

1580s TRANSFER ATTEMPTS OF THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH'S SEAT TO THE RUTHENIAN LANDS OF THE POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH (RZECZPOSPOLITA)

Larysa SHVAB , Yulia TOKARSKA 

Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Lutsk (Ukraine)
E-mails: lesyashvab@gmail.com, yuliya.tokarska@gmail.com

Abstract: *The article focuses on the historical issue surrounding the 1580s plans to transfer the Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremiah II Tranos' seat to the Rus regions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Due to the changes in the structure of the Constantinople Patriarchate and the fact that the Rus lands were becoming increasingly dependent on the Moscow, Lithuanian and Polish principalities, such a plan allowed for a new context of relations between the Kyiv Metropolitanate and the Constantinople Patriarchate. The unification of the Eastern and Western Churches in the 15th century enabled popes to actively participate in the Kyiv Church's life. At the end of the 16th century, the functioning of church institutions varied throughout the Christian world. The Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches were planning a missionary invasion of the East, while the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Kyiv Metropolitanate were becoming increasingly consumed by the institutional crises. The shared aspirations of the Greek Orthodox and Kyiv Churches in the revival of Byzantine Church ecclesiastical, cultural, and political traditions strengthened the institutional ties between the Kyiv Metropolitanate and the Patriarchate of Constantinople. They were defined at the end of the 16th century by the calendar reform and the prospect of establishing a patriarchate in the East Slavic lands, namely in the settlement of the Orthodox Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl Ostrozkyi. The claims of the Ruthenian-Ukrainians to a patriarchate in the Rus lands boosted the formation of the Moscow Patriarchate (1589).*

Keywords: *Constantinople Patriarchate, Kyiv Metropolitanate, Moscow, the seat, East Slavic lands.*

Rezumat: Tentativele de strămutare a scaunului patriarhului ecumenic în ținuturile rutene ale Uniunii polono-lituaniene (Rzeczpospolita), în anii 1580. Articolul se concentrează asupra problemei istorice legate de planurile anilor 1580 de a transfera scaunul Patriarhului Ecumenic Ieremia al II-lea Tranos în regiunile ucrainene din Uniunea Polono-Lituaniană. Din cauza modificărilor în structura Patriarhiei Constantinopolului și a faptului că ținuturile rutene deveneau tot mai dependente de principatele Moscovei, Lituaniei și Poloniei, un astfel de plan a conturat un nou context al relațiilor între Mitropolia Kievului și Patriarhia Constantinopolului. Unirea Bisericilor Răsăriteană și Occidentală în secolul al XV-lea a permis papilor să participe activ la viața Bisericii de la Kiev. La sfârșitul secolului al XVI-lea, modul de funcționare a instituțiilor bisericești a variat în întreaga lume creștină. În timp ce bisericile romano-catolică și protestantă plănuiau o invazie misionară în Orient, Patriarhia Constantinopolului și Mitropolia Kievului erau din ce în ce mai consumate de crizele instituționale. Aspirațiile comune ale Bisericii Ortodoxe Grecești și cele a Kievului de renaștere a tradițiilor bisericești, culturale și politice ale Bisericii Bizantine au întărit legăturile instituționale între Mitropolia de la Kiev și Patriarhia Constantinopolului. La sfârșitul secolului al XVI-lea, acestea au fost influențate de reforma calendaristică și de perspectiva înființării unei patriarhii în ținuturile slavilor răsăriteni, și anume în reședința prințului ortodox Konstantyn-Vasyl Ostrozkyi. Pretențiile rutenilor-ucrainenilor asupra unei patriarhii în ținuturile rutene au impulsat formarea Patriarhiei Moscovei (1589).

INTRODUCTION

Religious issues have affected not just the life of the Church throughout history. Political problems have often determined the destiny of various religious communities, and the church has been the decisive factor in specific social processes or political changes. The Orthodox Christian Church of Byzantium faced several threats from both the East and the West. For these reasons, its hierarchies sought measures to protect or save the church. The attempts of the Patriarch of Constantinople to relocate the centre of the church to the region dominated by the Slavic Orthodox represent a fascinating historical moment. Besides the Papacy and Patriarch Jeremiah II Tranos' of Constantinople, a quartet of notable political and religious figures repeatedly supported these attempts, including the Polish king Stephen Báthory (1576-1586), the Grand Crown chancellor and Great Crown hetman Jan Sariusz Zamoyski (1578-1605), the Archbishop Dionysius Rally-Palaeologus of Cyzikus (? - 1620), and, last but not least, the highly influential Kostiantyn Vasyl Ostrozkyi (1526-1608), the founder of the so-called Ostroh Academy (ca. 1576). The Ukrainian Orthodox Church canonised this nobleman on July 12, 2008, for his religious accomplishments.

HISTORIOGRAPHY OVERVIEW

The Ukrainian historiography of this topic is associated with the names of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy¹, Mykhailo Vozniak², Orest Levitskiy³, Volodymyr Antonovych⁴, Ivan Krypiakevych⁵, Ivan Nechuy-Levytskyi⁶, Bohdan Buchynskiy⁷, Volodymyr Favorskiy⁸, Ivan Vlasovskiy⁹, Mykhailo Harasevych¹⁰, Ivan Ohienko¹¹,

¹ Mykhailo Hrushevskiy, *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury v 5-ty tomakh* [History of Ukrainian Literature, in 5 Volumes], Kyiv, Lviv, Nakladom tovarystva imeni Tarasa Shevchenka, t. 5, 1923, t. 6, 1995; Ibid, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy: v 10-ty tomakh* [History of Ukraine-Russia: in 10 Volumes], Kyiv, Lviv, Nakladom avtora, t. 5, 1905, t. 6, 1907.

² Mykhailo Vozniak, *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury* [History of Ukrainian Literature], Lviv, Nakladom tovarystva „Prosvita”, t. 1, 1920, t. 2; 1921, t. 3, 1924; Ibid, *Shkola Uspenskoho bratstva u Lvovi* [Assumption Brotherhood School in Lviv], Lviv, 1936.

³ Orest Levitskiy, *Yuzhno-russkie arhierey XVI i XVII v.* [South Russian Bishops of the 16th and 17th Centuries], “Kievskaya starina”, 1882, №1, s. 49–100; Ibid, *Vnutrennee sostoyanie Zapadno-Russkoy tserkvi v Polsko-Litovskom gosudarstve v kontse XVI v. i Uniya* [The Internal Situation of the Western Russian Church in the Polish-Lithuanian State at the End of the 16th Century], Kiev, Tip. G. T. Korchak-Novitskogo, 1884.

⁴ Volodymyr Antonovych, *Narys stanovyshcha pravoslavnoi tserkvy na Ukraini vid polovyny XVII do kintsia XVIII st.* [An Outline of the Position of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine from the Middle of the 17th to the End of the 18th Centuries], in *Russkaya istoricheskaya biblioteka*, 1908, t. 8, c. 81–154.

⁵ Ivan Krypiakevych, *Z diialnosti Possevina* [From the Activities of Possevin], in *Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, 1912, kn.VI, s. 5–28.

⁶ Ivan Nechuy-Levytskyi, *Unii i Petro Mohyla, Kyivskiy mytropolit* [Union and Petro Mohyla, Metropolitan of Kyiv], Cherkasy, Siiach, 1918.

⁷ Bohdan Buchynskiy, *Studii z istorii tserkovnoi unii. Misailiv lyst* [Studies in the History of Church Union. Missail's Letter], in *Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, 1909, kn., s. 5–24; Ibid, *Studii z istorii tserkovnoi unii. II Mytropolyt Hryhorii* [Studies in the History of Church Union. II Metropolitan Gregory], in *Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, 1909, kn. 2, s. 5–22.

⁸ Volodymyr Favorskiy, *Tserkva ta natsionalnyi rukh na Ukraini* [Church and National Movement in Ukraine], Kyiv-Kharkiv, Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1929.

