

THE UNCROWNED KINGS OF RUTHENIA AND JESUITS
KOSTIANTYN VASYL' OSTROZ'KYJ AGAINST
PIOTR SKARGA (1577-1608)

The last quarter of the 16th century was marked not only by intensive cultural changes within the Orthodox Church of the Kyjivan Metropolitanate, but also by active contacts between Eastern Orthodox Ruthenia and Western Christianity and mutual attempts to unite the divided *pax Christiana*. The reformation movement, which at the end of the 1510's had already spread onto the Polish and Lithuanian lands of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL), by the 1540's, reached Ruthenian lands, populated basically with Eastern Orthodox Ruthenians, generally influencing the nobles of Western and Central Ruthenia-Ukraine. The Warsaw Confederation (1573) approved of the principle of religious tolerance in the State.

The initiative of Polish Jesuits concerning the dialogue with the Orthodox East about uniting the Churches was based on Counter-Reformation activity. The important role of secular patrons accounted for by the specificity of the Orthodox ecclesiology, on the background of the weak authority of the hierarchies in the Orthodox Church of the Metropolitanate, made a lay person, Prince Kostiantyn Vasył' Ostroz'kyj (Polish *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogiński*), the informal, but only real head of the Church. It was he who was approached by Jesuits with their plans regarding the union.

Kostiantyn Vasył' Ostroz'kyj was "the most powerful and the richest magnate in the whole kingdom" (according to Orazio Spannocchi, a secretary of the Apostolic Nuncio Alberto Bolognetti)¹ and "the pillar of the Orthodox faith" (according to Orthodox polemicists).² Ostroz'kyj belonged to the Princely class, which embodied the political independence of the region in concentrating their control over all the local gentry's corporations by controlling almost all of the administrative posts in Volhynia and Central

¹ E. RYKACZEWSKI, *Relacye nuncyuszów apostolskich*. T. 1. Poznań, 1864, p. 460.

² Z. KOPYSTENSKIJ, *Palinodia*, in: *Russkaja Istoričeskaja Biblioteka*. T. IV. *Pamjatniki polemičeskoj literatury v Zapadnoj Rusi*, SPb, 1878, col. 1135.

Ruthenia-Ukraine. After the Union of Lublin in 1569, the Princes became the real rulers of Ruthenia. Their domains were “States within States”, with their own legal proceedings, tax system, and army. The military forces of some of the Ruthenian aristocrats were much more prominent in actual numbers than the royal mercenary army, thus guaranteeing its owners real power, political weight, and impunity. We need only recall the fact that there were from two to six thousand soldiers in the regular royal mercenary army, whereas, Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl’ Ostroz’kyj could post an army of from fifteen to twenty thousand men if need be. So there should be no wonder that he was viewed as one of the leading candidates for the Polish throne in 1574.³

The Ostroz’kyj family

Ostroz’kyj’s parents, Prince Kostiantyn Ivanovyč, Grand Lithuanian Hetman, and Princess Oleksandra Olel’kovyčivna-Sluc’ka, were Eastern Orthodox Christians. Kostiantyn Vasyl’ was born around 1524/25.⁴ The young Prince received no proper education at home, finishing only the first stage of schooling there.⁵ Perhaps, Kostiantyn Vasyl’ had studied Greek or Latin, but he rarely used Latin expressions in his correspondence. Taking into account the fashion of the time, this was indicative of his incomplete education. The later speeches of Ostroz’kyj in the Senate were laconic and very concrete, without the usual Latinisms and diffuse quotes. Thus, his education did not fit the Renaissance ideal of an educated Polish aristocrat of the 16th century. The reason for this was that that ideal of education only spread into the Ruthenian lands of the GDL later, due to the influence of Protestant gymnasiums

³ N. JAKOVENKO, *Ukrajins’ka šljaxta z kincja XIV - do serejdyny XVII stolittja*. Volyn’ i Central’na Ukrajina, vyd. 2. Kyjiv, 2008, p. 80, 85, 118-121.

⁴ A detailed explanation of the year of the Prince’s birth can be found in: T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski (ok. 1524/1525 - 1608) wojewoda kijowski i marszałek ziemi wołyńskiej*, Toruń, 1997, p. 22-24. For a comparison: T. CHYN-CZEWSKA-HENNEL, *Ostrogski Konstanty Wasyl*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny (PSB)*. T. XXIV, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk, 1979, p. 489.

⁵ Such early study was typical for many future Polish senators and parliamentarians. They could later upgrade their education at the King’s or bishop’s court, at the University of Krakow, or some foreign university. (A. KAMLER, *Od szkoły do senatu. Wykształcenie senatorów w Koronie w latach 1501-1586. Studia*, Warszawa, 2006, p. 44, 47-58, 127.)

