

Dorota Kozaryn

Uniwersytet Szczeciński

University of Szczecin

ORCID: 0000-0002-2308-015X

## **Expressions in the Description of Orthodox Christianity in *Kronika, to jest historyja świata* by Marcin Bielski (1564)**

The first Polish-language general and Polish history written by Marcin Bielski (circa 1495–1575) includes information about the history of individual nations, descriptions of the territories occupied by them, as well as about their cultures, languages and religions. Bielski's way of describing particular faiths allows us to notice two basic models: The first one consists in presenting a particular faith in the form of a separate book (as in Protestantism) or chapters (as in Judaism, Islam or pagan faiths); the second involves interweaving information about a particular religion while describing various events, places or characters. This is the method used by the author of *Kronika* when delivering to the reader knowledge about Eastern Christianity, that is, Orthodox Christianity. I make linguistic determinants for the description of this religion the subject of the presented considerations in order to answer the question to what extent Bielski was familiar with Orthodox Christianity and why he did not single out the description of the Orthodox Church in the form of a separate part of *Kronika*. In this article, the term *Orthodoxy* includes the faith under the Eastern rite from the period before and after the Schism in 1054. First, a few words about the history of this religion. Orthodoxy from Greek: *orthodoxía*, i.e., 'correct worship', 'correct faith' as 'a divine-human organism whose head is Jesus Christ, and whose body is a community of angels and baptised people united by faith in God and the mystery of the Eucharist' [cf. entry *cerkiew* (*tserkov*) in: *Słownik polskiej terminologii prawosławnej* (*Dictionary of Polish Orthodox terminology*)], as Rev. Henryk Paprocki claimed "was formed in the Middle East and the eastern part of the Roman Empire, as well as in Egypt and the Caucasus. Before the 4<sup>th</sup> century, we can talk about the multiplicity of

liturgical and theological traditions that were synthesised between the 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> centuries, which was largely affected by the Ecumenical Councils and the Doctrine of the Church Fathers” [Paprocki 2008: 9]. “The clear distance between the eastern and western vision of Christianity has continued since the 7<sup>th</sup> century, although the signs of differences appeared [...] in the 4<sup>th</sup> century” [Radziukiewicz, ed. 2000: 8]. Jan Stradomski [cf. Stradomski 2003: passim] believes that clear damage to the unity of the universal Church appeared in the early 11<sup>th</sup> century, when the Patriarch of Constantinople, one of the five who the whole of Christianity was subject to between the 4<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> centuries (the others had their capitals in Rome, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem), Sergius II, ordered the name of the then Pope Sergius IV (1009–1012) to be removed from the liturgical prayers in response to a papal letter announcing the assumption of sovereignty over Constantinople and containing a profession of faith that included the word *Filioque*, literally meaning “and the Son”, added to the eighth article of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed as early as the 5<sup>th</sup> century. This was contrary to the decree of the third Ecumenical Council of Ephesus in 431. This would be the main cause of the Great Schism, although the immediate cause of putting a curse on the Roman Church was a conflict connected both with papal interference in the eastern ecclesiastical rite in the south of Italy, and with the closure of Latin rite churches in Constantinople. For this closure, the legate of the late Pope Leo IX, Cardinal Humbert, excommunicated the Patriarch of Constantinople, Michael Cerularius in June/July 1054, while the Patriarch of Constantinople convened a synod, which ordered the burning of the legate’s bulla and approved a curse being imposed on the Roman Church. According to Stradomski, the sense of the realness of breaking the bond between Rome and Constantinople was brought by the Fourth Crusade, whose participants captured and destroyed Constantinople in 1204, which Bielski described in *Kronika* as follows: “Seeing the misrule and murder among the Constantinople emperors, the Latin rite Catholics and Germans took control of the city of Constantinople and took the crown and the *spectrum*” (“Bacząc Łacinnicy i Niemcy, iż nierząd a morderstwo między konstantynopolskimi cesarzmi, ubieżeli im miasto Konstantynopole, *sceptrum* i koronę wzięli”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 109].

The *Kronika* does not contain the lexeme *Orthodoxy* (*prawosławie*). Bielski’s *hapax legomenon* performs its function [cf. Mayenowa, ed., 1974: 116] as a *Grecianism* (*grecyzna*), appearing in the description of the religion of the Lithuanians and Eastern Slavs and their relations with Moscow:

although Jagiełło, as a father, had baptised all of them in Lithuania in the Christian faith according to the Roman Church, yet they were many who turned to

the Grecianism [...] with Moscow, and all in Ukraine turn away from Moscow due to the cruelty that Moscow uses to its subjects, for no one there has their own property in anything, as all belongs to the great priest who imposes capital punishment for any reason.

aczkolwiek był Jagiełło wszyscy pokrzczył w Litwie jako ociec na krześcijańską wiarę według Kościoła rzymskiego, wszakże sie ich wiele ku greczyźnie [...] z Moskwą obróciło, a snadź wszyscy na Ukrainie, jedno sie zawždy odciągają od Moskwy dla okrucieństwa, które czyni Moskiewski nad poddanymi swymi, bo tam żadny nie ma własności swej w każdej rzeczy, jedno księdza wielkiego wszystko, k temu o lada przyczynę wszystkie na gardle karze. [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 264]

