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

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

Streszczenie. Ogłoszenie unii Kościoła wschodniego z Kościołem katolickim w Rzeczypospolitej pogrążyło diecezję przemyską w konflikcie wyznaniowym na niemal całe XVII stulecie. Jego częścią stały się zabiegi o posiadanie świątyń i materiałne zabezpieczenie Cerkwi. W wyniku działalności fundacyjnej szlachty przemyskiej powstały trzy monastery: w Topolnicy (1616), ufundowany przez Turzańskich; monaster Lityński (1621) założony przez rod Lityńskich oraz monaster w Bilinie Wielkiej (1669). Fundatorzy należeli do najaktywniejszych przeciwników wprowadzenia unii w diecezji. Monasterzy wspomagali również członkowie innych ortodoksyjnych rodzin. Na mecenas szlachecki złożyła
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się także dbałości o położone w rodzinnych dobrach cerkwie, które należało odbudowywać po zniszczeniach najazdów tatarskich w XVII wieku.

Abstract. Establishing the union of the Orthodox Church with the Catholic Church in Commonwealth of Poland caused a religious conflict in a whole Diocese of Przemyśl lasting almost entire 17th century. The conflict included attempts to obtain churches and material allotments for particular Orthodox church. As a result of foundations established by nobles from Przemyśl area, three monasteries were built: in Topolnica (1616) founded by Turzański Family; in Hruszów (1621) founded by Lityński Family, and monastery in Bilina Wielka (1669). These benefactors were among the most active opponents of introduction of the Union in the Diocese. Allowances for those monasteries were paid by members of other Orthodox families. Local nobility took also care about Orthodox churches from their estates; those buildings very often had been demolished during Tatars’ forays in 17th century and their refurbishment was necessary. The article presents this attempts focusing on their effects.
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The Przemyśl diocese was the most Western eparchy of the Eastern Church in the old Commonwealth. Its territory extended to Przemyśl Land and Sanok Land, included eastern fragments of Lwów Land, the Lubaczów precinct of the Belz Voivodeship, Sącz and Biecz Counties of the Kraków voivodeship, the Spisz district, as well as the north-eastern territory of the Sandomierz voivodeship. In the East, the Przemyśl diocese bordered the Lwów diocese, and in the Northeast, the Chełm eparchy. From the South, its borders extended to the diocese of Mukachevo which at the same time constituted the borders of the Polish-Lithuanian State. The territory of the Przemyśl diocese, in terms of matters of faith, co-existed with the Latin diocese of Przemyśl, whose faithful were in the majority in the West. In the East, they were outnumbered by Ruthenians/Eastern Orthodox populace.

---

After the Eastern Church of the Commonwealth formed a union with Rome, the Eastern Orthodox bishop of Przemyśl, Michał Kopysteński, together with the Lwów bishop, Gideon Balaban, remained with Eastern Orthodoxy. Until his death in 1609, Kopysteński maintained his position at the Przemyśl Cathedral. The King’s will was such that his successor be Atanazy Krupacki of the Uniate Church. His appearance in Przemyśl spurred a nearly 100 year dispute over the diocese between adherents of the Orthodox and Uniate faiths. This has already been described in detail by Antoni Prochaska, among others, who showed the impulsivity of the Przemyśl nobility as well as the scrupulousness of the Przemyśl hierarchs, bringing the competition for the bishopric to the local conflict over Orthodox benefices.

This topic was then taken up by Marian Bendza (in very one-sided papers, nearly passing over archival sources, dedicated to the history of the Przemyśl diocese). New light was shed on the lives of Przemyśl’s Eastern Orthodox adherents by Jaroslav Isajewycz and Beata Lorens, who documented the activity of the Orthodox Brotherhoods in defense of Eastern Orthodoxy. Jurij Stecyk then examined the role and material status of Baslian monks in the Przemyśl diocese. This research showed that the conflict in the Przemyśl eparchy was not only an armed conflict over the bishopric, but was additionally one of a few areas of activity taken up by members of the Orthodox Church in defense of their faith. In reference to the determinations of the aforementioned scholars, I would like to more closely examine the nobiliary foundations on the territory of the Przemyśl eparchy from the end of the 16th century to 1691, when Innocent Win-

---


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

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

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

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

\[6\] T. Kempa, Wobec kontreformacji: protestanci i prawoslawni w obronie swobód wyznaniowych w Rzeczypospolitej w końcu XVI i w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku, Toruń 2007, s. 141.