(from the mid 16th century on) and Jesuit colleges (from the last quarter of that century on), that is, when Kostiantyn Vasyľ was over thirty years old. Therefore, the prospect of future study at the nearby University of Krakow, for instance,⁶ was not seriously taken into account by guardians of Ostroz'kyj, not because of the Catholic nature of the institution, but because of a specific understanding of education by the Lithuanian and Ruthenian magnates, who primarily saw a military lifestyle and training as the surest means to obtain and hold powerful positions.

The career of Kostiantyn Ivanovyč, one of the five richest magnates of the GDL, might well serve as a role model for his son. The huge estates acquired by Kostiantyn Ivanovyč Ostroz'kyj, were mainly bestowed on him due to his military successes and expenses incurred by wars. Moreover, being an Orthodox Christian, he was also granted the positions of Grand Lithuanian Hetman (1497), Castellan of Wilno (1511), and Voivode of Trakai Voivodeship (1522), which was an obvious violation of the Privilege of Horodlo of 1413, which stipulated that senior positions, including the Castellan positions, were only to be granted to Catholics.⁷ Another exception made for Kostiantyn Ivanovyč's sake was changing the order of the seats in the Senate, so that Voivode of Trakai Voivodeship received the first seat among secular senators. Like his father, Kostiantyn Vasyľ became one of few Ruthenian magnates to obtain the highest positions in the GDL. Thus, it was no wonder, that Kostiantyn Vasyľ inherited an attitude to education oriented exclusively from the viewpoint of its practical benefits in furthering his own political ambitions and solidifying his ownership of property. For that reason, the Prince did not send any of his sons, Januś (born in 1554), Kostiantyn (born about 1555) and Oleksandr (born in 1570) to any university, limiting their education to home schooling, although two of the eldest sons were dispatched to the Habsburg court in Vienna at the ages of 15 and 14 years

⁶ The vast majority of Polish secular senators at that time were auditors in one or even several universities: first of all at the University of Krakow, then in the great Protestant universities, those geographically close to Poland as well as in Italian universities (A. KAMLER, *Od szkoły do senatu...* [see n. 5], p. 128-149).

⁷ *Prilavlenie k Ipalskoj letopisi: Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*. T. II. SPb, 1860, p. 279.

old, respectively.⁸ Sending sons from local politically influential noble families to the courts of European rulers was a common practice at the time, but because of high costs, it was not done often. The same can be said about as was traveling to foreign universities for study abroad.⁹ We can assume that in that case Ostroz'kyj followed the example of his Catholic father-in-law, Grand Hetman of Poland Jan Tarnowski, who had sent his son Jan Krzysztof to the Habsburg court in Vienna from 1549 to 1553.¹⁰

The Ostrogski's religious affiliations

Kostiantyn Vasył', an Eastern Orthodox, was married to a Catholic, as was his Orthodox brother Illja. Unlike Kostiantyn Vasył', his wife Zofia Tarnowska kept close ties with her Catholic family after marriage, and visited her father's residence Tarnów quite frequently. That residence was the birthplace of Januś, their eldest son, as well as a school for him and his younger brother and sisters, who were taught by Kacper Cichocki, a canon of Sandomierz.¹¹ Zofia died in 1570, when the youngest son Oleksandr was an infant, and Januś was 16 years old, Kostiantyn was 15 years old, Kateryna was 11 years old, and Hał'ska was around 10 years old. It is known that all the children of the Ostroz'kyj family, except Hał'ska, were baptized in the Orthodox Church, but all of them, except Oleksandr, died as Catholics. Although three of the elder children converted to Catholicism as adults, their personal contact with their Catholic mother in childhood was most certainly a fertile ground leading to their later conversions.

Typifying the patriarchal family system of the time and, in this case, the Ostroz'kyj's, Kostiantyn Vasył' had dominance even over his adult sons,¹² for whom he personally selected marriage partners from non-Orthodox families. His two daughters were given over in marriage to Protestants: Kateryna was given to Krzysztof Radziwiłł "Piorun", a Lithuanian Calvinist leader (in 1578), Hał'ska was

⁸ T. KEMPA, *Dzieje rodu Ostrogskich*, Toruń, 2002, p. 124.

⁹ A. KAMLER, *Od szkoły do senatu...* [see n. 5], p. 163-164, 239.

¹⁰ W. DWORZACZEK, *Hetman Jan Tarnowski. Z dziejów możnowładztwa małopolskiego*, Warszawa, 1985, p. 315-316; A. KAMLER, *Od szkoły do senatu...* [see n. 5], p. 50-51, 54, 147, 158.

