CONFESSIONALIZATION FROM BELOW: THE DORMITION CONFRATERNITY AT THE FOREFRONT OF ORTHODOX CONFESSION BUILDING IN EARLY MODERN LVIV

By

Bogdan Pavlish

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of History

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Matthias Riedl

Second Reader: Professor Jan Hennings

Budapest, Hungary

2017

Abstract

The main argument of this thesis is that the process of confession-building in the Orthodox church of Poland-Lithuania was to a large extent initiated and supported by the movement of confraternities of lay people with the Lviv Dormition confraternity at the head. The communal model of confessionalization is employed as a theoretical framework of the research.

Drawing on published and archival documents of the confraternity, mainly its correspondence with ecclesiastical authorities of the Orthodox Church, the thesis aims to reconstruct confraternity's contribution to the processes of social disciplining and confessional identity-formation within the Ruthenian Orthodox community at the turn of the seventeenth century. The research focuses on the confraternity's role in disciplining local Orthodox clergy and laity in line with the confessional principles. It is also argued that the confraternity itself took an active part in shaping Orthodox confessional ideology in the Ruthenian church.

Though the focus of the thesis is the Orthodox (both clerical and laic) community of Lviv between the 1580s and 1600s, it inevitably zooms out both geographically and chronologically due to the confraternity's extensive involvement in wider confessional processes.

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations

AZR – *Akty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Zapadnoi Rossii, sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoi komissiei.*

AIuZR – *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii, izdavaemyi Vremennoi komissiei dlia razbora drevnikh aktov.*

DS – *Diplomata Statuaria a Patriarchis Orientalibus Confraternitati Stauropigianae Leopoliensi a 1586-1592 data, cum aliis litteris coaevis et appendice.*

MCSL – *Monumenta Confraternitatis Stauropigianae Leopoliensis.*

PKK – *Pamiatniki, izdannye Kievskoi komissiei dlia razbora drevnikh aktov*.

PNCL – *Privilegia Nationum Civitatis Leopoliensis (XIV-XVIII saec.).*

TsDIAL – *Tsentralnyi Derzhavnyi Istorychnyi Arkhiv Ukraiiny, Lviv*.

Introduction

The Dormition confraternity of Orthodox burghers of Lviv was one of the most significant social and religious phenomena in Ukrainian history at the turn of the seventeenth century. Much of its unique character the confraternity owed to a multiconfessional and multiethnic environment of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in close interaction with which it was constantly shaped. In the late-sixteenth century, under the influence of new religious tendencies in European Christianity, Poland-Lithuania began to experience a process of growing confessionalization promoted by different Christian denominations, chiefly by Catholics and Protestants. Increasing confessional polarization was particularly discernible in the vibrant urban environment of Lviv where several religious communities lived side by side. Establishment of the Dormition confraternity in 1586 was, therefore, a reaction of the Orthodox population of the city to the challenges posed by the age of confessionalization to their community and its collective identity.

Thesis statement. The Dormition confraternity initiated the process of Orthodox confessionalization in Poland-Lithuania in the late-sixteenth century. Drawing on its extensive institutional, intellectual and material resources, the confraternity embarked on an ambitious campaign of imposing social and clerical discipline in the diocese of Lviv and the entire Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania. It was largely a communal process carried out from below by Orthodox lay people who started to establish confraternities in other towns and villages of the Commonwealth following the example of their co-religionists from Lviv. Legitimacy of this undertaking was secured by the endorsement the Dormition confraternity received from Eastern patriarchs. Though the local hierarchy of the Orthodox Church attempted to transform the communal confessionalization into large-scale centralized reform of ecclesiastical institutions, this process was interrupted by the conclusion of the Brest union in 1596 which effectively led to the divison of the Church.

Chronology. The thesis deals with the Dormition confraternity in the first two decades of its existence, that is from 1586 till 1606. A particular emphasis is placed on the first decade of 1586-1596 when the confraternity managed to successfully promote its program of confessional reforms through the extensive cooperation with metropolitan of Kyiv. The chronological scope of the research, however, is often widened in order to provide a more general account of the origins of the confraternity and its impact on further evolvement of Orthodox confessionalization.

The object. This thesis is focused on the confessionally inspired activities of the Dormition confraternity. Therefore, the main object of the research is the process of Orthodox confessionalization as it was implemented by the confraternity in the late-sixteenth century. Concentration on the institution of confraternity allows to identify links between large social structures, such as the church, and particular individual experience of ordinary people, in this case the urban community of believers. Thus, confessionalization as a macrohistorical process can be investigated in its very specific microhistorical manifestation which provides an illuminating perspective on mechanisms of introduction, reception and opposition to religious changes. Consequently, the research focus on the confraternity as an institution of collective action can bring the lost agency back to common people of the early modern period who were actively involved in great social and religious tranformations of their age.

Sources. The research is based on the body of documents preserved in the archive of the Dormition confraternity which is now a part of the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Lviv (abbreviation–TsDIAL). All major materials of the first two decades of confraternity's existence were published in several different series of source documents in the late-nineteenth century. Most comprehensive of them are two volumes, the *Monumenta Confraternitatis Stauropigianae Leopoliensis* (abbreviation–MCSL) and *Diplomata*

Statuaria a Patriarchis Orientalibus Confraternitati Stauropigianae Leopoliensi a 1586-1592 data, cum aliis litteris coaevis et appendice (abbreviation–DS), both published in Lviv in 1895. Another important publication of confraternity's documents was issued in the series of the Archive of South-Western Russia (abbreviation–AIuZR) (volumes 11 and 12 of the first part) in 1904. The published collections of sources were supplemented with some unpublished documents from the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Lviv. Some source materials were also found in appendices to the studies of the confraternity's history.

The overwhelming majority of the sources analysed in this research constitutes the correspondence between the Dormition confraternity and various hierarchs of the Orthodox Church, predominantely the Eastern patriarchs and metropolitan of Kyiv. Most of these documents are basically letters of complaint which might be also classified as petitions and supplications appealing to the ecclesiastical authorities in respect of different problems experienced by the Orthodox population of Lviv. Typically those letters addressed a broad range of issues, such as clerical discipline of local priests, institutional and material support of the confraternity or educational affairs of the confraternity's school. Another group of sources employed in this research are normative documents that regulated operation of the confraternity, outlined its mission and legal status. These are the statute confirmed by ecclesiastical authorities of the Orthodox Church and royal privilege issued by the king of Poland-Lithuania Zygmunt III Waza. There is also a valuable body of evidence contained in the protocols of confraternity's meetings. These materials give a rare insight into the internal affairs of the confratermity, particularly its treatment of corporate discipline.

A diverse character of source materials requires a special approach to their interpretation. The most basic rule applied throughout this research is based on identification of overtly normative and rhetorical statements which, if possible, have to be additionally verified by other sources or at least located in the immediate historical context.

This does not suggest that some statements in the sources are absolutely true and some are absolutely fictious. All of them are always partly true and partly fictious. Even when many ideas and intentions, expressed in these letters and petitions, were neither fully true nor ever realized, they still cannot be dismissed as irrelevant because they definitely received certain responses which could influence the entire course of events. The aim of interpretation, therefore, is to disentangle different semantical layers of the sources and show which effect each of them had in each particular situation.

Structure. The first chapter lays the groundwork for the thesis by providing a historiographical and methodological account of the confessionalization approach to early modern history of Europe. The confessionalization thesis of Heinz Schilling and Wolfgang Reinhard is criticized from the communalist perspective which is adopted as a theoretical framework of the research. Historiography of Orthodox confessionalization in Poland-Lithuania is, therefore, also assessed against the communalist model of confessioalization.

The second chapter deals with the attempts of the Dormition confraternity to discipline Orthodox priests and bishops. Extensively informing Eastern patriarchs and local hierarchy of numerous disciplinary offences committed by the local clergy, the confraternity managed to instigate legal proceedings against some offenders. Special attention is paid to the patterns of interaction between the Lviv burghers and ecclesiastical authorities in their joint attempts to make parish priests comply with the norms of canon law. Moreover, the demands of the confraternity were incorporated into the program of ecclesiastical reforms initiated by the synod of bishops of the Orthodox Church in 1590.

The third chapter investigates activities of the confraternity aimed at disciplining of the Orthodox laity. Maintanence of corporate order and discipline within the confraternity was regarded as an integral part of the project. Since the confraternity was understood by its members as a vanguard of Orthodox revival, it had to set a good example for the rest of

believers. The school and printing press of the confraternity are examined as one of the most effective and consistent mechanisms of communal confessionalization. These institutions enabled the confraternity to shape a new confessional identity of the Orthodox population in the entire Commonwealth. Finally, the paschal controversy of 1586-1592 graphically illustrated confraternity's zeal for correction and homogenization of religious rituals.

1. Confessionalization and social disciplining reconsidered

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a theoretical and historiographical framework for the rest of the work focusing on the theory of confessionalization and social disciplining in early modern Europe. It is also aimed at clarification and explication of key terms used in this work. The first part of the chapter examines major principles of the confessionalization thesis put forward by Heinz Schilling and Wolfgang Reinhard in the 1970s-80s. Then follows an overview of the criticism of their notion of confessionalization with a particular emphasis on the discussion of grass-roots structures and agency in this process. The second part of the chapter explores recent attempts of historians to apply the confessionalization thesis to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Here, in particular, close attention is paid to the limitations of this theory in the multiconfessional context of the Commonwealth dominated by institutions and practices of noble self-government. Finally, the third part of the chapter argues for the application of the confessionalization theory to the early modern history of Orthodox population in Poland-Lithuania.

1. 1. Confessionalization and social disciplining in early modern Europe

It seems that the confessionalization theory has been so widely and extensively criticised for the last three decades that it should have been abandoned by historians a long time ago. Indeed, it has been many times corrected and nuanced by specialists in various fields – law, humanism and theology – let alone geographical areas of early modern Europe.[1] And yet the confessionalization theory still retains its remarkable research value. Despite all the sound criticism, it continues to dominate theoretical and historiographical debates in early modern history providing a systematizing famework for all kinds of

[1] For a brief outline of the confessionalization debate see Ute Lotz-Heumann, "The Concept of 'Confessionalization': a Historiographical Paradigm in Dispute", 4 *Memoria y Civilizacion* (2001): 106-13.

historical surveys of European politics, society, religion and culture. [2] Moreover, geographical applicability of the theory has been growing significantly wider in recent years extending far beyond the initial area of the Holy Roman Empire. Suffice to say that the confessionalization paradigm was successfully applied to the ealry modern Ottoman Empire providing a cogent interpretation of the parallel state and confession building processes informed by Sunni Islam.[3]

On the whole, the theory of confessionalization has been demonstrating a considerable degree of adaptability to new empirical evidence and changing theoretical trends in early modern historiography. It proved to be particularly flexible to numerous case-studies in social and religious history which eventually helped it to reconcile its large-scale structural explanations with their often inconsistent day-to-day manifestations. Another undeniable merit of the confessionalization thesis is the comparative perspective it provides on historical processes underpinned by religious beliefs and practices of different Christian (and even Muslim) denominations. These roughly defined characteristics of the theory have inspired this research of bottom-up Orthodox confession building in early modern Poland-Lithuania. There are, therefore, two major points which will guide this overview of the confessionalization thesis. The first is the comparative potential of the theory, particularly in relation to the Orthodox Christianity, while the second is its recent adaptations to various local institutions and processes.

In its initial and most widely current formulation, the confessionalization thesis was put forward in the late-1970s by Wolfgang Reinhard and Heinz Schilling in the course of their parallel studies of early modern German history. Concentrating on religious landscape of the Holy Roman Empire during the period following the Reformation, Reinhard and

[2] For a recent discussion of the confessionalization theory see Forum (Marc Forster et al.), "Religious History beyond Confessionalization", *German History* 32:4 (2014): 579-98.
[3] Tijana Krstic, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011), 100.

Schilling argue that three major contemporary confessions, namely Catholicism, Lutheranism and Calvinism (sometimes Anglicanism is added), underwent similar and interconnected processes of intensive ideological and institutional formation. This effectively led to the establishment of three confessional churches with their relative internal uniformity and distinctive theological identities outlined by confessions of faith.[4] According to Reinhard and Schilling, such a radical transformation of early modern religious life inevitably involved significant changes of fundamental political and social structures. Therefore, confessionalization is seen by them first and foremost as a large-scale process of general or societal history (*Gesamt- oder Gesellschaftsgeschichte*) embracing almost all areas of public and private life of early modern European societies.[5]

Another distinctive methodological charactersitic of the confessionalization theory is its emphasis on structural and functional similarities between different confessional churches and their trajectories in the early modern period. Therefore, religious history of post-Reformation Europe is no longer seen only as a mutually exclusive struggle of Protestantism and Catholicism, but rather as a competition of different confessions for the same set of resources which prompted them to use the same set of institutional and ideological tools oftern borrowed from each other. Such a structural-functional approach enables historians to draw illuminating comparisons and parallels between the denominations which might seem to be uncompatible because of their theological differences. Focusing on common social, political, cultural and intellectual functions of early modern confessions, the confessionalization thesis, therefore, provides a solid

[4] Wolfgang Reinhard, "Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State. A Reassessement," *The Catholic Historical Review* 75:3 (1989): 390; Heinz Schilling, "Confessionalization in the Empire: Religious and Societal Change in Germany between 1550 and 1620," in Heinz Schilling, *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society. Essays in German and Dutch History* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 217.
[5] Schilling, "Confessionalization in the Empire," 208-09.

methodological basis for large-scale comparative studies of religion's impact on European societies.[6]

Such an extensive scope of the effects attributed to confessionalization is what makes Reinhard and Schilling's theory considerably different from the notion of confessional building (*Konfessionsbildung*) developed by Ernst Walter Zeeden in the 1950s. Restricted to the field of church history and theology, his idea of the parallel formation of three confessional churches with their respective confessions of faith was adopted by Reinhard and Schilling and recasted into the all-embracing confessionalization paradigm.[7] Confessional building, therefore, was integrated into the broader confessionalization theory as a term describing the formation of separate confessional churches proper. Whereas all subsequent effects of this process on wider early modern society are essentially denoted by the term of confessionalization. Given the close intertwinement of confessional building with confessionalization, they are rarely separated from one another so that the two terms denoting them are often used interchangeably.

According to Reinhard and Schilling, the logic of confessionalization in the Empire and across early modern Europe comprised several interconnected processes. Drawing on Reinhard's analysis of the Catholic Church, there might be identified five stages of confessionalization with a strong emphasis on the process of church building. They have to be understood as elements of analytical rather than strictly chronological development of early modern confessional churches. The first stage was the formulation and adoption of the orthodox religious doctrines usually encapsulated in the confessions of faith, such as the *Augsburg Confession* of Lutherans or the Catholic *Professio Fidei Tridentina*. With the help of clearly defined doctrines, each confessional community was able to draw its external boundaries which were intended to distinguish it from other competing confessions. The

[6] Heinz Schilling, "Confessional Europe," in *Handbook of European History, 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, ed. Thomas A. Brady et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 642.
[7] Lotz-Heumann, "The Concept of 'Confessionalization'," 95.

second stage was the spread of correct doctrinal beliefs and practices across large groups of believers. Particularly important for these purposes was the use of the printing press which enabled wide currency of confessional literature (catechisms, pamphlets, collections of sermons and many other publications). Complementary to the operation of propaganda were various mechanisms of censorship intended to guard believers from heretical ideas of competing confessions. Thus, all churches sought to establish their monopoly on orthodox Christianity.[8]

The third stage of confessionalization, according to Reinhard, was aimed at internalization of confessional ideas and identities by ordinary believers. Most effectively this task was accomplished by means of mass regular education which involved inculcation of the norms of religious and social discipline. Introduction of specifically confessional rituals and practices could also serve educational objectives of early modern churches. Finally, the fourth stage of confessionalization presupposed regular control of the achieved (or, more often, only intended) confessional uniformity of church communities. Visitations of local parishes were particularly effective in maintaining confessional homogeneity and social discipline in the church. Sometimes, however, more radical and coercive measures were taken. Expulsion or persecution of religious minorities was the most extreme way of securing group uniformity.[9] As Reinhard's account of confessionalization clearly suggests, the last two stages of this process particularly depended on the support of secular authorities. European monarchs could supplement ecclesiastical engagement in censorship and education with a sufficient number of qualified personnel.[10] More important, the state was able to facilitate confessionalization with the use of large-scale violence and coercion against religious dissidents.

[8] Reinhard, "Reformation, Counter-Reformation," 391-92.
[9] Ibid., 393-94.
[10] Ibid., 396.