Referring to Orthodoxy, Bielski uses the words *Greek* (*grecki*) and *Ruthenian* (*ruski*), derived from ethnonyms. To name Eastern Christianity, the adjective *Greek* (*grecki*) is combined with the nouns: *faith* (*wiara*) [e.g., “There were Slovaks of the Greek faith” (“byli Słowacy greckiej wiary”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 370; “He accepted the Greek faith” (“grecką wiarę przyjął”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 39; “she followed the Greek faith” (“ku greckiej wierze stroiła”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 157; “they profess the Greek faith” (“wiarę grecką wyznawają”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 346], *rite* (*obyczaj*) [“no baptism, either under the Roman or Greek rite” (“krzest żadny, tak rzymskim obyczajem, jako greckim”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 117; “Christians, some under the Greek rite, others under the Roman rite” (“krześcijanie, jedni obyczajem greckim, drudzy rzymskim”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 308; “she was baptised under the Greek rite” (“okrzciła sie greckim obyczajem”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 311], *church* (*kościół*) [“to unite the Greek and Latin Churches” (“aby zjednoczyli Kościoły greckie z łacińskimi”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 101], *system* (*sposób*) [“Christians first adhering to the Greek system” (“krześcijanie napierwszy, greckim sposobem trzymając”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 431], *system of faith* (*sposób wiary*) [“having abandoned the Greek system of faith” (“opuściwszy grecki sposób wiary”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 48], *obedience* (*posłuszeństwo*) [“following both the Greek and Roman obedience” (“tak greckiego, jako rzymskiego posłuszeństwa naśladowując”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 289]. To describe Eastern Christianity associated with Ruthenia (after the baptism of Kiev Ruthenia in 988), Bielski uses the adjective *Ruthenian* (*ruski*), mainly in conjunction with the noun *faith* (*wiara*). For example, in information about Bolesław George, the Volyn-Halite prince poisoned in 1340 for “wanting to depart from the Ruthenian faith” (“odstąpić chciał od ruskiej wiary”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 136]; in presenting the actions of Isidore, the Metropolitan of Kiev and Patriarch of Constantinople, unsuccessfully trying in 1439 “to unite the Ruthenian

faith with the Polish one, he kept going to father Pope to Rome, where Eugenius [...] made him a cardinal and gave him the power to unite them” (“o to, jako by mógł zjednoczyć ruską wiarę z polską, jeździł do ojca papieża do Rzymu, tam go Eugenius [...] uczynił kardynałem i dał moc zjednoczenia ich”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 187]; in the description of the fourth wife of Jagiełło, *Zofka*, who in 1422 “was baptised and given to the king, because she was of the Ruthenian faith, and she was given the name Zofija” (“okrzczona i oddawana była królowi, bo ruskiej wiary była, a dano jej imię Zofija”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 178] or the daughter of Ivan III the Great, given as a wife to King Alexander, whom the Poles “did not want to crown because she was of the Ruthenian faith, and did not want to be baptised under our – as Bielski writes – baptism” (“koronować nie chcieli, iż ruskiej wiary była, a nie chciała się okrzcić na nasz – jak pisze Bielski – krzest”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 230]. *Ruthenian rite* (*Obyczaj ruski*) used to describe the religion appears only once in the description of religious practices by Helena Moskiewska, who, remaining faithful to her faith, was able to participate in the services, because “in the castle she had her chapel under the Ruthenian rite” (“na zamku miała swoją kaplicę obyczajem ruskim”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 230].

Orthodoxy is invoked in *Kronika* also by the name of the inhabitants of Greece and the name of the land of *Ruthenia* (*Ruś*). Nouns: *Greek* (*Grek*) and *Grecian* (*Greczyn*) are used in *Kronika* to refer to Eastern Christians both before and after the Great Schism. The lexeme *Grecian* (*Greczyn*) is rarely used: Once for the term of one of the Apostles of the Slavs, “Bishop St. Cyril the Grecian” (“biskupa s. Cyrylla Greczyna”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 605] and once for the description of already mentioned Isidore, who is referred to as indicating his connection with Orthodoxy: “Isidorus [...] the Grecian, Archbishop of Kiev” (“Izydorus [...] Greczyn, arcybiskup kijowski”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 187]. The noun *Greek* (*Grek*) appears more often in the singular when determining individuals [e.g., “Athanasius the Greek” (“Atanazyjus Grek”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 65 about St. Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria], and in the plural for naming the whole of the followers [e.g., “the second one was elected by the Greeks in Constantinople” (“drugiego wybrali Grekowie w Konstantynopolu”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 79]. The plural form often appears in comparison with the term followers of Western Christianity [e.g., “Unification of the Greeks with Latin rite Catholics” (“zjednoczenia Greków z Łacinniki”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 201; “neither the Latin rite Catholics nor the Greeks understood” (“nie rozumieli Łacinnicy ani Grekowie”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 79] and the Orthodox from Ruthenia in a variable order [e.g., “among the Ruthenians and the Greeks” (“u Rusi i u Greków”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 44; “among the Greeks and the Ruthenians” (“u Greków i u Rusi”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 105]. When there is

only the lexeme *Ruthenia* (*Ruś*), considering it a name of the religion is questionable, because if we read: “of Boris [...] and Hleb [...] brothers, [...], who Ruthenia worships as martyrs” (“Borysa [...] i Hleba [...] bracia, [...], które Ruś święci za męczenniki”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 313], “Bishop Stefan [...], who is worshiped by Ruthenia” (“biskup Stefan [...], którego święci Ruś”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 336] or “Ruthenia observes her holiday on the eleventh day of July” (“święci jej święto Ruś dnia jedennastego lipca”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 311], the word *Ruthenia* (*Ruś*) can be interpreted as the name of the religion, which may be indicated by references to saints, and as the name of the land inhabited by people worshipping the persons mentioned. The same is true of the noun *Greek* (*Grek*), as not every use of it in *Kronika* means an Eastern Christian, for Bielski uses the name to describe the inhabitants of the land of Greece, but also to describe the original faith of that nation. See:

And so the Greeks, where the head of all the sciences was, always had strange idols invented, some for in a battle, others in weakness: Jupiter was against the air, Mars was for fighting, Juno for wealth, Venus for fertility. They praised the sun and the moon as well as many others, to which they prayed and make sacrifices. In addition, they made wicked holidays, when their girls and wives were given freely to anyone for their desires and as indulgence.