¹¹ T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski...* [see n. 4], p. 33, 52, 92.

¹² *Ibidem*, p. 92, 113.

given firstly to Jan Kiszka, a leader of Lithuanian Arians (in 1574), and later to the mentioned Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Piorun” (in 1579). Among the daughters, only Kateryna bore an heir; her son Januś was a Calvinist and was educated in the faith of his father and never left it.

Among the three sons of Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl' only the middle one, Kostiantyn, married an Orthodox, Oleksandra Tyškevyč (Polish *Tyszkiewicz*) about 1579,¹³ with whom he finally converted to Catholicism in 1583. The eldest son, Januś, was twice blessed by his father to marry a non-Orthodox, Zuzanna Serezy, and later, Katarzyna Lubomirska, a Catholic. It is not known for sure whether Zuzanna Serezy was a Catholic or a Protestant at the time of their marriage in 1582, but the history of the Jesuit Lithuanian province for 1589 mentions her conversion “ab haereticorum turba ad Ecclesiam [from the crowd of heretics to the Church]”,¹⁴ and therefore, we can undoubtedly consider her to have been a Catholic since that date. In 1592, Oleksandr Ostroz'kyj was asked by his father to marry Anna Kostka, a Catholic, whose parents were founders of the first Jesuit house in Ruthenia. Her father's whole family was closely associated with the Jesuits.

What influenced Kostiantyn Vasyl' Ostroz'kyj to choose non-Orthodox matches for four of his five children? It is unlikely that the choice was motivated by reduction in the number of Orthodox believers among the richest of the Ruthenian magnates, whose sons and daughters, naturally, might be potential sons-in-law and daughters-in-law for Prince Ostroz'kyj. Obviously, the magnate's typical understanding of marriage as one of the most effective ways of increasing one's family property, strengthening a financial position, and extending spheres of political influence outside the family region, might have played an important role in his decision. Thus, the confessional differences were not taken into account. The marriage of Kostiantyn Vasyl' himself made him a son-in-law of a Great Hetman of Poland and the biggest magnate of the Kingdom of Poland with broad connections and great influence outside Poland and Lithuania. After the death of his brother-in-law, the

¹³ N. JAKOVENKO, *Relihijni konversiji: sprobha pohljadu zseredynty*, in: N. JAKOVENKO, *Paralel'nyj svit. Doslidžennja z istoriji ujavlen' ta idej v Ukrajinі XVI-XVII st.* Kyjiv, 2002, p. 64.

¹⁴ *Lithuanicarum Societatis Iesu historiarum libri decem auctore Stanislao Ros-towski recognoscente Ioanne Martinov.* Parisiis-Bruxellis, 1877, p. 162.

last Tarnowski, Ostroz'kyj inherited the largest magnate of domains in Little Poland.

1. Why was Skarga not listened to (1577)

The Jesuits first arrived in the Kingdom of Poland in 1564, at the invitation of Stanislaus Hosius, the Bishop of Warmia. The first contact between Kostiantyn Vasyl' Ostroz'kyj and the future Jesuit Piotr Skarga (who, according to the Jesuit scholars, *was the most prominent figure in Poland from the first generation of Jesuits, or possibly in the entire history of the Polish Jesuit Province*)¹⁵ occurred three years later, in 1567, when Skarga delivered a grave-side oration for the Prince's brother-in-law Jan Krzysztof Tarnowski. Skarga had been a confessor of Tarnowski's wife's, Zofia Odrowążówna (she later became the mother of Kostiantyn Vasyl's future daughter-in-law), being a priest in the court of her husband. Ten years later, in 1577, Skarga, as a Jesuit, recalled that meeting in a dedication to Prince Ostroz'kyj in his book *O jedności Kościoła Bożego pod jednym pasterzem i o greckim od tej jedności odstąpieniu* [*On the unity of the Church of God under one Pastor and on the Greek separation from that unity*], calling upon the Prince to apply every effort in order to unite the Ruthenians with Rome.¹⁶

In order to understand the connection between these two events we need to turn our attention to a few factors.

The first factor: the role of Vasyl' Ostroz'kyj

First of all, Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl' Ostroz'kyj was considered "the pillar of the Orthodox faith" not only because of his denomination and lineage from the Rurik dynasty,¹⁷ but also, because of

¹⁵ J. KRAJCAR, *Jesuits and the genesis of the Union of Brest*, in: *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, Romae, 1978, vol. 44, fasciculus 1, p. 146-147. About Piotr Skarga (1536-1612), see Josef MAJKOWSKI, *Skarga (Pierre)*, in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, t. 14, Paris, 1990, c. 944-946; Wolfgang HELLER, *Skarga SJ Piotr*, in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, t. 10, Herzberg, 1995, c. 620-622.