\[7\] Ibidem, s. 186.
of the orthodox temple in Jarosław in 1596 and supported the brotherhood associated with it\(^8\). He founded orthodox temple in Kańczuga on July 19\(^{th}\), 1600, transferring there 400 zł which had been noted earlier by his priest in Wola Pośańska. He exempted this temple from duties toward the court and maintained the hospital in its vicinity\(^9\). In 1601, for a sum of 100 grzywna, he gave Popovsý Leoný the church in Zaleska Wola, along with benefits, exempting it from all duties toward the court\(^10\). In January of 1602, for the sum of 300 zł he gave the Orthodox church in Grzańska to the priest Symeon, later designating this sum for this church\(^11\).

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

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

---

\(^8\) Biblioteka Jagiellońska, rkp 6071 I, s. 373; K. Gottfried, *Anna Ostrog ska wojewódzka województwa włońskiego*, Jarosław 1939, s. 19–25.

\(^9\) Nacjonální muzeu u Lvovi im. Andreá Šeptic’kogo (further: MNL), Pka-2205, k. 222; ibidem, Pka-2207, k. 644–645.


\(^11\) Central’níj deržavníj istoričnij arhiv Ukrajini m. Lviv (further: CDIAUL), f. 129, op. 3, nr 42, k. 1; Wasył Uljanowski, when quoting this document, noticed only that A. Ostrogski sold the priest land, omitting information about money intended for an orthodox church, V. Ul’ianov’s’kij, *Knâž Vasíl’ Kostântin Ostroâckij: istoričnij portret u galerjej predkiv ta našadkiv*, Kiev 2012, s. 1262.
tional activity. Interestingly, from the end of the 15th century to the final years of the 16th century, there were formed five monastic centers on the territory of Przemysł (Dereżyce, Nahujowice, in Przemysł in the year 1500 arose the monastery of the Dormition of the Mother of God, in 1563, the Cathedral of the Mother of God, and in 1570 in Ulucz the monastery of The Raised Cross)\(^\text{12}\). However, during the battle period against the union in the 17th century, there arose as many as 23 monasteries. The majority of these were located in royal lands. The king, by possessing the right of patronage over the churches in his kingdom, decided about the construction of new temples and monasteries. It should be noted that the first of the Przemysł monasteries, as in Dobromil, was built thanks to the initiative of the Catholic Jan Szczęsny, who authored “Discourse on the Ruthenian Nation” [polish: Mowy o narodzie ruskim]. Minor records for this monastery were kept by the Orthodox nobility throughout the entire 17th century. These noble families included the Ustrzycki, the Drewnicki of Boberka, the Kropiwnicki, the Jaworski, the Rogozieński, the Krolicki, the Oleksiczów, the Petranowski, and the Romanowski\(^\text{13}\).

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

\(^{12}\) CDIAUL, f. 201, op. 46, nr 1917, k. 587; Ű. Stecik, Vasiliani’ki monastiri, s. 219 (typescript).

\(^{13}\) Naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefani’ka NAN Ukrajini, Lviv, f. 3 (MB), sygn. 1261, k. 3v.
the monastery of Saint Ivan in Nahujowice\textsuperscript{14}. It is clear that in reality the monastery of the Holy Savior in Stary Sambor remained in the hands of the Uniates, as the brother of bishop Krupcki, Józef, became the abbot\textsuperscript{15}. It was likely feared that other monasteries would fall into the bishop’s hands.

In response to the efforts of the Uniates, an Orthodox monastery in Topolnica was founded on April 4\textsuperscript{th} of 1616 and was funded by Grzegorz Turzański, relative of Theodore Turzański, one of the leading opponents of Krupecki, and by Anastasia of the Wysoczański\textsuperscript{16}. It bears noting that a document was created not long after the diet of Sądowa Wisznia, March 12\textsuperscript{th} of 1616, in which the necessity to meet the demands of the members of the Orthodox Church was clearly raised, which included the liquidation of processes set forth by Krupecki against the Orthodox clergy who did not acknowledge the 1596 union of Brest\textsuperscript{17}.

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

\textsuperscript{14} APP, ABGK, suppl. 47, s. 209–214; A. Prochaska, \textit{Władzy Krupeczki}, s. 734–735; J. Krochmal, \textit{Unia kościelna w eparchii przemyskiej}, "Premislia Christiana" 1997, t. 7, s. 80.