⁹ Ivan Vlasovskiy, *Narys istorii Ukrainskoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy: v 4-kh tomakh* [Essay on the History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church: in 4 volumes], Kyiv, Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva Kyivskoho Patriarkhatu, 1998.

¹⁰ Mykhailo Harasevych, *Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenae*, Lviv, 1862.

¹¹ Ivan Ohienko, *Kniaz Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi i yoho kulturna pratsia. Istorychna monohrafiia* [Prince Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi and his Cultural Activity. Historical Monograph], Vinnipeh, 1958; Idem, *Ukrainska tserkva: Narysy z istorii Ukrainskoi Pravoslavnoi*

Arkadii Zhukovskiy¹², Ihor Skochyliias¹³, Borys Gudziak¹⁴, Leonid Tymoshenko¹⁵,

Tserkvy [Ukrainian Church: Essays on the History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church], Kyiv, Ukraina, t. 1–2, 1993.

- ¹² Arkadii Zhukovskiy, *Petro Mohyla i pytannia yednosti tserkov* [Petro Mohyla and the Issue of Unity of Churches], Kyiv, Mystetstvo, 1997; Idem, *Ideia tserkovnoi yednosti u tvorchosti Petra Mohyly (1597–1647)* [The Idea of Church Unity in the Works of Peter Mohyla (1597–1647)], in “Tserkva i zhyttia”, 1990, vyp. 2, s. 23–28; Idem, *Sproby yednosti Tserkov u XVII st. (Pravoslavna perspektyva)* [Attempts to Unite the Churches in the 17th Century. (Orthodox perspective)], in Volodymyr Yaniv (Ed.), *Yuvileynyy zbirnyk prats' naukovoho konhresu u 1000-littya khreshchennya Rusy-Ukrayiny*, München, 1988–1989, s. 208–235.
- ¹³ Ihor Skochyliias (Ed.), *Sobory Lvivskoi yeparkhii XVI–XVIII stolit* [Councils of the Lviv Diocese of the 17th – 18th Centuries], Lviv, Vydavnytstvo UKU, 2006; Andrzej Gil, Ihor Skochyliias, *Volodymyrsko-beresteiska yeparkhiia XI – XVIII stolit: istorychni narysy* [The Volodymyr-Brest Diocese of the 11th – 18th Centuries: Historical Essays], Lviv, 2013.
- ¹⁴ Borys Gudziak, *Kryza i reforma: Kyivska mytropoliia, Tsarhorodskiy patriarkhat i geneza Beresteiskoi unii* [Crisis and Reform: the Kyiv Metropolitanate, the Constantinople Patriarchate and the Genesis of the Brest Union], Lviv, Instytut Istorii Tserkvy, Lvivska Bohoslovska Akademiia, 2000.
- ¹⁵ Leonid Tymoshenko, “Zhal nam dushy i sumnenia vashei mylosty” (*Kyivskiy mytropolyt Onysyfor Divochka pered vyklykom chasu*) [“We are Sorry for the Soul and the Reason of Your Grace.” Kyiv Metropolitan Onysifor the Girl Before the Challenge of Time], in “Drohobytskyi kraieznavchyy zbirnyk”, X, 2006, s. 149–165; Idem, *Yezuity i Beresteiska unii* [Jesuits and the Brest Union], in “Kyivska starovyna”, 2001, №4, s. 43–55; Idem, *Artykuly Beresteiskoi unii 1596 r.* [Articles of the Brest Union of 1596], in “Ukrainskyi istorychnyy zhurnal”, 1996, №2, s. 15–34; Idem, *Skilky tserkovnykh bratstv zasnuvaly patriarkhy v XVI – pershii polovyni XVII st.? (Malodoslidzheni aspekty henezy ta masshtabiv stavropihiiskoi formy orhanizatsii myrianskoho rukhu v Kyivskii mytropolii)* [How Many Church Fraternities were Founded by Patriarchs in the 16th – First Half of the 17th Century? (Little-Studied Aspects of the Genesis and Scale of the Stavropegial Form of Organization of the Secular Movement in the Kyiv Metropolitanate)], in “Zapysky NTSh”, T. 264, 2013, s. 234–256; Idem, *Geneza ta ideia Ostrozkoi akademii u svitli istoriohrafii ta novykh hipotez* [Genesis and the Idea of the Ostroh Academy in the Light of Historiography and New Hypotheses], in “Ostrozka davnyina”, T. 3, Ostroh, 2014, s. 148–191; Idem, *Intryhy i konflikty v istorii ukladennia Beresteiskoi unii u svitli dokumentalnykh dzherel ta polemichnoi lateratury* [Intrigues and Conflicts in the History of the Brest Union in the Light of Documentary Sources and Polemical Literature], in “Sotsium. Almanakh sotsialnoi istorii”, XI–XII, Kyiv, 2015, s. 185–209.

Ihor Mytsko¹⁶, Vasil Ulyanovskiy¹⁷, Nataliia Yakovenko¹⁸, Petro Kraliuk¹⁹, Petro Saukh²⁰, Vitalii Shevchenko²¹, Serhii Plokhii²², Oleksandr Sahan²³, Ivan Okhtyrskiy²⁴, and Polish historiography with the names of Kazimierz Chodyncki, Jan Krajcar, Marek Melnik, Tomasz Kempa, and others.²⁵ They have contributed to

¹⁶ Ihor Mytsko, *Ostrozka sloviano-hreko-latynska akademiia (1576 – 1636)* [The Ostroh Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy (1576 – 1636)], Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 1990.

¹⁷ Vasil Ulianovskiy, *Istoriia tserkvy ta relihiinoi dumky v Ukraini: u 3-kh kn.* [History of the Church and Religious Thought in Ukraine: in 3 books], Kyiv, Lybid, 1994.

¹⁸ Nataliia Yakovenko, *Ukrainska shliakhta z kintsia XVI – do seredyny XVII st. (Volyn, Tsentralna Ukraina)* [Ukrainian Gentry from the End of the 16th – until the Middle of the 17th Centuries (Volyn, Central Ukraine)], Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 1993; Eadem, *Paralelnyi svit. Doslidzhennia z istorii uiaflen ta idei v Ukraini XVI–XVII st. Naukove vydannia* [Parallel World. Research on the History of Ideas in Ukraine in the 16th – 17th Centuries. Scientific Publication], Kyiv, Krytyka, 2002.

¹⁹ Petro Kraliuk, *Ostrozka Bibilia yak forpost pravoslavno-slovianskoho svitu* [Ostroh Bible as an Outpost of the Orthodox-Slavic World], in “Vidomosti Mytropoliu UAPTs u diaspori i Yeparkhii u Velykii Brytanii”, LV, 2004, ch.1, s. 34–37; Idem, *Osoblyvosti vyjavu natsionalnoi svidomosti ukraintsiv v ukrainskii suspilno-politychnii dumtsi XVI – pershii polovyni XVII st* [Features of the Manifestation of the National Consciousness of Ukrainians in the Ukrainian Socio-Political Thought of the 16th – First Half of the 17th Centuries], Lutsk, Nadstyria, 1996.

²⁰ Petro Saukh, *Kniaz Vasyl-Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi* [Prince Vasyl Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi], Rivne, Volynski oberehy, 2002.

²¹ Vitalii Shevchenko, *Pravoslavno-katolytska polemika ta problemy uniinosti v zhytti Rusy-Ukrainy doberesteiskoho periodu* [Orthodox-Catholic Polemics and Problems of Unity in the Life of Russia-Ukraine in the pre-Brest Period], Kyiv, Pressa Ukrainy, 2002.

²² Serhii Plokhii, *Papstvo i Ukraina. Politika Rimskoy kurii na ukrainskikh zemlyah v XVI – XVII vv.* [The Papacy and Ukraine. The Politics of the Roman Curia on the Ukrainian Lands in the 16th – 17th Centuries], Kyiv, Vyshcha shkola, 1989.