¹⁶ P. SKARGA, *O jedności Kościoła Bożego pod jednym pasterzem i o greckim i ruskim od tej jedności odstąpieniu*, in: *Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioleka*. T. VII: *Pamjatniki polemičeskoj literatury v Zapadnoj Rusi*, kn. 2. SPb, 1882, sz. 228-229. At the same time Skarga sent an copy of his book to the prince.

¹⁷ See n. 128.

his status as “the uncrowned king of Ruthenia” and the richest magnate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Even King Sigismundus I the Elder permitted Kostiantyn Vasyľ’s father, Kostiantyn Ivanovyč, to build new Orthodox churches, contrary to existing prohibitions, and turned the largest Volhynian monastery of Žydyčyn over to his wardship, as well as promising him the right to propose the next candidate for the post of archimandrite.¹⁸ Vasyľ Ivanovyč had obtained a royal privilege and the consent of the Metropolitan of Kyjiv to the right of wardship over the domain of the Kyjivan Metropolitanate, in case of absence of the Metropolitan; he also facilitated the royal confirmation of the privilege allowing for independent legal proceedings for the Eastern Orthodox Church.¹⁹

We should recall that according to the practice of those times, parish priests and superiors of monasteries depended more on their secular patrons, whose juridical-administrative authority they were subjected to, than on their bishops; sometimes, even Church statutes were decreed by secular patrons.²⁰ Taking into account the fact that Kostiantyn Ivanovyč also influenced the nomination of Orthodox bishops, we may regard him to be *de facto*, not only, and indubitably, the principal secular patron of the Orthodox Church in the GDL, but also its informal head.

Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ also had an influence on the nomination of superiors in the monasteries founded by his ancestors, as well as the monasteries and churches he founded himself.²¹ On the basis of Sigismundus Augustus’ privilege of 1571, Ostroz’kyj controlled the gathering of contributions by monks of the Kyjiv Monastery of the Caves in the Novhorod-Sivers’kyj region, and acted as a negotiator in land disputes between the Orthodox clergy and secular landowners, and petitioned the King to confirm the privileges

¹⁸ *Arxiv Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii*, č. 8, t. 4, Kiev, 1907, N XXXIV.

¹⁹ Z. WOJTKOWIAK, *Konstanty Ostrogski*, in: *PSB*. T. XXIV, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk, 1979, p. 488.

²⁰ B. N. FLORJA, *Krizis organizacionnyx struktur pravoslavnoj cerkvi v XVI v.*, in: *Brestskaja unija 1596 g. i obščestvenno-političeskaja bor’ba na Ukraine i v Belorussii v konce XVI - načale XVII v. Č. 1: Brestskaja unija 1596 g. Istoričeskie pričiny*, Moskva, 1996, p. 33-34.

²¹ There were about six hundred churches and twenty monasteries in the Prince’s domains (O. LEVICKIJ, *Predislovie*, in: *Arxiv Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii*, č. 1, t. 6, Kiev, 1883, p. 51.)

of churches, monasteries, as well as the privileges and statutes of confraternities.

He was a founder of the Ternopil Orthodox Confraternity and a member of the L'viv (Polish *Lwów*) Orthodox Stauropegial Confraternity. What is more, the election of Orthodox bishops, of the Metropolite of Kyjiv and the major posts in the monasteries, depended on the Prince's will. Later, in 1592, Ostroz'kyj seemed to have succeeded in obtaining an exceptional privilege from Sigismundus III Vasa, according to which the King agreed not to award any high posts in the Orthodox Church to anyone without consultation with Ostroz'kyj.²² Despite the doubtful authenticity of this document (it was published in the Orthodox polemical work *Apokrisis*, written by Christophoros Philaletes, which was a pseudonym of the client of Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl', an adherent of the Czech Brethren Marcin Broniewski,²³ and was published in the Polish language in 1597 in the Arian printing house and in the Ruthenian language in Ostroh a year later), it is important to realize that the document implies an explicit approbation by the royal authority (should it be authentic) or Prince Ostroz'kyj's implicit demand (should it be a falsification) to submit nominations of Orthodox hierarchs for his approval.

The second factor: the Jesuit college at Jaroslav (1573)

In 1571 the aforementioned Ostroz'kyj's relative, Zofia Odrowążówna, donated the first estate for the future Jesuit college, to be established in her residence in Jaroslav. This decision was influenced by Piotr Skarga. Skarga himself (already a Jesuit) was the principal mediator in negotiations between Zofia and the Society of Jesus. In fact, the Polish Jesuits wanted to have their house in a more prominent and royal city, such as Peremyśl' (Polish *Przemysł*) or L'viv, but not in a private town in which they could

²² T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski...* [see n. 4], p. 95-100.