A tak Grekowie, gdzie była głowa wszystkich nauk, / zawždy mieli dziwnie wymyślane bożki, jedny na walki, drugie w niemocy: Jowisz był przeciw powietrzu, dla walki Mars, Juno dla bogactwa, Wenus dla płodu. Słońce i miesiąc chwalili, i inych wiele, którym modły i ofiary czynili. Nadto jeszcze i święta ku sprosności ustawiali, na które swoje dziewczki i żony wolno każdemu ku lubości dawali, dla swoich odpustów. [Bielski 2019, vol. 1: 369–370].

There is another way of invoking the Orthodox in *Kronika* – the use of the adjective *Greek* (*grecki*). It appears in a substantialised form, as in the description of the way Christianity existed in Bielski’s time: “it is in our Christianity, because they divided into three: Some Roman [...], some Greek [...], some newly baptised from the brothers [...], some condemning the others, which God cannot stand too long” (“sie to u nas w krześcijaństwie najduje, bo sie także na troje rozdzielili: jedni rzymscy [...], drudzy greccy [...], drudzy nowokrzeczeńcy z bratry [...], jedni drugie potapiając, czego Bóg długo/ cirpieć nie może”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 1: 430–431]. There is also the adjective *Greek* (*grecki*) combined with the terms for identifying people, for example, “Cyril [i.e., St. Cyril of Jerusalem – D.K.] and Nazanzenus Greek scholars” (“Cyryllus [tj. św. Cyryl Jerozolimski – D.K.] i Nazanzenus ludzie greccy uczeni”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 70],

“Greek Christians” (“krześcijanie greccy”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 405]. The latter way occasionally appears also with the use of the adjective *Ruthenian* (*ruski*), for example, “Three Lithuanian bishops who profess the Roman faith: Vilnius, Kiev, Żmudź, more Ruthenians, also churches” (“Biskupów trzech litewskich, którzy wiarę rzymską wyznawają: wileński, kijowski, żmudzki, ruskich więcej, także kościołów”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 346].

It should be emphasized that Bielski does not avoid using names connected with Eastern Christianity: *Christian*, *Christianity* (*krześcijanin*, *krześcijański*, *krześcijaństwo*), for example:

In Armenia there are the first Christians of the Greek rite, because St. Peter first founded the papal chair at Antioch, but they separated themselves from the Greeks in some aspects.

W Armeniiej są krześcijanie napierwszy, greckim sposobem trzymając, bo tam był s. Piotr napierwej stolec papieski założył w Antyjochijej, wszakże odszczepili się od Greków w niektórych artykulech. [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 431]

Vladimir Ruthenian the first Christian

Włodzimierz Rusin pierwszy krześcijanin [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 39 marg.]

and they sent to Morava again for Borzyvoj, asking him as a natural lord to turn to his chair for them. And he did this and asked Swatopluh to send his bishop with him, and he did so, and converted many people to the Christian faith, but with great difficulty.

posłali do Morawy zasię po Borzywoja, prosząc jako pana przyrodzonego, aby się zaś k nim na swój stolec nawrócił. Który to uczynił i prosił Swatopluha, aby z nim posłał biskupa swego[...], który posłał, i nawrócił wiele ludu na krześcijańską wiarę, acz z wielką trudnością. [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 606]

This Olha went to Constantinople to learn the Christian faith

Ta Olha jeździła do Konstantynopola wiary krześcijańskiej wyknąć [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 37]

Herberstyn does not believe[...] that he [Vasyl Ivanovich, i.e., Vasyl III–D.K.] when he demanded from the pope or emperor to annoint to the Moscow kingdom, [as Paulus Iovius wrote [...],] for he is an enemy to the pope who calls him an apostate, and he claims that he is not a pope, but a Roman doctor; he says that the real pope is the patriarch of Constantinople, ‘for he has not departed from the Christian faith,’ as he says.

Nie daje temu wiary Herberstyn [...], aby on [Wasył Iwanowicz, i.e. Wasył III–D.K.] kiedy żądał u papieża albo cesarza pomazania na królestwo moskiewskie, {jako Paulus Iovius napisał [...],} gdyż on jest nieprzyjacielem papieżowi i odszczepieńcem go zowie, a mieni go być nie papieżem, ale doktorem rzymskim, prawym papieżem powiada być patrijarchę konstantynopolskiego, ‘bo sie ten nie odszczepił od krześcijańskiej wiary’, powiada. [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 319]

Azov [...], where the great merchant store is and where everyone is free to sell and buy, regardless of where they come from, from the Turks or from the Tatars, as from Christianity; and it is in the Turkish power

Azow [...], gdzie wielki skład kupiecki tak z Turek, z Tatar, jako z krześcijaństwa, każdemu tam wolno, by nie wiedzieć skąd był, przedawać i kupować, a w tureckiej mocy jest. [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 324]

Readers seem to perceive these terms as being related to Orthodoxy only where there is an additional definition (such as Greek Christians). However, the very fact of assigning the same name to both branches of Christianity [e.g., “Christians, some under the Greek rite, others under the Roman rite” (“krześcijaństwo, jedni obyczajem greckim, drudzy rzymskim”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 308] offers proof of their equal treatment in the history of the world written by Bielski.

There was also clergy among the Orthodox. To designate the superiors of the Eastern Church after the Schism, but also bishops, most often of Constantinople, from the earlier period, Bielski uses the term *patriarch* (*patryjarcha*), e.g., “He sent messengers to Constantinople to urge Paul, the patriarch, [...] to stop the Aryan cult” (“posłał posły do Konstantynopola, aby namawiali Pawła patryjarchę [...], aby przestał sekty aryjańskiej”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 99]; “[he] had a quarrel with the patriarch of Constantinople [...] about the supremacy of dignity, which Boniface obtained with Phocas’ order” (“ten się swarzył z patryjarchą konstantynopolskim [...] o zwierzchność dostojności, którą za rozkazaniem Fokasowym obdzierzał Bonifacyjusz”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 94]; “There in Rome he [Pope Eugene IV–D.K.] crowned the Emperor Sigismund [...], and he brought John Palaeolog [...] the Emperor of Constantinople to the unity of the Roman Church with his patriarch [...] [who was Joseph II at that time – D.K.], having established the parliament in Florence” (“Tam w Rzymie [papież Eugeniusz IV–D.K.] Zygmunta cesarza [...] koronował, a Jana Paleologa [...] cesarza konstantynopolskiego ku jedności Kościoła rzymskiego przywiódł z jego patryjarchą [...] [którym był wtedy Józef II–D.K.], sjęm we Florencyjej uczyniwszy”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 170]. The last of these quotations describes the so-called Florentine Union of 1439, intended to reverse the effects of the Great Schism, which

