

# **TEKST – TOŻSAMOŚĆ – TWÓRCA**

## **ROZWAŻANIA O HUMANISTYCE WSPÓŁCZESNEJ**



**Eseje i rozprawy doktorantów  
Wydziału “Artes Liberales”  
Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego**



Warszawa 2017

**Tekst – Tożsamość – Twórca**  
**Rozważania o humanistyce współczesnej**

# **Text – Identity – Author On Contemporary Humanities**

Essays and studies by doctoral candidates  
at the Faculty of “Artes Liberales”,  
University of Warsaw

Concept of the seminar and intellectual supervision of the volume:  
Prof. Alina Nowicka-Jeżowa

Edited by  
Ewa Niedziałek, Krzysztof Usakiewicz, Izabela Wienczek



Warszawa 2017

# **Tekst – Tożsamość – Twórca** **Rozważania o humanistyce współczesnej**

Eseje i rozprawy doktorantów  
Wydziału “Artes Liberales”  
Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego

Koncepcja seminarium i opieka merytoryczna nad tomem  
prof. Alina Nowicka-Jeżowa

Redakcja

Ewa Niedziałek, Krzysztof Usakiewicz, Izabela Wienczek



Warszawa 2017

Recenzent  
*Maciej Abramowicz*

Redakcja naukowa  
*Alina Nowicka-Jeżowa, Maciej Abramowicz, Małgorzata Borowska,  
Hieronim Grala, Maria Kalinowska, Ewa Łukaszyk, Jolanta Sujecka*

Redakcja i indeks  
*Ewa Niedziałek, Krzysztof Usakiewicz, Izabela Wienczek*

Korekta artykułów i streszczeń w jęz. angielskim  
*Antoni Górny*

Fotografie  
(na s. 89, 95, 97, 100 i 103) *Krystyna Dąbrowska (BUW)*

Projekt okładki  
*Paulina Popławska*

ISBN  
978-83-63636-59-3

Publikacja dofinansowana jako projekt badawczy (BST) ze środków na naukę  
otrzymanych przez Wydział „Artes Liberales” w 2016 r.

Skład i łamanie, druk i oprawa  
Zakład Graficzny UW

zam. 255/2017

## Przedmowa

Ale ten właśnie dyskusyjny element powinien zachęcić młodych czytelników i być dla nich bodźcem do intensywnego ćwiczenia w poszukiwaniu prawdy, a przez poszukiwanie – zaostrzyć w nich bystrość i krytycyzm myślenia. Najważniejszym kluczem do przybytku mądrości jest ciągle, to znaczy częste stawianie pytań.

Piotr Abelard<sup>1</sup>

Eseje i rozprawy zawarte w tomie stanowią pokłosie seminarium „Tradycje i nowe drogi humanistyki współczesnej”, prowadzonego w Instytucie i na Wydziale „Artes Liberales” w latach 2014-2016 pod kierunkiem prof. Aliny Nowickiej-Jeżowej, z udziałem profesorów Wydziału. Skierowane do doktorantów seminarium miało na celu przedstawienie głównych nurtów humanistyki współczesnej oraz podjęcie debaty o potencjalach dawnych i nowych metod badawczych. Służyło ożywieniu refleksji metodologicznej, szczególnie w obszarach interdyscyplinarnych, i doskonaleniu umiejętności poszukiwania i wdrażania metodologii adekwatnej do przedmiotu studiów. Całość podzielona była na dwie części.

W roku akademickim 2014/2015 seminarium odbywało się według formuły: wykład profesorski – dyskusja uczestników – podsumowanie i wnioski. Przedmiotem wykładów i dyskusji, prezentowanych niekiedy w dwu- lub trójgłosie (zgodnym bądź polemicznym) były: zagadnienia tradycji klasycznej we współczesnej myśli o człowieku, przedstawione przez prof. Jerzego Axera, prof. Katarzynę Marciniak i prof. Roberta Sucharskiego, problematyka historii idei jako przestrzeni badań interdyscyplinarnych i szansy na scalenie danych (prof. Alina Nowicka-Jeżowa, prof. Jolanta Sujecka, dr Maciej Falski). Prof. Henryk Samsonowicz omówił znaczenie nauk historycznych w humanistyce współczesnej, a prof. Maria Kalinowska historyczność i ahistoryczność w badaniach

---

<sup>1</sup> P. Abelard, Przedmowa do *Tak i Nie*, [w:] Idem, *Rozprawy (Pisma wybrane II)*, przeł. i oprac. L. Joachimowicz, Instytut Wydawniczy PAX: Warszawa 1969, s. 286. Cytat przywołany na jednym z seminariów przez prof. Henryka Samsonowicza.

nad literaturą. Prof. Paweł Stępień wraz z dr Katarzyną Zimek rozważali, czy współczesna filologia stała się „nekropolią historii literatury”, czy też stanowi propozycję na przyszłość. Dr Hieronim Grala mówił o „radości bycia gąsienicą” czyli o sensie klasycznego źródłoznawstwa w naszych czasach, zaś prof. Szymon Wróbel i mgr Krzysztof Pacewicz rozpatrywali miejsce i integrującą rolę filozofii w refleksji humanistycznej, zastanawiając się nad jej „abdykacją bądź ponowną intronizacją” oraz powrotem filozofii jako teorii czystego dyskursu. Prof. Krzysztof Rutkowski przypomniał o szaleństwie jako źródle mądrości, z którego wywodzą się filozofia i literatura. Prof. Szymon Wróbel i mgr Krzysztof Skonieczny przedstawili dwie koncepcje autorstwa w ujęciu Freuda, rozważając postaci naukowca i artysty na tle horyzontów badawczych psychoanalizy. Prof. Maciej Abramowicz omówił pogranicza językoznawstwa i literaturoznawstwa. Prof. Ewa Łukaszyk i mgr Ewa Niedziałek zwróciły uwagę na transkulturowy wymiar przestrzeni literackiej w humanistyce zglobalizowanego świata, zaś prof. Jolanta Sujecka poruszyła problematykę tożsamościową w kontekście miejsc pamięci.