\textsuperscript{15} M. Bendza, \textit{Prawosławna diecezja}, s. 153.

\textsuperscript{16} NMI, PKA 220/4, k. 683–686; CDIAUL, f. 684, op. 1, nr 3016, k. 1–2v; ibidem, f. 201, op. 4b, nr 1917, k. 336; APP, ABGK, suppl. 47, s. 170–172.

\textsuperscript{17} „Bracia nasi religii greckiej wnoszą na szedzích naszych i na terytorialnym sejmiku wnieli nasze swe, odżywiając się do praw i przywilejów swoich daunych i do konstytucyjnej im na religię i prawa ich służących; zalecamy pośłom naszym, aby pilnie instancją i starania takie na sejmie przyszłym czynili, jakoby do uspokojenia przyszło i prawa ich uczeń zachowane były, a procesy, które przeciwo popom od księdza Krupeckiego otrzymane są, aby penitens zniezione były, Ich Męź różnej religii bracia nasi szukają także i żąдают uspokojenia swego, starać się będą pp. pośłowie nasi, jakoby pokój prawem Ich Mioim był warowany, prawom Kościoła rzymskiego katolickiego w niczem nie derogując. a proces utrique parti serventi żeby był namówiony”, Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej (further: AGZ), t. 20: Akta sejmikowe wsi w 1572–1648, t. 1, Lwów 1931, nr 105, s. 155.
of the advowson were ordered to respect these principles when appointing the monastery’s hegumen. When selecting a superior, they were supposed to consult with the monastery’s settled monks. It bears noting that Aleksander Szeptycki, Teodor Winnicki, and Roman Popiel were made ktitors by Turzański. The first two belonged to the active opponents of Atanazy Krupecki. Turzański obliged the monks to be guided both by the resolutions of the Fathers of the Church and by the rules of the monastery, as a means to maintain a clean conscience, and above all, the monks were obliged to remain faithful to the Orthodox faith and to the patriarch of Constantinople. If any of the monks were to abandon the faith, they would face anathema.18

In the following years, the Turzański family confirmed the bequests for the monastery, and three years after the fund Jacko Turzański – Litowicz bequeathed unto the monastery the services of two peasants. Later donors were the Kopyșeńskis, the collateral line of this house related to the bishop Michal, such as Andrzej and Aleksander Kopysteński.19

The next monastery foundation comes from 1621 and should be treated as a consequence of the change in the Orthodox situation after the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophanes, renewed the church hierarchy in October of 1620 as he returned from Moscow after the ordination of the Philaret. At that time, Izajasz Kopiński, hegumen of the Międzygorze Transfiguration Monastery and alumnus of the stauropegion school of the Lwów brotherhood, was consecrated as Bishop of Przemyśl.20 The second

18 „W czym oni powinniś swoje wiedzę mając za to sumieniem swym czystym dosić czynić podług ustaw Ojców Świętych i Monasterów Świętych około tego postanowionych, które są pod posłuszeństwem i władzą Cerkwi Świętej wschodniej i świętokrzyskich Patriarchów ta-miecznych a nie innych, gdyż streż Pani Boże Wszechmogący, (iako to już najdują się ludzie niesłeczni i bezbożni) żeby, który Ihumen albo czerwiec do inzego posłuszeństwa cerkiew albo Kościoła kędryńcowie na potyom pomknął się, tedy zarazem od tego Monasterza i cerkwie świętej Trójce wyżej mianowanej na wieki odpada i miejsca mieszkania przy tym monasterzu mieć nie ma pod przekleństwem i wyklenizowem Anatemy i Maranafy”, MNL, Fala-2204, k. 683; CDIAUL, f. 684, op. 1, nr 3016, k. 1v–2; Ú. Stecik, Śląskie monasterzki fundacji, s. 253.