Schilling's notion of confessionalization is actually very similar. He distinguishes four key tendencies common to the formation of all confessional churches in early modern Europe. The first one was an alliance of ecclesiastical and secular authorities in their concerted attempt to establish a confessionally homogenious community of believers and subjects. With a considerable degree of intensity this process took place in the Protestant states of Scandinavia and the Empire, in England and Switzerland, but also in the Catholic lands of Spain, France and Bavaria. As a result, and this was the second characteristic of confessionalization, the state started to collaborate with the church in administering important public affairs, such as the marriage, education, poor relief and social welfare, which in the Middle Ages had fallen primarily to the ecclesiastical competence. Building on the strong secular assistance, the early modern churches then sought to impose their confessional doctrines on the masses of ordinary people. This process, classified by Schilling as the third tendency of confessionalization, assumed a form of extensive social disciplining campaign carried out by various mechanisms of education, control and supervision of believers' social and religious behavior. Finally, the fourth tendency was the emergence of a new type of clergy who had to meet growing demands of the confessional churches for a tighter grip on their flocks. Despite radically different doctrinal views on the nature of priesthood, the Protestant and Catholic Churches, however, adopted a very similar course of action aimed at professionalization of the sacerdotal office with a strong emphasis on pastoral ministry.[11]

As this brief overview of Reinhard's and Schilling's ideas clearly indicates, they interpret confessionalization as a largely coercive top-down process of disciplining large groups of early modern society undertaken by concerted efforts of ecclesiastical and secular authorities. The state-church cooperation, therefore, had a reciprocal effect. Not only

[11] Schilling, "Confessional Europe," 647-55.

territorial states facilitated confessionalization, but also emerging confessional churches, in their turn, contributed considerably to the early modern state-building. In particular, they provided territorial rulers with adequte ideological means of educating loyal office-holders and subjects.[12] Thus, inferring from Reinhard's and Schilling's notion of confessionalization, the parallel processes of church and state building converged on social disciplining of early modern European societies. It was exactly the enterprise on which the state-church collaboration assumed its amplest proportions but also yielded presumbaly the greatest results discribed by Reinhard and Schilling as the modernization, rationalization and bureaucratization of European societies.[13]

In its initial formulation, the confessionalization thesis owes its pronouncedly state-oriented character to the notion of social disciplining (*Sozialdisziplinierung*). As a historiographical concept, it was coined by Gerhard Oestreich and originally denoted a general process of introducing discipline in all areas of human life by «police legislation» of early modern absolute monarchies. According to Oestreich, social disciplining was, therefore, imposed by central territorial authorities on private and public life of the subjects in order to secure their unreserved obedience and service for the benefit of the state.[14] In its initial version, social disciplining, however, did not presuppose any substantial relation to the process of confessional building. Moreover, Oestreich even suggested that the state-imposed discipline had succeeded in guarding early modern societies against the religious strife instigated by confessional rivalry of emerging churches.[15] As a result, social disciplining was originally understood as a necessary counterbalance to what later would be called confessionalization.

[12] Schilling, "Confessionalization in the Empire," 233.
[13] Reinhard, "Reformation, Counter-Reformation," 397-98; Schilling, "Confessionalization in the Empire," 235-38.
[14] Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*, trans. David McLintock (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 268-72.
[15] Ibid., 267.

This contradiction in terms, however, did not prevent Reinhard and Schilling from incorporating the concept of social disciplining into the theoretical framework of confessionalization. Though they rarely use the term in its original definition, their notion of disciplining process closely resembles that of Oestreich. Their position basically hinges on the above mentioned assumption that allmost all confessional churches closely cooperated with emerging territorial states in order to secure effective application of uniform confessional doctrines to large groups of believers.[16] In other words, Reinhard and Schilling complemented the notion of social disciplining with a religious dimension by emphasizing a leading role of confessional churches and their doctrines in this process. The original meaning of the Oestreich's concept, however, left almost intact – the early modern state remained one of the two, along with the church, principal agents of the coercive top-down imposition of discipline and order on largely inert society. Moreover, according to Reinhard and Schilling, confessionalization, in most cases, favoured the formation of centralized territorial states across Europe. Consequently, the two principal theoretical frameworks of early modern European historiography, that of confessionalization and state-building, merged with the help of the shared notion of social disciplining.

Despite the considerable cogency of this theoretical synthesis, the confessionalization thesis, nevertheless, has been most often criticized exactly for its blind acceptance of the idea of strong state institutions capable of controlling and thus disciplining all levels of early modern society.[17] Many recent studies in political, social and religious history of early modern Europe, however, have convincingly demonstrated that the confessionalization thesis can no longer be premised on this assumption. To begin with, the very connection between early modern state building and social disciplining has been substantially revised. As Philip Gorski has shown, state strength depended on the intensification of religious

[16] Reinhard, "Reformation, Counter-Reformation," 390; Schilling, "Confessional Europe," 647-48.
[17] Joel F. Harrington and Helmut Walser Smith, "Confessionalization, Community, and State-Building in Germany, 1555-1870," *The Journal of Modern History* 69:1 (1997): 83.

discipline not only because it was imposed by central authorities from above but mainly because it was promoted and sustained by local communities from below.[18] Moreover, he argues that such a communal type of disciplining was far more effective than a coercive one in terms of bringing about profound social transformations which could facilitate state building.[19] Consequently, Oestreich's notion of social disciplining as a top-down process has been reinterpreted as a complex process of constant negotiations between state authorities and local communities.

More important, micro-historical perspective on confessionalization allowed historians to arrive at a similar conclusion that the state by no means dominated early modern society. Numerous case studies of Protestant and Catholic parishes in the Empire and elsewhere in Europe have proven that social disciplining yielded the most significant results only when it was furthered by communities of believers themselves.[20] Therefore, Heinrich Richard Schmidt has correctly called for the end of "etatism" (*Etatismus*) in the confessionalization studies noting that state involvement was "an accidental, not an essential or structural characteristic" of confessionalization.[21] As an alternative, he has advanced a communalist interpretation of confessionalization (*Konfessionalisierung als kommunaler Vorgang*) with the community (*Gemeinde*) at the centre of historical research. He particularly argues for the study of institutions and practices of communal self-regulation as a pivotal disciplining mechanism whose operation also entailed internalization of external compulsion (*Fremdzwang*) exerted on the community from above by secular and ecclesiastical authorities. Therefore, the state (as well as the church hierarchy) is not completely eliminated from the process of confessionalization. Its role is rather

[18] Philip S. Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), 158-59.
[19] Ibid., 33.
[20] Heinrich Richard Schmidt, "Sozialdisziplinierung? Ein Plädoyer für das Ende des Etatismus in der Konfessionalisierungsforschung," *Historische Zeitschrift* 265:3 (1997): 648-58.
[21] Ibid., 660.

subordinated to that of the community – communal self-regulation not only adapted state influence but also effectively shaped it by producing and communicating specific local demands for disciplining. [22] Consequently, central authorities, both secular and ecclesiastical, used to depend on local processes of confessionalization and not vice versa, as Reinhard and Schilling assumed following the "etatist" pattern of Oestreich.

The communalist interpretation of confessionalization has been exemplified and significantly elaborated by Marc Forster's study of Baroque Catholicism in Southwest Germany. Examining the formation of Catholic identity in the region in 1550-1750, Forster argues that it basically resulted from the long tradition of religious communalism widely practiced by the local population. At the heart of Catholic communalism in Southwest Germany was the dominance of the commune (*Gemeinde*) of lay people over the religious life of the parish. Found in villages and towns throughout the region, the communes exerted strong influence on the parish clergy as well as the laity. Due to their control of parish finances, they were responsible for maintaining the parish churches, chapels and other sites of worship.[23] According to Forster, communalism remained to be an organizing force of the Catholic Church in Southwest Germany even after the introduction of the Tridentine reforms in the late-sixteenth century. Despite a new tendency to establish a strict hierarchical structure of the church, there was a general consensus in the region that "the parish, the local church, and the local clergy should be managed and controlled as much as possible by the *Gemeinde*".[24]

Drawing on his study of the religious life in villages and towns of Southwest Germany, Forster launches powerful criticism of the confessionalization thesis of Reinhard and Schilling. First of all, he calls into question the model of confessionalization as a

[22] Schmidt, "Sozialdisziplinierung?," 680-81.
[23] Marc R. Forster, *Catholic Revival in the Age of the Baroque: Religious Identity in Southwest Germany, 1550-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 185.
[24] Ibid., 187.

centralized and coherent policy implemented by state institutions. As the example of Southwest Germany demonstrates, a strong Catholic identity of the local population developed without any considerable pressure from above. Then, Forster elaborates his previous point by claiming that changes of the local religious life derive neither from "an elite-sponsored program of social discipline and modernization". Therefore, and this is his final critical remark, the confessionalization in general and Baroque Catholicism in particular were premised first and foremost on the popular support and not an elite initiative. The confessional identity had to appeal to believers and relate to their everyday needs in order to take root in the community.[25] Consequently, Forster argues for an interactive model of religious change with the focus on constant negotiations between secular and ecclesiastical authorities, on the one hand, and local communities, on the other.[26]

Despite their fierce criticism of some of the key ideas of Reinhard and Schilling, neither Schmidt nor Forster rejects the confessionalization thesis as such. They rather suggest to shift an emphasis of the theory from the state towards the local community. It also seems that neither Schmidt nor Forster completely rejects the idea of social disciplining. As in the case of confessionalization, they suggest instead to interpret it as a process of communal self-regulation which only occasionally came into contact with state institutions. Both Schmidt and Forster highlight the significance of interactive relations between central, secular or ecclesiastical, authorities and local communities in the promotion of confessionalization. In contrast to what has been assumed by Oestreich, Reinhard and Schilling, this interaction was largely initiated and steered by local population who sought a settlement of their particular problems and grievances.

The communal model of confessionalization constitutes a methodological basis for this study of the Dormition confraternity. It is, thus, focused on the religious changes

[25] Forster, *Catholic Revival in the Age of the Baroque*, 15.
[26] Ibid., 16.

pushed for by lay people who extensively appealed for support to the highest ecclesiastical and some secular authorities. In most cases, these appeals assumed a form of collective petitions, supplications and letters of complaint which urged the elites to solve the most pressing of local problems or at least to endorse the measures already taken by the community itself. Of course, this interaction was accompanied by permanent renegotiation of the positions of both sides. However, even more pronouncedly than in the rest of Europe, local communities of lay people shaped an agenda of Orthodox confessionalization in Poland-Lithuania. There was little if any pressure for the religious reform from the hierachy of the Orthodox Church. The situation would change only after the numerous requests received from the confreaternity. Therefore, the study of the Dormition confraternity could not only provide one more example of the communal confessionalization but also shed light on the way how this process was channeled by lay people to the church hierarchy and then carried on by their joint actions.

1. 2. Orthodox confessionalization in Poland-Lithuania

Orthodox confessionalization has not yet become an integral part of a broader confessionalization debate. General theoretical and methodological discussions of confessionalization do not usually refer to religious history of early modern East-Central Europe let alone the Orthodox Church. This is partly because the theory has not been embraced by scholars of early modern history of the region. They usually call into question the applicability of the confessionalization thesis derived from the specific historical context of the Empire to significantly different political and social landscape of East-Central Europe. Even when they employ the theory of confessionalization, they tend to do this with great caution and numerous reservations. [27] And this is absolutely justified if

[27] Alfons Brüning, "Confessionalization in the *Slavia Orthodoxa* (Belorussia, Ukraine, Russia)? – Potential and Limits of a Western Historiographical Concept," in *Religion and the Conceptual Boundary in Central and Eastern Europe: Encounters of Faith*, ed. Thomas Bremer (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 66-67.

confessionalization is understood in its original meaning as a process closely intertwined with state building. Early modern polities of East-Central Europe, indeed, did not follow the same pattern of state building as their counterparts in Central and Western Europe did.

Such a qualification of the confessionalization theory is particularly relevant to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Unlike many other European monarchies in the early modern period, the Commonwealth was jointly governed by the king and the large estate of nobles assembled in the diet (*sejm*). The diet not only co-managed all major public affairs but also elected the king. The political dominance of the nobility was attested by a wide range of rights and privileges enjoyed by all nobles regardless of their social or economic inequality. One of the most fundamental was the right of free profession of faith which effectively meant equality of all Christian confessions within the noble estate of the Commonwealth. In 1573 the nobility's freedom of religion was legally established by the Warsaw Confederation which was aimed at securing peace among the religious dissidents in the turbulent time of interregnum. It was a formal confirmation of the long established practice of religious tolerance which helped the king and the nobility to manage multiconfessional society of the Commonwealth.[28]

Coexistence of various religious groups within boundaries of one commonwealth is exactly what makes Poland-Lithuania different from many other early modern European polities. The Commonwealth was permanently inhabited by Catholics, Orthodox Christians, Protestants of different denominations, Jews and small communities of Muslims. Though the majority of the population and nobility was Catholic even in the heyday of the Reformation, there was always a critical number of Orthodox population which thus made it almost impossible for the king to pursue Catholic confessionalization of the entire Commonwealth. Therefore, strong ties between the royal power and Catholicism had not

[28] Michael G. Mueller, "Protestant Confessionalization in the Towns of Royal Prussia and the Practice of Religious Toleration in Poland-Lithuania," in *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, ed. Ole Peter Grell and Bob Scribner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 264-65.

been forged up until the second half of the seventeenth century when first attempts to restrict political participation of "religious dissidents" were undertaken. The first and only expulsion of religious minority of the Polish Brothers was intended definitely not to establish confessional homogeneity of the Commonwealth but rather to secure its political stability. [29] Judging from these simple facts, it becomes evident that the type of confessionalization described by Reinhard and Schilling was not only hardly conceivable in Poland-Lithuania but would also have severely undermined state institutions and overall operation of the Commonwealth.[30]

Such confessional plurality was based on the leading role of the estates in social and religious life of the region. In Poland-Lithuania as well as other early modern kingdoms of East-Central Europe, political elites most actively involved in the process of confessionalization were represented mainly by the nobility and not by monarchs or public officials of the state, as it was in other parts of Europe. Due to the wide extent of their rights and privileges, nobles were poised to protect their freedom of religion from any attempts of the king to impose a uniform confessional order throughout his domains. A long tradition of liberty and self-government of the nobility, therefore, facilitated the spread of Protestantism and subsequnt Protestant confessionalization in the kingdoms of East-Central Europe untill the early-seventeenth century. At the same time, Catholic confessionalization, launched in response to the advance of Protestantism, also hinged on ideals and practices of the noble political tradition. Despite the support of royal authority, Catholic confessionalization in Poland-Lithuania, thus, eventuated not in the formation of modern state structure but in the strengthening of higher nobility. Contrary to the state-oriented model of confession

[29] Anja Moritz, Hans-Joachim Mueller, Matthias Pohlig, "Konfesjonalizacja Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej w XVII i XVIII wieku?," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 108:1 (2001), 42.
[30] For a similar conclusion about the effect of confessionalization on the multiconfessional army of the Commonwealth see Robert Frost, "Konfesjonalizacja a wojsko w Rzeczpospolitej 1558-1668," in *Rzeczpospolita wielu wyznań*, ed. Adam Kaźmiercyzk et al. (Krakow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2004), 97.

building, both Protestant and Catholic confessionalizations in Poland-Lithuania, therefore, significantly intensified a conflict between the state and the nobility.[31]

These structural characteristics of Poland-Lithuania and other polities of the region, namely the deeply embedded confessional plurality and nobility dominance, have correctly led historians to a conclusion that "a "one-to-one"-application of the confessionalization theory would be completely misleading".[32] Indeed, political, social and religious structures of East-Central Europe were significantly different from those of the rest of early modern Europe, so the confessionalization thesis should be adapted to the new historical context. One of the most crucial pecularities of confessionalization in Poland-Lithuania, therefore, is its regional character. Being one of the largest and most populous polities of early modern Europe, the Commonwealth spanned a number of distinct historical regions with their particular legal, ethnic and religious backgrounds. In the late-sixteenth century those were predominantely Catholic Poland and Lithuania, Orthodox Ruthenia (present day Ukraine and Belarus) and Protestant Royal Prussia. It would be, therefore, much more accurate and productive to treat these regions and not the entire Commonwealth as basic territorial units of confessionalization in Poland-Lithuania. At the turn of the seventeenth century religious developments in each of these parts of the Commonwealth demonstrated a considerable degree of coherence and resemblence to the process of confessional building which in the rest of Europe was experienced by individual territorial polities.[33]

The regional approach informs recent attempts to apply the confessionalization thesis to the Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania. The idea of Orthodox confessionalization was pioneered by Serhii Plokhy. He argues that in the first half of the seventeenth century the

[31] Winfried Eberhard, "Voraussetzungen und Strukturelle Grundlagen der Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa," in *Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa: Wirkungen des religiosen Wandels im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert in Staat, Gesellschaft und Kultur*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke and Arno Strohmeyer (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999), 101-02.
[32] Jorg Deventer, " "Confessionalization" – a useful theoretical concept for the study of religion, politics, and society in early modern East-Central Europe?," *European Review of History/Revue europeenne d'histoire* 11:3 (2004): 416.
[33] Moritz, Mueller, Pohlig, "Konfesjonalizacja Rzeczypospolitej," 42.