Zgodnie z przywołanym wyżej mottem niniejsze wystąpienia nie tylko zwięźle przedstawiały dany temat, lecz również artykułowały szereg wątpliwości, towarzyszących współczesnym humanistom. Padły pytania, niekiedy fundamentalne, niekiedy prowokacyjne, ale zawsze niosące echo współczesnych tendencji badawczych: czy humanista musi być nowoczesny? Skąd się bierze kultura i czy istnieje w niej postęp? Czy historia jest nauczycielką życia? Gdzie kończy się prawda i zaczyna ideologia? Czy z prac badacza można odczytać jego system wartości? Jak sprawić, żeby dzieło do nas mówiło? Jeśli filologia umarła, to co i jak bada filolog? Czy istnieje filologia bez kulturoznawstwa? W czym imieniu mówi filozof? Gdzie się rodzi literatura? Jakiej prawdy broni psychoanaliza? Czy antyk jest rzeczywiście naszą ojczyzną duchową i kulturową? Czy badaczowi bliżej jest do motyla czy do gąsienicy<sup>2</sup>?

Druga część seminarium, które odbywało się w roku 2015/2016, skupiła się wokół kategorii autora, tekstu i przekładu. Tym razem swe

---

<sup>2</sup> Metaforę tę przywołał I. Ševčenko, w eseju *Dwa rodzaje dzieł historycznych*, przeł. P. Ratkowska, [w:] *Pojęcia, problemy, metody współczesnej nauki o sztuce: dwadzieścia sześć artykułów uczonych europejskich i amerykańskich*, J. Białostocki (red.), PWN, Warszawa 1976, s. 424-442.

indywidualne prace badawcze przedstawiali doktoranci. Omówiono temat autobiografizmu, obecności twórcy w dziele, „rewitalizacji autora”, oraz z drugiej strony – jego postmodernistycznej dekonstrukcji. Problematyka tekstologiczna została rozszerzona o refleksję nad utworem muzycznym i obrazem oraz cyfrową postacią utworu, problemami jego edycji i zawiłościami przekładu literackiego (wykład inicjujący prof. Małgorzaty Borowskiej i dra Przemysława Kordosa). Eseje doktorantów zostały poddane dyskusji w gronie profesorów i studentów różnych dziedzin humanistyki, co nie tylko umożliwiło dopracowanie i pogłębienie prezentowanych zagadnień, ale także pozwoliło na interdyscyplinarne rozszerzenie problematyki.

Teksty włączone do tej publikacji zostały ułożone według klucza, który wydaje się najtrafniej oddawać ich zakres tematyczny. Namysł nad relacją między tekstem, tożsamością i twórcą można odnaleźć we wszystkich prezentowanych esejach, chociaż każdy z autorów odmiennie określił punkt wyjściowy swoich rozważań. Zróznicowanie to odzwierciedla podział publikacji na trzy rozdziały: Tekst – Tożsamość – Twórca. Uniwersalny charakter przyjętego klucza pozwala jednocześnie na odnalezienie ważnej przestrzeni komunikacji pomiędzy początkującymi badaczami, którzy podążając różnymi drogami, podejmują podobne wyzwania. Kwestia relacji między tekstem, tożsamością i twórcą sytuuje się tym samym w centrum refleksji nad problemami tradycyjnej i współczesnej humanistyki, która była przewodnim tematem seminarium.

Pierwsza kategoria – Tekst – otwiera w prezentowanej triadzie najszersze pole interpretacyjne. Otwierający tę część rozważań esej Krzysztofa Pacewicza podejmuje tematykę teorii dyskursu. Poddając krytyce teorię emocji Williama Reddy’ego, autor zadaje pytanie o możliwość istnienia stabilnej i uniwersalnej, pozatekstowej „kotwicy” dla tekstu. Kolejne dwa eseje opierają się na analizie konkretnych typów dyskursów. Antoni Górny skupia się na współczesnych debatach, dotyczących kryzysu uniwersytetu, by poprzez analizę koncepcji ideologii Louisa Althussera dojść do ogólniejszej refleksji nad rolą ośrodków akademickich w życiu społecznym i politycznym państwa. Ganna Okhrimenko opisuje szesnasto- i siedemnastowieczne polemiki religijne widziane przez pryzmat analiz Kijowskiej Akademii Teologicznej. W zamykającym ten



rozdział eseju Izabela Wienczek przedstawia poszukiwania autora i danych bibliograficzno-proweniencyjnych poprzez analizę kilku starych druków, wskazując przy tym na niebagatelną rolę, jaką w pracy badacza odgrywa dynamiczny rozwój narzędzi internetowych.

Teksty zgromadzone w drugiej części skupiają się na problemie tożsamości grup społecznych; szukają odpowiedzi na pytania, jak jest ona kształtowana bądź w jaki sposób można ją odczytać poprzez różne rodzaje dyskursu. Krzysztof Usakiewicz rozpatruje kwestię, czy Karagiozis – słynna postać greckiego teatru cieni – może zostać zinterpretowana w oparciu o kategorię *homo balkanicus*. Karolina Szmigielska poddaje analizie wygnańczą społeczność tybetańską, skupiając się na współczesnej, dopiero tworzącej się hybrydycznej tożsamości młodych Tybetańczyków, których nazywa „głodnymi duchami”. Esej Olhi Tkachenko rozpatruje natomiast ukraińską tożsamość widzianą z perspektywy prasy polskiej.

Ostatnia z prezentowanych kategorii – Twórca – uzupełnia tematykę tomu o rozważania na temat intelektualisty, jego obecności w tekście i obecności ujawnianej poprzez tekst. Natalia Kmieć poddaje refleksji wizję intelektualisty stworzoną przez Edwarda Saida, który uwypukla szczególne językowe kompetencje twórcy. Julia Krzesicka posługuje się postacią słynnej amerykańskiej myślicielki Susan Sontag, by prześledzić genealogię stawania się intelektualistą. Zamykający tom esej Ewy Niedziałek interpretuje książkę „Roland Barthes o sobie samym”, jako artystyczną próbę stworzenia poprzez tekst utopijnej przestrzeni wolności nie tylko twórczej, ale także jednostkowej.