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

20 M. Bendza, Prawosławna diecezja, s. 133; A. Mironowicz, Kościół prawosławny w dziejach dawnej Rzeczypospolitej, Białystok 2001, s. 81.
important event for the Orthodox community was the letter of Cyryl Lukarys, Patriarch of Alexandria, to the Przemyśl brotherhood, in which he wrote about the oppression of Orthodox believers and brought them words of consolation portending better times for the Orthodox Church. At the same time he called for steadfast Orthodox faith despite the actions of those supporting the Pope, those who strove for fundamental changes of the rights of old Eastern Orthodoxy.21

As a consequence of these events, in 1621, the Hruszowa heirs of nine Lityński noblemen: Adam, Mikołaj, Michał, Bazyli, Daniel, Filip, Wasyl, Samuel, and Xenofont funded a monastery in the Hruszowski forest known as Bór on the River Czarniawka, where there once stood a permanent, wooden tserkva and monastic cell. The work “A history of the Szczepłocki monastery of the holy order of Saint Basil the Great of the Ruthenian province,” written in 1771 by the Dobromil curate Innocent Matkowski, provided information that those funding the monastery were brothers.22 This information was accepted by Jurij Stecyk in his research.23 However, in the foundation documentation, these so-called brothers referred to themselves as “noblemen” and Hruszowa heirs.24 In light of this, it seems that they were merely related to each other. The fact that in this act there appear two people with the same name – Wasył in the Ruthenian version and Basil in the Latin one – speaks in favor of this interpretation. The Lityński belonged to the most significant Orthodox nobility in the territory of the Przemyśl diocese. Family ties connected them with the Przemyśl orthodox bishop Michał Kopyściński. His wife, Anna, was the daughter of one of the founders, Adam Lityński, who was with Kopyściński at the Brest synod. In turn, after the death of the bishop Michał, he condemned the giving of the Przemyśl bishopric to the Uniate Krupecki. Adam Lityński together with four of the founders – Mikołaj, Michał, Samuel, and Wasył, took part in attacks on the Uniate bishop Krupecki at the diet of Sądowa

21 APP, ABGK, suppl. 28, s. 16–18.
22 Naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanika NAN Ukrajini, Lviv, f. 3 (MB), sygn. 608, k. 2.
23 Ū. Steck, Slábovščí monastiršť fundáci, s. 254.
24 MNL, PkA-2207, k. 359.
Wisznia in 1610, for which afterwards they, along with 20 other people, were brought before the diet court25. Lityński was involved in the political life of the Ruthenian nobility. In the years 1624, 1628, and 1629, he represented Przemyśl in the diet, the only such Orthodox representative26.

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

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


27 „Nad to już nic nie odmieniać ani umniejszać, ani co nowego przyczynić tak w wyznaniu prawdziwej wiary, jako nabożności w wszystkich ceremoniach cerkiewnych y w kalendarzu ani czasów, ani świąt odmieniać, ale tak jakośmy Rui prawdziw chrześcijanie z przodków swych przyszli, nienaruszenie wiecznie trzymać mają, y ludzi prawodawnych chrześcijan Pana Bożego przewożąc, utwierdzać wedle powinności swej duchownej mająć”, MNL., Pki-2207, k. 360.
fields, garden, mill, and pastures. In the following years, he supported
the monastery with donations for prayers for the dead, which was noted
in the intentional prayer books of the monastery. Among the donors to
the monastery we find Alexander Kopysteński of house Ustrzycki, as well
as Orthodox adherents not coming from the Przemyśl diocese, including
the very metropolitan Peter Mogila, Warłam Jasiński, Bohdan Hulewicz,
the deputy cup-bearer of Wołyń, and Anna Mohylanka, the wife of the
Sandomierz voivode.

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

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

---

28 Naukowa biblioteka im. V. Stefaniaka NAN Ukraiini, L’viv, f. 3 (MB), sygn. 608, k. 2.
29 Naukowa biblioteka im. V. Stefaniaka NAN Ukraiini, L’viv, f. 3 (MB), sygn. 386, op. 1, nr 411, k. 5v, 46–48v.
astery the land “Xenofolański,” on which the monastery apiary stood. On September 1 of 1663, Waclaw of Ochłopów Hulewicz bequeathed a field. In 1661, the owner Jan Wyszotrawski bequeathed unto the monastery three pieces of land, which would stay in the monastery’s possession until accumulating a profit of 400 zł. In exchange for the land the court paid the monks cash. For another sum of 300 zł bequeathed unto the monastery by Wyszotrawski’s widow, a funeral was conducted for him on the field by the monks. The endowments bequeathed unto the monastery by the first three donors were taken away pursuant to the constitution of 1635, which banned the bequeathing of real-estate unto the Church30.