Kyivan metropolitanate started its own project of confessionalization undeer the growing pressure of Catholicism and Protestantism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.[34] At the heart of this process lay a comprehensive program of ecclesiastical reforms initiated by the metropolitan Petro Mohyla of Kyiv (1633-1647). Grappling with a protracted crisis of the Orthodox Church, Mohyla introduced strict discipline in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, profoundly reformed confessional education and standardized the Orthodox liturgy. His most prominent achievement was the confession of faith which for the first time in the history of Eastern Christianity provided a coherent formulation of the Orthodox doctrine. According to Plokhy, the ecclesiastical reforms of Mohyla "helped to set the whole Orthodox world on the path of confessionalization".[35]

Another important characteristic of Orthodox confessionalization in Poland-Lithuania was the increasing dependence of the church on secular authorities, particularly the Ruthenian nobility and cossacks. Starting from the 1620s, the cossacks maintained close relations with the Orthodox hierarchy. They positioned themselves as the defenders of Orthodox Christianity.[36] This alliance between secular and ecclesiastical elites reached its climax during the cossack revolt under the lead of Bohdan Khmelnytsky in 1648-1654. The nascent cossack polity, which resulted from the revolt, substantiated its political ideology and international legitimacy by appropriating religious ideas and symbols of the Orthodox confession. According to Plokhy, the fusion of religion and politics attested to a structural affinity of Orthodox confessionalization with similar processes in other contemporary polities of Europe.[37] On the whole, it is quite clear that Plokhy employs the confessionalization thesis in its original interpretation provided by Reinhard and Schilling. His analysis is focused on the process of confessionalization as it was imagined and

[34] Serhii Plokhy, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 11.
[35] Ibid., 96-7.
[36] Ibid., 194.
[37] Ibid., 12-3.

promoted by the ecclesiastical and political elites. Ordinary Orthodox population, therefore, is treated as a predominantely passive receiver of the elite-sponsored program of confession building and disciplining. Orthodox confessionalization, therefore, is depicted as a top-down process initiated by the ecclesiastical hiearchy, supported by the political elite of the cossackdom and successfully imposed on the Ruthenian society.

A similar interpretation of Orthodox and Greek Catholic confessionalizations has been advanced by Piotr Wawrzeniuk in his study of confessional civilising in the diocese of Lviv in 1668-1708. He argues that the process of confessionalization in the diocese was primarily intended to civilize and educate the parish clergy and thus secure the submission of the diocese to the Uniate Greek Catholic Church. Assuming a form of extensive religious reform, confessional civilising was inspired and carried out by the bishop Iosyf Shumliansky of Lviv who made a determined effort to discipline Greek Catholic priests in compliance with the model of the Roman Catholic clergy. As Wawrzeniuk claims, the ecclesiastical policy of the bishop exemplified new tendencies towards Catholic confessionalization in Poland-Lithuania. Civilizing and disciplining of the Uniate clergy, therefore, was an integral part of this process.[38] Despite different treatment of the origins of Orthodox and Greek Catholic confessionalizations by Plokhy and Wawrzeniuk, they, nevertheless, agree on the nature of this process. In both cases confessionalization is interpreted as an external pressure applied by the ecclesiastical elite to the mass of believers in order to make them compliant with the ideal of confessional church. Though Wawrzeniuk takes into account some instances of popular resistance to the ecclesiastical reforms, he does not integrate them into the process of confessionalization.[39]

Focusing on the confessional activities of the Dormition confraternity, this study adopts a radically different notion of confessionalization which has been earlier called the

[38] Piotr Wawrzeniuk, "Confessional Civilizing in Ukraine: the Bishop Iosyf Shumliansky and the Introduction of Reforms in the Diocese of Lviv 1668-1708*"* (PhD diss., Södertörns högskola, 2005), 143-45.
[39] Ibid., 117-42.

communal one. It is premised on the assumption that any large-scale transformation of religious life, such as confessionalization and disciplining of early modern European societies, entailed permanent interaction between ordinary believers and political or ecclesiastical authorities. Moreover, lay people usually took the lead in this interaction and thus determined overall progress of confessionalization. In the case of the Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania, the laity was represented by confraternities which managed religious life of their communities and articulated their grievances and aspirations. The confraternities, therefore, were the driving force of the Orthodox confessionalization that began to evolve in the late-sixteenth century – in fact, much earlier than Plokhy and Wawrzeniuk claim concentrating only on confessional reforms from above.

An assumption that Orthodox confessional building was initiated by the confraternity movement in the 1580s has been advanced by Mikhail V. Dmitriev.[40] However, his treatment of this process as a uniquely Orthodox phenomenon that had little to do with early modern Protestantism and Catholicism does not allow any systematic cross-confessional comparisons that lie at the heart of confessionalization studies. Quite paradoxiacally, by this statement Dmitriev effectively denies any value of the confessionalization thesis for the study of the Orthodox Church. As a result, his analysis of the confraternity movement is devoid of any concepts and theoretical models that are usually employed within the confessionalization framework. This study of the Dormition confraternity will try to show that the theory of confessionalization, namely its communal interpretation, can be productively applied to the history of the Orthodox Church in Poland-Lithuania.

[40] Mikhail V. Dmitriev, *Mezhdu Rimom i Tsargradom: Genezis Brestskoi tserkovnoi unii 1595-1596 gg.* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 2003), 283; idem, "Tserkovnye bratstva Kievskoi mitropolii v konce XVI veka: rezultat 'pravoslavnoi konfessionalizatsii'?," in *Sravnitelnaia istoria: metody, zadachi, perspektivy*, ed. Marina Paramonova (Moscow: IVI RAN, 2003), 147.

2. The Lviv Dormition confraternity and disciplining of the clergy

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the role the Dormition confraternity played in the process of disciplining of the Ruthenian Orthodox clergy in the late-sixteenth century. The chapter consists of three parts. The first part provides an outline of political and religious condition of the Orthodox Christians living in sixteenth-century Lviv. It is particularly focused on the issue of institutional crisis of the Ruthenian Orthodox Church and how it contrasted with the renewal and advance of post-Tridentine Catholicism in Poland-Lithuania. The second part of the chapter examines first consistent initiatives of the Dormition confraternity on reforming local ecclesiastical affairs by supervising and informing on behavior of parish priests in Lviv and the surrounding area. Close attention is paid here to the privileged legal status of the confraternity which enabled it to cooperate with Eastern patriarchs over the heads of local Ruthenian bishops. The third part, finally, argues that the Dormition confraternity and other similar associations of laypeople effectively initiated and supported the first large-scale reforms of the Ruthenian clergy implemented from above in the early 1590s.

2.1. The Orthodox Christian community in sixteenth-century Lviv

On the Christmas Eve on January 3, 1584, the Roman Catholic archbishop of Lviv Jan Dymitr Solikowski along with several other members of his chapter came to the Orthodox church of the Dormition of Virgin Mary situated in Ruthenian street. According to some witnesses to this unusual event, the Catholics were armed with "guns and many other weapons". With the first tolls of bells, they immediately entered the church and prevented an old priest from starting the liturgy. The archbishop's brother Wojciech Solikowski grabbed the priest by his beard and threw him out of the church. The Orthodox parishioners that had gathered inside for the mass had to leave the building as well. Finally, the

archbishop Solikowski ordered that the doors of the church be locked and sealed so that no one could get inside undetected.[41]

Having closed the only Orthodox church within the city walls, the group of Roman Catholic clerics and laymen did not hesitate to interrupt ongoing Orthodox services on the outskirts of Lviv. Five more suburban Orthodox parishes – St. George's cathedral, the church of the Annunciation, St. Nicholas's and St. Onuphrius's churches in the Krakow suburb and the church of the Epiphany and Christ's baptism in the Halycz suburb – witnessed the same scene. Adherents of the archbishop Solikowski bursted into the churches in the middle of the masses, expelled priests and laypeople and locked the doors forbidding anybody to open them and continue the liturgy. These actions were occasionally accompanied by small-scale violence, allegedly coming from both Catholic and Orthodox sides.[42]

A detailed account of this conflict was provided by the Orthodox bishop of Lviv Hedeon Balaban (1569-1607) who accused the archbishop Solikowski and his chapter of violating royal privileges of the Orthodox community of Lviv. As it is evident from the bishop's petition to the court, the sole reason for the conflict lay in a wish of the Catholic authorities of the city to make the Orthodox community celebrate Christian feasts, in this case it was Christmas, according to the Gregorian calendar. Since the Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania did not accept the calendar reform of the pope Gregory XIII, they celebrated all religious feasts ten days later than the Catholics did. As a result, Lviv witnessed one of the major religious conflicts in the entire Commonwealth.[43] Given the potentially disastrous consequences of the controversy, the king Stefan Batory reacted immediately. On January 9, 1584, he assured the Orthodox community of Lviv that the introduction of the Gregorian calendar should not breach their right of free worship of

[41] *MCSL*, 98.
[42] Ibid., 98-99.
[43] Serhii Plokhy, *The Cossacks and Religion*, 66.

"Greek religion". Consequently, the Orthodox population of the city was allowed to use the old calendar.[44]

Exceptional though it was in the multireligious setting of the Commonwealth, this brief conflict between the two Christian denominations is a graphic illustration of complex interethnic relations and new religious tendencies taking place in Lviv in the second half of the sixteenth century. Permanently inhabited by large groups of Catholic Poles (38%) and Germans (8%), Orthodox Ruthenians (24%), Jews (8%) and Armenians (7%), the city was among the most culturally diverse in Poland-Lithuania at the time.[45] Belonging to different religious and linguistic traditions, these ethnic communities could peacefully coexist within the same urban space on the basis of the Magdeburg law and royal privileges issued by the Polish kings.

From the mid-fourteenth century when Lviv was incorporated into the Polish kingdom, the Catholic community dominated political and economic life of the city. Only members of the Roman Church were effectively qualified as proper citizens who fully contolled municipal institutions (council and court) and enjoyed all economic privileges (free trade, tax exemption and others).[46] At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the structure of municipal government underwent several significant changes. As a result of increasing cultural assimilation, Germans gave place to Poles who became the dominant ethnic group within the urban elite of Lviv.[47] Apart from that, the city council gradually gained greater autonomy from the citizens, thereby becoming a more exclusivist and almost aristocratic institution. Attempts at democratization and diversification of the municipal

[44] *MCSL*, 101-102.
[45] Yaroslav Hrytsak, "Lviv: A Multicultural History through the Centuries," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 24 (2000): 50.
[46] Myron Kapral, *Natsionalni hromady Lvova XVI-XVIII st.* (Lviv: Piramida, 2003), 47.
[47] Ibid., 46.

government in the 1570s, however, did not undermine the influence of the Catholic patriciate.[48]

Other ethnic groups, thus, were severely deprived of some basic rights and privileges because of their different religious affiliation. Even though they comprised rougly a half of the total urban population, Ruthenians, Jews and Armenians were always segregated as minorities which could possess property and permanently dwell only in particular streets and districts of the city. For this reason, their legal status was normally regulated by separate royal privileges issued specifically to each community. Most segregated was the Jewsih community which had a great deal of legal, economic and religious autonomy from the magistrate.[49] Since the Magdeburg law was fully applicable only to the Catholic citizens of Lviv, Ruthenians and Armenians were allowed to use their own laws insofar as it was necessary and possible. This right, however, was mainly restricted to religious affairs, whereas in all other legal matters Ruthenian and Armenian citizens of Lviv were subject to the jurisdiction of municipal government.[50]

Now it is appropriate to focus on the state of the Ruthenian community of Lviv in the second half of the sixteenth century. As the Orthodox Christians of the Eastern (Byzantine) rite, Ruthenian citizens were initially forbidden from participating in the municipal government. They also could not enjoy a lot of economic rights that were monopolized by Catholics. Shortly after the conclusion of the 1569 Lublin union, Ruthenians, however, managed to acquire a crucial legal recognition of their equal status with the Catholic citizens of Lviv. According to the 1572 royal privilege issued by the king Zygmunt II August, Orthodox Christians were allowed to occupy any municipal office in the council or in the

[48] Jan Ptasnik, "Walki o demokratzyację Lwowa od XVI do XVIII wieku," in *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 39 (1925): 230.
[49] Olha Kozubska-Andrusiv, "'…propter disparitatem linguae et religionis pares ipsis non esse…': 'Minority' Communities in Medieval and Early Modern Lviv," in *Segregation-Integration-Assimilation: Religious and Ethnic Groups in the Medieval Towns of Central and Eastern Europe*. Ed. Derek Keene et al. (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009): 61.
[50] Ptasnik, "Walki o demokratyzacje Lwowa", 249.

court. Additionally, Ruthenian artisans could establish their own guilds or join the existing ones, whereas Ruthenian merchants could freely trade in the city and throughout the Commonwealth.[51]

The extensive range of rights and freedoms that were conferred on the Ruthenian community gravely endangered political and economic domination of the Catholic patriciate. The municipal authorities, therefore, refused to recognize the validity of the royal privilege. As it had been long before, Ruthenians were still denied access to the municipal government. Moreover, almost all of their newly acquired economic rights and freedoms were annulled by a decree of the king Stefan Batory in 1578.[52]

From that time on, political and economic restrictions of Ruthenians were getting more and more coupled with religious discrimination against the Orthodox Church. The kings of the Commonwealth, namely Stefan Batory and particularly Zygmunt III Waza, sought the union of the Orthodox Christians with Rome by means of economic deprivation of the Ruthenian community in Lviv. Composed entirely of Catholic burghers, the city council was a close ally of the royal power in this enterprise.[53] The Catholic Church itself was at the forefront of the religious conflict with the Orthodox citizens. It is worth noticing that Lviv was essentially second most significant administrative centre of the Roman Church in the entire Commonwealth. Since one of two Catholic archbishoprics in Poland-Lithuania was situated in Lviv (another one was in Gnezno), the city was inevitably exposed to the influence of the church reform initiated by the Council of Trent (1545-63).[54]

In 1583, the archbishopric of Lviv was occupied by Jan Dymitr Solikowski. A member of a new generation of Polish bishops educated in line with the premises of the

[51] *PNCL,* 50.
[52] Lucja Charewiczowa, «Ograniczenia gospodarcze nacyj schizmatyckich i zydow we Lwowie XV i XVI wieku». *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 39 (1925): 201.
[53] Ibid., 202-203.
[54] Stanislaw Litak, "W dobie reform i polemik religijnych," in *Chrześcijanstwo w Polsce. Zarys przemian 966-1979*, ed. Jerzy Kłoczowski (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1992), 229.

Trent Council, he very soon became a leading proponent of the Catholic reform in Poland-Lithuania. Quite predictably, his primary concern was the discipline and prestige of the clergy in his archdiocese. By means of regular synods and canonical visitations, the archbishop Solikowski succeeded in reinforcing administrative and pastoral control of the church over local parishes, thereby considerably enhancing social standing of the church.[55] More notable, however, were his determined efforts to incline the Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania to the union with Rome. The controversy over the calendar reform in Lviv at the turn of 1584 was a small but telling manifestation of the archbishop's growing preoccupation with the church unification.

The advance of the Counter-Reformation in the Ruthenian lands of the Commonwealth was substantially facilitated by the deep crisis of the Orthodox Church. Throughout the sixteenth century, the Kyivan metropolitanate, which the Orthodox diocese of Lviv belonged to, was experiencing a steady decline of the entire institutional structure. One of the biggest problems was the right of secular patronage over the Orthodox Church which enabled civil authorities (kings, dukes, magnates and nobles) to appoint all key Orthodox clerics and extensively interfere in ecclesiastical affairs. As a result of this policy, by the second half of the sixteenth century, most Orthodox hierarchs, whose appointment was motivated primarily by financial considerations, totally lacked any basic moral and intellectual qualities required for effective governement of the church. The state of local clergy was by no means better. Deprived of any systematic education and ecclesiastical control, the parish priests were largely responsible for the celebration of liturgy, while their pastoral and spiritual duties were completely neglected.[56]

[55] Litak, "W dobie reform," 216-218, 230. For a more detailed account of the Catholic reform in Poland-Lithuania see Jerzy Kłoczowski, *A History of Polish Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 84-125.
[56] Borys A. Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 62-63.

Another crucial element of the decline of the Orthodox Church in Poland-Lithuania was the increasing atrophy of its fundamental administrative institutions. Of course, ever since the Ottoman conquest in 1453, the patriarchate of Constantinople had gradually lost its administrative sway over the Orthodox hierarchs in Eastern Europe. But the sixteenth century witnessed a shrinkage of hierarchical relations between Constantinople and Kyiv of an unprecedented scale. Despite the precarious condition of the Kyivan metropolitanate, Eastern patriarchs had little if any interest in ecclesiastical affairs of their flock in Poland-Lithuania.[57] Apart from that, the Ruthenian Orthodox Church was also deprived of its another institutional pillar which was the synod of bishops. Dogmatically defined as a cornerstone of Eastern ecclesiology, the synod of bishops was, however, abandoned by the Kyivan metropolitans for almost the entire sixteenth century. Only in 1589 the synod was finally summoned due to the visit of the Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople (1572-1595 with intervals).[58]

This bleak picture of the Orthodox Church could not be more contrasting with the first gains of Catholic renewal in the second half of the sixteenth century. Despite the strong impact the Reformation had on Poland-Lithuania and its nobility, the Catholic Church, nevertheless, retained its institutional structure almost intact. Unlike the patriarchate of Constantinople, the papal Curia significantly enhanced its control over the Catholic clergy in Poland-Lithuania by introducing a permanent office of the papal nunciature in the 1550s. By the end of the century, the Catholic Church, therefore, regained its social repute and appeal among the Polish-Lithuanian nobility attracting many former Protestants and Orthodox.[59]

[57] Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*, 64.
[58] Ibid., 67.
[59] Kloczowski, *A History of Polish Christianity*, 110-112.