²³ *Apokrisis. Sočinenie Xristofora Filaleta. V dvux tekstax, pol'skom i zapadnorusskom, 1597-1599*, in: *Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioteka*. T. 7, SPb, 1882, stb. 1003-1820; J. RZOŃCA, *Klienci Konstantego Wasyla Ostrogskiego w walce z unią brzeską na sejmach przełomu XVI i XVII wieku*, in: *Patron i dwór. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI-XVIII wieku*, pod red. E. DUBAS-URWANOWICZ, J. URWANOWICZA, Warszawa, 2006, p. 310, 315-320.

turned into potential hostages at its owners' will. In 1573 the proposition was finally accepted and the Jesuits came to Jaroslav.²⁴

Thus the first Jesuit college in Ruthenia was established, and Zofia became the first secular founder of the Society of Jesus in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. From 1573 onwards, the Jesuit house in Jaroslav developed dynamically, growing into a solidly based and well-organized Jesuit centre. In 1574, Zofia was married for the second time, this time to Jan Kostka from Sztemberg, and she expanded the foundations for the future Jesuit church and college. In 1575, the Jesuits opened a primary school with grammar classes and a school theatre. In 1576 the Marian Sodality of the Annunciation was started and in 1577 a poetics class was begun with a rhetoric class opened in the next year, thus making the Jesuit school a secondary one. The Jesuits also organized the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament for the townspeople. The Jesuits of Jaroslav founded a number of missions in Volhynia, Podolia, and Pokutia.²⁵

The third factor: the Academy of Ostroh (1576)

About 1576, in another region of Ruthenia, in Volhynia, Kostiantyn Vasyľ Ostroz'kyj founded an educational-publishing center at his residence in Ostroh, which was named the "academy" by contemporaries, according to a custom of the 15th-16th centuries for naming scholarly communities and circles. The initial aim of the academy was to prepare the first published edition of the Church Slavonic Bible in order to confirm the equality of this language with the other sacral languages, such as Hebrew and Latin. Probably around 1578, under the association of scholars, the academia, the printing house and the school were established. The academy was called the "Greek college", the "three-language lyceum" and the "three-language gymnasium". Taking into consideration the scarcity of knowledge as to the curricular contents, it is supposed that the subjects taught were within the seven *artes liberales*.²⁶ The humanistic notion of a Hebrew-Greek-Latin three-language lyceum

²⁴ K. LEŃ, *Jezuickie kolegium Św. Jana w Jarosławiu 1573-1773*, Kraków, 2000, p. 6-27.

²⁵ S. ZAŁĘSKI, *Jezuici w Polsce*. T. IV (1). Kraków, 1905, p. 158, 159, 163, 177, t. IV (3), Kraków, 1905, p. 160; K. LEŃ, *Jezuickie kolegium...* [see n. 24], p. 106-108.

was transformed into the idea of a Slavonic-Greek-Latin school on the Orthodox grounds in Ostroh, which later became a standard for Orthodox educational practice in Ruthenia.²⁷

One third of all the books published by the Ostroz'kys' printing houses in Ostroh and Derman' were liturgical service books and the writings of the Church Fathers. A third of the books were mainly anti-Catholic works, messages of Patriarchs and other persons of note (such as Kostiantyn Vasyľ Ostroz'kyj or Ivan Vyšens'kyj), as well as polemical works. A fifth of the books were Greek and Slavonic primers and readers for use in the school; a tenth of the books were editions of the New Testament, Psalter, and the Bible.²⁸

The first complete, printed edition of all the books of the Bible in Church Slavonic was prepared and published by the members of the Ostroh circle in 1581, and is recognized until now as a canon in the Orthodox Slavonic world from the textual point of view, and as a masterpiece of Slavonic printing art from the polygraphical point of view. The Bible was composed on the basis of comparing and translating various copies of books of the Bible into the Greek, Latin, Church Slavonic, and Czech languages, and, especially, the manuscript sent by the Pope.²⁹

²⁶ I. Z. MYC'KO, *Ostroz'ka slov'jano-hreko-latyns'ka akademija (1576-1635)*, Kyjiv, 1990, p. 20, 24-26.

²⁷ J. ISAJEVYČ, "Lycaum Trilingue": koncepcija humanistyčnoji školy v Jevropi, in: *Ostroz'ka davnyna*, 1995, Vyp. 1, p. 8-12.