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

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

30 Naukowa biblioteka im. V. Stefanika NAN Ukraini, Iiv, f. 3 (MB), sygn. 608, k. 2–2v.
31 Ù. Stecik, Šlaheti/ki monastiri/ki fundaciji, s. 255.
32 Idem, Vasilian/ki monastiri, s. 34 (typescript).
33 A. Gliwa, Kraina upartych niepogód. Zniszczenia wojenne na obszarze ziemi przemyskiej w XVII wieku, Przemyśl 2013, s. 673–1008.
za; in Nowoszczyce, belonging to the Hordeńśkis (1621); in Ortnice, in Dobrowłany near Stryj, belonging to Hryńka Dubrowlański; in Monasterzec, belonging to Wasiłek Wysoczański; in Uhery Zapłaćńskie, belonging to Ihnat Radyłowski (1624) Hordynia (1626) and Mikołaj Horodyński (1626); in Nowoszyce, belonging to Iwan Horodyński; in Sickiercze belonging to the Hordynśkis; in Stupnica, belonging to the Stupnickis; later, in Bereźnica, belonging to Basil Ustrzycki (1648); and in Chłopczyce, belonging to Paweł Chłopeczki (1656) and Szeptyce.35

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

The orthodox temple in Popiele belonging to the Kolodrub Popiel family was quickly rebuilt after having been destroyed in 1620, because no later than in 1621 the Tatars burnt it down again.36 At the end of the 17th century, Alexander and Basil Kopysteński were the tserkva's interpolators.37 Just as with the church in Borysław belonging to Roman Popiel, it was destroyed by the Tatars and rebuilt in 1621, and then burnt down again in 1624.38 Between 1624 and 1626, a new tserkva was built in Błażów which belonged to Andrzej Błażowski and which stood, with certainty, until the end of the 1620s. Ignacy Radyłowski rebuilt the temple in Uhory Zapłaćńskie before the end of the 1630s.39 The Hordeńśkis probably rebuilt the orthodox church in Hordynia, which was destroyed by the Tatars in 1626. A Ruthenian parish district existed there until 1692, though it is not clear to whom it belonged.40 The reconstruction of these buildings was

35 Ibidem, nr 340, s. 82, 98–99, s. 205–206; A. Gliwa, Kraina, s. 688, 692.
36 CDIAUL, f. 13, op. 1, nr 1072, s. 39–40; A. Gliwa, Kraina, s. 695.
37 A. Gliwa, Kraina, s. 1008.
38 Ibidem, s. 730.
39 Ibidem, s. 728.
40 CDIAUL, f. 13, op. 1, nr 456, s. 1559–1561; A. Gliwa, Kraina, s. 745.
not so much an element of struggle against the union as simply an act of meeting the need of the faithful to possess their own sanctuaries. To the first group belonged the place of worship foundation of St. Michael in Bojary formed in 1606 by Fedor Bojarski. When establishing this foundation he decreed that “old fashion” masses be conducted according to the resolutions of the seven Ecumenical Councils\(^\text{41}\). Interestingly, this foundation certificate was placed into the municipal records of Przemyśl only in 1613, during intense disputes between members of the Orthodox and Uniate churches and the efforts of the bishop Krupecki for his sovereignty to be recognized by the secular clergy.

Wills, which usually carry much information about the religious attitudes of the testators, in this case confirm only that the Orthodox nobility did not go beyond standard bequests for “prayers for the dead.” Out of 20 wills composed by Orthodox nobility with which I am familiar, only in two are there bequests going beyond requests for prayers for the deceased’s soul in the nearest orthodox church. The first is the will of a certain Rozłucki from the year 1655 in which he passes on 30 zł to the monastery of Spaski, 30 zł to Krechów, and 10 zł to the monastery of Topolnicki\(^\text{42}\). The second is the will of Prokop Ilnicki Jaroszewicz of impoverished nobility, who, in his testament of 1683, bequeathed 60 zł in debt to the monastery in Ławrów and recommended the financing of some instruments for the temple in Łostiańska. He bequeathed the priest thereof a sheepskin coat\(^\text{43}\).

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

\(^{41}\) CDIAUL, f. 13, op. 1, nr 329, s. 611.

\(^{42}\) Ibidem, nr 382, s. 1982–1983.

\(^{43}\) Ibidem, nr 437, s. 490–492.
events of the region in the 17th century. The number of bequests made by the faithful for monastic centers increased only in the 18th century, when there were fewer wars and elementary disasters, and the very diocese was already Uniate. With regard to the church foundations, the lack of sources constitutes a serious limitation.
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