2.2. Social disciplining of the clergy from below

A growing tension between the developing Catholic and decaying Orthodox Churches was particularly discernible in Lviv as nowhere else in Poland-Lithuania. The Ruthenian burghers could obtain a first-hand experience of the challenges and threats the Counter-Reformation posed to the unprepared Orthodox clergy and laypeople. Deprived of any effective institutionalised means of political struggle, they responded to this complex religious situation with an establishment of a lay confraternity at the Dormition church in Lviv.

The statute of the confraternity was ratified by the Patriarch Joachim V of Antioch (ca. 1581-1592) who visited Lviv early in 1586, an official year of the Dormition brotherhood's inception.[60] The document was confirmed by the Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah II in 1587, by the metropolitan of Kyiv Mykhailo in 1590 and finally by the king of Poland-Lithuania Zygmunt III in 1592.[61] According to the list of its founding members, the Dormition confraternity was composed predominantly of the lower- and middle-class merchants and craftsmen of Ruthenian descent and Orthodox religion. From the late 1580s on, a number of Greek merchants who permanently resided in Lviv started joining the brotherhood.[62] Theoretically, any person of Orthodox faith regardless of their ethnic and social status could become a member of the Dormition confraternity. The only exception was the clergy. Magnates, normally, were not active members of the brotherhood as well.[63]

A model of confraternity as a way of organizing religious life of the laity was most likely adopted from the Catholic Church. Since the first two brotherhoods in Lviv appeared

[60] *MCSL*, 113-19; *DS*, 3-15; Iaroslav Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2006), 21.
[61] *DS*, 35-38; *MCSL*, 218-220.
[62] *AIuZR* 1:12, 3-6; Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 47-48.
[63] Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 43-44.

already in the fourteenth century[64], the Orthodox population of the city must have closely learnt these organizations, their structure and a wide range of activities. The Dormition confraternity, however, had a number of significant pecularities which radically distinguish it from all its possible predecessors. Unlike its Catholic counterparts, the Lviv brotherhood enjoyed an unprecedented level of autonomy from ecclesiastical authorities of the Kyivan metropolitanate. Due to the stauropegial privilege of 1593, the confraternity was exempted from the jurisdiction of local bishops and the metropolitan of Kyiv and subordinated directly to the patriarch of Constantinople.[65] Issued to the lay brotherhood, such a legal status was totally uncommon not only in the Catholic but also in the Orthodox Church where it was usually conferred on important monasteries or churches. Nevertheless, the Dormition confraternity started referring to the stauropegial privilege of the patriarch in order to assert its independence from the local Orthodox hierarchs.[66]

Because of this exceptional position within the Orthodox Church, the Lviv brotherhood, and this is its another distinctive feature, could exert an enormous amount of influence on local clergy and laity. According to the 1586 statute, the confraternity was obliged to maintain proper discipline not only among its members but also among the clerics and laypeople of Lviv and the surrounding area. Once having identified a priest or layperson who transgressed the "law of Christ", the confraternity was supposed to reproach and correct this person. If he or she did not want to improve his or her behavior, a local bishop had to be involved. This kind of jurisdisction was not restricted merely to the city of Lviv but extended over other towns and villages.[67]

Since the confraternity was in a permanent conflict with the bishop Hedeon of Lviv, it used to address disciplinary cases directly to the metropolitan or one of the Eastern

[64] Stanislaw Litak, "Bractwa religijne w Polsce przedrozbiorowej XIII-XVIII wiek. Rozwoj i problematyka," *Przeglad Historyczny* 88:3-4 (1997): 508.
[65] *DS*, 87-90.
[66] Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 26-27.
[67] *MCSL*, 117.

patriarchs. Moreover, the statute stipulates the right of the confraternity to judge clerical and laic wrongdoers by its own fraternal court. The severest punishment that had to be imposed on the incorrigible sinners was an excommunication from the church.[68] Coupled with extensive autonomy from the local hierarchs, this immense amount of rights and prerogatives made the Dormition confraternity one of the most influential institutions in the Orthodox Church in Poland-Lithuania.[69]

Potential outreach of the Lviv brotherhood was significantly amplified by the rapid spread of confraternities all across the Orthodox lands of the Commonwealth. By the early seventeenth century, similar organizations of laic self-government were established in all major towns and villages of the Ruthenian palatinate. There were Orthodox brotherhoods in other parts of Poland-Lithuania, most prominently in Vilnius, Kyiv, Lutsk, Lublin and Brest. All these confraternities were largely organized on the pattern of the Lviv brotherhood. They, therefore, were also obliged to take care of morally decent life of their communities. Apart from adopting the same statute without any substantial alterations, many of them also recognized the Lviv brotherhood as the senior confraternity.[70] Informal though these relations might be, the Dormition confraternity could effectivelt employ them to promote its cause among Orthodox nobles, burghers and even peasants all over the Commonwealth.

Occupying such an exceptional place within the ecclesiastical structure of the Kyivan metropolitanate, the Dormition confraternity was extremelly well predisposed to initiate reformation of the local church. In this regard, discipline of the clergy was an issue of the utmost urgency. It was not specific only to the Ruthenian Church. Contemporary Protestantism and Catholicism were confronted with a very similar challenge of the formation of new competent clergies. Different confessions of Western Christianity

[68] *MCSL*, 117.
[69] Mikhail V. Dmitriev, "Tserkovnye bratstva," 135.
[70] Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 32.

responded with a set of remarkably similar measures aimed at improvement of theological competence and social standing of parish priests and pastors.[71] According to a shared pastoral ideal, the new clergy was supposed to provide its flock with adequate spiritual guidance and confessional instruction.[72] Almost the same objectives were implied by the Dormition confraternity in its attempts to discipline the Orthodox clergy.

This becomes evident already in the brotherhood's statute. Written, most likely, by the burghers themselves, the statute provides a list of the wrongdoings that might constitute the most common violations of the ecclesiatical law committed by parish priests. The brothers are instructed to identify and judge those priests who have been seen drunk in a tavern, or those who have practiced any kind of magic, visited witches or sorcerers themselves or encouraged others to do this. The statute also reproaches those priests who lent money with interest and administer the sacrament of marriage for unchaste women. Last but by no means least are the regulations concerning the clerics who have been married for the second time or are, in general, sexually impure.[73]

The Dormition confraternity started implementing this ambitious program of policing ecclesiastical discipline from the very first days of its existence. As it soon would become a rule, the brethren allied their efforts with the authority of Eastern patriarchs, this time it was Joachim V of Antioch. During his stay in Lviv in January of 1586, he issued a decree which directly addressed the problem of the clerical discipline in the diocese of Lviv. Harshly critisizing corrupt morals of the local clergy, the patriarch excommunicated all those priests who had violated church canons of sexually decent behavior. Those were primarily the clerics who either had extramarital affairs or were married twice. The patriarch also stipulated some vague measures in order to prevent further violations of the church law. He

[71] Luise Schorn-Schütte, "The new clergies," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity, Volume 6: Reformation and Expansion 1500-1660*, ed. R. Po-chia Hsia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 452-53.
[72] Ibid., 446.
[73] *MCSL*, 118.

obliged the bishop Hedeon and all other archpriests to inspect their dioceses for any priests or deacons who might breach church canons. Additionally, laypeople were ordered to inform local ecclesiastical authorities of any misconduct of their parish priests.[74]

There is little if any doubt that the patriarch's brief inspection of the Lviv diocese as well as the subsequent decree were instigated by the newly established Dormition confraternity. Great emphasis placed on the issue of clerical discipline in the brotherhood's statute suggests that Lviv burghers were particularly concerned with solving this problem. Moreover, their consequent complaints about the bishop Hedeon's negligence of the patriarch's decree indicates that the latter was hardly interested in changing anything in his diocese. Given the scarcity of institutional links between the Eastern patriarchates and the Kyivan metropolitanate, no wonder the bishop of Lviv could easily ignore instructions of the patriarch. The Dormition confraternity, however, had little choice but to press both sides for closer cooperation.

Several months later, in May of 1586, the confraternity addressed almost the same set of disciplinary issues in their letter to the patriarch Theoleptus II of Constantinople (1585-1586). Seeking patriarch's blessing of their active engagement in local ecclesiastical affairs, the brethren provided an extensive list of wrongdoings allegedly committed by the Ruthenian clergy.

> How are the lay people supposed to act reasonably if they see priests and bishops [behaving as] offenders, blasphemers, traitors, bribers, [as those who] denounce and forbid learning … , [while] vindicating those who outrage order and hate learning … - how to defend [ourselves] from such insolence?[75]

Particularly interesting is a subsequent complaint that neither local bishop nor parish priests observe their pastoral duties, thereby completely neglecting spiritual needs of their flock.

[74] *MCSL*, 130-31.
[75] Ibid., 141.

The confraternity, thus, was deeply concerned with preventing their co-religionists from leaving the church or living a sinful and disorderly life.[76] Ultimately the letter implies that a proper Christian should resist such misconduct of the clerics regardless of their rank.

The letter also contains a clear indication of another substantial reason for confraternity's anxiety about the moral and professional state of the Ruthenian clergy. This is the validity of the sacraments allegedly administered by local priests with insufficient piety and devotion to the church rituals. One of the questions addressed to the patriarch of Constantinople concerns the problem of blasphemous priests and a bishop (meaning most likely the bishop Hedeon of Lviv) who celebrate the Holy Communion, the body and blood of Jesus Christ, without proper reverance giving it even to those people who have not confessed and repented of their sins.[77] Underpinning this complaint is most likely a highly demanding view of the Eucharist presented by St Paul who warns against the unworthy reception of the communion because it might bring divine punishment on the community in the form of disease and death (1 Cor. 11:27-30). More importantly, the negligence of the pivotal Christian sacrament is harmful to the spiritual well-being of believers endangering their salvation and eternal life. The Orthodox laity, therefore, was in the most profound way threatened by the misdeeds of impious clergy.

Though this long list of clerical transgressions cannot be taken at face value, the very fact that it was sent to the patriarch of Constantinople proves that the problem of ecclesiastical discipline was real and the confraternity was determined to solve it. The first systematic actions on the part of the patriarch, however, had to wait until 1589. On his way back from Moscow, Jeremiah II of Constantinople made a prolonged stay in Poland-Lithuania. Having received a royal sanction of his ecclesiastical authority over the local Orthodox Church, the patriarch made an effort to correct the most serious violations of the

[76] *MCSL*, 141.
[77] Ibid.

church law which had been identified in the Kyivan metropolitanate. An extensive scope and number of the decrees promulgated by Jeremiah in Poland-Lithuania clearly indicates his commitment to reform the Ruthenian Church.[78]

One of the problems directly addressed by the patriarch's reforms was discipline of the Orthodox clerics, namely their second (or third) marriage which usually took place after death of the first wife. According to Eastern ecclesiastical law, priests let alone bishops could not be married twice. For this reason, Jeremiah, quite unexpectedly to all Orthodox hierarchy and clergy, deposed the metropolitan Onysyfor of Kyiv in July of 1589.[79] Several months later, in November, the patriarch issued a decree in which he once again denounced all priests and bishops married twice. Claiming that such clerics do not have divine grace and spiritual authority to administer the sacraments, Jeremiah demanded that every Orthodox christian, either hierarch or burgher, ought to reproach and hate them "as enemies of the truth and adversaries of the church order".[80]

The patriarch also issued a decree regulating performance of the rituals of confession and communion which were, in his words, commonly violated by the Ruthenian clergy. The text of the document contains discernible traces of the complaints sent to Constantinople by the Dormition confraternity three years earlier, in 1586. The Kyivan metropolitan and bishops are admonished to give permission to administer confession only to those priests who are decent and competent. The patriarch, more importantly, pays close attention to securing great solemnity of the sacrament of the Eucharist. He, therefore, obliges priests to impose proper penance on their confessants and instruct them in rudiments of the Eucharist, that is teach them that they are going to receive body and blood of Jesus Christ.[81] This might apperently suggest that the Ruthenian clergy used to ignore these important pastoral duties,

[78] Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*, 196.
[79] Ibid., 198-199.
[80] *MCSL*, 209.
[81] *DS*, 109.

so the laity did not know most basic principles of Christian doctrine. Regardless of whether these regulations were issued with confraternity's assistance or not, they cogently illustrate the widespread negligent treatment of church sacraments in the Ruthenian Church as it had been testified by the confraternity before.

The Dormition confraternity hardly had direct impact on the reforms of Jeremiah. Even though letters and petitions from the Lviv burghers might have given the patriarch some idea of the crisis in the Ruthenian Church, he certainly was able to observe all ecclesiastical affairs first-hand during his five-months visitation. It was, however, far more important that due to the patriarch's push for reforms, the confraternity's cause of disciplined and dutiful clergy gained an institutional support of the church. This would become particularly evident during the next few years that witnessed close cooperation between the Lviv burghers and the metropolitan Mykhailo of Kyiv, a new officeholder after the deposition of Onysyfor. He became the major ally of the confraternity in its pursuit of Orthodox renewal.

2.3. Social disciplining of the clergy from above

On January 7, 1590, shortly after Jeremiah had left Poland-Lithuania, the metropolitan Mykhailo defrocked a group of priests from the Lviv diocese because of their refusal to obey patriarch's decrees.[82] Most likely, those were twice-married clerics who kept their offices despite having been deposed by Jeremiah. Notifying the confraternity of this decision, the metropolitan expressed his gratitude to the Lviv burghers for the information they had provided him on the unruly priests. He also charged them with informing those clerics about their deposition. The metropolitan also advised the confraternity to fulfil this task with the help of some of their parish priests, assuming that this might be more effective

[82] *MCSL*, 216.

way of delivering his decision.[83] Well aware of the protracted conflict between the Lviv brotherhood and bishop Hedeon, Mykhailo openly sided with the former. That might be the reason why he entrusted the confraternity with the task that normally would have had to be performed by the bishop.

The new metropolitan very well recognized the full worth of the Dormition confraternity and its activities for the restoration of order in the Ruthenian Church. The first in a long time synod of bishops, summoned in Brest in June 1590, clearly manifested the growing influence of confraternity movement on the church hierarchy. In a circular issued to the Orthodox population of Poland-Lithuania, the metropolitan and the bishops announced an unprecedented decision to convoke similar synods of the entire Ruthenian clergy on June 24 every next year. Given the supreme role of synod in administrative structure of the Orthodox Church, such an initiative clearly suggested determination of the hierarchy to launch a program of profound ecclesiastical reforms.[84] Outlining a preliminary list of the most urgent transformations, the synod heavily drew on the agenda of confraternity movement. Along with a common appeal to put ecclesiastical affairs in order, the synodal circular also urged the clergy and laity to "think about schools, education, hospices and other good matters".[85] Those were exactly the activities pursued by the Dormition confraternity from its very beginning.

Another crucial achievement of the 1590 Brest synod was a decision to impose administrative discipline on the clergy with much more rigour than before. First of all, there was a strict requirement to all bishops to be present at annual synods along with all archimandrites, hegumens and protopresbyters of their dioceses. Violation of this rule had to be punished by immidiate removal from ecclesiastical office. Secondly, the synod

[83] *MCSL*, 217.
[84] Dmitriev, *Tserkovnye bratstva*, 143-46.
[85] *MCSL*, 250. For a similar interpretation of the 1590 Brest synod and its program of reforms see Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*, 212-13.

prohibited any interference of local priests and deacons in affairs of each other parishes. A disciplinary fine constituted 100 kopy in Lithuanian currency paid into a synodal coffer.[86] This decision was apparently intended to put an end to numerous jurisdisctional conflicts and establish a firm control of central ecclesiatical authorities, namely the synod and metropolitan, over local clergy.

Despite the fact that the Ruthenian Orthodox hierarchy attempted to seize the initiative, the Dormition confraternity did not abandon their own efforts to advocate the cause of church reform from below. The Lviv burghers kept regularly informing the Eastern patriarchs on the state of affairs in their diocese. On February 6, 1592, they sent a letter to the patriarch of Constantinople with a list of quite regular complaints about the bishop Hedeon's obstruction of the confraternity's activity. The brethren also voiced their grivences about bishops of Chełm, Pinsk and Przemyśl who had been consacrated despite being married for the second time. According to the confraternity, such a flagrant violation of church canons, especially if commited by higher clergy, would inevitably instigate other twice-married priests not to obey church law and authorities.[87]

On the same day the confraternity sent a very similar letter to the patriarch Meletios I (Pegas) of Alexandria. Pitiful condition of the Ruthenian clergy is described here even in a more vivid manner. The hierarchs are collectively blamed for bringing shame on the church. Twice-married bishops and priests are denounced once again. More importantly, the letter mentions a decision of the synod prohibiting such clerics from conducting liturgy and administering the sacraments. This regulation, however, was predictably ignored. The confraternity also lamented the spread of numerous heresies and growing conversions of Orthodox Ruthenian nobility to Catholicism because of a lack of dutiful pastors and

[86] *MCSL*, 251.
[87] Ibid., 340.

teachers of church doctrine. The letter ends with a desperate plea for patriarch's visit to Lviv in order to save the Ruthenian church from its total destruction.[88]

Another similar letter of complaint was once again sent to the patriarch Jeremiah on September 7, 1592. The same issues of poor clerical discipline are reinforced here with growing anxiety about a possible union of the Ruthenian hierarchy with the Catholic Church.[89] Clergy's neglect of matrimonial canons, therefore, is implicitly coupled with the imminent threat of being subordinated to the papacy. In their responses to these numerous petitions of Lviv burghers, the Eastern patriarchs usually provided detailed accounts of the church teaching concerning particular issues of clerical discipline. For example, on September 20, 1592, the patriarch Meletios sent the Dormition confraternity a long letter elaborating on matrimonial law of the church and its application to the cases of some Ruthenian bishops. Referring to the canons of the holy synods, Meletios rules that a married priest could occupy episcopal office only on condition that he has sent his wife to a monastery, preferably far away from his diocese. Not mentioning any disciplinary penalties for the breach of this canon, the patriarch concludes his letter with an insightful analysis of human sexuality from the perspective of New Testament and patristic theology.[90] However beneficial and instructive this response might be, it hardly addressed very concrete problems of the Ruthenian Church.