²⁸ This was calculated on the basis of the list of twenty-seven titles of the printing house in Ostroh and three titles of the printing house in Derman'. (J. ZAPASKO, J. ISAJEVYČ, *Kataloh starodrukiv. Knyha perša (1574-1700)*. L'viv, 1981, n^{os} 3, 4, 10-13, 16-20, 31-33, 36-42, 44, 61, 63, 64, 66, 68, 70, 87, 88.) My results are a little bit different from those of J. Isajevyč, presented in: J. D. ISAJEVYČ, *Preemniki pervopečatnika*, Moskva, 1981, p. 19.

²⁹ Antonio Possevino wrote about the "Schiavona" manuscript sent by the Pope (J. KRAJCAR, *Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij and Rome in 1582-1584*, in: *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, Romae, 1969, vol. 35, fasciculus 1, p. 195.) J. Isajevyč and I. Z. Myc'ko presumed it was the Greek language manuscript from the Pope (J. D. ISAJEVYČ, *Literaturna spadščyna Ivana Fedorova*, L'viv 1989, p. 135; I. Z. MYC'KO, *Ostroz'ka...* [see n. 26], p. 107). Among the copies, known for certain, which were used for comparing and translating, there were the Greek Septuaginta (it was stressed on the title page of this edition that the Bible was a detailed translation of this copy) and the Church Slavonic Bible of Gennadij of 1499, which was a gift of Ivan IV the Terrible, which was mentioned by Kostiantyn Vasyľ Ostroz'kyj in the foreword.

Insofar as far as Prince Ostroz'kyj himself and the Jesuits were among the main protagonists of religious life in Ruthenia at that time, modern historiography links the establishment of the academy to the Jesuits' activity, and asserts that the academy was founded by Ostroz'kyj as a countermeasure to their actions, as well as an answer to Skarga's challenge to the Orthodox in his book "O jedności kościoła Bożego...".³⁰

However, Skarga's book was published after Ostroz'kyj's "providing his answer" to it in founding the academy. Rather, Skarga's book was an "answer" to the Prince's plans for the foundation of the academy. After all, the book was published in early 1577 and the academy, as a publishing-educational centre, was founded in late 1576. Hence, it is possible that Skarga's statement about the impossibility and the lack of precedence for studying in the Church Slavonic language in colleges and academies was a rebuke to Ostroz'kyj's plans.³¹

We should seek the Orthodox Prince's "foundational motivations" not in the dimension of his personal controversy with the Jesuits, nor even, with one very famous Jesuit, but in the realm of the activity of persons of the Prince's circle and standing. During the expansion of the Reformation, the Lithuanian and Polish magnates and nobles, who had recently converted to Protestantism, began building houses of worship with attached schools on their private estates. The most famous educational initiatives of the Protestant aristocracy were schools for their communities established in the years after 1550. Calvinist schools were founded by Mikołaj Oleśnicki in Pińczów, by Stanisław Szafranec in Secemin, by Stanisław Michał Stadnicki in Dubieck, and by Andrzej Myszkowski in Bychawa. Also, the Czech Brethrens' school was founded by Rafał Leszczyński in Leszno.³²

³⁰ See for instance the latest works in the Ukrainian and Polish historiography: M. B. ТОПОЛСКА, *Stan wyznaniowej i językowej tożsamości Rusinów w Rzeczypospolitej obojga narodów (1569-1648)*, in: *Europa Środkowo-Wschodnia. Ideologia, historia a społeczeństwo. Księga poświęcona pamięci Profesora Wojciecha Peltza*, Zielona Góra, 2005, p. 58; *Spółczesność-religia-kultura, Między sobą. Szkice historyczne polsko-ukraińskie*, pod red. T. CHYNCZEWSKIEJ-HENNEL, N. JAKOWENKO, Lublin, 2000, p. 125; N. JAKOWENKO, *Historia Ukrainy od czasów najdawniejszych do końca XVIII wieku*, Lublin, 2000, p. 159.

³¹ I. Z. MYC'KO, *Ostroz'ka...* [see n. 26], p. 28-29.

³² S. TWOREK, *Szkolnictwo protestanckie w epoce Reformacji i Kontreformacji*, in: *Wkład protestantyzmu do kultury polskiej*, Warszawa, 1970, p. 113-119.