Różnorodność tematów, metod i dziedzin, które spotkały się w sali konferencyjnej Wydziału „Artes Liberales” z jednej strony inspirowała do wędrówki po nieznanych dotąd ścieżkach, odkrywania zadziwiających analogii bądź punktów stykowych między pozornie odległymi obszarami, z drugiej zaś sprzyjała integracji młodszej kadry z doświadczonymi badaczami oraz lepszemu poznaniu specyfiki badań prowadzonych na Wydziale. Mamy nadzieję, że prezentowane w tym tomie teksty choć w części pozwolą na oddanie inspirującej atmosfery seminarium.

W tym miejscu chcielibyśmy – zarówno autorzy zebranych w tomie tekstów, jak i wszyscy uczestnicy wtorkowych spotkań – serdecznie podziękować przede wszystkim Pani Profesor Alinie Nowickiej-Jeżowej, która była pomysłodawczynią wyjątkowej koncepcji obu seminariów, prowadzącą i moderatorką wszystkich spotkań. Inspirując powstanie tomu, objęła następnie swą życzliwą opieką kolejne etapy jego powstawania. Wszyscy współtworzący seminarium profesorowie byli pierwszymi wnikliwymi czytelnikami esejów, nie szczędząc im ważnych komentarzy i uwag. Recenzowane przez profesorów i dyskutowane podczas zajęć teksty zyskiwały na merytorycznej i formalnej wartości. Bez tak aktywnego zaangażowania profesorskiego grona niniejszy tom z pewnością by nie powstał.

Ewa Niedziałek  
Krzysztof Usakiewicz  
Izabela Wiencek



## Foreword

The discrepancies which these texts seem to contain raise certain questions which should present a challenge to my young readers to summon up all their zeal to establish the truth and in doing so to gain increased perspicacity. For the prime source of wisdom has been defined as continuous and penetrating enquiry.

Pierre Abélard<sup>1</sup>

The essays and studies comprising this volume are the fruit of a seminar entitled “Traditions and new paths in contemporary humanities,” conducted at the Institute and Faculty of Artes Liberales between 2014 and 2016 under the supervision of Prof. Alina Nowicka-Jeżowa, with the participation of other professors at the Faculty. Devised with the Faculty’s graduate students in mind, the purpose of the seminar was to discuss the major currents of contemporary humanities and spark debates on the potential of old and new methods of analysis. The seminar served to animate methodological reflection, particularly with regards to interdisciplinary approaches, and provided an opportunity for improving the ability to obtain and implement methods suitable for the objects of study.

The course was divided into two parts. In the academic year 2014-2015 the seminar followed the formula of a professorial lecture accompanied by discussion among the participants and a summation with conclusions. The lectures and discussions, at times involving two or three perspectives (complementary or divergent), addressed such questions as that of the relationship of the classical tradition to contemporary reflections on man, as presented by Prof. Jerzy Axer, Prof. Katarzyna Marciniak, and Prof. Robert Sucharski; or of the problematic of the history of ideas as the locus for interdisciplinary studies and for a potential unification of data (Prof. Alina Nowicka-Jeżowa, Prof. Jolanta Sujecka, Dr. Maciej Falski). Prof. Henryk Samsonowicz deliberated on the

---

<sup>1</sup> Translation by David Jones, adapted from: Anders Piltz, *The World of Medieval Learning*, Totowa, NJ, Barnes & Noble Books, 1981, p. 82. The basis for the translation is the version in Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 178, col. 1349.

significance of historical sciences for contemporary humanities, while Prof. Maria Kalinowska discussed the historicity and ahistoricity in the study of literature. Prof. Paweł Stępień and Dr. Katarzyna Zimek questioned whether contemporary philology has become “the necropolis of the history of literature,” or whether it still has something to offer for the future. Prof. Hieronim Grala argued for the “joy of being a caterpillar,” or, for the continuing purposefulness of traditional source studies, while Prof. Szymon Wróbel and Krzysztof Pacewicz examined the place and integrating role of philosophy within the humanities, considering its “abdication or perhaps another enthronement” and return as a theory of pure discourse. Prof. Krzysztof Rutkowski reminisced on madness as a source of knowledge ensconced in both philosophy and literature. Prof. Szymon Wróbel and Krzysztof Skonieczny presented two concepts of authorship according to Sigmund Freud, positing the figures of the scientist and of the artist against the backdrop of the analytic horizons of psychoanalysis. Prof. Maciej Abramowicz traced the boundaries of language studies and literary studies. Prof. Ewa Łukaszuk and Ewa Niedziałek highlighted the transcultural aspect of literary space in the humanities of a globalised world, while Prof. Jolanta Sujecka addressed the question of identity in the context of spaces of memory.

As the motto to this foreword suggests, these presentations briefly outlined the problems, while also articulating a number of doubts harboured by contemporary humanists. Questions were posed – at times fundamental, at times provocative, but always resonant with the echoes of current research tendencies: Does a humanist have to be modern? Where does culture come from and does it progress? Is history the teacher of life? Where does truth end and ideology begin? Do a scholar’s studies carry the imprint of her system of values? How can we make works speak to us? If philology is dead, then what and how does a philologist study? Is there a philology without cultural studies? In whose name does the philosopher speak? Where is literature born? What truth does psychoanalysis stand for? Is Antiquity truly our spiritual and cultural home? Is a scholar a butterfly or a caterpillar?<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The metaphor was proposed by Ihor Ševčenko, *Two Varieties of Historical Writing*, „History and Theory” 8, no. 3 (1969): pp. 332-345.

The second part of the seminar, which took place in the academic year 2015-2016, focused on the categories of author, text, and translation. It was then that graduate students delivered their individual presentations. Among the topics under discussion were autobiographical writing, the presence of the author in the work, the “revitalisation of the author,” as well as her postmodernist deconstruction. The textological problematic was extended into considerations on musical works and images, and the digital shape of a work, the problems of its editing, and the complexities of literary translation (opening remarks by Prof. Małgorzata Borowska and Dr. Przemysław Kordos). The essays written by graduate students were discussed with the professors and students of various branches of the humanities, which not only helped improve and enhance the analyses on display, but also allowed for a more interdisciplinary approach to the problems.