After the conclusion of the Brest union in 1596, the Dormition confraternity quickly lost an interest in policing local clergy. As one of the most fierce opponents of the union, the confraternity had to turn its attention and energy to far more serious challenges than twice-married priests. Since the metropolitan Mykhailo and great majority of Ruthenian bishops had supported an idea of joining the Catholic Church, the Dormition confraternity

[88] *MCSL*, 344-45.
[89] Ibid., 377.
[90] Ibid., 381-82; *PKK* 3, 33-34.

ended up without strong allies in the hierarchy.[91] From now on, a betrayal of Constantinople would become the focal point of the confraternity's allegations against the Ruthenian hierarchs and clergy. Shortly after the proclamation of union with Rome, in autumn 1596, the brotherhood maintained that the Ruthenian bishops had come under the papal authority in order to avoid patriarch's punishment for their numerous violations of the church law, especially its matrimonial canons. This petition was addressed to the Ruthenian delegates at sejm who were asked to influnce the king and senators so that they would depose those bishops who had supported the Brest union.[92] When the ecclesiastical institutions had proved to be completely irrelevant and ineffective, the confraternity started to seek help from the secular authorities.

Effectiveness of all these petitions about the violation of church discipline is an issue of utmost importance. Judging from the analysed sources, there is no decisive answer to this question. On the one hand, a large number of almost identical demands voiced by the confraternity in the course of several years clearly indicates that they were not immediately satisfied. Institutional weakness of the Kyivan metropolitanate and the entire Eastern Orthodox Church was a primary reason of this situation. Neither patriarchs nor metropolitan and bishops could exercise effective control over all local parishes and their priests. Moreover, some local ecclesiastical practices were so deeply rooted in popular mentality, that even patriarchs' decisions could not undermine their authority. Such was the issue of twice-married priests and bishops.[93] In this regard, all complaints of the Dormition confraternity were to no avail.

On the other hand, it is difficult to deny a tectonic shift in the attitude of the hierarchy to the church crisis. And the Dormition confraternity played a leading part in launching and

[91] Mikhail V. Dmitriev, "Conflict and Concord in Early Modern Poland: Catholics and Orthodox at the Union of Brest," in *Diversity and Dissent: Negotiating Religious Difference in Central Europe, 1500-1800*, ed. Howard Louthan et al. (New York: Berghahn Books, 2011), 119.
[92] *TsDIAL* 129/1/311, 1.
[93] Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*, 199.

sustaining this process. Its petitions to Eastern patriarchs and Kyivan metropolitan helped to draw their attention to the undogmatic local practices and norms that were hardly problematic for the majority of Ruthenian clergy. Once the hierarchy had embarked on the church reform, the confraternity movement with the Dormition confraternity at the head became a model and driving force of the entire undertaking. Working at the grass-roots level, Orthodox burghers in Lviv and elsewhere in Ruthenia could effectively push for more intensive disciplining of local clergy. They closely cooperated on this cause with the metropolitan Mykhailo by informing him of violations of church law in their parishes. From this perspective, the confraternity had an immense impact on church reforms.

Underpinning the confraternity's policing initiatives was its protracted conflict with the bishop Hedeon. Scandalized by the attempts of Lviv burghers to appoint their own priests without the episcopal consent, Hedeon condemned and excommunicated all parishioners of the Dormition church because of their unlawful interference in ecclesiastical matters.[94] The confraternity, in its turn, accused the bishop of obstructing its activity, beating its priests and members and spreading heresies. Complaints about twice-married and negligent priests figured prominently in this list of accusations because the bishop was supposed to be directly responsible for the disobedient clergy in his diocese.

But the struggle for more disciplined and dutiful priests was not completely subordinated to the pragmatic considerations of confraternity's struggle for survival. They certainly overlapped but only in part. Control of the behavior of local clergy, especially parish priests and deacons, was integral to the Dormition confraternity's mission as it had been initially declared in its statute and then embraced by many other confraternities. In the last decades of the sixteenth century, Orthodox burghers of Lviv and other towns across Eastern Poland-Lithuania had an acute awarness of the deepening crisis their church was

[94] *MCSL*, 151-52, 166, 171.

going through. Living side by side with Catholics, Orthodox Greeks and sometimes Protestants, they could easily acknowledge relative impoverishment of their own religious situation.

Decay of the Orthodox clergy, therefore, must have been particularly discernible against the background of vigorous post-Tridentine Catholicism preoccupied, among other things, with disciplining parish priests and encouraging their pastoral ministry.[95] It was by no chance that the confraternity frequently criticized Orthodox priests for the neglect of spiritual and social well-being of their flocks. More importantly, this lack of pastoral care on the part of the established church substantially shaped the confraternity's agenda which included, most prominently, religious education, book printing and social relief. In the early 1590s, the accusations of clergy's disobedience to law and Eastern patriarchs had been significantly reinforced with the growing fear of union with Rome. But once the unification took place, other urgent problems gradually started to dominate the confraternity's agenda.

[95] John W. O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013), 19-21.

3. The Lviv Dormition confraternity and disciplining of the laity

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate key directions of the Dormition confraternity's engagement in social disciplining of the Orthodox Ruthenian laity. It is divided into three parts each of which explores different disciplinary issues and processes at different social levels. The first part deals with the maintenence of order and discipline among the members of the confraternity. Here, in particular, a detailed analysis of the normative framework provided by the confraternity's statute is complemented with an overview of disciplinary cases settled by the confraternity in the early-sixteenth century. The second part of the chapter investigates confessional dimension of the process of social disciplining. It is, therefore, concentrated on the role of the confraternity's school and printing press in developing and spreading an Orthodox religious mindset across the Ruthenian lands of Poland-Lithuania. The third and final part of the chapter is a case-study of a remarkable public campaign undertaken by the Dormition confraternity against an undogmatic magical ritual widely practiced by the local Orthodox clergy and laity. This episode serves a graphic illustration of the vital contribution made by the Dormition confraternity to the first attempts of Orthodox confessional building in Poland-Lithuania.

3.1. Social discipline within the confraternity

Confraternity's involvement in social and confessional disciplining of the Orthodox laity was, in a sense, more conventional and less controversial than its engagement in policing behavior of the clergy. In early modern Poland-Lithuania and elsewhere in Europe, especially after the council of Trent, confraternities were first and foremost known as lay organizations aimed at fostering Christian spirituality and piety of their members.[96] In the late-sixteenth century, newly established Orthodox confraternities were also primarily

[96] Litak, "Bractwa religijne," 511; for a case-study of the role of lay confraternities in the Catholic reform see Danilo Zardin, "Relaunching confraternities in the Tridentine era: shaping consciences and christianizing society in Milan and Lombardy," in *Politics of Ritual Kinship: Confraternities and Social Order in Early Modern Italy*, ed. Nicholas Terpstra (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 190-209.

concerned with encouraging Ruthenian burghers and peasants to live according to the precepts of the Bible and church doctrine. Social disciplining of priests, so actively promoted by the Dormition confraternity, was, therefore, closely related to social disciplining and confessional instruction of the laity which was deprived of the pastoral attention of church.

The statute of the confraternity provides a comprehensive account of basic principles, norms and practices that were supposed to regulate discipline inside the fraternal community. Authority to exercise communal justice in relation to the sinners is defined as a primary concern of the confraternity. Referring to relevant passages from the New Testament and especially St. Paul's Epistles, the statute implicitly identifies the confraternity with the church as a body of believers. Salvation of the entire community, thus, hinges on spiritual well-being of each particular member of the body. It is, therefore, absolutely crucial for the confraternity to look after behavior of its members and punish them if they have violated God's law and church doctrine.[97]

Corporate discipline within the confraternity was premised on a simple biblical model lying at the heart of church discipline in Western and Eastern Christianity.[98] According to Matthew 18:15-18, any conflicts between Christians must be settled inside their community, firtsly by the sides direcly involved in the dispute and then, if necessary, by additional two or three witnesses from within the community. If neither of these measures puts an end to the conflict, the church has to step in. Referring to this passage from the New Testament, the statute draws one more parallel between the church and the confraternity which is called "a council (*sobor*) of people" and "a living church of God".[99] Such a persistent identification of the confraternity with the true (living) church lays the foundation for the

[97] *MCSL*, 114.
[98] Ute Lotz-Heumann, "Imposing church and social discipline," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Volume 6, Reformation and Expansion 1500-1660*, ed. R. Po-chia Hsia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 245.
[99] *MCSL*, 114.

former's separation from and even rivalry with the established ecclesiastical institutions. At the time of protracted institutional crisis of Ruthenian Orthodoxy, confraternities were envisaged by the laity as a genuine locus of evangelical spirit of brotherly love and cooperation which might bring about a revival of the entire church.

Taking an analogy between the confraternity and the church to extremes, the statute stipulates confraternity's right to apply a sentence of excommunication. For the sake of confraternity's salvation, unrepentant sinners who neglect a fair judgement of their brothers ought to be excommunicated from the confraternity and the church as the rotten members of the body of believers.[100] As it will soon become clear, this provision was rather a rhetorical exaggeration than a real legal mechanism of exercising confraternity's authority. Moreover, such a right could hardly be conferred on the Orthodox laity. And members of the Dormition confraternity, as the future events would clearly demonstrate, were well aware of this fact. Since the statute was most likely written by confraternity's members themselves, they might have simply neglected to make it fully compliant with the church canons. Whereas strong rhetorical effect of the clause was undeniably beneficial for confraternity's standing.

Execution of communal justice normally took place within confraternity's regular mode of operation, that is during its monthly meetings. According to the statute, members of the confraternity had to convene for regular meetings at least every four weeks in order to settle their common affairs. These monthly meetings were presided by four senior members who were also responsible for governing the confraternity in the interim. The seniors were elected by a general assembly of the confraternity for the term of one year.[101] Disciplinary trials must have been occuring at the regular meetings along with other administrative

[100] *MCSL*, 114.
[101] Ibid., 115.

proceedings.[102] The seniors, therefore, must have also presided over the execution of justice in the confraternity, though junior members were supposed to have a say in making a final decision.[103]

The statute stipulates a wide range of offences that might provide grounds for the instigation of disciplinary proceedings. They comprise two distinctive groups one of which is restricted to the internal discipline of the confraternity, while the other extends to the discipline of entire Orthodox community in which the confraternity operates. With regard to the internal discipline, the brethren are to be liable for neglecting their duties, missing confraternity's meetings without a legitimate reason, disobeying confraternity's or seniors' orders and, finally, offending each other by profane language. As far as the wider communal discipline is concerned, the brethren are to be liable for extramarital sexual relations, drunkness, bribery, extortion and idolatry. [104] On the whole, both sets of norms are quite extensive but also highly schematic and ill-defined. There is often a great deal of indeterminacy about the actual meaning of some of them.

According to the statute, the confraternity could pursue two different disciplinary strategies against the offenders depending on whether those are members of the confraternity or not. In the former case, there are two types of sentence to be applied by the confraternity, namely imprisonment on the bell tower of the Dormition church and a fine paid in the form of some amount of wax. After having served a certain sentence, usually a combination of both short-time imprisonment and a fine, the offender ought to apologize to and reconcile with the person whom he has offended. If the offender does not repent of his misdeeds, a priest has to excommunicate that person from the church.[105] In the latter case, when the social order is breached by an outsider, the confraternity has to caution such a

[102] Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 60.
[103] *MCSL*, 116.
[104] Ibid., 115-16.
[105] Ibid., 116.

person that he or she must stop violating the Bible. If such warnings with "references to Scripture" are to no avail, a local bishop has to step in.[106]

Protocols of the confraternity's regular meetings provide an extremely valuable piece of information which could demonstrate how the ideal of corporate order and discipline was actually implemented in everyday life. The first systematic records of confraternity's activities date only from 1599, thirteen years after its establishment. These are proceedings of different scope and thoroughness which document only the most significant issues addressed by the confraternity at its monthly meetings. Disciplinary trials were recorded with particularly uneven frequency. They prevail in the first five years of the protocols, from 1599 till 1604, and then disappear for the next decade and a half reemerging only in 1618 with a much lower intensity than before. The following analysis of the disciplinary proceedings is based on the records of the first five-year period when the protocols seem to be most attentive to all kinds of offences committed by confraternity's members.[107]

A total of 19 cases could be roughly divided into two almost equal groups of which the first one (10 cases) includes the offences committed against the entire confraternity and the second one (9 cases) includes the offences committed against one of confraternity's members. The offences against the common good of the confraternity are usually concerned with the negligence of corporate duties, such as absences at meetings and disregard for collecting donations to the communal coffers. A particularly interesting and illustrative case was being decided at the confraternity's trial on "the first Sunday after Christmas" in 1600. A brother Lukash Bartnykovych was, at first, accused of treating with disrespect his brothers (i.e., members of the confraternity) who had informed the seniors of his misdeeds. Then he was charged primarily of tarnishing a public image of the confraternity:

[106] *MCSL*, 117.
[107] *AIuZR*, 1:11, 58-69.

> Keeping the keys from the church crypt, he went to the tavern to drink [alcohol], where he was brought in disrepute, and because of this, shame (*zelzhyvost*) was brought on the entire confraternity and ridicule (*nasmivane*) [was brought on the confraternity] from people of other religions (*inovirtsov*).[108]

Lukash was sentenced to imprisonment and one stone of wax. Though the confraternity had decided not to remove him from the office of crypt-keeper, he, nevertheless, refused to serve the sentence and left the meeting in hurry. Mentioned several times under the same entry of the protocols, his disobedience must have outraged his confreres.

This case cogently illustrates confraternity's approach to the implementation of disciplinary policy in real-life situations. To begin with, there is a wide range of offences represented in Lukash's actions as they were registered in the protocols. He neglected his corporate duties by bringing the keys from the church crypt to the tavern where they could have easily been lost or stolen. He also compromised his personal moral repute by most likely getting drunk. Consequently, he defamed the entire confraternity right in front of people of other religions. This small detail about the crowd at the tavern suggests that the Orthodox community of Lviv was also indirectly damaged by Lukash's irresponsible behavior that night. Finally, he blatantly disrespected his senior brothers and openly rebelled against confraternity's authority.

Highlighting different aspects of Lukash's misconduct, the text of the protocols implicitly ranges all his offences by their relative gravity. As the judgement suggests, Lukash was punished first and foremost for tarnishing the public image of the confraternity and allegedly of the entire Orthodox community. The damage caused to the confraternity's repute, therefore, is described with particular attention to the details. While the two other offences figure rather less prominently in the wording of the judgement. Lukash's carelessness in relation to the communal property and his drunkness are treated merely as the components of the larger and more serious charge of publicly discrediting the

[108] *AIuZR*, 1:11, 59.

confraternity. They most likely would have not deserved to be punished individually. Finally, though the disrespect for the fellows and communal authority were described most extensively in the protocols, they did not receive any coherent corporate response.

At the heart of confraternity's disciplinary policy, therefore, is the maintanence of its institutional integrity and exemplary public reputation. The rest of the cases recorded in the protocols confirm this conclusion. Offences committed by brothers against each other posed a major threat to the internal corporate order, so they were treated with special attention. The protocols contain a number of almost identical cases in which some confraternity's members are punished for insulting each other by slandering, using profane language or threatening with physical violence.[109] Of considerable significance is the fact that most of these offences took place in the sacred space – in the immediate vicinity or right inside the confraternity's church.[110] Signifying great gravity of such misdeeds, this circumstance clearly indicates religious underpinnings of the discipline imposed by the confraternity.

Though the protocols of disciplinary trials concentrate largely on social and corporate offences, the internal discipline of the confraternity was hardly regarded by its members as a merely corporate concern. Being compared to the mystical body of Christ, the confraternity as well as many of its activities were shot through with sacral symbols, religious rituals and meanings. Peace and order within the confraternity, therefore, constituted an integral element of greater ecclesiastical and mystical order of the church. Thus, the seniors were warned against diregarding their corporate duties on pain of condemnation which befalls everyone who neglects God's matters.[111] The same maxim might have been easily applied to all other members of the confraternity. Finally, the excommunication as the gravest sentence assigned even for disciplinary offences provides the most convincing argument for the profoundly religious character of the confraternity. An infringement of the corporate

[109] *AIuZR*, 1:11, 60; 64; 66.
[110] Ibid., 60; 66.
[111] *MCSL*, 115.

discipline, therefore, did not significantly differ from any other act of violating God's law, encapsulated in the Ten Commandments. As a member of the church, the confraternity, at the same time, itself adopted an ecclesiological model of the Christ's body whose rotten members had to be cut off .