failed to produce the desired results. Bielski calls the Orthodox clergy *priests* (*kapłani*) when he invokes those from the beginning of the development of the Eastern Church [“to the east of the sun all priests were allowed to have wives” (“na wschód słońca kapłanom wszystkim było wolno żony mieć”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 67], also with the grammatical modifier *Greek* (*grecki*) [“Greek priest” (“kapłan grecki”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 428; “It was permitted for Greek priests to have wives” (“dopuszczono greckim kapłanom żony mieć”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 101], and he calls them *popes* (*popi*) when he describes the Moscow clergy [e.g., “There were many Ruthenian people who wished Moscow more fortune than Lithuania with ours because they had joint popes or churches with Moscow, they have to have one faith with each other.” (“Ruskiego ludu było wiele, którzy więcej życzyli Moskiewskiemu fortuny niż Litwie z naszymi, gdyż oni z Moskwą jedny popy albo kościoły mają, muszą z sobą jednej wiary być”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 264], also with the grammatical modifier *Ruthenian* (*ruski*) [“Ruthenian popes” (“popów ruskich”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 249; “He did not worship the Ruthenian popes” (“popów ruskich jej nie chował”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 316; “through the betrayal of the Ruthenian popes” (“przez zdradę ruskich popów”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 331]. An exception to this rule is the name *Pope John* (*Pop Jan*), given to the legendary priest, the king of the Christian state allegedly existing in the Middle Ages in Asia or Ethiopia, who, as Bielski writes,

believes in Christ and Gospels, but not in the Roman system. In 1534 he sent several learned men [...] of his own to Portugal to become accustomed to the Spanish language and the faith according to the Roman Church; when they were accustomed, they said that they observed the Christian faith according to the doctrine of the St. Philip the Apostle.

wierzy [...] w Krystusa i Ewanjeliję, wszakże nie po rzymsku. Posłał był lata 1534 kilka uczonych ludzi [...] swoich do Portugaliję, aby nawykli języka hiszpańskiego i wiary według rzymskiego Kościoła; gdy nawykli, powiadali, iż oni według nauki s. Filipa Apostoła wiarę krześcijańską trzymają. [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 425].

When we read the description of the faith in the country of Pope John, we find references to Orthodoxy in the “pre-Ruthenian” version: “They, as also the Greeks, have their patriarch” and “their priests have wives, but when the wife dies, he cannot marry another woman, as is the case with the Greeks” (“Mają też swego patryjarchę jako i Grekowie” oraz “kapłani u nich/ żony mają, ale gdy mu umrze, pojąć innej nie może, jako u Greków”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 425–426].

The problem of combining the sacraments of priesthood and marriage was, according to *Kronika*, the first cause of *the rupture of the Greeks from*



*the Roman Church (rozerwania Greków od Kościoła rzymskiego)*, which was described as taking place during the Council of Nicaea I in 325, as follows:

In this very Nicaea there was a common parliament established under the rule of Constantine, attended by many bishops, desiring to add more dignity and honour as well as holiness to the priesthood, [...] they wrote down the canons so that no priest could take a wife, and if any of them were already married, they shouldn't sleep with their wives. If they did otherwise, such priest would be cursed and deprived of dignity. Paphuntius from the Greeks was against it, saying to them a long thing that from this no good would come, only killing, adultery, quarrels, fights or contempt, even though he led the best life, this will not go without being defamed by people, saying: "The marital status is noble, for it is God himself that set this over everything else." Some of them agreed to his reasoning, others did not, and for this reason the Greeks were torn from the Roman Church first, and so it continued, until during the rule of Pope Agathon, they united in Constantinople under the rite that all priests were allowed to have wives in the east, but in the west they were not, that is: Germany, Italy, Poland, Hungary and others.

W tej też Nicenie złożon był sjem pospolity duchowny za Konstantynusa, na którym było wiele biskupów, chcąc dostojność większą a zacność z świątobliwością uczynić kapłańskiemu stanowi, [...], spisali kanony, aby żaden duchowny żony nie pojmował, a jeśli je którzy mieli, aby z nimi nie legali, którzy by inaczej czynili, wina na nie klątwę miała być i zrzucenie z dostojństwa tego. Przeciw temu był od Greków Pafuncyjus, rozwodząc im długą rzeczą, iż z tego nic dobrego nie uroście, jed/no zabijanie, cudzołóstwo, zwady, przymówki i zelżenie większe duchownemu stanowi, choćby który najlepszy wiódł żywot, nie będzie bez obmówki ludzkiej, mówiąc: "Ślachtetny jest stan małżeński, bo ji sam Bóg ustawił nade wszystkie inne". Dali miejsce niektórzy jego powieści a drudzy nic, z tej przyczyny było rozerwanie Greków od rzymskiego Kościoła napirwsze i tak trwało, aż się potym za papieża Agatona [...] zjednoczyli w Konstantynopolu tym obyczajem, iż na wschód słońca kapłanom wszystkim było wolno żony mieć, ale na zachód nic, to jest: Niemcom, Włochom, Polakom, Węgrom i innym. [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 66–67]

And again, in the description of the Council of Constantinople III in 681:

He [i.e., Pope Agaton from Sicily – D.K.] attended the great synod at Constantinople, which, with the permission of the emperor, had the Greek Churches unite with the Latin Churches, at which the Greek priests were permitted to have wives,

and to take the body of the Lord in two forms at the urging of Paphuntius, [...] their representative, who had previously claimed in the Nicene Parliament that nothing good would come out of it, but the Italian nothing [...].