The texts included in this publication were arranged in a manner that seems to best suit their thematic breadth. Thoughts on the relationship between text, identity, and the author are common to all of the essays presented here, though each of the writers embarks on his or her analysis from a peculiar point of departure. This diversity finds expression in the division into three sections: Text – Identity – Author. This universal key also creates a crucial space for communication between emerging scholars, who, though following different paths, face similar challenges. The question of the relationship between the text, the identity, and the author is thus situated at the very heart of considerations on the problems of traditional and modern humanities – the main subject of the seminar.

The first category – Text – provides the broadest interpretative field in the triad. Krzysztof Pacewicz’s opening essay discusses the theory of discourses. Embarking on a critique of William Reddy’s theory of emotions, the author questions the possibility of a stable and universal, extratextual “anchor” for the text. The two subsequent essays are based in an analysis of specific types of discourses. Antoni Górny focuses on contemporary debates concerning the crisis of the university in order to provide a broader analysis of the role of academic centres in the social and political life of the state through Louis Althusser’s theory of ideology. Ganna Okhrimenko describes sixteenth- and seventeenth-century

religious polemics through the prism of analyses from the Kiev Theological Academy. In the closing essay of this section, Izabela Wiecek discusses the pursuit of the author and data concerning the source and its provenance in the context of several seventeenth-century works, while pointing to the unprecedented role the dynamic development of Internet resources plays in scholarship.

Texts in the second section focus on the question of the identity of social groups – the manner in which it takes shape or the ways in which it can be read through different kinds of discourses. Krzysztof Usakiewicz considers the possibility of interpreting Karagiozis – a famous character from Greek shadow play – through the category of *homo balkanicus*. Karolina Szmigielska analyses the Tibetan diaspora with a particular focus on the contemporary, emerging hybrid identity of the young Tibetans, whom she dubs “hungry spirits.” Olha Tkachenko’s essay, on the other hand, looks at Ukrainian identity from the perspective of the Polish press.

The final category – Author – extends the range of themes addressed in the volume with considerations on the intellectual and her presence in the text or traced through the text. Natalia Kmiec reflects on the vision of the intellectual proposed by Edward Said, who highlights the author’s particular linguistic competencies. Julia Krzesicka invokes the famous American thinker Susan Sontag to trace the genealogy of becoming intellectual. The closing essay by Ewa Niedzialek interprets *Roland Barthes* by Roland Barthes as an artistic attempt to use the text to create a utopian space for not only creative, but also individual freedom.

The diversity of themes, methods, and approaches on display at the conference room of the Faculty of Artes Liberales served, on the one hand, to inspire a trip down as yet uncharted roads through a discovery of surprising analogies or meeting points between ostensibly distant areas, while on the other, fostering integration between the younger members of the Faculty and the more established scholars, as well as a deeper understanding of the specificity of the research conducted at the Faculty. We hope that the texts presented in this volume carry at least some of the inspiring atmosphere of the seminar.

---

We – both the authors of the texts included in this volume and all participants in the Tuesday sessions – would like to thank Professor Alina Nowicka-Jezowa, the author of the original concept for both seminars and the supervisor and moderator on all meetings. Having inspired the creation of this volume, she then extended her benevolent care over each subsequent stage of its creation. All of the professors involved in the seminar were the primary, attentive readers of the essays, and provided many valuable comments and observations. Reviewed by the professors and discussed during the seminar, the texts gained both in academic merit and in formal worth. Without this active professorial involvement, this volume would not have been possible.

Ewa Niedziałek  
Krzysztof Usakiewicz  
Izabela Wiencek





## Spis treści

### Tekst

Krzysztof Pacewicz – Emocje: prawdziwe kotwice świata znaków?  
William Reddy’ego kruczata przeciwko teorii dyskursu..... 23

Antoni Górny – Dyskurs nauki w epoce kryzysu uniwersytetu: rozważania nad koncepcją ideologii Louisa Althussera ..... 45

Ganna Okhrimenko – Representation of the Main Stereotypes of Orthodox and Uniate Polemists (16th – 17th century) in Scientific Works of the Representatives of Kyiv Theological Academy (1819-1920): Interpretative Textual Analyses ..... 73

Izabela Wienczek – O tradycyjnych i nowych metodach w badaniach nad dawną książką ..... 87

### Tożsamość

Krzysztof Usakiewicz – Odmiany homo balkanicus. Próba typologii w oparciu o materiał grecki i bułgarski przełomu XIX i XX wieku .... 113

Karolina Szmigielska – „Głodne duchy” – dyskurs medyczny jako narzędzie polityki tożsamościotwórczej ..... 137

Olha Tkachenko – Text as a Source of Identity: Ukrainian Identity in Polish Press. Methodological Remarks and Empirical Examples .. 161

### Twórca

Natalia Kmieć – Intelktualista jako mistrz języka..... 179

Julia Krzesicka – O stawaniu się intelektualistą – na przykładzie sylwetki Susan Sontag .....	195
Ewa Niedziałek – Roland Barthes pisze Rolanda Barthesa. Utopia obalonego sensu.....	217

## Contents

### Text

Krzysztof Pacewicz – Are Emotions the Real World-Anchors of Signs? William Reddy’s Crusade Against Discourse Theory..... 23

Antoni Górny – The Discourse of Science and the Crisis of the University: Reflections on Louis Althusser’s Concept of Ideology ..... 45

Ganna Okhrimenko – Representations of the Main Stereotypes of Orthodox and Uniate Polemists (16th – 17th century) in Scientific Works of the Members of Kyiv Theological Academy (1819-1920): Interpretative Textual Analyses ..... 73

Izabela Wiencek – On Traditional and New Methods in the Study of Early Printed Books ..... 87

### Identity

Krzysztof Usakiewicz – Varieties of Homo Balkanicus: An Attempt at a Typology on the Basis of Greek and Bulgarian Material from the Turn of the 19th and 20th Century ..... 113

Katarzyna Szmigielska – “Hungry Spirits”: Medical Discourse as a Tool for Identity-Making ..... 137

Olha Tkachenko – Text as a Source for Identity: Ukrainian Identity in Polish Press. Methodological Remarks and Empirical Examples..... 161