Underlying this religious normative framework of the confraternity was a theological tradition of the Eastern Christianity. Though by the late-sixteenth century the Eastern patriarchates had not yet produced any coherent system of beliefs in reaction to Protestant and Catholic confessions of faith, there was a number of distinctive confessional features which could easily distinguish Eastern Orthodoxy from other Christian denominations. A strict adherence to the church fathers and ancient councils was probably the most notable of these. Though equally venerated in the West as in the East, the church fathers, however, were held in special esteem as the highest, if not exclusive theological authority by the early modern Orthodox Church.[112] Another significant difference was a particular emphasis of the Eastern Orthodox theology on the Cappadocian Fathers – John Chrysostom, Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus (also commonly referred to as the Theologian). According to the Orthodox tradition, patristic writings, especially those penned by the Three Cappadocians, comprise an integral part of the church canon because they provide the only correct interpretation of the Bible.[113]

Great significance of the church fathers in forging a distinctive confessional identity of the confraternity is attested by the practice of reading and studying patristic texts at the meetings after the liturgy. The statute contains a short clause which instructs "Christian people of all estates to come together with a priest or in the confraternity in order to read (*pochitat'* which also means to pay respect to) the books of the Old and New Testaments

[112] Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine*. *Vol. 2: The Spirit of Eastern Christendom, 600-1700* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974), 286.
[113] Ibid., 19.

according to the tradition of the holy fathers".[114] This rather indistinct statement was corroborated and clarified by the confraternity's letter sent to the patriarch of Constantinople in May, 1586. The first question addressed to the patriarch is the one asking him for a permission to read the texts of the church fathers:

> Does it befit lay Christian craftspeople to come together on feast days after regular prayers and after the holy liturgy [in order] to read holy books of Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, John Crysostom and other saints according to the rules of the apostles and holy fathers?[115]

Carrying the idea of religious self-education even further, the brethren also asks the patriarch if it is appropriate for the lay Christians to study the Scriptures together by "talking and writing to each other about good deeds".[116]

The practice of reading the Bible and patristic literature by lay Christians without any clerical supervision provoked fierce opposition from the bishop Hedeon.[117] The same letter to the patriarch suggests that the Dormition confraternity experienced significant difficulties because of the clergy and bishop who "fordbid learning and condemn those who learn… and [the clergy and bishop] bring a lot of books into oblivion".[118] This accusation finds further confirmation in a contemporary account of the bishop Hedeon's attitude towards religious education of lay Orthodox population. During his visit to the small town of Holohory near Lviv in the spring of 1588, the bishop was greeted by a group of Orthodox burghers who decided also to ask their pastor about some principles of Christian life. They were particularly interested in the correct arrangement of communal affairs in the local confraternity which they established following an example of the Orthodox burghers in

[114] *MCSL*, 118.
[115] Ibid., 140.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Konstantin V. Kharlampovich, *Zapadnorusskie pravoslavnye shkoly XVI i nachala XVII veka, otnoshenie ikh k inoslavnym, religioznoe obuchenie v nikh i zaslugi ikh v dele zashchity pravoslavnoi very i tserkvi* (Kazan: Tipolitografia Imperatorskogo universiteta, 1898), 291.
[118] *MCSL*, 141.

Lviv. Irritated by the mention of the Dormition confraternity, Hedeon answered that "this is an inappropriate thing for plain people to ask about the doctrine". When two burghers from the local confraternity insisted on their demand, the bishop arrogantly dismissed them responding that they have nothing to do with the Scripture, so he is not going to teach them anything. [119] Presumably Hedeon's attitude towards much more radical educational initiatives of the Dormition confraternity was hardly different, if not even worse.[120]

Though some Protestant influences might have reached the Dormition confraternity,[121] the immediate reason for the religious self-education of the laity lay most likely in clergy's blatant neglect of their pastoral duties. Constituting an integral element of confraternity's regular activities, collective reading and interpretation of the Bible and church fathers was crucial to the formation of its distinctive confessional identity as the genuine centre of Orthodoxy. This practice had to provide all members of the community with necessary spiritual means not only for their individual salvation but also for the benefit of communal integrity and well-being. The scriptural and patristic liturature, therefore, formed a normative framework for the maintanence of order and discipline within the confraternity whose members were inculcated to live according to biblical ideals of brotherly love and compassion.

3.2. Confessional schooling and printing

Social disciplining of the Orthodox community living in Lviv and even in entire Poland-Lithuania was equally crucial to the Dormition confraternity's mission. Like morals of the Ruthenian clergy, social behavior and religious worship of the Orthodox laity received considerable amount of attention from the confraternity in the late sixteenth

[119] *MCSL*, 155.
[120] A slightly different interpretation of bishop Hedeon's take on religious education of laity is proposed in Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 88-89.
[121] M.V. Kashuba, "Reformatsiini idei v diialnosti bratstv na Ukraiini (XVI-XVII st.)," in *Sekuliaryzatsiia dukhovnoho zhyttia na Ukraiini v epokhu humanismu i Reformatsii*, ed. E. A. Hryniv (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1991), 29.

century. To promote the cause of social disciplining the Lviv burghers employed a wide range of mechanisms and tools. Some of these, like confessional education and printing press, were common to contemporary processes of confession-building in Catholic and Protestant Churches elsewhere in Europe.[122] Some, however, such as the privilege of stauropegion, were shaped by unique local circumstances. The confraternity, nevertheless, managed to apply all the leverage at its disposal effectively combining old institutional forms with new technological inventions and structural opportunities.

Education occupied an absolutely central place in confraternity's activity. This was an area of probably the most systematic efforts and also the most remarkable accomplishments. Moreover, educational initiatives of the confraternity had an extensive impact on the broader Orthodox population due to the constant assistance provided by the Lviv burghers to other confraternities all across Poland-Lithuania. At the heart of confraternity's ambitious educational program was a school with a printshop attached to it. Both institutions had existed in Lviv for a while before 1586,[123] yet the emergence of Dormition confraternity gave new impetus to their activities.

Drawing on material support of Ruthenian craftsmen and merchants as well as political influence of the Orthodox nobility and hierarchy, the confraternity secured financial stability and institutional continuity of the school and printshop. An operation of the school was permanently overseen by two members of the confraternity elected by the general assembly once a year. Additionally, all teachers and students of the school were obliged to strictly comply with a new statute of the school entitled the Pedagogical rule and adopted on October 8, 1586. Written in Ruthenian and then translated into Greek,[124] this document provided the confraternity's school with a succinct account of its mission,

[122] Wolfgang Reinhard, "Reformation, Counter-Reformation", 391-92; Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe, 1550-1750* (London: Routledge, 1989), 89; Lotz-Heumann, "Imposing church and social discipline," 246.
[123] Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 146-47.
[124] Ibid., 168.

curriculum and a code of conduct for teachers and students. The purpose of the school is defined in pronouncedly religious and confessional terms. Referring to "the ancient customs and rules of the holy fathers of Greek rite", the confraternity declares its ambition to overcome "the lack of learning of the (Orthodox Church) law", thus fostering "the spread of the salvation among all (Orthodox) brothers".[125] The school, therefore, was intended first and foremost to contribute to general awareness of the tenets of Orthodox Christian faith.

An outline of the school curriculum, included in the rule, sheds light on the content of religious education. Constituting a core subject of the curriculum, grammar was supposed to be taught initially in three languages, namely Church Slavonic, Greek and the vernacular (Ruthenian) with a particular emphasis on the first two. A command of Church Slavonic and Greek could open doors for Ruthenian laity to a deeper understanding of the church culture, liturgy and patristic intellectual tradition. After having mastered the languages, students could proceed to the study of dialectics and rhetoric.[126] The rule also prescribes the teacher to expose his pupils to the fundamentals of astronomy, arithmetic, geometry and music. Yet these subjects were apparently treated with less care because they were required to be taught only once a week on Saturday.[127] Nevertheless, in 1592, the school was granted a royal privilege of teaching liberal arts (*pro tractandis liberalibus artibus*),[128] thus becoming one of the first Orthodox institutions of secondary education in Poland-Lithuania.

Apart from the regular subjects of trivium and quadrivium, the school's rule emphasizes even greater importance of studying Orthodox Christian doctrine. The teacher is required to inculcate students with "the teachings of the holy gospels, books of the apostles, all prophets and the holy fathers as well as philosophers, poets, historians and others".[129] On

[125] *DS*, 21.
[126] Ibid., 29.
[127] Ibid., 26. For more information on quadrivium in the confraternity's school see Kharlampovich, *Zapadnorusskie pravoslavnye shkoly*, 438-41.
[128] *PNCL*, 57-8.
[129] *DS*, 26.

Sunday, the students have to be instructed in the nature of different Christian feasts and provided with an authoritative interpretation of the relevant passages from the Gospel and St Paul's epistles that has been earlier read at the liturgy.[130] Very much like the disciplines of trivium, this part of school education was based largely on Greek intellectual tradition. The assumption is corroborated by the prevalence of Greek authors in the confraternity's library which contained a wide range of books from the Classical, Hellenistic, and Byzantine epochs.[131] Starting from the early-sixteenth century, however, the school curriculum was significantly influenced by Western European intellectual currents. Polish and Latin were introduced into the curriculum, whereas rhetoric and dialectic started to be taught according to Latin handbooks.[132]

The printshop was intended to support religious and educational initiatives of the confraternity. The patriarch Jeremiah permitted the Dormition confraternity to publish a vast range of literature including the gospels, various liturgical books and handbooks in liberal arts.[133] Using the printing press of Ivan Fedorov the Muscovite, the Lviv Ruthenian burghers printed predominantely Greek and Church Slavonic texts in order to provide the confraternity's school and church with necessary books. In 1591, the printshop published the grammarbook of Greek and Church Slavonic entitled *Adelphothes*. Some pastoral and theological works of the church fathers, namely St John Chrysostom's "On the education of children" and "On the sainthood", were also printed by the confraternity. Since the Ruthenian Church had not yet obtained its own printing press, the metropolitan Mykhailo occasionally asked the confraternity to publish some important ecclesiastical decrees, so they could gain wider currency among the Orthodox population.[134] The Orthodox clergy

[130] *DS*, 27.
[131] Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 174.
[132] Kharlampovich, *Zapadnorusskie pravoslavnye shkoly*, 414.
[133] *PKK* 3, 17.
[134] Iaroslav Isaievych, *Ukraiinske knyhovydannia: vytoky, rozvytok, problemy* (Lviv: Instytut ukraiinoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 2002), 142-145.

very soon appreciated the role of printing in confessional building and launched its own printshop near Lviv in the early sixteenth century.[135]

Equipped with relevant printed literature, the confraternity's school was clearly intended to provide the Ruthenian community of Lviv with intellectual means to promote Orthodox faith and culture in its uneven rivalry with Catholicism and, to a lesser extent, Protestantism. In the early 1590s, in a number of letters to Eastern patriarchs, the confraternity underlined the pressing need for well-educated teachers who could prevent Orthodox people from converting to Catholicism or adopting a union with Rome.[136] This noble aspiration of the confraternity attracted widespread support of the Orthodox patriarchs and metropolitans who regularly highlighted great significance of education for the common good of the entire church. Consequently, the confraternity's school was granted an exclusive right to be the only Orthodox educational institution in Lviv and the immediate vicinity. Firstly issued by the patriarch Jeremiah in 1589, this privilege was immediately confirmed by the metropolitan Mykhailo of Kyiv and the Brest synod in 1590.[137] Such a remarkable monopoly on education laid the foundation for potential (but unfulfilled) formation of uniform confessional ideology in Lviv and throughout the Orthodox lands of Poland-Lithuania.

In the first years of its operation, the school achieved significant gains in spreading confessional education to the wider Orthodox population. In 1591, schoolmasters Stefan and Kyryl as well as able students of the school were allowed to "preach the word of God" at the Dormition church in Lviv and at any other church wherever they would happen to be.[138] This sanction of the metropolitan Mykhailo implicitly recognized great significance of the confraternity and its school for the cause of Orthodox education. It also suggested a lack of

[135] Isaievych, *Ukraiinske knyhovydannia*, 148.
[136] *MCSL*, 344; 377.
[137] *PKK* 3, 17; *MCSL*, 219, 259.
[138] *AZR*, 4: 37; *MCSL*, 272.

competent clergy who could preach the gospel in a proper way, so the task was entrusted to the laic teachers and students of the school. The metropolitan's decision, nevertheless, complied with the reforms of the patriarch Jeremiah who effectively allowed knowledgeable and virtuous laypeople to deliver sermons on the gospel.[139] The confraternity's school, therefore, fitted perfectly into the changing and porous structure of the contemporary Orthodox Church.

Confraternity's engagement in the religious learning was not restricted to the territory of one city. For the first several years of schooling and printing at the Dormition church, Lviv had turned into the most powerful centre of Orthodox scholarship which could supply Orthodox communities throughout Poland-Lithuania with competent teachers, handbooks and other studying resources. Rapidly emerging confraternities, in their turn, desperately needed intellectual support to provide religious education for their communities. The Ruthenian hierarchy and clergy were overtly unable to meet growing demands of their flock for systematic instruction in the Orthodox faith. On July 5, 1592, the Orthodox bishop Mykhailo of Przemyśl asked the Dormition confraternity for a teacher who could instruct children of the diocese in the basics of grammar and the holy scripture. He explained that the current state of local schooling was so poor that it could not satisfy the wish of noble estates to educate their children.[140] The Dormition confraternity responded with consent noticing, however, that the bishop's request could not be fulfilled straight away. Since all school masters and able students were currently teaching in "Vilnius, Brest and elsewhere", there was no one competent enough to be sent to Przemyśl.[141] Emerging Orthodox schooling in Poland-Lithuania hinged on the intellectual resources of the Dormition confraternity.

[139] *DS*, 106.
[140] *MCSL*, 363.
[141] Ibid., 365.

The printing press was yet another crucial element of the confraternity's leverage. Books and pamphlets, printed in Lviv, were in demand by other Orthodox communities which started establishing their own schools. Of all products of the Lviv printshop, the Greek and Church Slavonic grammarbook *Adelphothes*, therefore, gained the widest currency. By the early sixteenth century, the Vilnius and Kyiv Orthodox confraternities bought several hundred copies of the grammarbook for their school libraries. Most of the publications, however, were not so saleable and thus could not secure a profit high enough to sustain confraternity's printing agenda.[142]

Despite the financial difficulties, the confraternity was still poised to further the cause of Ruthenian printing primarily by sharing its exeprtise. In 1602, the prince Konstantyn Ostrozky, the most influential Orthodox magnate in Poland-Lithuania at the time, invited the confraternity's printer Kasianovych to come to Ostrih and bring with him Greek fonts for printing some works of the patriarch Meletios of Alexandria.[143] Given the status of Konstantyn Ostrozky as a pioneer and major patron of Ruthenian printing, this request testifies to the great significance and high quality of confraternity's printshop. In the late 1610s, several prominent Ruthenian printers and teachers from Lviv helped to establish an Orthodox school and printing press in Kyiv.[144] These were the institutions that later on would facilitate ambitious religious reforms of the metropolitan Petro Mohyla of Kyiv.[145]

Consequently, education and printing constituted the bulk of Dormition confraternity's efforts to impose social discipline on the Orthodox of Poland-Lithuania. Those were the most systematic and effective of all available mechanisms of confessional building with far-reaching effect on Orthodox religious and intellectual development in the

[142] Isaievych, *Ukraiinske knyhovydannia*, 147.
[143] *TsDIAL* 129/1/372, 1.
[144] Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 214-15.
[145] For more detailed accounts of the Orthodox reform launched by Mohyla see Plokhy, *Religion and Cossacks*, 96-97, 237-46; Ambroise Jobert, *Od Lutra do Mohyły: Polska wobec kryzysu chrzescijanstwa 1517-1648* (Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, 1994), 271-77.

mid-seventeenth century. As in the case of social control of the Ruthenian clergy, disciplining of the laity was primarily prompted by an urgent need to restore and solidify weak church institutions, both laic and clerical, in the face of growing Catholic threat. The Dormition confraternity's schooling and printing, therefore, were intended to inculcate the Orthodox Ruthenians with the basics of Eastern Christian tradition to keep them from joining the Catholic Church. However, this objective was often pursued by the use of "confessionally alien" means, such as Latin handbooks in liberal arts or Catholic practices of religious instruction. [146] Nevertheless, the Dormition confraternity significantly contributed to the emergence of educational and intellectual centres in many Orthodox communities of Poland-Lithuania.

3.3. Correction of popular religion

A missionary zeal of the Dormition confraternity to defend and strengthen Orthodoxy could assume far more radical and ambitious forms than just schooling and printing. At the very outset of its existence, the confraternity embarked on a rather extraordinary campaign against some popular religious rituals which had become an integral part of the local Christian tradition but had no scriptural justification whatsoever. Drawing on its extensive institutional, material and intellectual resources, the confraternity succeeded in putting the uniformity and canonicity of popular worship at the top of the agenda of church reforms. Reconstruction of this episode, usually neglected by historians, could display one more important link between the Orthodox confessionalization in Poland-Lithuania and similar processes occuring in other Christian denominations in early modern Europe.