²³ Oleksandr Sahan, *Vselenske pravoslavia: sut, istoriia, suchasnyi stan* [Universal Orthodoxy: Essence, History, Current State], Kyiv, Svit Znan, 2004.

²⁴ Ivan Okhtyrskiy, *Pid znamenniam beresteiskoi podii (dukh Beresteiskoi Unii 1595–96): istorychne nasvitlennia ta bohoslovske mirkuvannia z nahody yuvileiu 400-littia Beresteiskoi Unii* [Under the Sign of the Brest Event (Spirit of the Brest Union 1595-96): Historical Coverage and Theological Considerations on the Occasion of the 400th Anniversary of the Brest Union], Vydavnytstvo oo. Salezian, 1993.

²⁵ Kazimierz Chodyncki, *Kościół prawosławny a Rzeczpospolita Polska. Zarys historyczny 1370–1632* [The Orthodox Church and the Republic of Poland. Historical Outline 1370–1632], Warszawa, Drukarnia Kasy im. Mianowskiego, 1934; Jan Krajcar, *Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij and Rome in 1582 – 1584*, *Orientalia Christiana Periodika*, Vol. 35, 1969, s. 193–214; Marek Melnyk, *Zagadnienia soteriologiczne widziane w świetle projektu Unii Konstantego Ostrožskiego* [Soteriological Issues Seen in the Light of Kostiantyn

the historical research development by focusing on the history of religion and the Church in Ukraine during the 16th and 17th centuries. Historians studied the Metropolitanate of Kyiv's various challenges and institutional connections with Western Christian denominations and the Mother Church in Constantinople.

The corpus of documents issued by Athanasius G. Welykyj in Rome and Ukraine is relevant to the study of the topic.²⁶ Athanasius G. Welykyj's multi-volume edition *From the Annals of Christian Ukraine*²⁷ was republished in Ukraine. Athanasius G. Welykyj is a recognised authority in the field of knowledge of the history of the Church.

Isidorus I. Patrylo²⁸, Pacivo Lozovei²⁹ and Sophia Senyk³⁰ provided information about the Kyiv Metropolitanate from the 14th to the end of the 16th centuries. Ihor Ševčenko³¹ and Georg P. Majeska³² offered a comprehensive outline of Russia

Ostrozkyi's Union Project], in Stanisław Stępień (Ed.), *Polska - Ukraina 1000 lat sąsiedztwa*, Przemysł, T. 4, 1998, s. 97–142; Tomasz Kempa, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski (ok. 1524/1525–1608): Wojewoda Kijowski i Marszałek Ziemi Wołyńskiej* [Kostiantyn Vasyl Ostrozkyi (c. 1524 / 1525–1608): Voivode of Kiev and Marshal of the Volyn District], Toruń, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 1997; Idem, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski wobec katolicyzmu i wyznań protestantskich* [Kostiantyn Vasyl Ostrozkyi Towards Catholicism and Protestant Denominations], in "Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce", 1996, No. 40, s. 17–36; Andrzej Gil (Ed.), *Studia z dziejów i tradycji metropolii kijowskiej XII-XIX wieku* [Studies in the History and Traditions of the Kiev Metropolitanate of the 12th - 19th Centuries], Lublin, Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2009.

²⁶ Athanasius G. Welykyj (Ed.), *Acta S. C. de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam Catholicam Ucrainae et Bielarusjae spectantia*, Vol. 1-5, Romae, 1953-1955; Idem, *Documenta Unionis Berestensis eiusque auctorum (1590 - 1600)*, Romae, PP. Basiliani, 1970; Idem, *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia (1075–1953)*. Vol. 1-2, Vol. I, 1075–1700, Romae, PP. Basiliani, 1953.

²⁷ Atanasiy Velykyy, *Z litopysu khrystyans'koyi Ukrayiny. Tserkovno-istorychni radiolektsiyi z Vatykanu* [From the Annals of Christian Ukraine. Church-Historical Radio Lectures from the Vatican], Vol. 1–9, Rome, PP. Basiliani, 1968-1977.

²⁸ Isidorus I. Patrylo, *Archiepiscopi-metropolitani Kievo-Halicienses (Attentis Praescriptis m. p. "Cleri sanctitati")*, Romae, PP. Basiliani, 1962.

²⁹ Pacivo Lozovei, *De Metropolitanarum Kioviensium potestate (988 - 1596)*, Romae, PP. Basiliani, 1962.

³⁰ Sophia Senyk, *A History of the Church in Ukraine*, Vol. 1, *To the End of the Thirteenth Century (Orientalia Christiana Analecta)*, Rome, Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1993.

³¹ Ihor Ševčenko, *Ukraine Between East and West. Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century*, Edmonton, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1996.

³² Georg P. Majeska, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth*

and Byzantium's relations, while Dorothea Wendebourg³³ published one of the few biographies of Patriarch Jeremiah II. Otto Kresten³⁴ provided information about the relations between the Kyiv Metropolitanate and Patriarch Jeremiah II. At the same time, the calendar issue and misunderstanding between the Western and Eastern Churches were discussed at the 1982 Conference.³⁵

RESEARCH CONTEXT

The Orthodox religious culture centred on the history of Byzantium predominated in the Ruthenian territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th century. Despite centuries of complex and multifaceted relations with Constantinople, Ruthenian clergy recognised the universal hierarch as "patriarch and father". The decline of the Byzantine Empire and changes in the structure of the Constantinople Patriarchate, on the one hand, and the fact that the Ruthenian lands became more dependent on the Principalities of Moscow, Lithuania, and Poland, on the other hand, created a new context of relations between the Metropolitanate of Kyiv and the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The union between the Eastern and Western Churches (1439) and its long echo in the Metropolitanate of Kyiv created the conditions for Roman Popes to participate directly in the life of the Kyiv Church.

At the end of the 16th century, the Christian world witnessed various church institution situations. The Western world, aided by reform movements, strengthened the leading denominations: the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches were preparing for a missionary invasion of the East. At the same time, institutional crises increasingly consumed the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Metropolitanate of Kyiv. The Greek Orthodox and Kyiv Churches were ready to revive and preserve the Byzantine Church's religious, cultural, and political heritage.

Patriarch Jeremias II Tranos initiated the reform of the Greek Orthodox Church after he acceded to the patriarchal throne in May 1572. His pastoral work

Centuries, Washington D. C., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1984.

³³ Dorothea Wendebourg, *Reformation und Orthodoxie. Der ökumenische Briefwechsel zwischen der Leitung der Württembergischen Kirche und Patriarch Jeremias II von Konstantinopel, in den Jahren 1573 - 1581*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

³⁴ Otto Kresten (Ed.), *Das Patriarchat von Konstantinopel im ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert. Der Bericht des Leontios Eustratios im Cod. Tyb. Mb 10.*, Wien - Köln - Graz, Böhlau, 1970.

³⁵ George V. Coyne, Michael A. Hoskin, Olaf Pedersen (Eds.), *Gregorian Reform of the Calendar. Proceedings of the Vatican Conference to Commemorate its 400th Anniversary 1582 - 1982*, Città del Vaticano, Pontificia Academia Scientiarum, 1983.

was noticed in the Eastern Christian world, where a new ethos of the Eastern Church was expected, as well as in Western-Protestant and Catholic circles. Involved in European interdenominational controversy, Jeremias consistently yet tolerantly supported Orthodox normative principles. However, the Orthodox Catholic position on adopting a new church calendar took an unexpected turn and this unprecedented communication time amongst Christian hierarchs ended.

At this time, in the early 1580s, the institutional relations between the Metropolitanate of Kyiv and the Patriarchate of Constantinople were strengthened. They were determined by the calendar reform and the prospect of establishing a patriarchate in the East Slavic lands.