### Author

Natalia Kmiec – The Intellectual and the Mastery of Language ..... 179

Julia Krzesicka – On Becoming Intellectual: The Case of Susan Sontag .....	195
Ewa Niedziątek – <i>Roland Barthes</i> by Roland Barthes: The Utopia of Deposed Meaning .....	217

Ganna Okhrimenko

**Representations of the Main Stereotypes of Orthodox  
and Uniate Polemists (16th – 17th century)  
in Scientific Works of the Members of the Kyiv  
Theological Academy (1819-1920):  
Interpretative Textual Analyses**

This objective analysis of contemporary social, political and cultural realities is based on a retrospective review of some of the most complex and controversial historical events for Ukrainians. One historical phenomenon had a particularly significant influence on the formation and development of modern cultural and religious traditions in the Ukraine: the Orthodox-Catholic polemical dialogue that took place at the turn of sixteenth and seventeenth century. The radically opposed views on the church reforms in this period – from continuous Polonisation to the attempt to unite the Orthodox and Catholic traditions – informed the pursuit of the sources of stereotypes in some research centers. Kiev Theological Academy played an especially important part in those processes at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth century.

One should first explain the meaning of Polonisation. According to Leon Wasilewski, Polonisation was the acquisition or imposition of elements of Polish culture, particularly the Polish language, as experienced in some historical periods by the non-Polish populations on territories controlled by, or under substantial influence of, Poland. As with other types of cultural assimilation, it could occur either voluntarily or by force, which is most visible in the territories where Polish language or culture were dominant or where their adoption could result in the increased prestige or social status, as in the case of the nobility of Ruthenia and Lithuania.<sup>1</sup>

In the late 16th century Ruthenian nobles became increasingly prone to Polonisation, with the process often initiated by education in Jesuit

---

<sup>1</sup> L. Wasilewski, *Kresy Wschodnie*, T-wo wydawnicze w Warszawie: Warszawa 1917, p. VII, as cited in: А.Ф. Смалянчук, *Паміж краёвасцю і нацыянальнай ідэяй. Польшкі рух на беларускіх і літоўскіх землях. 1864-1917 г.*, ГрДУ: Гродна 2001, p. 24.

schools and conversion to Roman Catholicism. Jesuit schools gained significant renown at that time. There were 23 Jesuit colleges in the Ruthenian-Lithuanian territory. The most important of those were the colleges in Jarosław, Lutsk, Kamianets-Podilskiy, Vinnytsia, Bar, Brest, Przemyśl, Pinsk, and Kyiv. Through their schools, the Jesuits succeeded in converting large numbers of Ruthenians to Roman Catholicism and in Polonizing them.

Another way Polonisain which Jesuits pursued Polonisation was through polemic literature. Figures such as Piotr Skarga and Benedykt Herbest actively promoted the Church Union of Brest in their polemic treatises – *Sejm Sermons* (1597) and *Elucidations of the Faith of the Roman Church and the History of Greek Enslavement [...] Written for the Conversion of Rus* (1586).<sup>2</sup>

Members of the Kiev Theological Academy saw the polemical heritage as an important historical source of information for the study of the condition of Orthodox and Uniate churches within the Commonwealth. It was perceived as a “civilized method” for the Orthodox Church to protest against the administration of the Union, as well as a source of information for an analysis of the moral and educational level of the advocates and opponents of the conduct of the Union. Members of the Kiev Theological Academy opposed the views of the Polish literary critic Aleksander Brückner on the entire post-Union controversy, mostly claiming Orthodox literature to be objective.<sup>3</sup>

To represent the stereotypes expressed by the members of the Kiev Theological Academy, I used the tools of interpretative textual analysis, which includes semiotical, rhetorical, and ideological analysis, among many others. These types of analyses seek to reach beneath the surface (denotative) meanings and examine the more implicit (connotative) social meanings. Such approaches often treat culture as a narrative or

---

<sup>2</sup> P. Skarga, *Kazania sejnowe*, as cited in: *Памятники полемической литературы Западной Руси*, Кн. 2 (*Русская историческая библиотека издаваемая Археографической комиссией*, т. 7), Археографическая комиссия: Петербург, 1882, p. 223-612; B. Herbest, *Wiary kościoła rzymskiego wywody u greckiego niewolstwa historia: dla iedności. Z kościelnej dłuższej historiey, dla Rusi nawrocenia pisaney [...]*, as cited in: *Памятники полемической литературы...*, p. 613-632.

<sup>3</sup> A. Brückner, *Spory o unię w dawnej literaturze*, „Kwartalnik Historyczny” 1896, t. 10, nr 3, p. 579-581.

story-telling process in which particular “texts” or “cultural artifacts” consciously or unconsciously refer to larger stories at play in the society. The key issue in this context is the manner in which texts create subject positions (identities) for those who use them.

Thus, the main objective of the academicians was to develop arguments that would highlight the bias at the heart of the Unitarian controversy.

**The first argument.** According to Stefan Shafarevich and Ivan Makarevich, graduates of the Kiev Theological Academy who authored a study on the charactersitics of Uniate polemical works, the most important aspect of this brand of literature was its value as a source for the history of the Union in Western Rus.<sup>4</sup> But the historical significance of the Uniate controversy is offset by its one-sided treatment of issues related to the adoption of the Union. The Uniate work of Ipatii Potii, *The Union, or an Exposition of the Main Articles*, exhibits a particular bias:

In this book, bias is present when questions are raised of the union, in defence of the arguments of the union. In this case, the author does not neglect anything, using all possible scientific methods, often abused in favour of the ecclesiastical evidence, to transmit this information and the facts of history. Yes, some passages from the writings of the men of God support the Latin doctrine and employ the proper inductive method in line with the Greek text, but the author does not understand them properly and as they were understood by the Greek Fathers. The second fragment is induced out of context, others fail to address omissions, and yet others are borrowed directly from falsified documents.<sup>5</sup>

Incidentally, after the proclamation of the Union of Brest, Ipatii Potii was one of its leading supporters, both defending it against the Orthodox opposition and seeking equal rights with Roman Catholics in the

<sup>4</sup> С. Шафаревич, *О западно-русском полемическом сочинении «Уния альбо выкладъ преднейших артикулов к одноченью греков с костелом рымским належущих»*, Institute of Manuscripts, National Library of Ukraine (IMNLU) (F. 304, Od. zb. № 736), Киев 1878, p. 99; И. Макаревич, *Исследование об Антиррисисе, историко-полемическом сочинении, направленном против Апокрисиса Христофора Филалета*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 771), Киев 1879, p. 26.