The sixteenth century witnessed the intensification of permanent tensions between official and popular Christianity throughout confessionally-divided Europe. All Protestant denominations as well as the Catholic Church, prompted by the Reformation, were trying

[146] Kharlampovich, *Zapadnorusskie pravoslavnye shkoly*, 414-17.

either to supress or at least to keep under control various magical forms of ritual life widely practised by ordinary people.[147] The first generation of Lutheran and Calvinist reformers were particularly disturbed by a strong popular belief in healing and other magical effects of physical nature ascribed to different church sacramentals, such as benedictions and exorcisms. Labelling most of these practices as "superstitious" and "idolatrous", Protestants intially excluded them from the simplified official version of the liturgy.[148] The Catholic Church also attempted to grapple with magical elements in popular worhsip primarily by prohibiting unauthorized magical rituals but also introducing stricter regulations of official rituals.[149] Despite all these efforts, popular religion proved to be hardly controllable by ecclesiaastical authorities of any denomination. Protestantism as well as Catholicism had little choice but to adopt varying degrees of tolerance to different suspicious practices of popular Christianity.[150]

Questionable however their efficacy was, these attempts to purify and regulate popular Christian worship constituted an important part of the larger process of confessionalization. Early modern Protestant and Catholic reformers were equally concerned with the imposition of doctrinally correct forms of belief and behavior on their flocks. In order to secure other-worldly salvation and this-worldly loyalty of the Christian masses, all European churches, with varying degrees of support from the secular authorities, started to purify and standardize religious life of the ordinary people. This process was primarily based on the abolition or, more often, restriction of different "preconfessional forms of popular religiosity" which were supposed to be substituted or at least rectified by confessional doctrines.[151]

[147] Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 207-15.
[148] Robert W. Scribner, *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), 45.
[149] Ibid., 42.
[150] Po-chia Hsia, *Social Discipline*, 151-52.
[151] Heinz Schilling, "Confessional Europe," 652.

With different intensity and efficiency, similar processes of "the reform of popular culture" were simultaneously taking place in Eastern Christianity, namely in Orthodox Muscovy. Leaning on the vital support of tsars, the Muscovite churchmen managed to promulgate several edicts against various forms of magic and immoral behavior widely practiced by local Orthodox population.[152] Almost identical attempts to restrain and regulate popular religion were undertaken also in the Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania. In striking contrast to other parts of the Christendom, the Ruthenian reformers, however, had little if any support of the secular authorities, either of the royal court or of the sejm both of which were predominantly Catholic by their composition and confessional ideology. Therefore, zealous Orthodox laypeople, organized into religious confraternities, played a vital role in the confessional struggle for correct forms of Christian worship. Here, as in many other fields of contemporary Ruthenian society, the Dormition confraternity took the lead.

The most contentious ritual issue disturbing the Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania right before the Brest union was probably the popular celebration of Easter. The first documented evidence of this prolonged paschal controversy is a letter of the bishop Hedeon to Orthodox burghers of Rohatyn. On March 22, at the very beginning of the Great Lent and thus of the paschal period of 1586, Hedeon addressed an urgent problem of "new heretical thought" disseminated among the Orthodox population of Rohatyn by "some of their neighbours" who claimed that there was no need to bless bread and other food during the Easter liturgy. This idea outraged Hedeon so deeply that he did not hesitate to denounce its adherents as "the heretics condemned by the seven ecumenical councils [and] the holy fathers". The burghers of Rohatyn, therefore, were strictrly forbidden to embrace and spread

[152] Burke, *Popular Culture*, 214-15.

this heretical belief as well as maintain any relations with those who had introduced it to them.[153]

In spite of appealing to the authority of "the ancient Christian custom and apostolic tradition", the bishop's own stance on the matter was far from dogmatically correct. In the same letter, Hedeon provided his succinct theological account of the popular Easter ritual:

> Therefore, on the day of Christ's ressurection Orthodox Christians bring to the church either food or bread or *pascha* (that is the paschal bread) or lamb (some kind of bakery) which are blessed (*osviashchaty*) there and which are meant to be identical (*vse odyno rozumiiutsia*) with Christ, the son of God and the immaculate lamb who sacrificied himself for everyone and by this blessed food common Orthodox people commemorate his burial and rising from the dead.[154]

According to this definition, the ritual has at least two meanings whose combination seem to be extremely problematic from the dogmatic standpoint. The first and most controversial meaning is the identification of the blessed paschal food with Jesus Christ. This equation is overtly sacrilegious because it implicitly ascribes qualities of the Eucharist (real presence of Jesus Christ) to the profane objects, that is the food brought to the church by laypeople. In this regard, the ambivalent verb *osviashchaty*, used in the Ruthenian original of the letter, denotes most likely not a simple act of benediction but rather an act of consecration which effectively turns the food into the body of Christ. According to the Orthodox as well as Catholic doctrines, however, Christ can become present to the people only in the Eucharist under the appearences of bread and wine. The second meaning attributed to the ritual by Hedeon is a commemorative one which could be dogmatically much more acceptable. However, coupled with the first interpretation of the blessed food, the commemoration of Christ's burial and ressurection suggests the same controversial imitation of the Eucharist

[153] *MCSL*, 134.
[154] Ibid.

whose performance is also intended to memorialize the Last Supper, the sacrifice on the cross and the promise of eternal life.

All these considered, the ritual described by the bishop was hardly compatible with the fundamental precepts of the Orthodox faith because it implied overtly sacrilegious treatment of the most important Christian sacrament. Such grave dogmatic mistakes attested not only to the obvious fact of ill theological competence of the contemporary Ruthenian hierachy but also to a more general lack of coherent and comprehensive church doctrine which could be uniformly applied to all Orthodox communities. Even such a crucial issue as the nature of the Eucharist had not been decisively settled by the Eastern Orthodox Church up until the mid-seventeenth century when the Catholic doctrine of transsubstantiation was finally adopted with minor confessional alterations.[155] Absence of any dogmatic definition of the Orthodox teaching, in striking contrast to Protestant and Catholic confessions of faith, induced numerous local variations in the performance of rituals and other ecclesiastical matters.

As the brief Hedeon's account suggests, the ritual of sanctifying food at the Easter liturgy was deeply revered by the Orthodox Ruthenians, both the clergy and laity. Deemed to be a real embodiment of Jesus Christ, the paschal bread and other eadibles were presumably believed to have a powerful effect not just on the spiritual well-being but equally on the physical health of believers. Besides the above mentioned sacrilegious meaning, the ritual, thus, was also suffused with popular magical beliefs. Although origins of the ritual were obviously pagan, with the advance of Christianity it was very soon incorporated into the liturgical ceremony celebrated on the day of Easter. Therefore, it was regarded as an integral part of the Easter liturgy, one of the most solemn Christian rites. As a result, it became almost impossible to distinguish between the superstitious or magical and

[155] Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 292.

proper liturgical elements of the paschal celebration.[156] The bishop's letter graphically illustrated this ambiguity.

Hedeon continued his vigorous fight against any innovations in the Easter liturgy with a direct attack on instigators of the controversy. On April 30 of the same year, he excommunicated two Lviv burghers, brothers Jurko and Ivan Rohatyntsi (i.e., the natives of Rohatyn) accusing them of agitating the Ruthenian layity and clergy for new heretical ideas.[157] Both brothers were members of the Dormition confraternity and probably they were those "neighbors" who over a month ago had attempted to convince the Rohatyn burghers not to bring food to the Easter liturgy. Subsequent course of events would leave no doubt that the point of contention between the bishop and these two brothers was exactly the popular paschal ritual. Backed by the confraternity, Jurko and Ivan might have sought help from the Greek bishop Arsenios of Elasson and Dimonika who at that time was inspecting the Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania. He immediately stood up for the brothers Rohatyntsi and their "divine devoteness to the authentic church rite". Invoking his plenipotentiary status of the exarch of the ecumenical patriarch, Arsenios, therefore, roundly condemned the practice of sanctifying "meat and bread and other food" at church. He was particularly outraged by the great reverence showed by Ruthenian priests and lay people for the blessed paschal food.[158] Consequently, it was the first concerted attempt of the confraternity's members and the Greek hierarchy to rid the Ruthenian Orthodox Church of popular magical rituals.

In order to assure the success of this ambitious enterprise, the Dormition confraternity decided to secure support of the ecumenical patriarch himself. In the above mentioned letter

[156] See Scribner, *Popular Culture*, 32.
[157] *MCSL*, 136.
[158] Appendix 2, in Amvrosii S. Krylovskii, *Lvovskoe Stavropigialnoe bratstvo: Opyt tserkovno-istoricheskago issledovaniia* (Kyiv: Tipografiia Imperatorskago Universiteta Sv. Vladimira, 1904), 14-15.

to the patriarch of Constantinople, written on May 28, they asked among other things whether it is proper for Orthodox Christians to sanctify food on Easter.

> Does it befit [an Orthodox Christian], on the day of Easter, to bring bread, meat, eggs and horseradish to the church and have all these being sanctified by the priest, and we are taught by our shepherds to call this [food] holy and designate it as the *pascha*, and we praise this bread, meat, eggs and horseradish so reverently as [we praise] Christ … and because of this sorcery multiplies in our land?[159] (*sic*)

This account encapsulates two most controversial characteristics of the popular paschal ritual. Firstly, it suggests that lay Ruthenians are taught by their priests to identify the sanctified food with Jesus Chirst. This interpretation of the ritual closely resembles the one provided by the bishop Hedeon in his letter to the Rohatyn burghers. Quite paradoxically, the very same meaning of the ritual which was praised by the bishop is, however, effectively denounced by the confraternity. Secondly, this account claims that the paschal ritual is somehow related to the spread of magical practices among the local Orthodox Christians. Even without any further evidence, it is not difficult to establish such a link between the two phenomena. Consequently, the confraternity managed to provide a convincing argument for the undogmatic nature of the ritual.

In the remainder of the same question addressed to the patriarch, members of the confraternity hint at a possible source of their remarkably profound knowledge of the tenets of Orthodox faith. Complaining about the persecution of those local Orthodox who do not observe this paschal ritual, they mention also Greeks living along with them in Lviv. Because those do not bring food to church on Easter, local clergy call them heretics.[160] Most likely, members of the confraternity learnt about the controversial character of the local religious practice from their Greek co-religionists who had never seen anything similar in their homeland. Indeed, as a vibrant trading city, late-sixteenth century Lviv attracted large

[159] *MCSL*, 141.
[160] Ibid., 142.

number of merchants from Greece who very often permanently resided in the city and took an active part in life of local Orthodox community. Moreover, the 1586 register of the confraternity's founding members contains some names of Greek merchants, such as Constantine Korniakt, Manolis Arphanes Marinetos, Manolis Madzepata and several others.[161] For other members of the confraternity they were not just rich and influential merchants but also representatives of the Greek Orthodox culture who preserved authentic Christianity of the apostles and church fathers and could transmit it to the ignorant Ruthenians.[162] The paschal controversy, inspired by the Dormition confraternity, was probably the most tangible effect of these cultural transfers.

The question about the popular paschal practice of blessing food, however, left unanswered by the patriarch of Constantinople. Despite the decree of the bishop Arsenios decisively prohibiting the practice, the paschal controversy was far from its conclusion. Neither side of the argument was willing to give up. The confraternity continued to agitate Ruthenians for abandonment of this "impious ritual", while the bishop Hedeon kept opposing any "heretical innovations" which could have undermined ancient Orthodox piety. On April 1, 1588, less than a week before the Easter, Hedeon wrote to the Orthodox dean Hrehoriy of Lviv who asked him if there was a need to sanctify food at the Easter liturgy. The dean must have been prompted to ask this question because of the unceasing pressure of the confraternity's members and their adherents. Quite expectedly, the bishop urged Hrehorij to strictly observe the ritual of blessing food on Easter. This time, however, he

[161] *AIuZR*, 1:12, 3-4; Isaievych claims that this register was compiled not in 1586 but three years later, in 1589, yet he provides no explicit reason for his claim, see Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 47.
[162] Two years later, in 1588, the Dormition confraternity received another influential Greek, the bishop Arsenios of Elasson and Dimonika who taught at the confraternity's school for two months and helped to prepare the Greek-Slavonic grammar *Adelphotes* printed in 1591, see Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 147-48.

refrained from the controversial comparisons of the blessed food with Jesus Christ, arguing instead that this paschal practice was deeply rooted in local Orthodox tradition.[163]

At the next stage, the paschal controversy finally reached the patriarch of Constantinople and the hierarchy of the Kyivan metropolitanate. During his visitation of the Ruthenian Church in November of 1589, the patriarch Jeremiah issued a decree prohibiting some dogmatic errors widely committed by the local population. One of these was the practice of blessing and venerating food on the day of Easter. The patriarch highlighted that the bread blessed at the paschal liturgy did not differ from any other bread, thus it had to be treated like ordinary food and simply consumed by believers or distributed among the poor. The Ruthenians, therefore, were strictly forbidden to regard any ordinary food with reverence pertinent only to the consecrated bread, that is the Eucharist.[164] The patriarch's decree, thus, gave rather ambivalent instructions on how to deal with the popular paschal practice. It certainly denounced the key point of the practice which is the veneration of the blessed food as holy and supposedly miraculous. And yet the performance of the practice was not explicitly prohibited because the patriarch encouraged believers to eat the blessed food and distribute it among the poor.

Despite the overall ambiguity of the patriarch's decision, the 1590 synod of Ruthenian bishops effectively incorporated it into the body of local ecclesiastical law. Along with several other popular rituals of highly dubious canonicity, the bishops proscribed any paschal sanctification of food condemning it as a heretical ritual. They rather surprisingly did not touch on undogmatic theological implications of the practice, noting only that "the genuine *pascha* is our Lord Jesus Christ".[165] Some time after the synod's conclusion, the decree on the correction of Easter celebration was printed by the Dormition confraternity in Lviv and spread across the Orthodox parishes. That was the first time that the Ruthenian

[163] *MCSL*, 153-54.
[164] *DS*, 71.
[165] *MCSL*, 259-60.

Church became directly involved in an extensive public campaign promoted primarily by the use of printing materials. No wonder the Dormition confraternity was at the forefront of this campaign. It had one of few printing presses in Ruthenia and it was zelous in its struggle against superstitious and magical practices of popular religion.

It is difficult to determine an exact area covered by the printed pamphlets with the text of the synodal decree. Judging from some indirect evidence, by the beginning of the 1591 at least the diocese of Lviv had been permeated by these publications. In his letter to the clergy of Horodok county on March 12, the bishop Hedeon mentioned "the printed letters from Lviv concerning … the sanctification of bread on [the day of] Christ's ressurection". Giving his subordinates an interpretation of the synod's decision, he wrote them that they did not have to abandon the paschal ritual completely, "even though there are episcopal signatures on these letters". Hedeon instead urged the clergy to preserve the "ancient Christian custom" with a crucial qualification – believers had to be taught by their priests not to use the paschal food for any magical purposes.[166] There was no mention, however, of the nature of the blessed food – whether it had still to be venerated as if it was identical with Christ or not. Whatever was the actual intention of the bishop, he came up with a sensible and far-sighted decision which could effectivelly adapt too strict requirements of the synod to the popular religious practices resistant to any radical change.

According to some other evidence, the same pamphlets were circulated by the metropolitan Mykhailo in the towns of Rohatyn and Halych. Here, as in Horodok, the decision of the synod was opposed by the bishop Hedeon. An Orthodox priest Symeon, who fled from Lviv to avoid persecution by the bishop, told that while taking refuge in Halych he received from the metropolitan Mykhailo a copy of "the printed letter on the Easter celebration issued by the Brest synod". According to Symeon, this letter was nailed to the

[166] *MCSL*, 285.

entrance door of a local church. However, by October 1591 it had been already removed from the door and torn up by a relative of the bishop. After that incident, Hedeon denounced and excommunicated the priest Symeon for spreading heretical ideas, meaning the decision of the Brest synod concerning the celebration of Easter.[167] This episode clearly illustrates that the attitude of the bishop Hedeon towards the synodal decree was getting more hostile as time passed. He was not willing to share his pastoral authority with the synod of bishops let alone with the lay people from the Dormition confraternity.

The metropolitan Mykhailo and the synod of bishops had little if any leverage to make the bishop Hedeon obey their decisions. The Dormition confraternity attempted to influence the situation by one more petition to the patriarch of Constantinople. On February 6, 1592 members of the confraternity sent a letter to the patriarch Jeremiah describing in great detail the recent conflict between the bishop Hedeon and the priest Symeon in Halych. They particularly concentrated on the bishop's neglect of the patriarchal and synodal decrees prohibiting "old heretical" customs of the local population, namely visual depiction of God the Father and liturgical benediction of food on Easter. Hedeon was accused of preserving and encouraging these practices. According to the confraternity's petition, such a blatant violation of ecclesiastical order and Orthodox doctrine might provoke Ruthenians to seek unification with the Catholic Church.[168] As the threat of church union approached, all minor issues of popular rituals and beliefs were losing their former intensity. They remained in the background of much more important processes on which the very existence of the Ruthenian Church hinged.