TRANSFER OF THE PATRIARCH'S SEAT AS A WAY OUT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL CRISIS OF THE PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE

The Orthodox Church's institutional crisis, triggered by the fall of Constantinople under the pressure of the Ottoman Empire, influenced the way of life of the Orthodox world at the end of the 16th century.³⁶ The patriarchal throne holders succeeded each other due to struggles and intrigues. This was the case with Patriarch Metrophanes III, who held the patriarchal throne twice, from 1565 to 1572 and 1579 to 1580, and only his death in 1580 cleared him from further conspiracies against his successor Jeremias II Tranos, the most famous Orthodox Church leader in the 16th century. Jeremias served as Patriarch of Constantinople three times, from 1572 to 1579, 1580 to 1584, and 1587 to 1595. The High Porte had no concerns about cultivating and fostering conspiracies surrounding Jeremias since he was thought to be pursuing anti-Ottoman policies in connection with Pope Gregory XIII. The Patriarchate of Constantinople had a particularly severe institutional and financial crisis in the 1580s, during which time it increasingly believed in the Tsardom of Muscovy.

Greek emissaries were present in the 16th century in the territories of Wallachia, Moldavia, Ruthenia, and the Tsardom of Muscovy. Many people ended up leaving the Muslim rule they were under, but the majority went to Moscow to collect donations for Orthodox church institutions.

Greek clergy, therefore, arrived in the Ruthenian lands of the Polish-

³⁶ P. M. Kralyuk, R. Torkonyak, I. D. Pasichnyk, *Ostroz'ka Bibliya v konteksti ukrayins'koyi ta yevropeys'kykh kul'tur* [Ostroh Bible in the Context of Ukrainian and European Cultures], Ostroh, Ostroz'ka Akademiya, 2006, s. 25.

Lithuanian Commonwealth on their way to Moscow. However, they often stayed longer and integrated into the local Orthodox community, learning about its church and religious life. This was the case with a learned theologian in 1518, the time of reviving Roman-Moscow church relations, a monk from the Vatopedi Monastery named Maxim, who was known as the Greek in Muscovy. He was invited to the Tsardom of Muscovy for several years of godly work, but it seemed that he stayed there for his entire 38-year life, 26 of which he spent in prison.³⁷ Travels to the Tsardom of Muscovy, the risks involved, and the humiliation suffered by Greek beggars testify to the Orthodox Church's hopelessness and sorrow. The Orthodox Greeks explained the reasons for their plight directly to the Ottoman rule, but "their petitions show that the various factions into which the Greek Orthodox were divided often disagreed with each other or allowed the Turks to manipulate them, only complicating institutional and financial problems."³⁸ The Greeks' situation was complicated because their travels inevitably had a political and diplomatic purpose. The Greeks transmitted information to the rulers on both sides: Moscow and Turkey. Muscovites were always distrustful of foreigners and treated newcomers coldly and sparsely. The Greeks' requests got increasingly dramatic. And they were continually informing potential donors about the poverty of their Church.³⁹ The Patriarchate of Constantinople declined under the Ottomans long before the disclosure of the unhealthy state of the Ruthenian Orthodox Church. The intrigues of 1584 plunged the Patriarchate into a long-term financial and institutional crisis.

From his first accession to the patriarchal throne in 1572, Patriarch Jeremias Tranos, rightly called the Great, set out to correct the decline of Ecumenical Orthodoxy. He led the struggle against simony and extortion at all levels of the church, even the lowest, prohibited collecting confession and communion fees and punished those who were excommunicated. Jeremias administered church affairs with special care. The trip to the accessible territory of Greece and the Peloponnese was aimed at getting acquainted with the state of affairs in church life. The unsatisfactory condition of the Church forced the Patriarch to send envoys to the Tsardom of Muscovy to help the "Mother Church."

Many problems of the Patriarchate were explained by the Greek church people's low cultural and intellectual level. The Patriarch Jeremias could not help

³⁷ Vitalii Shevchenko, *Pravoslavno-katolytska polemika* [Orthodox-Catholic Polemics], s. 194–195.

³⁸ Borys Gudziak, *Kryza i reforma* [Crisis and Reform], s. 124.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, s. 126.

but realise that “there was an urgent need to raise the education and take the Orthodox clergy to a higher level.”⁴⁰ Although historians accept that Jeremias’ plans included educational reforms, they do not consider them well thought out, systematic, and wise. In the 16th century, the system of education and training of priests in Greece did not undergo visible changes. Additionally, this circumstance will later push the Ruthenian hierarchy away from the reform initiatives of Jeremias in the Metropolitanate of Kyiv.

The association of Jeremias with Western Christian denominations was particularly notable for his first two terms on the patriarchal throne. The response to the interdenominational controversy came from the Orthodox Patriarchate, on the one hand, and from the German Lutherans, on the other hand. The latter used the levers to establish contacts with the Greek Orthodox Church through envoys in Constantinople, correspondence, translation of the Augsburg Confession into Greek, calls for controversy, etc. Of course, they never agreed upon the doctrines. Roman Catholic polemicists appreciated Jeremias for the way he defended traditional church structures while exercising restraint and showing respect for his opponents. Therefore, when Pope Gregory XIII signed the bull on February 24 1582, which changed the chronology, Jeremias was expected to approve this decision in Catholic circles. On May 28 and June 10, at an audience with Jeremias, the Patriarch did not reject the proposal to the envoy of the Roman Curia, Livio Cellini, but pointed out the inconsistency of the Gregorian calendar with the canons of the Council of Nicaea (325). Negotiations with Cellini convinced Jeremias that Pope would decide on an agreement between the parties. That is why, when he learned about the Pope’s decision in late June-early July 1582 to introduce a new calendar in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and its Ruthenian-Belarusian lands,⁴¹ while he continued negotiations with Cellini, Jeremias changed his attitude toward the introduction of a new calendar. He sent letters to the head of the Kyiv Church, Metropolitan Onesiphorus (Divochka)⁴², to

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, s. 48.

⁴¹ Serhii Plokhii, *Papstvo i Ukraina* [Papacy and Ukraine], s. 39.

⁴² The figure of Metropolitan Onesiphorus (Divochka) (1579 – 1589) was not given much attention, perhaps because there were various rumours about him as about a dishonest priest. Myths about the metropolitan were dispelled by Mykhailo Hrushevsky: “he was an energetic fighter for internal order in the church” (Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, *Do biohrafiï mytropolyta Onysyfora Divochky* [To the Biography of Metropolitan Onesiphorus the Maiden], in *Zoshyty naukovoï tovarystva Shevchenka*, Lviv, 1906, t. LXXIV, kn.VI, Mittheilungen, s. 5–9; Leonid Tymoshenko, “*Zhal nam dushy i sumnenia vashei mylosty*” (*Kyivskiy mytropolyt Onysyfor Divochka pered vyklykom chasu*) [“We

the burghers of Vilnius and Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl Ostrozkyi, stating that he opposed the calendar reform and called on all Orthodox to follow the old Julian calendar to calculate Easter. Having learned from the Prince of Ostroh about the great discontent among the Ruthenian people, the Patriarch sent Protosyncellus Nikephoros, Archimandrite Dionysius, and a Ruthenian student Theodore, who was supposed to be the translator, to the Ruthenian lands to carefully study the situation and strengthen the faith of the Ruthenian people. The Patriarch promised to send a second mission to the Ruthenian lands for educational purposes. Although the letters and the Patriarch's envoys did not solve the problems caused by the "Latin stellar observers,"⁴³ they initiated the attentive attitude of the Patriarchate of Constantinople towards Ruthenian religious life. Thus, the 1580s in the Ruthenian lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth began with "great confusion" amongst Ruthenian "people of quality and clergy" due to the introduction of the calendar reform by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582.⁴⁴ However, another outcome of this event was the closer relationship between the Metropolitanate of Kyiv and the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which helped improve the Ruthenian people's religious and ecclesiastical life.