Ten to [tj. papież Agaton pochodzący z Sycylii – D.K.] był synod wielki w Konstantynopolu udziałem cesarskim, aby zjednoczyli Kościoły greckie z łacińskimi, na którym dopuszczono greckim kapłanom żony mieć i pod dwiema osoboma [...] ciało Pańskie brać z namowy Pafuncyusa [...] ich posła, który przed tym rozwodził na sejmie niceńskim, iż z tego nie miało nic dobrego uróść, ale włoskim nic [...]. [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 101]

The sacrament of the Eucharist in the Church of Eastern Christians is described – apart from the quote above – also in the following passage in *Kronika*: “And the fresh wafer [...] was used during the mass, because before this [i.e., before the decree of Pope Alexander, who was in office in the years of the First Vatican Council in 107–116 or 105–115 – D.K.] simple bread was sacrificed, as it is today among the Ruthenians and the Greeks” (“a opłatkiem prasnym [...] słuźono we mszy, bo przed tym [tzn. przed postanowieniem papieża Aleksandra, sprawującego funkcję w l. 107–116 lub 105–115 – D.K.] prosty chleb poświęcano, jako dziś u Rusi i u Greków”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 44].

Bielski, presenting the history of the popes, cites the decision of Pope Nicholas I [9<sup>th</sup> century], who ordered that “no baptism, either under the Roman rite or the Greek rite [...] to be renewed” (“krzest żadny, tak rzymskim obyczajem, jako greckim, [...] nie był odnawian”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 117]. It has already been mentioned in this article about non-compliance with this order in 15<sup>th</sup>-century Poland. In *Kronika*, a different rite of baptism is emphasized, that is, immersion in water of the whole baptised child: “For among the Greeks and the Ruthenians the whole baby is dipped in the water when they baptise the baby” (“abowiem u Greków i u Rusi wszystko dziecię maczają w wodzie, gdy je krzczą”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 105]. This way of baptising seemed so unique that it was used as a comparison in describing the behaviour of Muslims in Mecca: “Also, there is a well, from which people take water for the remission of sins, and in it they wash from the feet to the top of their heads, as the Greeks, when children are baptised; everything in the water will soak, assuming that they may get rid of their sins.” (“Jest też tam studnica, z której ludzie biorą wodę ku zglądzeniu grzechów, takżeż sie w niej omywają od stóp aż do wierzchu głowy, jako Grekowie, gdy dzieci krzczą; wszystko w wodzie omoczy, mni mając, aby tym grzechów pozbyli”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 409]. Bielski cites twice the description of the baptism of the later saint, Vladimir I the Great (956/958–1015), from about 980 the Grand Duke of Kiev, who married the daughter of the Byzantine emperor Basil II and received baptism in

989, after which “he ordered all his subjects to be baptised, and they did so that they all together in Dnieper, including his sons, in the number of twelve who he had with his first wives.” (“rozkazał wszystkim poddanym, aby się pokrzcili, i uczynili tak, iż się wszyscy razem w Dnieprze pokrzcili, i synów jego/ dwanaście, które miał z pierwszymi żonami”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 39–40]. The first of these descriptions contains the history of the ruler and his indecision about the religion:

Vladimir [...]. He was urged by the Tatars to accept their faith, he did not want to; he did not want a Jewish one, nor did he want the Latin one, but the ambassadors of Constantinople persuaded him to accept the Greek faith, and before he accepted it, he demanded the sister [...] of Basilius and Constantine [...], the Greek emperors who refused to agree, stating that he was not worthy of her because he was not a Christian, so he promised to be baptised. And when he came to Carzygrod [i.e., to Carogrod, for that is how the Slavs called Constantinople – D.K.], he became blind, he complained to the woman that she was so unfortunate. She said: “If you are baptised, you will get rid of your blindness”; so it happened, when he was baptised by the bishop of Korson in the summer of 990, he started to see and then he married her, her name was Anna.

Włodzimierz [...]. Był namawian z Tatar, aby wiarę ich przyjął, nie chciał; żydowskiej też nie chciał, też i łacińskiej nie chciał, ale posłowie konstantynopolscy namówili go, iż grecką wiarę przyjął, a niżli przyjął, żądał siostry [...] u Bazyljusa a Konstantyna [...], greckich cesarzów, którzy mu odmówili, iż jej nie godzien, ponieważ nie jest krześcijaninem, on się obiecał okrzyć. A gdy przyjechał do Carzygroda [tj. do Carogrodu, tak bowiem Słowianie nazywali Konstantynopol – D.K.], oślnął na oczy, posłał do panny skarżąc się, iż tak niefortunna. Ona rzekła: “Skoro się okrzyć, zbędzie ślepoty”; tak-że się stało, skoro go okrzył biskup z Korsona lata 990, przejrzał, a potem brał z nią ślub, której było imię Anna. [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 39]

The second description is much shorter, but includes a name change: “This man, Volodymyr, was going to Czarzyhrod at the urging of some, [...] to Konstanty and Basel [...], and there he was baptised and took their sister Anna, and assumed the name Basil, that is, Vasył.” (“Ten to Wołodzimierz/ z namowy niektórych jechał do Czarzyhroda [...] do Konstantego i Bazylego [...], a tam się okrzył i siostrę ich pojął Annę, a samemu dano imię Bazyli, to jest Wasyl”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 312–313]. Regaining sight through baptism is compared today with both the life of St. Vladimir and with St. Paul regaining his sight, while his choice of the Greek faith among all the others, is attributed to the position of the Council of boyars, who thought that this faith was the best, because: “If the Greek

faith had not been better than the others, your grandmother Olga, the wisest of people, would not have accepted it.” [Bractwo 2013: 2]. Bielski also writes about St. Olga. Her baptism is presented briefly in two places:

This Olha went to Constantinople to learn the Christian faith, and there she was baptised, but her son did not want to, and the name given to her was Helena. When she was going from Carzyhrod [...], the patriarch blessed her, saying: ‘Blessed are you among Ruthenian women, *etc.*’ [...]

