii Gizel's "Tractatus de Anima"], in: Gizel, Вибрані твори 3, 51–81, here: 53, 56–57.

cording to the new historiosophical view. Kyiv was a form. Its traditions and cultural discourses should shape a new complex Rossian/Russian identity. In this dimension, Kyiv was a source like a metaphysical mother. Moscow was a recipient. The political dimension had another hierarchy that was consistent with the actual political context in the third part of the 17th century. Myth-making was a key tool in creating the political dimension, while logical and metaphysical categorizing was a key tool for the metaphysical dimension. Metaphysical speculation in politics paradoxically denied the self-sufficiency of each component. It was *distinctio rationis* (rational distinction)[47] between Ukraine and Moscovia, which could not be differentiated as form and matter. The idea of non-difference between Ukraine and Moscovia was a result of logical speculation, not an ontological fact.

5. Conclusions

Ukrainian clerics simulated relations between Ukraine and Moscovia according to the scholastic way of thinking. Gizel united the Synopsis and scholastic philosophy. This link is surprising because of the myth-making style of the Synopsis and the strict logical considerations in Gizel's philosophical writings. However, we can reconstruct some common discourse. The political ideologeme of non-difference between Ukraine and Moscovia was a logical categorization *ex natura rei*. Theophanes Procopowicz continued the scholastic line that started in the first half of the 17th century in Ukraine. The way in which historical knowledge was organized, was based on logical procedures of Aristotelian, more specifically scholastic philosophy. Logical and metaphysical categories were used as political. The ideological precondition of the "unified people" myth was created by Kyivan scribes in the 17th century. It was caused by the extrapolation of metaphysical categories and a scholastic approach to political issues under particular historical circumstances: the Protestant challenge, the Catholic Counter-Reformation and the political crisis of the Ruin period. Paradoxically, the ideological construct that is presented as nativist in contemporary Russia, can't be explained without reference to Western thought

47 Gizel was followed by this scholastic distinction between *distinctio rationis* and *distinctio realis* in his logics, Inokentii Gizel, Tractatus tertius "De distinctionibus". Tractatus quartus "De universalibus", in: Gizel, Вибрані твори 2, 53–62. See the explanation in: Mykola Symchych, Проблема проміжних розрізнень у філософському курсі Інокентія Гізеля [The Problem of Intermediate Distinctions in the Philosophical Course of Inokentii Gizel], in: Sententiae 2 (2009) 201–216.

and the unintended early modern influence from Ukraine. That conception was an attempt to find a rational solution for political challenges in Ukraine during the Ruin period by harmonizing logic and politics. Paradoxically, that attempt was aggressively consumed by imperialism and its propaganda. The idea of unity was transformed into the idea of denial when confessional unity was replaced by national identity. In fact, the original idea about confessional unity and ethnic ties changed when Russian imperialism started to grow in the 18th and 19th centuries.

The source of the unity myth was rooted in political resentment of part of the clerical elites in Ukraine. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church attempted to create a framework to protect the episcopal supremacy and distanced itself from the mass movements. This intention aligned very well with the monarchical sympathies of the clergy. Scholastic logic was used as a means to help form the myth of ethnic unity[48].

48 Today's Orthodox Church of Ukraine has experienced a true revolution in legitimacy. A good example is the ongoing calendar reform. The Church hierarchs follow laymen's expectations.