Patriarch Jeremias II acted as an experienced diplomat and authoritative hierarch during the second term on the patriarchal throne in 1580-1584; therefore, his removal in 1584 and exile to the island of Rhodes worried both Roman authorities and Ruthenian noblemen, especially the Prince of Ostroh.⁴⁵

Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl Ostrozkyi was a crucial figure in the events of the

Feel Sorry for the Souls and Doubts of Your Mercy" (Kyiv Metropolitan Onesiphorus The Girl Before the Challenge of Time], in "Drohobytskyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk", X, 2006, s. 149-165; Vasylii Ulianovskyy, *Istoriia Tserkvy ...*, Vol. 1, s. 73-75).

⁴³ Ivan Malishevskii, *Aleksandriiskii patriarh Meletii Pigas i ego uchastie v delah Russkoi tserkvi* [Patriarch of Alexandria Meletius Pigas and His Participation in the Affairs of the Russian Church], Kiev, V tipografii Kievo-Pecherskoi Lavri, 1872, t. 2, s. 98.

⁴⁴ The charter of the King of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth Stefan Batory obliged all subjects to adopt a new calendar. This innovation could affect many spheres of human existence: liturgical, economic and family life (Orthodox often married Catholics or vice versa), so it immediately ran into widespread opposition (Makarii /Bulgakov/, ep. Vinnitskii, *Istoriya russkoi tserkvi* [History of the Russian Church], SPb, Tipografiya R. Golike, 1879, t. IX, s. 427-434). Therefore, the king issued decrees prohibiting the forcible implementation of the reform (*Akty Zapadnoi Rossii* [Acts of Western Russia], t. 3, ss. 280, 315-316), but "the calendar conflict" lasted a long time, which is reflected in the numerous polemical literatures.

⁴⁵ Ivan Ohienko, *Kniaz Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi i yoho kulturna pratsia...*, s. 52.

1580s and 1590s, which preceded the Union of Brest.⁴⁶ He became the representative for the Ruthenian Orthodox community and the bearer of a “strict Orthodox spirit”⁴⁷ because no one else in the Orthodox hierarchy held similar power and authority. For Ostrozkyi, the Church was his ward.⁴⁸ Polish historian Marek Melnyk wrote that Ostrozkyi was the bearer of patristic ideas about the Church as Mother, deeply rooted in the minds of Ruthenians, and his interference in religious affairs was motivated by filial responsibility for its fate. “The emphasis on the “maternal” function of the Church and the shared responsibility for the “Mother Church” was the soteriological background of the joint participation of the laity and the Orthodox hierarchy in the life of the Ruthenian Church,” Marek Melnyk wrote.⁴⁹ The Prince of Ostroh had a special affection and respect for Constantinople. Therefore, the removal of Jeremias from the patriarchal throne by the “worst” intriguer, Pachomius, in 1584 and his exile to the island of Rhodes became an unmeasured disaster for the Christians.

Thus, both parties and Pope Gregory XIII, for his part, conceived a plan to unite the Eastern Slavs, stemming from the permanent difficulties of the Patriarchate and the commitment of Jeremias to the Roman throne, at least until 1582 (Eastern Slavs in the 1570s and 1580s also increasingly considered the status of the Patriarchate of Constantinople). The Prince of Ostroh, for his part, considered the possibility of taking Jeremias to either Muscovy or Ruthenia to his lands.⁵⁰

People authorised by the Roman Emperor and Pope arrived in the Tsardom of Muscovy in 1576. The letter to Ivan the Terrible emphasised the great piety of the Muscovites and expressed confidence in the possibility of persuading the Muscovites to “reject the differences between Greek and Roman law,”⁵¹ paving the way for a union with the Catholic Church.

That same year, another legation led by Rudolph Klenke arrived in the land of Moscow. Klenke had a letter of recommendation from Pope Gregory XIII. His Holiness intended to convince the Russian tsar to unite with the Apostolic See “so that such a significant and wonderful part of the Christian body, so to say, united with the other members into a unified being, would act together in agreement

⁴⁶ Mykola Shkribliak, Oleksii Balukh, *European Reformation and Distinguishing Features of the Institutional Design of the Early Protestant Currents in the Ukrainian Lands*, in “Codrul Cosminului”, XXIII, 2017, No. 1, p. 134-135.

⁴⁷ Leonid Tymoshenko, *Geneza ta ideia Ostrozkoï akademii ...*, s. 150.

⁴⁸ Jan Krajcar, *Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij and Rome in 1582 – 1584*, s. 208–209.

⁴⁹ Marek Melnyk, *Zagadnienia soteriologiczne...*, s. 97.

⁵⁰ Borys Hudziak, *Kryza i reforma...*, s. 180.

⁵¹ Vitalii Shevchenko, *Kilka dokumentalnykh svidchen...*, s. 68.

with them.”⁵² Pope wrote that one could not rely on the Patriarch of Constantinople because he was entirely dependent on the Sultan, and “therefore it would be much more proper if His Majesty allies with the Roman Church...”⁵³

Hopes for the possible compliance of Muscovites were growing during the mission of Istoma Shevrigin in Rome on August 25 1580. At that time, the Polish king Stephen Bathory was besieging the city of Pskov. The Russian tsar and the Boyar Duma decided to request Pope to facilitate a reconciliation between the Tsardom of Muscovy and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.⁵⁴ Shevrigin, “a young lad”, who was from a lowly family, because everyone was wary of sending a decent boyar’s son,⁵⁵ was the one to hand over the charters with this request. Pope Gregory XIII saw the request as a chance to convince Muscovy’s Tsardom to join Rome.

Among the people who were not overjoyed by the tsar’s intentions to ally with Rome was the Polish king Stephen Báthory. He called Ivan the Terrible “an executioner who is not inclined to accept the Catholic faith”⁵⁶ – and he was right, for the Tsardom of Muscovy remained hostile to Western sciences even in the 1510s, while the reformation movement was gaining momentum in Europe.⁵⁷ Antonio Possevino, papal diplomat, helped end the Polish-Russian war, but the religious part of the apostolic legate’s programme failed. To Possevino’s arguments, Ivan the Terrible responded that “our faith will not converge with yours, the Christian faith has been by itself for a long time, and the Roman church has been by itself... There is no religion we want besides our faith, our true Christian faith, and we do not need any teaching beyond our true Christian faith.”⁵⁸ The tsar also rejected Possevino’s last argument - the decision of the Council of

⁵² *Perepiska pap s rossiiskimi gosudaryami v XVI veke, naidennaya mezhdru rukopisyami, v Rimskoi barberinevskoi biblioteke. Izdana s perevodom aktov s latinskogo na russkii yazik* [Correspondence of Popes with Russian Sovereigns in the 16th Century, Found Between Manuscripts, in the Roman Barberine Library. Published with the Translation of Acts from Latin into Russian], Sankt Peterburg, Akademiya nauk, 1834, s. 39.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, s. 58.

⁵⁴ Vladimir Snesarevskii, *Papskii nuntsii Antonio Possevino i russkii poslanets Istoma Shevrigin* [Papal Nuncio Antonio Possevino and Russian Envoy Istoma Shevrigin], in “Voprosi istorii”, 1967, № 2, s. 213–215.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, s. 213.

⁵⁶ *Akty istoricheskie, otnosyashch'iesya k Rossii, izvlechennyye iz inostrannykh arkhivov i bibliotek A. I. Turgenevym* [Historical Acts Relating to Russia, Extracted from Foreign Archives and Libraries by A. I. Turgenev], t. II, Sankt Peterburg, 1842, s. 13.

⁵⁷ Vitalii Shevchenko, *Pravoslavno-katolytska polemika*, s. 189–194.

⁵⁸ *Akty istoricheskie, otnosyashch'iesya k Rossii...*, s. 13.