Ta Olha jeździła do Konstantynopola wiary krześcijańskiej wykąć i tam się okrzyła, ale syn nie chciał, a imię jej dano Helena. Gdy jechała z Carzyhroda [...], błogosławił jej patryjarcha, mówiąc: ‘Błogosławionaś ty między niewiastami ruskimi *etc.*’ [...]. [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 37]

and in another passage: “When she came to Kiev, she was baptised under the Greek rite, going to Greece [i.e., to Constantinople – D.K.] (“Przyjechawszy na Kijów, okrzyła się greckim obyczajem jechawszy do Grecyjej [tj. do Konstantynopola – D.K.]”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 311], further announcing her role in the acceptance of Christianity by Ruthenia: “This was the very first Christian lady in Ruthenia; it was 6463 years before the creation of the world under the rule of the emperor John of Constantinople. This Olha is like the sun according to Ruthenia [can be compared to the sun – D.K.], saying: ‘She illuminates the world the same way as she illuminated us with the holy baptism’, only she could not persuade her son [Sviatoslav I, father of Vladimir I – D.K.] to be baptised” (“ta napierwszą krześcijańską panią była u Rusi; było temu lat od stworzenia świata 6463 za cesarza Jana konstantynopolskiego. Tę to Olhę Ruś przywłaszcza słońcu [czyli porównuje ze słońcem – D.K.], mówiąc: ‘Jako słońce świat oświeca, tak też ona nas oświeciła krztem świętym’, tylko syna [tj. Światosława I, ojca Włodzimierza I – D.K.] nie mogła namówić na krzest”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 311].

The reasons for the acceptance of Christianity by Moravian Borzyvoj were presented in an interesting way:

Moravian Swatopluk, the king, already a Christian, who learned the first faith from Cyril [...], was a great master [...], he asked Semowit to come to him through his deputies [...] Semowit was a Polish prince, Moravian Borzywoj, who was still a pagan, a Ruthenian boyar [...] He asked others to sit down at the table according to their dignity, but he ordered Borzywoj to sit separately on the ground to eat. He was embarrassed and asked: “Why is that?” He said, “you are a pagan, therefore you are unworthy to eat together with the baptised.” From that time, he received the Holy Spirit, having asked the bishop St. Cyril

the Grecian about the Christian faith rite. He asked for baptism for him and the whole court. And the king Swatoplůh with the Ruthenian boyar was his godfather [...]. When he arrived in Bohemia, he baptised his wife Ludmila with children, where first in Bohemia the mass was set in the Slavonic language from Bishop Cyril and Methodius with papal permission.

Swatoplůh morawski król będąc juź krześcijaninem, pierwiej wiary nauczon od Cyrylla [...], był wielkim panem [...], prosił do siebie przez posły Semo-wita [...] ksiąźęcia polskiego, Borzywoja morawskiego, który jeszcze był poga-ninem, bojaryna [...] ruskiego, inne z nich sadzał za stół wedle ich dostojen-stwa, ale Borzywojowi na ziemi osobno kazał przykryć i jeść dawać. Który za wstydem spytał: "Czemu tak?". Odpowiedział, "iześ ty poganin, przetoś niego-dzien z krześcijany jadać". Od tego czasu wziął Ducha Świętego, wypytawszy biskupa s. Cyrylla Greczyna o sposobienie wiary krześcijańskiej, prosił aby był okrzczon ze wszytkim dworem. A król Swatoplůh z bojarynem ruskim był jego kmotrem [...]. Przyjechawszy do Czech okrzcił żonę Ludmilę i z dziećmi, gdzie napierwej w Czechach msza słowieńskim językiem ustawiona była od biskupa Cyrylla a Metodyjusa z przyzwoleniem papieskim. [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 605]

Other actions carried out by *Bishop Cyril and Methodius* (*biskupa Cyrylla a Metodyjusa*), i.e., Apostles of the Slavs, appearing in the above description, are referred to in *Kronika* under "A.D. 902" ("Lata Pańskiego 902"), presenting their first mission and the shortened course of the dispute over the so-called trilingual heresy:

At that time, under the rule of Arnold [...] the emperor, two Christian men came to the Slavonic lands, one Slovak Czuryło, and the other Greek Methodius [...] from Greece, who had been sent by Michael Palaeologus the Emperor of Constantinople at the request of some of the Slavonic lords who first came to Moravia. There they founded the Christian Church in Wielgrad [...] and baptised many people under the Christian faith. They were requested to go to Rome, and there they were asked why they had the mass held in the Slavonic language rather than in Latin. They answered: "David wrote: 'Let every spirit praise the Lord' [...]; and also St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians: 'The Lord's Word should be delivered in the language one understands'" [...]. After these talks, the pope allowed the Christian Church to have a mass in the Slavonic language. At Kleparz [...] in Kraków, this custom was recently lost, because there at the Holy Cross the mass was sung in the Slavonic language.

Tego czasu, pod Arnolfem [...] cesarzem, przyszli do słowieńskich ziem dwa mężowie krześcijańscy, jeden Słowak Czuryło, a drugi Grek Metodyjus [...]

z Grecyj, które był posłał Michał Paleolog cesarz konstantynopolski na prośbę niektórych panów słowieńskich, którzy napierwej przysli do Morawy, tam założyli Kościół krześcijański w Wielgradzie [...] i ludzi na krześcijańską wiarę wiele pokrzčili. Wyzwani byli do Rzym, a tam ich pytano, czemu słowieńskim językiem mszą miewali, a nie łacińskim. Odpowiedzieli: “Napisał Dawid: ‘Wszelki duch niechaj chwali Boga’ [...]; teź i s. Paweł pisał do Koryntów: ‘Jaki kto język rozumie, takim mu ma być Słowo Boże powiadano’ [...]”. Po tych rozmowach dopuścił papież w Kościele krześcijańskim mszą mieć słowieńskim językiem. Na Kleparzu [...] w Krakowie niedawno ten obyczaj zaginał, bo tam u Świętego Krzyża mszą słowieńskim językiem śpiewano. [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 35]

The findings of later historians prove that Czuryło (a Ukrainian figure by the name of Cyril) and Methodius were brothers. They came from Sołuń, so they were both “Greeks and Slovaks” (“Grekami i Słowakami”). We also learn from *Kronika* how Methodius died:

Swatoboj [...], [i.e., Świętopelk II–D.K.] The son of Swatopluch and the nephew of the emperor, when he became king of Moravia, began to be cautious and did strange things, so that he killed bishop St. Methodius, because the bishop did not wait for him with the vespers [...]