After 1592 the paschal controversy vanished from the agenda of the Dormition confraternity. By that time it had become for the first time widely known in Poland-Lithuania about a project of the church union discussed for several years by Ruthenian

[167] *MCSL*, 322.
[168] Ibid., 340.

bishops at the Brest synods. On March 18, the king Zygmunt III issued an edict announcing his support of the union project.[169] Such rapid and radical changes of religious situation could not go unnoticed by the Dormition confraternity. Starting from February 1592, almost all correspondence between the confraternity and various political or ecclesiastical authorities was suffused with growing anxiety about possible subordination of the Ruthenian Church to Rome. This might have been a reason for the gradual dissappearence of disciplinary issues from the confraternity's agenda. Consequently, the paschal controversy ended with no tangible results. Once a contentious practice, the blessing of food on Easter has been widely observed by Ukrainian Christians (both the Orthodox and Greek Catholics) up to these days. Thus, the bishop Hedeon was basically right when he was trying to moderate radical requirements of the synod and confraternity to proscribe this popular practice completely.

At the turn of the seventeenth century, the Dormition confraternity launched out an ambitious program of social disciplining of the Orthodox population of Lviv and the surrounding area. Very soon, however, the territorial scope of the disciplining attempts grew wider extending over the diocese of Lviv and the entire Kyivan metropolitanate. The repertoire of disciplining mechanisms expanded as well. One of its constituent elements was the corporate discipline within the confraternity framed by confessional ethos of Eastern Christianity. Since the confraternity was perceived by its members as an Orthodox stronghold, maintenance of the corporate order was essential to the revival of the entire Ruthenian Church. Confessional schooling and printing were intended to further the Orthodox cause with much greater rigour and outreach. These activities allowed the confraternity to spread its confessional ideals and ideas to wider audience over large area of Eastern Poland-Lithuania. More important, a new intellectual elite of the Ruthenian Church

[169] Dmitriev, *Mezhdu Rimom i Tsargradom*, 142.

was forged by the confraternity's school and its faculty involved in Orthodox education far beyond the city walls of Lviv. Combining such extensive institutional resources with the missionary zeal of its members, the confraternity even attempted to remove some unorthodox religious practices from Ruthenian Christianity in order to make it more complaint with the Orthodox doctrine. Cooperating with the higher ecclesiastical hierarchy, the Lviv burghers succeeded in obtaining and promulgating a prohibition of controversial paschal ritual. Even though this campaign for the correction of popular religion had eventually failed, it served a clear evidence of the leading role played by the Dormition confraternity in Orthodox confessionalization of the late-sixteenth century.

Conclusion

As a part of the broader movement of Orthodox lay people organized in religious brotherhoods, the Dormition confraternity emerged in response to the deep institutional crisis of the Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania in the late-sixteenth century. When the ecclesiastical hierarchy and clergy had completely neglected their pastoral duties, the laity assumed control of the religious life in their parishes. Building on the tradition of lay involvement in parish management, the confraternity movement gave new impetus to this process. The Dormition confraternity in Lviv set an example for many other brotherhoods how to manage material resources of the parish church, organize popular devotions, control the performance of the clergy and oversee morals of the parishioners. The confraternity, therefore, was the backbone of the religious life at the most basic level of church structure. This characteristic of the Orthodox confraternity movement in Poland-Lithuania closely resembles the features of the communal church in Southwest Germany where local communes (*Gemeinde*) of lay people administered the bulk of parish affairs. Thus, in both cases the process of confessionalization bore a pronouncedly communal character.

The agenda of the Dormition confraternity, however, was by no means determined solely by challenges of the church crisis. The confraternity aimed to achieve much more ambitious objectives of greater confessional awareness and solidarity of all Orthodox Christians in Poland-Lithuania. In other words, it was striving for the formation of distinctive Orthodox identity of the Ruthenian population. In sixteenth century Lviv this aspiration resulted from close contact with Polish Catholicism which had recently started its own project of confessional building. Being a direct target of Catholic confessionalization, the Dormition confraternity, therefore, adopted many tools and mechanisms of its opponents in order to succeed in the confessional rivalry. Thus, the process of Orthodox confessional

building was commenced by the laity motivated by the desire to preserve and strengthen its collective confessional identity.

Like elsewhere in early modern Europe, the communal confessionalization in the Orthodox Church of Poland-Lithuania was based on the constant interaction between local communities of believers and ecclesiastical authorities. Religious changes, therefore, were negotiated and shaped by both sides, though the laity usually seized the initiative. In the case of the Dormition confraternity this mechanism of confessionalization was significantly enhanced by means of the privilege of stauropegion which enabled contacts between the believers and the hierarchy over the heads of local bishops, generally hostile to any change of the existing state of affairs. Direct access to the Eastern patriarchs and the metropolitan of Kyiv proved hugely helpful allmost in all activities of the Dormition confraternity. In particular, it facilitated confraternity's attempts to impose discipline on parish priests and some local bishops. In numerous letters of complaint addressed to the patriarchs, the confraternity accused those clerics of neglecting their pastoral and liturgical duties as well as violating matrimonial law of the church. The hierarchs used to react to these petitions with vigorous denouncement and excommuncation of the offenders of clerical discipline. In 1590, moreover, the patriarch Jeremiah and metropolitan Mykhailo undertook a series of profound ecclesiastical reforms which were informed by the confessional agenda of the Dormition confraternity.

Disciplining of the Orthodox laity also heavily depended on the interaction of the Dormition confraternity with the church hierarchy. Apart from the area of corporate discipline where the confraternity enjoyed almost complete autonomy, most confessional initiatives, directed at the broader Orthodox population, required some kind of sanction of the metropolitan and the synod of bishops. At the same time, the hierarchy became depended on the growing intellectual and material resources of the confraternity. For

example, lay teachers and students of the confraternity's school were encouraged by the metropolitan Mykhailo to preach the gospel in order to instruct common people in orthodox Christian teaching. The paschal controversy of 1586-1592 provides the most graphic illustration of the cooperation between the confraternity and the hierarchy. The former's initiative to purify popular religion was reinforced by the latter's authoritative prohibition of superstitious practices. Then, the decree of the synod of bishops was published by the confraternity because the church did not have its own printing press. Consequently, these concerted efforts of the laity and the ecclesiastical hierarchy helped to initiate the radical religious change which, however, turned out to be a failure.

The Dormition confraternity hardly had any coherent plan of full-scale confessionalization of the Orthodox Church. Neither it had sufficient institutional and material resources to consistently implement any such project. Therefore, almost all confessional activities of the confraternity, including its schooling and printing, very often lacked regularity and uniformity of operation. However, they always remained heavily informed by confessional rhetoric of Orthodox revival which became an integral part of public discourse of the Ruthenian burghers and nobility in Poland-Lithuania. This commitment to the Orthodox religious tradition was the cornerstone of a new confessional identity that started to be forged among the Ruthenian population of the Commonwealth.

Bibliography or Reference List

Unpublished sources

TsDIAL Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukraiiny (Lviv) fund 129, op. 1, nos. 311, 372.

Published sources

1. *Akty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Zapadnoi Rossii, sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoi komissiei* (=AZR). Vol. 4: 1588-1638. St. Petersburg, 1851.
2. *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii, izdavaemyi Vremennoi komissiei dlia razbora drevnikh aktov* (=AIuZR). Pt. 1, vols. 11-12. Kyiv, 1904.
3. *Diplomata Statuaria a Patriarchis Orientalibus Confraternitati Stauropigianae Leopoliensi a 1586-1592 data, cum aliis litteris coaevis et appendice* (=DS). Vol. 2. Lviv, 1895.
4. Krylovskii, Amvrosii S. *Lvovskoe Stavropigialnoe bratstvo: Opyt tserkovno-istoricheskogo issledovaniia.* Kyiv: Tipografiia Imperatorskago Universiteta Sv. Vladimira, 1904.
5. *Monumenta Confraternitatis Stauropigianae Leopoliensis* (=MCSL). Vol. 1. Ed. Wladimirus Milkowicz. Lviv, 1895.
6. *Pamiatniki, izdannye Kievskoi komissiei dlia razbora drevnikh aktov* (=PKK). Vol. 3. Kyiv, 1898.
7. *Privilegia Nationum Civitatis Leopoliensis (XIV-XVIII saec.)* (=PNCL). Ed. Myron Kapral. Lviv, 2010.

Secondary literature

1. Brüning, Alfons. "Confessionalization in the *Slavia Orthodoxa* (Belorussia, Ukraine, Russia)? – Potential and Limits of a Western Historiographical Concept." In *Religion and the Conceptual Boundary in Central and Eastern Europe: Encounters of Faith*, edited by Thomas Bremer, 66-97. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
2. Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe.* New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
3. Charewiczowa, Lucja. «Ograniczenia gospodarcze nacyj schizmatyckich i zydow we Lwowie XV i XVI wieku» [Economic restrictions of the schismatic nations and Jews in Lviv of the 15th and 16th centuries]. *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 39 (1925): 193-227.
4. Deventer, Jorg. " "Confessionalization" – a useful theoretical concept for the study of religion, politics, and society in early modern East-Central Europe?" *European Review of History/Revue europeenne d'histoire* 11:3 (2004): 403-425.
5. Dmitriev, Mikhail V. "Conflict and Concord in Early Modern Poland: Catholics and Orthodox at the Union of Brest." In *Diversity and Dissent: Negotiating Religious Difference in Central Europe, 1500-1800,* edited by Howard Louthan, Gary B. Cohen and Franz A. J. Szabo, 114-136. New York: Berghahn Books, 2011.
6. ———. *Mezhdu Rimom i Tsargradom: Genezis Brestskoi tserkovnoi unii 1595-1596 gg.* [Between Rome and Constantinople: Genesis of the Brest Church Union]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 2003.

7. ———. “Tserkovnye bratstva Kievskoi mitropolii v konce XVI veka: rezultat ‘pravoslavnoi konfessionalizatsii’? [Church confraternities of the Kyivan metropolitanate at the end of the 16th century: the result of ‘Orthodox confessionalization’?].” In *Sravnitelnaia istoria: metody, zadachi, perspektivy* [Comparative History: Methods, Tasks, Prospects], edited by Marina Paramonova, 133-153. Moscow: IVI RAN, 2003.
8. Eberhard, Winfried. “Voraussetzungen und Strukturelle Grundlagen der Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa.” In *Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa: Wirkungen des religiosen Wandels im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert in Staat, Gesellschaft und Kultur*, edited by Joachim Bahlcke and Arno Strohmeyer, 89-103. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999.
9. Forster, Marc R. *Catholic Revival in the Age of the Baroque: Religious Identity in Southwest Germany, 1550-1750.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
10. Forum (Marc Forster, Bruce Gordon, Joel Harrington, Thomas Kaufmann and Ute Lotz-Heumann). “Religious History beyond Confessionalization.” *German History* 32:4 (2014): 579-98.
11. Frost, Robert. “Konfesjonalizacja a wojsko w Rzeczpospolitej 1558-1668 [Confessionalization and the Army in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth].” In *Rzeczpospolita wielu wyznań* [The Commonwealth of Many Confessions], edited by Adam Kaźmiercyzk, Andrzej Link-Lenczowski and Mariusz Markiewicz, 89-98. Krakow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2004.
12. ———. “Confessionalization and the Army in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth 1550-1667.” In *Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa: Wirkungen des religiosen Wandels im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert in Staat, Gesellschaft und Kultur*, edited by Joachim Bahlcke and Arno Strohmeyer, 139-160. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999.
13. Gorski, Philip. *The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.
14. Gudziak, Borys A. *Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
15. Harrington, Joel F. and Helmut Walser Smith. “Confessionalization, Community, and State-Building in Germany, 1555-1870.” *The Journal of Modern History* 69:1 (1997): 77-101.
16. Hrytsak, Yaroslav. “Lviv: A Multicultural History through the Centuries.” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 24 (2000): 47-73.
17. Isaievych, Iaroslav. *Ukraiinske knyhovydannia: vytoky, rozvytok, problemy* [Ukrainian Book Printing: Origins, Development, Problems]. Lviv: Instytut ukraiinoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 2002.
18. ———. *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine.* Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2006.
19. Jobert, Ambroise. *Od Lutra do Mohyły: Polska wobec kryzysu chrzescijanstwa 1517-1648* [From Luther to Mohyla: Poland in the Face of the Crisis of Christianity]. Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, 1994.
20. Kapral, Myron. *Natsionalni hromady Lvova XVI-XVIII st.* [National communities of Lviv in the 16-18th centuries]. Lviv: Piramida, 2003.
21. Kashuba, M.V. “Reformatsiini idei v diialnosti bratstv na Ukraiini (XVI-XVII st.) [Reformation Ideas in the Activities of Confraternities in Ukraine].” In *Sekuliaryzatsiia dukhovnoho zhyttia na Ukraiini v epokhu humanismu i Reformatsii* [Secularization of Religious Life in Ukraine in the Age of Humanism

and the Reformation], edited by Eugene A. Hryniv, 26-53. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1991.
22. Kharlampovich, Konstantin V. *Zapadnorusskie pravoslavnye shkoly XVI i nachala XVII veka, otnoshenie ikh k inoslavnym, religioznoe obuchenie v nikh i zaslugi ikh v dele zashchity pravoslavnoi very i tserkvi* [West-Ruthenian Orthodox Schools of the 16th and early-17th Centuries, Their Relation to Other Religions, Their Religious Education and Their Contribution to the Defence of the Orthodox Faith and Church]. Kazan: Tipolitografia Imperatorskogo universiteta, 1898.
23. Kłoczowski, Jerzy. *A History of Polish Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
24. Kozubska-Andrusiv, Olha. "'…propter disparitatem linguae et religionis pares ipsis non esse…': 'Minority' Communities in Medieval and Early Modern Lviv." In *Segregation-Integration-Assimilation: Religious and Ethnic Groups in the Medieval Towns of Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by Derek Keene, Balazs Nagy and Katalin Szende, 51-66. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
25. Krstic, Tijana. *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.
26. Litak, Stanislaw. "Bractwa religijne w Polsce przedrozbiorowej XIII-XVIII wiek. Rozwoj i problematyka [Church Confraternities in Pre-partiotion Poland of 13-18th Centuries. The Development and Problematic]." *Przeglad Historyczny* 88:3-4 (1997): 499-523.
27. ———. "W dobie reform i polemik religijnych [In the age of religious reforms and polemics]." In *Chrześcijanstwo w Polsce. Zarys przemian 966-1979* [Christianity in Poland. A Sketch of Transformations], edited by Jerzy Kłoczowski, 189-254. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1992.
28. Lotz-Heumann, Ute. "Imposing church and social discipline." In *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Volume 6, Reformation and Expansion 1500-1660*, edited by Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, 244-260. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
29. ———. "The Concept of 'Confessionalization': a Historiographical Paradigm in Dispute." *Memoria y Civilizacion* 4 (2001): 93-114.
30. Moritz, Anja, Hans-Joachim Mueller, Matthias Pohlig. "Konfesjonalizacja Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej w XVII i XVIII wieku? [Confessionalization of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 17th and 18th centuries?]." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 108:1 (2001): 37-46.
31. Mueller, Michael G. "Protestant Confessionalization in the Towns of Royal Prussia and the Practice of Religious Toleration in Poland-Lithuania." In *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, edited by Ole Peter Grell and Bob Scribner, 262-281. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
32. Oestreich, Gerhard. *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*, translated by David McLintock. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
33. O'Malley, John W. *Trent: What Happened at the Council.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.
34. Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine. Vol. 2: The Spirit of Eastern Christendom, 600-1700.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.
35. Plokhy, Serhii. *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
36. Po-chia Hsia, Ronnie. *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe, 1550-1750.* London: Routledge, 1989.

37. Ptaśnik, Jan. “Walki o demokratzyację Lwowa od XVI do XVIII wieku [Struggles for democratization of Lviv from the 16th till the 18th century].” In *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 39 (1925): 228-257.
38. Reinhard, Wolfgang. “Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State. A Reassessement.” *The Catholic Historical Review* 75:3 (1989): 383-404.
39. Schilling, Heinz. “Confessional Europe.” In *Handbook of European History, 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, edited by Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy, 641-681. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
40. Schilling, Heinz. “Confessionalization in the Empire: Religious and Societal Change in Germany between 1550 and 1620.” In Heinz Schilling, *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society. Essays in German and Dutch History,* 205-245. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
41. Schmidt, Heinrich Richard. “Sozialdisziplinierung? Ein Plädoyer für das Ende des Etatismus in der Konfessionalisierungsforschung.” *Historische Zeitschrift* 265:3 (1997): 639-682.
42. Schorn-Schütte, Luise. “The new clergies.” In *The Cambridge History of Christianity, Volume 6: Reformation and Expansion 1500-1660*, edited by Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, 444-464. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
43. Scribner, Robert W. *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany.* London: The Hambledon Press, 1983.
44. Wawrzeniuk, Piotr. “Confessional Civilizing in Ukraine: the Bishop Iosyf Shumliansky and the Introduction of Reforms in the Diocese of Lviv 1668-1708”. PhD diss., Södertörns högskola, 2005.
45. Zardin, Danilo. “Relaunching confraternities in the Tridentine era: shaping consciences and christianizing society in Milan and Lombardy.” In *Politics of Ritual Kinship: Confraternities and Social Order in Early Modern Italy*, edited by Nicholas Terpstra, 190-209. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.