Florence. However, he described the council and the union as unlawful acts, neglected by both the Greeks and their ancestors. They believe in Christ and the Gospel but not in those Greeks who accepted the alliance.⁵⁹ It was the second time the pinnacle of these aspirations recurred in the 16th century: in 1519, Pope Leo X, with the good intention of bringing the Tsardom of Muscovy to reconciliation with the Roman See, promised a royal crown for the prince of Moscow and the dignity of the Patriarch for the metropolitan, having closed his eyes to the escalation of the Muscovite-Lithuanian conflict and expansionist infringements of the Tsardom.⁶⁰ Now, just as then, the hopes of the Apostolic Capital for the union with Muscovites finally disappeared. Borys Gudziak wrote, "In 1580, on the return journey, which passed through the Ruthenian lands, Possevino's proposals received the recognition from the Orthodox Christians of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth."⁶¹ In the Ruthenian lands, the Italians met with several Ukrainian dukes and some members of the Ukrainian nobility. They said that if Ukrainians had opened their eyes, they would not have hesitated to leave the Orthodox Church and join the Roman Church (the Prince of Ostroh had been in contact with Possevino as early as 1576–1580).⁶² Therefore, the commitment of the Ruthenian secular nobility prompted Possevino to the idea that the union would reach the East starting from Lviv, Lutsk, Vilno, and Polotsk.⁶³ Possevino began active negotiations with the Prince of Ostroh for Church unification. In 1580, measures for union started to be taken at the highest level, and Rome focused attention on the Ruthenian lands. Each time, Possevino's reports strengthened this interest, especially since the papal ambassador permanently lost trust in the Russian tsar. Therefore, when the idea of repositioning the Patriarchate of Constantinople from a hostile environment occurred, Possevino did not even consider Moscow to be the place of its new possible location.⁶⁴ The Patriarchate and the Apostolic Capital's concern focused on the Metropolitanate of Kyiv. It led to the realisation of the Patriarchate's relocation to the Ruthenian lands in this instance.

⁵⁹ Ivan Malishevskii, *Zapadnaya Rus v borbe za veru i narodnost* [Western Russia in the Struggle for Faith and Nationality], Sankt Peterburg, 1897, s. 133.

⁶⁰ Vitalii Shevchenko, *op. cit.*, s. 183.

⁶¹ Borys Gudziak, *op. cit.*, s. 181.

⁶² Leonid Tymoshenko, *op. cit.*, s. 150.

⁶³ Serhii Plokhii, *Papstvo i Ukraina* [Papacy and Ukraine], s. 21–22; Ivan Okhtyrskyi, *Pid znamenniam beresteiskoi podii (dukh Beresteiskoi Unii 1595–96)* [Under the Sign of the Brest Event (Spirit of the Brest Union 1595–96)], s. 28.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

The Prince of Ostroh was interested in the Roman version of relocating the East Slavic Patriarchate. On the one hand, offering to provide it with a location in Ostroh, he showed due respect to Jeremias, and on the other hand, the prince considered the possible prospects for the union. As for this last statement, in the private life of Ostrozkyi, the “guardian and protector”⁶⁵ of the Church, there were numerous facts that directly indicated that in the 1580s, Ostrozkyi did not question the usefulness of the Roman See in the Ruthenia church affairs⁶⁶.

The prince’s interest in land explains his religious tolerance, according to Ukrainian historian Nataliia Yakovenko. The marriage strategy was a well-thought-out “family policy” to strengthen the lineage’s position in society and power structures by maintaining family connections among “great people”.⁶⁷ As the result of marriage to Suzanne Seredi, a Hungarian noblewoman, the Ostrozkyis acquired land within the territory of the Holy Roman Empire. They got to play a role in the relationship between the emperor and the Polish king.⁶⁸ The goal of the marriage of his son Oleksandr, “the Orthodox Church’s hope for the father”, with Anna Kostchanka, who supported Jesuits, was to get land in the Yaroslavl region, which would connect the prince’s property in Volyn and Malopolska. Ostrozkyi’s support of creating the Orthodox Patriarchate in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in this regard is illustrative. If that happened, the prince hoped to have a significant influence on this Church, especially since Ostroh was an option for the city of the Patriarchate, and Archbishop Dionysius Rally-Palaeologus of Cyzikus, who lived with the prince for more than ten years, was a candidate for the head of the new eparchy.⁶⁹ Rally worked in Ostroh on translating the Bible and was also a passionate supporter of the Florentine union. Therefore, after bringing the Church into an alliance with Rome and the personal interest of a highly respected Greek, Rally was a link in the plans for establishing the Patriarchate in Ostroh. That is why the idea of Patriarchate in the Ruthenian lands should be sought in Ostroh, a significant cultural and ideological centre at the turn of the

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, s. 45.

⁶⁶ Tomasz Kempa, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski (ok. 1524/1525–1608) ...*, s. 129; Idem, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski wobec katolicyzmu i wyznań protestantskich...*, s. 17–36.

⁶⁷ Nataliia Yakovenko, *Paralelnyi svit* [Parallel World], s. 40; Eadem, *Ukrainska shliakhta* [Ukrainian Nobility], s. 88–96.

⁶⁸ Ihor Mytsko, *Ostrozka sloviano-hreko-rymska akademiia* [Ostroh Slavic-Greco-Roman Academy], s. 65–71.

⁶⁹ Athanasius G. Welykyj (Ed.), *Litterae Nuniiorum Apostolicorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantes 1550– 1850*, vol. I, Romae, PP. Basiliani, 1953, p. 197; Ihor Mytsko, *op. cit.*, s. 23.

16th-17th centuries,⁷⁰ rather than in Rome.

Dionysius Rally convinced the papal nuncio Bolognetti in the summer of 1583 that establishing the Patriarchate in the Ruthenian lands would be the shortest path to reconcile the Metropolitanate of Kyiv with Rome. Bolognetti pointed out the agility of Rally when he again reminded him of the idea via some personal acquaintance, and the nuncio guessed that he had his reasons for advancing it. Nonetheless, he considered Rally's plan to remove the Ruthenian bishops from subordination to the ruling Patriarch of Constantinople worthy of thought. Consequently, referring it to Rome, the nuncio added that, as it seemed to him, Rally himself would not mind taking over the new Patriarchate, but at the same time noted that God's providence often turned human anticipations to an unexpectedly blessed path. Throughout February, rumours regarding the Patriarchate's dissolution emerged in Constantinople.⁷¹

After the exile of Jeremias to Rhodes, Rome transformed Rally's idea of creating the Patriarchate in the realm of Ostrozkyi into a proposal to transfer Jeremias to the Ruthenian lands or the Tsardom of Muscovy.⁷² Among the cities for the new possible location of the Patriarch, along with Ostroh, were Lviv, Slutsk, and Kyiv, from where patriarchal influence could efficiently spread to Moscow. Rome did not publicly announce its plans and did not share them with Ostrozkyi. As Bolognetti explained, Ostrozkyi had to assure the Patriarch that the Ottomans had deprived him of his patriarchal dignity after finding out about him being sympathetic to the union. Thus, it forced Ostrozkyi to support the relocation of the Patriarchate without revealing the general intentions of the Pope.⁷³

There is no evidence whether Jeremias gave a clear answer about the union with Rome. When he returned to the Apostolic See in 1587, the arguments in favour of the Patriarchate had lost their meaning, and Rome no longer took them seriously. Furthermore, Ostrozkyi did not insist on this idea anymore, realising that Jeremias did not accept the Union of Florence, and the prince, traditionally oriented towards Eastern Orthodoxy, relied on the opinion of the Patriarch in this matter. A third party, the Ottomans, not explicitly but indirectly influenced the Pope's decision to bury the project of the East Slavic Patriarchate. Pope, not without reason, was afraid that having found out their intentions, the Ottomans

⁷⁰ Ihor Mytsko, *op. cit.*, s. 3; Petro Kraliuk, *Ostrozka bibliia*, s. 31.

⁷¹ Borys Gudziak, *op. cit.*, s. 181.

⁷² Serhii Plokhii, *Papstvo i Ukraina* [Papacy and Ukraine], s. 45; Kazimierz Chodynicki, *Kościół prawosławny a Rzeczpospolita Polska...*, s. 250.