Swatoboj [...], [tj. Świętopelk II–D.K.] syn Swatopluchów a sistrzeniec cesarski, gdy został królem morawskim, począł być płochy a dziwne rzeczy stroić, tak że ubił biskupa s. Metodyjusa, iż go ze mszą do nieszporu [...] nie czekał. [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 606]

The very fact of recalling the Great Moravian mission and the Cyrilo-Methodian Rite, described by Jan Umiński as the one which was “jurisdictional Roman, linguistically Slavonic, and liturgically constituted a Byzantine-Roman-Slavonic blend” [Radziukiewicz 2000: 170]. The subordination to Rome was broken by Methodius’ successor, Gorazd, who did not confirm with an oath that the teaching he preached was in accordance with the teaching of the Roman Church. “Thus, the work of Cyril and Methodius – as Rev. Jerzy Klingner notices – remained in the orbit of the Eastern Church. The synthesis with the West failed. It was then that the Slavonic world began to divide between East and West, between two Churches, two civilizations [...]” [Radziukiewicz 2000: 171].

*Kronika* also describes some of the saints worshipped by Eastern Orthodoxy, each in a slightly different way. In the case of St. Olga there is information about who took care of her canonization and when her holiday is celebrated [“when Olha died, was buried in Kiev, then praised [...] by Vladimir’s grandson

[...]; her holiday is celebrated by Ruthenia on the eleventh day [i.e., 24 – D.K.] of July” (“Gdy umarła Olha, pogrzebiona w Kijowie, potym podniesiona [...] przez wnuka Włodzimierza [...]; święci jej święto Ruś dnia jedennastego [tj. 24 – D.K.] lipca”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 311]. With regard to St. Vladimir the Great, the way of ensuring the survival of his mortal remains was described [“when he died, the Rushians anointed him with ointments such that he still lies in the grave in Kiev in his whole [...] body, and therefore the Rushians celebrate him like an apostle [...]” (“gdy umarł, namazali go Ruzacy maściami takimi, iż jeszcze w zupełnym [...] ciele w grobie leży w Kijowie, stądże go Ruzacy święcą za jednego apostoła [...])” – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 313]; in the case of his two sons regarded as martyrs – their death and its perpetrator and the change of names [“Swatopołk [...] Then having plundered Kiev, he sent men for Boris [...] and Hleb [...] to beat them, and Ruthenia worships them as martyrs, having changed their names: one David [...], the other Roman [...]” (“Swatopołk [...] tedy Kijów odzierzawszy, naprawił na Borysa [...] i Hleba [...] bracią, iż je pobito, które Ruś święci za męczenniki, odmieniwszy im imiona: jeden Dawid [...], drugi Roman [...]”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 313]. *Kronika* also mentions St. Andrew the Apostle and St. Stefan, both in the context of their missionary activity [“they were taught the faith and how to write by one bishop Stefan [...] who is worshipped by Ruthenia” (“wiary i pisma nauczył ich jeden biskup Stefan [...], którego święci Ruś”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 336; “the Rushians wrote [...] that Saint Andrew [...] passed at that time through the River Dnieper from Greece, and then Lowad took a boat to this river to teach the Christian faith” (“Ruzacy pisali [...], iż święty Andrzej [...] na on czas przyjechał był rzeką Dnieprem z Grecyjej wzwođe, a potym do tej rzeki Lowad przyciągnął łodzią nauczać krześcijańskiej wiary”) – Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 329].

The place where the Orthodox rite is celebrated is referred to in *Kronika* by three names: *church*, *chapel* and *tserkov* (*kościół*, *kaplica* i *cerkiew*), always with an indication containing the *Ruthenian* modifier (*ruski*), e.g., “buried in the Ruthenian chapel” (“w ruskiej kaplicy pochowana”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 259], “the chapel under the Ruthenian rite” (“kaplicę obyczajem ruskim”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 230], “He collected great treasures in the Ruthenian churches” (“wielkie skarby pobrał w kościołach ruskich”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 136]. There is also information about the change of the Greek rite to the Latin rite in the case of the cathedral of St. John the Baptist at Przemyśl castle, described as follows:

Then King Vladislav came to Ruthenia, and at that time he ordered to bring down the Ruthenian church made from the Przemyśl castle of St. Ivan that

had been cut from one square, which is still in the bark of the great church at St. John, accompanied by a great grumbling by the Ruthenians [...].

Przyjechał potym król Władzisław do Rusi, a w ten czas dał kościół ruski z zamku przemyskiego świętego Iwana z kwadratu ciosanego na dół znieść, który jeszcze i dziś jest w korze wielkiego kościoła u s. Jana, z narzekaniem wielkim ruskim [...]. [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 174].