At the time of the establishment of the Ostroh publishing-educational centre, there were already two printing houses functioning on the estates of the Protestant relatives of Kostiantyn Vasyľ Ostroz'kyj. Thus the representative of the richest and most powerful family of Greater Poland, Łukasz Górka (1533-1573), Voievode of Poznań, who was an adherent of the Czech Brethren and later became a Lutheran (he was the last husband of Kostiantyn Vasyľ Ostroz'kyj's niece Halszka [Polish *Elżbieta*]), sponsored the translations of Protestant religious works into Polish. In 1558-1561, the printing house of another adherent of the Czech Brethren, Aleksander Augездеcki, functioned on his estate, Szamotuły. From 1560-1570, five general synods of the Czech Brethren and Lutherans took place in Górka's palace in Poznań, and from 1563 on, Lutheran services were held there.³³ The Prince's son-in-law, the leader of the Lithuanian Arians, Jan Kiszka, opened a printing house in 1570 at his estate Węgrów, and later in Łosk, where Szymon Budny published the New Testament in 1574.³⁴

At the moment of the publishing of the Ostroh Bible, a precedent existed. A Protestant magnate in the GDL had financed the preparation and publication of all the books of the Bible. From 1560-1563, the Calvinist Mikołaj Radziwiłł Czarny, Lithuanian Chancellor and Voievode of Wilno, sponsored the translation and publication of the Polish language Bible, the so-called *Biblia Brzeska* (or *Biblia Radziwiłłowska*, *Biblia Pińczowska*). The sole example of such activity among Orthodox magnates can be found in a short-term financing by Hrehory Chodkiewicz, Grand Hetman of Lithuania, Voivode of Kyjiv and Vitebsk, from 1568-1570, in Zabłudów, of the printing house where "Učytel'ne Evangelije [The Gospel]" was printed in Church Slavonic. So it is not difficult to see that Ostroz'kyj's publishing-educational activity in the Orthodox area ties in with the paradigmatic analogical activity by his contemporaries, including Protestant magnates and nobles.³⁵ This

³³ W. DWORZACZEK, *Łukasz Górka*, in: PSB. T. VIII. Wrocław-Kraków-Warszawa, 1959-1960, p. 413; A. SĄKOWSKI, *Życie kulturalne w XVI i w pierwszej połowie XVII w.*, in: *Dzieje Wielkopolski*, pod red. J. TOPOLSKIEGO, T. I: *Do r. 1793*, Poznań, 1969, p. 594.

³⁴ A. KAWECKA-GRYCZOWA, *Drukarze dawnej Polski od XV do XVIII wieku*. Z. 5: *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*, Wrocław, 1959, p. 123, 126.

³⁵ It is known, that Ostroz'kyj directly contacted prince Andrej Kurbskij, an organizer and sponsor of the translating circle in Myljanovyči in Volhynia (M.

observation can be seen as evidence confirming Serhij Plochy's assertion that Ostroz'kyj tried to turn Ostroh into an Orthodox Geneva, where the reformed Orthodox faith would be the political equivalent of the Calvinism so many Polish and Lithuanian magnates found so attractive.³⁶

The Jesuit Piotr Skarga

Thus, it is no wonder that in 1577, in the book *O jedności kościoła Bożego...* Piotr Skarga appealed to Prince Ostroz'kyj as a person who was also keen to promote the reform of the Orthodox Church and, correspondingly, was potentially able to direct that reform towards the unification of the Ruthenian Church with the Roman. Skarga regretted that the Ruthenians had been tolerant with heretics, and thus, appealed to them to accept the union, so as not to destroy their souls through heresies.³⁷ The Jesuit viewed the aim of the union to be the submission of Orthodox believers to the Pope's authority, as a guarantee of maintaining the nature of Christ's true Church.³⁸

In this context, Skarga understood Prince Ostroz'kyj's joining the union as tantamount to his conversion to Catholicism, as evidenced by the example of his children Kateryna and Januš.³⁹ The Jesuit thought that it would be necessary for the Prince's salvation to dissent "from the schism" immediately, before the general unification of the Churches could come about.⁴⁰ Despite the fact that Skarga acknowledged the possibility of preserving the Eastern rite, he considered acceptance of the Latin rite the ideal course of action.⁴¹

HRUŠEVSKYJ, *Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy*. T. VI. Kyjiv, 1995, p. 437-444; I. Z. MYČKO, *Oseredky kul'tury pry magnats'kyx i šljaxets'kyx dvorax*, in: *Ukrajins'ka kul'tura XIII - peršoji polovyny XVII stolit'*, pid red. J. D. ISAJEVYČA, Kyjiv, 2001, p. 531-539).

³⁶ S. PLOCHY, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*, Oxford, 2001. The title of the Ukrainian translation: *Nalyvajkova vira: Kozactvo ta religija v rann'omodernij Ukrajinі*, Kyjiv, 2006, p. 106, 112.

³⁷ P. SKARGA, *O jedności Kościoła Bożego...* [see n. 16], sz. 500.

³⁸ P. SKARGA, *O jedności Kościoła Bożego...* [see n. 16], sz. 228, 317-318.