<sup>5</sup> С. Шафаревич, *op. cit.*, p. 100-102.



Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In 1599, Potii became the second Uniate metropolitan of Kyiv and Halych (1600-13). He was also a noted polemicist writing in Ukrainian, Polish, and Latin. Several anonymous works have been attributed to him, including *The Union, or an Exposition of the Main Articles* (1595), *Anti-Discourse* (1599); *Polish trans* (1600), *A Defense of the Council of Florence* (1603) and *Harmony, or the Agreement of Faiths* (1608).

**The second argument.** Members of the Kiev Theological Academy also considered the independent status of Uniate Catholic literature and its dependence on the Jesuit polemics as a sign of bias: “Uniate works, written by the Jesuits, under their supervision and direction, are not at odds with the Jesuit postulate – ‘the goal justifies the means.’”<sup>6</sup> Unlike the polemical works of Piotr Skarga, such as *On the Unity of the Church of God*, which were the “pearls of Polish literature and a unique example of scholastic theological ideas,”<sup>7</sup> those of the Uniate writers consisted merely in repeating after the Latin Jesuit.<sup>8</sup>

**The third argument.** The Uniate controversy was artificial because the Uniates failed to provide an answer to the Orthodox polemicists and enter a dispute with them. The Uniates lost because Russian polemic used “common sense, artful humour, and witty sayings.”<sup>9</sup>

**The fourth argument.** The main advantage of the Uniate Catholic literature is the proper scientific basis of evidence in favor of the conclusion of the Union that it provides. For the members of the Kiev Theological Academy, this feature was irrelevant. In his study *Ivan Vyshenskyi and his message* (1873), Sergey Lebedev considers the two sides of scientific Uniate Catholic literature:

Uniates are primarily trying to support the adoption of the Union with theoretical arguments, using as evidence the dogmatic truth of Papal beliefs. According to the Uniates, the adoption of a compound rite was justified by

<sup>6</sup> С. Лебедев, *Иоанн Вишенский и его послания*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 582), Киев 1873, p. 29.

<sup>7</sup> Д. Медведев, *Книжица Клирика Острожского Василия*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 1051), Киев 1886, p. 39-41.

<sup>8</sup> С. Петруневич, *Западно-русская греко-униатская церковь в первую четверть века ее существования*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 2060), Киев 1909, p. 623.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 624.

the disgrace of the Eastern patriarchs and the plight of the Russian Church in a Catholic Poland, which made the Orthodox desire a quiet life.<sup>10</sup>

Uniate authors invoked historical facts in support of their arguments for the Union, turning to a variety of comparisons and contrasts with the texts of the Greek Church and to decrees of the ecumenical councils.<sup>11</sup> But they were unable to prove the scientific value of their works, because, for all its richness, Uniate propaganda was only valid for the intellectual stratum of the western societies and incomprehensible for the less educated.<sup>12</sup>

***The fifth argument.*** The dogmatism of the Uniates and the skill with which they used polemical techniques were insufficiently appreciated. For example, in his analysis of the polemical works, Ivan Makarevich stated that:

Antirrizis most likely serves as a complement to Apokrisis rather than its denial. Apokrisis is striking by its regularity, erudition, and the richness of the scriptural quotes used. All of this can be found in Antirrizis, but not to the same extent: the common texts refer to the works of the Fathers of the Church much less commonly than the Apokrisis.<sup>13</sup>

The members of the Kiev Theological Academy are also unsatisfied with the negative tone of the presentation of arguments for supporting the Union: “Uniates speak fanatically of holiness, the truth of the Roman Church... and the tone of the words they direct at those who oppose the Union resonates with caustic irritation.”<sup>14</sup> Thus, in spite of its historical significance, the Uniate polemical literature was completely biased, offering a non-objective view of the Union completely dependent on the Catholic dogmas and determined by a fanatical hostility towards the opponents.

<sup>10</sup> С. Лебедев, *op. cit.*, p. 29-30.

<sup>11</sup> С. Шафаревич, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 16.

<sup>13</sup> И. Макаревич, *op. cit.*, p. 26-27.

<sup>14</sup> С. Шафаревич, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

The academicians of Kiev fully assert the authority of the Orthodox polemicists. They divide the Ruthenian Orthodox polemical literature into two groups according to a qualitative criterion: conservative and liberal. According to Pavel Podvysotsky, conservative literature was forced into “talking against” the possibility of adopting the Union. This brand of polemical literature brought together fragments from the Holy Scripture and the mixed religious and moral content of the self-taught Orthodox scholars, who were loyal to the interests of their church. The second group of works consisted of “liberal” writings aimed at bringing the Uniates back to the Orthodox faith and confirming the truth of the Orthodox doctrine through the refutation of the Catholics. Due to their Western European education, the Orthodox authors of “liberal” polemical literature used the Protestant literature actively to find the best methods of reasoning with their opponents.<sup>15</sup>

The “conservative” Orthodox tendency was the main object of study for members of the Kiev Theological Academy. For them, the Ostroh scribes, whom they described as “the first real polemicists who succeeded in protecting Orthodoxy from the Catholic reforms,” were the foremost authorities. Furthermore, they described the “School of Ostroh in southwestern Russia” as the only educational centre where students could engage in a serious polemical struggle with Protestants and Jesuits.<sup>16</sup>

The school of Ostroh was founded between 1576 and 1580 by Orthodox magnate Prince Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski. The school, officially known as an academy, was modeled on the Western European educational institutions of the period. It taught the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, dialectics) as well as the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy). The languages of instruction were Latin, Greek, and Ruthenian, making it the only institution of higher education in the world at the time to teach that language.<sup>17</sup> Among the notable alumni of

<sup>15</sup> П. Подвысоцкий, *Западно-русские полемические сочинения по вопросу о восстановлении православной иерархии в Западной Руси в 1620 г.*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 2061), Киев 1909, p. 17-18.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 42.