⁷³ Tomasz Kempa, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski (ok. 1524/1525 – 1608)...*, s. 129.

would not release Jeremias since, at that time, they were considering restoring him to the throne.

Part of the Catholic and Orthodox (Hypatius Pocie) circles returned to the idea of establishing the Patriarchate in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the visit of Patriarch Jeremias in 1588–1589. However, it happened without Ostrozkyi's involvement and brought no result. In 1588, when Patriarch Jeremias arrived in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Chancellor Jan Zamoyski, in a conversation with legate Aldobrandini, mentioned the intentions to relocate the Patriarchate, naming Kyiv as the final potential location of the Patriarch. Zamoyski argued that this would facilitate the union. When Jeremias, appointed to be the Patriarch for the third time, passed through the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on his way to Moscow, he met with the chancellor in Lviv. On October 5, Zamoyski recounted the content of the conversation with the Patriarch in a letter to Aldobrandini. In particular, they discussed the relocation of the Patriarchate's capital to Kyiv, the ancient centre of the Metropolitanate of all Rus'. The chancellor also believed that this action could lead to the future unification of the Churches. According to Zamoyski, Patriarch Jeremias did not "avoid" this project.⁷⁴ However, it also remained unimplemented.

CONCLUSIONS

Nonetheless, Jeremias's visit to Moscow ended with the implementation of another project - the establishment of the Moscow Patriarchate. Jeremias arrived in the capital with the patriarchal retinue and stayed until the Muscovites resolved all issues regarding establishing their Patriarchate. According to *Ambassador's Book*, Muscovites requested Jeremias to create the Patriarchate in their lands. The bishop of Constantinople did not immediately support them⁷⁵ because he did not want to agree to the first proposal of Moscow, which was to grant the status of Patriarch to a Muscovite elected by the synod. Jeremias also saw serious canonical obstacles: tradition held that a church authority, the supreme organ of local and ecumenical Councils, shaped church policy in the Christian East. Jeremias could

⁷⁴ *Archiwum Jana Zamojskiego, kanclierza i hetmana wielkiego koronnego* [Archives of Jan Zamoyski, Chancellor and Grand Hetman of the Crown], t. 4 (1585 - 1588), Kraków, Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1948, s. 249–250.

⁷⁵ *Posolskaya kniga po svyazyam Rossii i Gretsii (pravoslavnyimi ierarhami i monastiryami) 1588 - 1594 gg.* [Ambassadorial Book on Relations Between Russia and Greece (Orthodox Hierarchs and Monasteries) 1588 - 1594], Moskva, Misl, 1988, s. 35.

not establish the fifth Patriarchate without the Orthodox Church Council's permission, consisting of three other Eastern patriarchs.⁷⁶

The battle of opinions continued for half a year and ended with Jeremias agreeing to appoint Metropolitan Jonah, Boris Godunov's protege, as the Patriarch of Vladimir, Moscow, and All Rus'.⁷⁷ On February 5 (January 26), 1589, Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremias II Tranos raised Jonah to the dignity of Patriarch of Moscow.⁷⁸ But it was not the end: Boris Godunov tried to convince Patriarch Jeremias II to relocate the Patriarchal Seat to Moscow.⁷⁹ Although they received a generous sum for which they had initially come, the Greeks did not comply with this demand, "even if the price of their superiority was increasing reliance on and service to the Turkish power, or the convergence of the Greek Orthodox Church with Catholicism."⁸⁰

The establishment of the Patriarchate of Moscow should be analysed in the light of Moscow's ambitions to unite the Eastern Slavs under the protectorate of the "heirs of the Rurik dynasty". Having annexed almost all of the lands of the central region, Grand Prince Ivan III began to claim the territory of the former Kyivan Rus'.⁸¹ In 1503-1504, the Prince of Moscow drafted the all-Rus' claims, informing the Grand Duke of Lithuania Alexander, who at that time had become the ruler of Poland, and his brother Vladislav of Hungary, that the Moscow tsars now owned not just the cities and the regions, but the entire Ruthenian land was "otchina" (fatherland) of Moscow rulers. In addition, referring to the continuous dynastic connection between Moscow and ancient Kyiv dukes, the prince did not hide his intentions "to get all of the otchina."⁸² According to the Russian historian Konstantin Kharlampovich, the establishment of the Patriarchate in Moscow must be viewed as a means of the Tsardom of Muscovy's struggle with Poland for the Lithuanian-Ruthenian lands.⁸³ Moscow used the Orthodox tradition of Kyivan Rus'

⁷⁶ Oleksandr Sahan, *Vselenske pravoslavia* [Ecumenical Orthodoxy], s. 199 – 214.

⁷⁷ *Posolskaya kniga po svyazyam Rossii i Gretsii...*, s. 39.

⁷⁸ Aleksandr Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i Tserkov v ih vzaimnyh otnosheniyah v Moskovskomu gosudarstve* [State and Church in Their Mutual Relations in the Moscow State], Odessa, Tip. Tehnik, 1912, s. 170.

⁷⁹ Oleksandr Sahan, *Vselenske pravoslavia* [Ecumenical Orthodoxy], s. 228.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ Ivan Ovsii, *Zovnishnia polityka Ukrainy (vid davnikh chasiv do 1944 roku)* [Foreign Policy of Ukraine (from Ancient Times to 1944)] Kyiv, Lybid, 2002, s. 63

⁸² *Sbornik imperatorskogo Russkogo Istoricheskogo Obsh'estva* [Collection of the Imperial Russian Historical Society], Sankt Peterburg, 1869, t. 35, s. 81–82.

⁸³ Konstantin Harlampovich, *Zapadnorusskie pravoslavnye shkoly XVI i nachala XVII veka,*

to ideologically legitimise its imperialist interests.

The establishment of the Patriarchate of Moscow finally buried any claims of Rusyns-Ukrainians to create a Patriarchate on Ruthenian lands. The Patriarch of Constantinople confirmed the fragility of the Church he represented. The Ruthenian society regarded Moscow's reality with fear, having witnessed its cruelty and darkness since duke Kurbsky. Based on this, the Ukrainian church elite was reluctant to converge with the Patriarchate of Moscow. Because of Jeremias' reformatory actions, the Kyiv church hierarchy was granted a secondary status, which paved the way for a union with Rome.

REFERENCES:

1. Coyne V. George, Hoskin A. Michael, Pedersen Olaf (Eds.), *Gregorian Reform of the Calendar. Proceedings of the Vatican Conference to Commemorate its 400th Anniversary 1582 – 1982*, Città del Vaticano, Pontifica Academia Scientiarum, 1983.

2. Gil Andrzej, Skochylias Ihor, *Volodymyrsko-beresteiska yeparkhiia XI – XVIII stolit: istorychni narysy* [The Volodymyr-Brest Diocese of the 11th - 18th centuries: historical essays], Lviv, 2013.

3. Gudziak Borys, *Kryza i reforma: Kyivska mytropoliia, Tsarhorodskiy patriarkhat i geneza Beresteiskoi unii* [Crisis and Reform: the Kyiv Metropolitanate, the Constantinople Patriarchate and the Genesis of the Brest Union], Lviv, Instytut Istorii Tserkvy, Lvivska Bohoslovska Akademiia, 2000.

4. Kempa Tomasz, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski (ok. 1524/1525–1608): wojewoda kijowski i marszałek ziemi wołyńskiej* [Kostiantyn Vasyl Ostrozkyi (c. 1524 / 1525–1608): Voivode of Kiev and Marshal of the Volyn District], Toruń, "POZKAL", 1997.

5. Kempa Tomasz, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski wobec katolicyzmu i wyznań protestantskich* [Kostiantyn Vasyl Ostrozkyi Towards Catholicism and Protestant Denominations], in "Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce", 1996, No. 40, s. 17–36.