Bielski referred in this way to the fact presented by Jan Długosz about the demolition of the *Ruthenian church* (*kościół ruski*) in 1470 and the use of its building material to construct a new temple. Bielski's use of the lexeme *tserkov* (*cerkiew*) is in line with the 16<sup>th</sup>-century practice, which – as shown by data from *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* (*Dictionary of the 16th century Polish language*) – presents two meanings of this word: “church, temple” and “the totality of the confessors and clergymen of one faith; the set of moral imperatives and laws (symbol of the union with God)” (‘kościół, świątynia’ oraz ‘ogół wyznawców i władz duchownych jednego wyznania; zespół praw i nakazów moralnych (symbol jedności z Bogiem)’) [cf. <http://spxvi.edu.pl/indeks/haslo/45612>]. In *Kronika, tserkov* (*cerkiew*) means a temple nine times, including: eight times – a synagogue and once – the place of Orthodox worship: “He did not build a Ruthenian tserkov in Vilnius” (“cerkwie ruskiej nie zbudował w Wilnie”) [Bielski 2019, vol. 3: 316]. Once again, in *Kronika, tserkov* (*cerkiew*) appears in the latter sense in reference to the Western Church in the description of the course of Maximilian's coronation mass for the Czech kingdom:

Then, when the king approached the altar, the archbishop turned to him, he began to speak *collectam* [...] from his pontificate, there kneeling the two bishops among whom the king was walking, and asked the Holy Mother of the Christian tserkov to allow him to be crowned for the kingdom”

“Potym gdy sie król do ołtarza przybliżył, obrócił sie k niemu arcybiskup, jął mowić *collectam* [...] z pontyfikału, tamże pokłękawszy dwa biskupowie między którymi król szedł, jeśli prosić matki świętej Cerkwie krześcijańskiej, aby tego raczyła dopuścić na królestwo koronować. [Bielski 2019, vol. 2: 627]

This shows that the use of this term only in relation to the Orthodox church must have appeared later.

From the above-presented linguistic analyses of the ways of referring Orthodoxy in *Kronika*, it follows that Bielski variously calls this religion, distinguishing the Greek and Ruthenian faith, he uses various Orthodox names, provides information about the manner of celebrating baptism, the Eucharist, places of



worship and worship of saints, and the mission of the St. Cyril and St. Methodius, he invokes the cause of the split of the two churches or the attempt to avert it. All this may be the evidence that Bielski – if only through the source texts used – had knowledge about the Eastern Church. However, the method used by the author, that is, describing Orthodoxy in a condensed way when presenting other events, places or history of individual figures, makes gaining information concerning the Eastern Church difficult for the reader, because it requires not only paying special attention in one's reading, which due to the size of *Kronika* (more than 490 folio sheets) is not easy, but also having knowledge about the history of Eastern Orthodoxy, in order to combine the described facts with this faith. The reasons for describing the Orthodox religion in this way can be twofold. The first of them may be that this is the way the Eastern Church is presented in texts used by Bielski as sources, because it should be recalled that *Kronika* is an efficient compilation and translation of many disclosed and undisclosed texts of a historical nature (The sources Bielski used included the general chronicles written by Johannes Nauclerus or Hartmann Schedl, from which he drew information about the history of emperors and popes, and it is in their descriptions that knowledge of Eastern Orthodoxy appears most often in *Kronika*. Thus, one could explain the distinction between the *Greek* (*grecka*) and *Ruthenian* (*ruska*) faith. The latter is mentioned mainly in book IX, devoted to the Moscow or Ruthenian people, and based on other sources, i.e., on the records of the imperial diplomat Sigismund von Herberstein or Paolo Giovia [cf. notes by D. Śnieżka in: Bielski 2019, vol. 1: 19]. The second reason which would be mainly a justification for calling the Orthodox followers and religion with general terms derived from the word *baptism* (*chrzest*), may be the probable way of treating various denominations in the Republic of the Two Nations. "In the Polish-Lithuanian state", as Stradomski write, "whose citizens boasted about their custom of respecting the rights of their neighbours to follow different religious practices, the real religious ferment in Catholic-Orthodox relations was brought only by the Counter-Reformation and the Union of Brest" [Stradomski 2003: 141]. Therefore, the lack of the name *Eastern Orthodoxy* (*prawosławie*), the failure to describe the Great Schism, and the clear emphasis made on the differences between the two denominations in Bielski's *Kronika* dated to 1564 are not surprising.

*Translated by Ewa Kisiel*

## References

- Bielski Marcin (2019), *Kronika, to jest historyja świata*, eds. Dariusz Śnieżko, Dorota Kozaryn, vol. 1–3, Szczecin.
- Bractwo Prawosławne św.św. Cyryla i Metodego, “Biuletyn Informacyjny” 2013, no. 2, p. 2 [online], <https://bractwocim.pl/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/2013-2.pdf> [accessed: 22 April 2023].
- Entry: *cerkiew*, [online], <http://spxvi.edu.pl/indeks/haslo/45612> [accessed: 22 April 2023].
- Mayenowa Maria Renata, ed. (1974), *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*, vol. 8, Wrocław.
- Paprocki Henryk (2008), *Prawosławie w Polsce*, Olszanica.
- Przyczyna Wiesław, Czarnecka Katarzyna, Ławreszuk Marek eds. (2022), *Słownik polskiej terminologii prawosławnej* [online], <https://sptp.uwb.edu.pl> [accessed: 15 April 2023].
- Radziukiewicz Anna, ed. (2000), *Prawosławie w Polsce*, Białystok.
- Stradomski Jan (2003), *Spory o “wiarę grecką” w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, Kraków.

Dorota Kozaryn

### Expressions in the Description of Orthodox Christianity in *Kronika, to jest historyja świata* by Marcin Bielski (1564)

The article examines the linguistic ways of describing Orthodoxy by Marcin Bielski in the third edition of his *Chronicle*, dated to 1564. The analyses show that Bielski uses various names for this religion, distinguishing between the Greek and Ruthenian faith, that he names the Orthodox in many ways, provides details about the manner of baptism, the Eucharist, places of worship and the veneration of saints, and the mission of St. Cyril and Methodius, and evokes the reasons for the split of both churches or attempts to resolve it.

**KEYWORDS:** diachronic linguistics; 16<sup>th</sup>-century Polish; religious vocabulary; Marcin Bielski’s idiolect.

**Dorota Kozaryn, Ph.D. professor at US** – Institute of Linguistics, University of Szczecin. Her research interests include: diachronic linguistics, historical stylistics, academic editing, idiolects.