<sup>17</sup> *Chrześcijańskie dziedzictwo duchowe narodów słowiańskich*, Z. Abramowicz (ed.), Wyd. UwB: Białystok 2003, p. 329.

the Ostroh Academy were religious writer Zakharia Kopystenskyi, hetman Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny, one of the fathers of Belarusian poetry Andrei Rymsha, and future exarchs: of Lviv – Gedeon Balaban, and of Polotsk – Meletyi Smotrytskyi, son of the first rector and a noted Orthodox writer and teacher.

The respect for the work of the representatives of the Ostroh educational centre is best illustrated by the scholarly studies of the polemical works of Vasil' Surazhskyi and Ivan Vyshenskyi. According to the Kiev Theological Academy graduate Dmitry Medvedev, Surazhskyi's polemics have two sides: "the positive, which claims the immunity of doctrines of the Christian faith and church ordinances, as well as the negative, which rejects the opinions of the enemies of Orthodoxy."<sup>18</sup> The scholar perceives the calm and balanced tone of Vasil' of Ostroh's "Book" as proof of his respect for the authority of the Holy Polemicist's text and its educational mission among the Orthodox, "indicating the failure of Orthodoxy's enemies – Vasil' (Surazhskyi) goes further and shows them as the violators of the apostolic and conciliar decrees; he also often adds exposés as a warning for the Orthodox."<sup>19</sup>

Medvedev also highlights the main disadvantages of his argumentation:

1. anthological style: "considering the work of Vasil' of Ostroh, we can see that much of it is simply borrowed from the Holy Scripture. This can be explained with the lack of literary means available for the cleric's use due to his ignorance of Latin and Greek and the nature of his attitude to these sources";<sup>20</sup>
2. lack of discretion in the presentation of material: "there was no detailed critical separation of the material – no much-needed separation of the necessary from the unnecessary."<sup>21</sup>

Vyshenskyi's analysis focuses primarily on the didactic, moral force of the "spiritual savior of the ecclesiastical life of the Rus."<sup>22</sup> The purpose of

<sup>18</sup> Д. Медведев, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

<sup>19</sup> И. Макаревич, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

<sup>20</sup> Д. Медведев, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

<sup>21</sup> И. Макаревич, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

<sup>22</sup> И. Балевиц, *Иоанн Вишенский и его неизданные сочинения*, IMNLU (F. 304,

the Holy Polemicist's works was not only to show the dangers of the Union, but also to awaken the religious consciousness of the Orthodox. According to Ivan Balevich, another graduate of the Kiev Theological Academy:

From the point of view of the scholarly polemic with the Uniates, Vyshenskyi's literary works have no special significance for the strictly scientific nature of the controversy. They are, however, undoubtedly more important for another reason: they had to awaken and strengthen the Orthodox love for the native faith, the willingness to defend that faith until the end.<sup>23</sup>

Another scholar of Vyshenskyi, Lebedev, listed the main advantages and disadvantages of his polemical works, which were inherent in the entire array of "conservative" Orthodox polemical literature.

The main advantages of Vyshenskyi's texts included:

- accessibility: "Vyshenskyi uses simple, spoken language, making inaccessible truths clear for the entire Russian folk";
- dramatic presentation of the basic ideas, which helps to better understand the subject;
- "vivid imagination";
- austerity and rigour, the polemicist writing for a society that is mired in sensual pleasures.<sup>24</sup>

As disadvantages of Vyshenskyi's texts, Lebedev names their sarcastic tone and the superficiality of the polemic.<sup>25</sup> According to the members of the Kiev Theological Academy, that inadequacy of the Orthodox polemical literature is justified by the early stage of its development: "Eastern science and literature, having only emerged at the end of the sixteenth and even in the early years of the seventeenth century, could not successfully challenge the Latin and Uniate polemicists, whose

---

Od. zb. № 969), Киев 1884, p.181.

<sup>23</sup> Ibidem, p. 34.

<sup>24</sup> С. Лебедев, *op. cit.*, p. 83-84.

<sup>25</sup> И. Балевич, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

scholarly achievements ensured their dominance.”<sup>26</sup> Only after some time did the Western theological polemics begin to reference works of both Eastern and Western Fathers of the Church, as well as historical documents. Instead of recycling the anthological form of previous “conservative” works, the early seventeenth century saw the appearance of completely independent and serious treatises that avoided the pitfall of simple mechanical selection of texts and applied documentary and scientific reasoning instead.

Ivan Sokal describes this Orthodox “accounting” literature as a “systematic structuring of documentation marked by thoroughness, variety in reasoning and scholarly knowledge, seriousness, and independence – these are the features that express the positive side of the West Russian polemics.”<sup>27</sup> In addition, the polemical works of that period are not as rich in rude remarks and epithets. As far as disadvantages are concerned, these Orthodox writings do not provide a full refutation of the Catholic doctrine.

Thus, according to Sokal, the main features of the Orthodox post-Union works were:

1. the usefulness of their content;
2. the autonomy in the study of controversial issues;
3. the scholarly grounding of the evidence;
4. the complete lack of apocryphal elements and use of all the wealth of Western theology of the first half of the seventeenth century;
5. the visible influence of the Catholic model of argumentation, which reflected the absorption of certain Catholic beliefs;
6. the rhetorical presentation of polemical material as an effect of the influence of scholastic theology;
7. the decreased hostility in the presentation of the debates, in contrast to the sharp attacks of Uniate polemicists in that period.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> К. Сендутьский, *Иоанн Вишенский и его сочинения*. IMNLU (F. 304. Od. zb. № 1091), Киев 1887, p. 162.

<sup>27</sup> И. Сокаль, *Западно-русские полемические сочинения против протестантизма в XVI – XVII вв. (до 1640-х гг.)*, IMNLU (F. 304. Od. zb. № 2114), Киев 1910., p. 698.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 751-752.