6. Krajcar Jan, *Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij and Rome in 1582 – 1584*,

otnoshenie ih k inoslavnym, religioznoe obuchenie v nih i zaslugi v dele zashchity pravoslavnoi very i tserkvi [Western Russian Orthodox schools of the 16th and early 17th centuries, their attitude towards the heterodox, religious education in them and merits in the protection of the Orthodox faith and Church], Kazan, 1898, s 15.

Orientalia Christiana Periodika, Vol. 35, 1969.

7. Kralyuk P. M., Torkonyak R., Pasichnyk I. D., *Ostroz'ka Bibliya v konteksti ukrayins'koyi ta yevropeys'kykh kul'tur* [Ostroh Bible in the Context of Ukrainian and European Cultures], Ostroh, Ostroz'ka Akademiya, 2006.

8. Kraliuk Petro, *Osoblyvosti vyjavu natsionalnoi svidomosti ukraintsiv v ukrainskii suspilno-politychnii dumtsi XVI – pershii polovyni XVII st.* [Features of the Manifestation of the National Consciousness of Ukrainians in the Ukrainian Socio-Political Thought of the 16th – First Half of the 17th Centuries], Lutsk, Nadstyria, 1996.

9. Kraliuk Petro, *Ostrozka Bibliia yak forpost pravoslavno-slovianskoho svitu* [Ostroh Bible as an Outpost of the Orthodox-Slavic World], in “Vidomosti Mytropoliu UAPT u diaspori y Yeparkhii u Velykii Brytanii”, LV, 2004, ch.1, s. 34–37.

10. Kresten Otto (Ed.), *Das Patriarchat von Konstantinopel im ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert. Der Bericht des Leontios Eustratios im Cod. Tyb. Mb 10.*, Wien – Köln – Graz, Böhlau, 1970.

11. Majeska P. Georg, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, Washington D. C., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1984.

12. Melnyk Marek, *Zagadnienia soteriologiczne widziane w świetle projektu Unii Konstantego Ostrogskiego* [Soteriological Issues Seen in the Light of Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi's Union Project], in Stanisław Stępień (Ed.), *Polska – Ukraina 1000 lat sąsiedstwa*, T. 4, Przemyśl, 1998, s. 97–142.

13. Mytsko Ihor, *Ostrozka sloviano-hreko-latynska akademiia (1576 – 1636)* [The Ostroh Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy (1576 – 1636)], Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 1990.

14. Ohiienko Ivan, *Kniaz Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi i yoho kulturna pratsia. Istorychna monohrafiia* [Prince Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi and his cultural work. Historical monograph], Vinnipeg, 1958.

15. Ohiienko Ivan, *Ukrainska tserkva: Narysy z istorii Ukrainiskoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy* [Ukrainian Church: Essays on the History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church], Kyiv, Ukraina, t. 1–2, 1993.

16. Okhtyrskyi Ivan, *Pid znamenniam beresteiskoi podii (dukh Beresteiskoi Unii 1595–96): istorychne nasvitlennia ta bohoslovske mirkuvannia z nahody yuvileiu 400-littia Beresteiskoi Unii* [Under the Sign of the Brest Event (Spirit of the Brest Union 1595-96): Historical Coverage and Theological Considerations on the Occasion of the 400th Anniversary of the Brest Union], Vydavnytstvo oo. Saleziian, 1993.

17. Ovsii Ivan, *Zovnishnia polityka Ukrainy (vid davnikh chasiv do 1944 roku)* [Foreign policy of Ukraine (from ancient times to 1944)], Kyiv, Lybid, 2002.

18. Plokhii Serhii, *Papstvo i Ukraina: Politika Rimskoj kurii na ukrainskikh zemlyah v XVI – XVII vv.* [The Papacy and Ukraine: The Politics of the Roman Curia on the Ukrainian Lands in the 16th – 17th Centuries.], Kyiv, Vyshcha shkola, 1989.
19. Sahan Oleksandr, *Vselenke pravoslavia: sut, istoriia, suchasnyi stan* [Universal Orthodoxy: Essence, History, Current state], Kyiv, Svit Znan, 2004.
20. Saukh Petro, *Kniaz Vasyl-Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi* [Prince Vasyl Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi], Rivne, Volynski oberehy, 2002.
21. Senyk Sophia, *A History of the Church in Ukraine*, Vol. 1, *To the End of the Thirteenth Century (Orientalia Christiana Analecta)*, Rome, Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1993.
22. Ševčenko Ihor, *Ukraine between East and West: Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century*, Edmonton, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1996.
23. Shevchenko Vitalii, *Pravoslavno-katolytska polemika ta problemy uniinosti v zhytti Rusy-Ukrainy doberesteiskoho periodu* [Orthodox-Catholic Polemics and Problems of Unity in the Life of Russia-Ukraine in the pre-Brest Period], Kyiv, Pressa Ukrainy, 2002.
24. Shkribliak Mykola, Balukh Oleksii, *European Reformation and Distinguishing Features of the Institutional Design of the Early Protestant Currents in the Ukrainian Lands*, in “Codrul Cosminului”, XXIII, 2017, No. 1, p. 121-138.
25. Skochylas Ihor (Ed.), *Sobory Lvivskoi yeparkhii XVI–XVIII stolit* [Councils of the Lviv Diocese of the 17th – 18th Centuries], Lviv, Vydavnytstvo UKU, 2006.
26. Snasarevskii Vladimir, *Papskii nuntsii Antonio Possevino i russkii poslanets Istoma Shevrygin* [Papal Nuncio Antonio Possevino and Russian Envoy Istoma Shevrygin], in “Voprosi istorii”, 1967, № 2, s. 213–215.
27. Tymoshenko Leonid, *Artykuly Beresteiskoi unii 1596 r.* [Articles of the Brest Union of 1596], “Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal”, 1996, №2, s. 15–34.
28. Tymoshenko Leonid, *Geneza ta ideia Ostrozkoi akademii u svitli istoriografii ta novykh hipotez* [Genesis and the Idea of the Ostroh Academy in the Light of Historiography and New Hypotheses], in *Ostrozka davnyina*, T. 3, Ostroh, 2014, s. 148–191.
29. Ulianovskyy Vasyl, *Istoriia tserkvy ta relihiinoi dumky v Ukraini: u 3-kh kn.* [History of the Church and Religious Thought in Ukraine: in 3 books], Kyiv, Lybid, 1994.
30. Wendebourg Dorothea, *Reformation und Ortodoxie. Der ökumenische Briefwechsel zwischen der Leitung der Württembergischen Kirche und Patriarch Jeremias II von Konstantinopel in den Jahren 1573 – 1581*, Gottingen, Vandenhoeck

& Ruprecht, 1986.

31. Yakovenko Nataliia, *Paralelnyi svit. Doslidzhennia z istorii uiavlen ta idei v Ukraini XVI–XVII st. Naukove vydannia* [Parallel World. Research on the History of Ideas in Ukraine in the 16th – 17th Centuries. Scientific Publication], Kyiv, Krytyka, 2002.

32. Yakovenko Nataliia, *Ukrainska shliakhta z kintsia XVI – do seredyny XVII st. (Volyn, Tsentralna Ukraina)* [Ukrainian Gentry from the End of the 16th – until the Middle of the 17th Centuries (Volyn, Central Ukraine)], Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 1993.

33. Zhukovskiy Arkadii, *Petro Mohyla y pytannia yednosti tserkov* [Petro Mohyla and the Issue of Unity of Churches], Kyiv, Mystetstvo, 1997.

34. Zhukovskiy Arkadii, *Sproby yednosti Tserkov u XVII st. (Pravoslavna perspektyva)* [Attempts to Unite the Churches in the 17th Century. (Orthodox perspective)], in Volodymyr Yaniv (Ed.), *Yuvileynyy zbirnyk prats' naukovooho konhresu u 1000-littya khreshchennya Rusy-Ukrayiny*, München, 1988–1989, s. 208–235.