### Findings:

1. In the context of polemical literature as an important historical source that should provide an objective analysis of the main issues related to the conclusion of the church reform, members of the Kiev Theological Academy representatives attempted to fashion a stereotype of the “progressive” Orthodox polemicist, using both positive and negative arguments.
2. The positive argument refers to the improving quality of Orthodox science and literature between the “conservative” and “liberal” level, as well as to the refinement of the rhetorical persuasion which the Orthodox polemicists invoked in defence of the purity of their faith. The negative argument in defence of the progressivity of the Orthodox argumentation consists in the questioning of the significance and objectivity of Uniate Catholic literature due to its perceived bias.
3. This stereotype was formed quite superficially by the Kiev academicians. Their few studies on the characterization of Uniate polemical works mostly contain general information about the historical context of the writing, and hypotheses concerning the authorship and sources used as basis for the texts. The texts themselves and the polemical techniques used are almost never addressed: the studies are limited to generalities such as the use of conventional techniques of Catholic polemicists, different types of relations, or repetitions and paraphrases.
4. The bias of the members of the Kiev Theological Academy against the Uniate literature can also be seen in the characteristics of works of those polemicists who had previously been apologists for Orthodoxy, but later moved to the Uniate Church. In particular, while exploring the works of Meletyi Smotriskyi on the protection of Orthodoxy, some scholars describe not only the content, but also the polemical aspect of his *Trenos*, recognising the polemicist’s status as a talented and renowned writer of the Orthodox camp. The

characteristic of Smotriskyi's polemics after his transition to the Uniate side, however, is limited exclusively to a list of his works. Meanwhile, contemporary scholars claim that it is in these works that Smotriskyi exhibits the more advanced methods of conducting a scholarly discussion.

In conclusion, a detailed interpretative textual analysis of the scholarly works of the members of the Kiev Theological Academy dedicated to the works of Orthodox and Uniate polemicists indicates a tendency towards the formation of stereotypes of "progressivism" and "prejudice" with a fairly strong emphasis on justifying the lack of scholarly basis and other deficiencies.



## Bibliography

Балевич Иван, *Иоанн Вишенский и его неизданные сочинения*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 969), Киев 1884.

Brückner Aleksander, *Spory o unię w dawnej literaturze*, „Kwartalnik Historyczny” 1896, t. 10, nr 3.

*Chrześcijańskie dziedzictwo duchowe narodów słowiańskich*, Abramowicz Zofia (ed.), Wyd. UwB, Białystok 2003.

Herbest Benedykt, *Wiary kościoła rzymskiego wywody u greckiego niewolstwa historia: dla iedności. Z kościelnej dłuższej historiey, dla Rusi nawrocenia pisaney* [...], as cited in: *Памятники полемической литературы в Западной Руси*, Кн. 2 (*Русская историческая библиотека издаваемая Археографическою комиссиею*, Т. 7), Археографическая комиссия: Петербург, 1882.

Лебедев Сергей, *Иоанн Вишенский и его послания*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 582), Киев 1873.

Макаревич Иван, *Исследование об Антиррисисе, историко-полемическом сочинении, направленном против Апокрисиса Христофора Филалета*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 771), Киев 1879.

Медведев Дмитрий, *Книжица Клирика Острожского Василия*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 1051), Киев 1886.

Петруневич Савва, *Западно-русская греко-униатская церковь в первую четверть века ее существования*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 2060), Киев 1909.

Подвысоцкий Павел, *Западно-русские полемические сочинения по вопросу о Восстановлении православной иерархии в Западной Руси в 1620 г.*, IMNLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 2061), Киев 1909.

Сендкульский Клавдий, Иоанн Вишенский и егосочинения. ІМНLU (F. 304. Od. zb. № 1091), Киев 1887.

Skarga Piotr, *Kazania sejtowe*, as cited in: *Памятники полемической литературы Западной Руси*, Кн. 2 (*Русская историческая библиотека издаваемая Археографическою комиссиею*, Т. 7), Археографическая комиссия: Петербург, 1882.

Сокаль Иван, *Западно-русские полемические сочинения против протестантства в XVI – XVII вв. (до 1640-х гг.)*, ІМНLU (F. 304. Od. zb. № 2114), Киев 1910.

Шафаревич Стефан, *О западно-русском полемическом сочинении «Уния альбо выкладъ преднейших артыкулов к одноченью греков с костелом рымским належащих»*, ІМНLU (F. 304, Od. zb. № 736), Киев 1878.

Wasilewski Leon, *Kresy Wschodnie*, T-wo wydawnicze w Warszawie: Warszawa 1917. P. VII, as cited in: А. Ф. Смалянчук, *Паміж краёвасцю і нацыянальнай ідэяй. Польскі рух на беларускіх і літоўскіх землях. 1864-1917 г.*, ГрДУ: Гродна 2001.

## Abstract

Scholars of the Kiev Theological Academy exhibited an interest in the polemic literature of the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth century. First of all, they analysed the themes of the polemics, suggesting and justifying their own account of the development of the polemic literature. Secondly, as a result of long research, members of the Kyiv Theological Academy determined the three main roles of the polemic literature. In their view, it was: 1) a vital historical source for research on the legal status of the Orthodox and Uniate Churches in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; 2) a refined mode of protest of the Orthodox ministry against the effects of the Union of Brest (1596); 3) a source on the moral and intellectual disposition of apologists and opponents of the Union. In the context of the polemic literature, the Kiev academicians endeavoured to form a stereotype of “progressive” Orthodox polemics using both positive and negative argumentation. The positive argumentation is connected with the transformation of Orthodox literacy from one of simple presentation of information to a more scientific approach. The negative argument for the progressiveness of Orthodox polemics is based in the questioning of the objectivity of the Uniate polemic legacy, which was labelled as tendentious.

Eseje i rozprawy zawarte w tomie stanowią pokłosie seminarium „Tradycje i nowe drogi humanistyki współczesnej”, prowadzonego w Instytucie i na Wydziale „Artes Liberales” w latach 2014-2016 pod kierunkiem prof. Aliny Nowickiej-Jeżowej, z udziałem profesorów Wydziału. Skierowane do doktorantów seminarium miało na celu przedstawienie głównych nurtów humanistyki współczesnej oraz podjęcie debaty o potencjałach dawnych i nowych metod badawczych. Służyło ożywieniu refleksji metodologicznej, szczególnie w obszarach interdyscyplinarnych, i doskonaleniu umiejętności poszukiwania i wdrażania metodologii adekwatnej do przedmiotu studiów.