³⁹ P. SKARGA, *O jedności Kościoła Bożego...* [see n. 16], sz. 230-231.

⁴⁰ P. SKARGA, *O jedności Kościoła Bożego...* [see n. 16], sz. 236.

⁴¹ P. SKARGA, *O jedności Kościoła Bożego...* [see n. 16], sz. 385, 491.

K. Chodyncki has drawn attention to an egregious inconsistency in two of Skarga's statements — the laity's pernicious influence in Orthodox Church matters, which caused a decline in respect towards the Orthodox clergy, and the clerical authorities' dependence on secular authority. Therefore, there an appeal was made to abandon the Orthodox clergy, should they oppose the union, and unite with Rome without them.⁴² Nevertheless, Piotr Skarga's aim was not reforming the Orthodox Church in order to eliminate its existing failings and shortcomings, but rather unification (or, at least, of its most influential believers, so they would be an example for the rest) within the Catholic fold.

The desperation in Skarga's efforts is revealed by the very fact of his appealing to Prince Ostroz'kyj with such a proposal. Appropriation of this variant of the union would have meant the Prince's voluntary rejection of the political and economic prerogatives the head of the Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was accustomed to, and, at the same time, the loss of political and economic benefits and privileges based on those prerogatives, within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the whole Christian world. The example of the Prince's own children's conversion to Catholicism was grounded in the lamest of reasons, especially as regards Januś. Firstly, Skarga held up the children as an example of those who had already united "z Zachodnią świtłością [with the Western Brightness]", but his example violated the Prince's traditional understanding of a model of family relations based on the medieval values of respect and piety to "the good antiquity" that, of course, being Orthodoxy. For Ostroz'kyj, this was an imposition of unacceptable "innovations",⁴³ and vio-

⁴² K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny a Rzeczpospolita Polska. Zarys historyczny 1370-1632*. Warszawa, 1934, p. 218-219.

⁴³ A striking example here is the remark by Nuncio Alberto Bolognetti, that Ostroz'kyj was not interested in mathematical and astronomical arguments in the matter of calendar reform, but rather in keeping the principle "nihil innovetur". However, Ostroz'kyj was impressed by the argument that the calendar was a return to a cherished antiquity and, therefore, promised to correspond with the Patriarch of Constantinople in the future on this matter, although the Patriarch had already rejected the reform. (*Polonia Vaticana* (MPV), ed. E. KUNTZE. T. 6. Cracoviae, 1938, N 224, p. 384. See concerning the understanding of the term "antiquity" and the adaptation of the only profitable "innovations" in Lithuanian Ruthenia: M. KRÓM, "Starina" kak kategorija srednekovogo mentaliteta (po materialam Velikogo knjažestva Litovskogo XIV - načala XVII

lated the notion of a strong patriarchy with its firm obedience to father and filial piety.⁴⁴

Secondly, Skarga was seen as impudent in the eyes of Ostroz'kyj, due to his direct criticism of the Prince's dear "antiquity", namely Orthodox theology, dogma, rites and the Church Slavonic language, as well as being critical of actions he had taken regarding his converted son. Januś probably switched to Catholicism between 1569 and 1573,⁴⁵ which, of course, caused friction and conflict with his father.⁴⁶ What is more, the Jesuit not only tried to defend and acquit the son, but to represent the son's act as heroic, writing that Januś was far from dishonoring the glory of the Prince and his famous ancestors, but, on the contrary, had increased it, conciliating the fact that he himself had two grandfathers who were of different religious confessions. Skarga wrote about Januś's fortitude in

vekov), in: *Mediaevalia Ucrainica: mental'nist' ta istorija idej*. T. 3. Kyjiv, 1994, p. 68-85; N. JAKOVENKO, "Čolovik dobryj" i "čolovik zlyj": z istoriji mental'nyx ustanovok v Ukrajini-Rusi kincja XVI - seredyny XVII st., in: *Mediaevalia Ucrainica...* T. 1. Kyjiv, 1992, p. 86-91.

⁴⁴ We mentioned earlier Kostiantyn Vasyl' Ostroz'kyj's practice of absolute dominance over even his adult sons. It was typical at that time and, in most cases, only ended with the father's death. (J. S. BYSTROŃ, *Dzieje obycajów w dawnej Polsce. Wiek XVI-XVIII*. T. II. Warszawa, 1976, p. 124-125; M. BOGUCKA, *The foundations of the old Polish world: Patriarchalism and the family. Introduction into the problem*, in: *Acta Poloniae Historica*, vol. 69, 1994, p. 37, 48-49, 52-53; M. BOGUCKA, *The lost world of the "Sarmatians". Custom as the regulator of Polish social life in Early Modern times*, Warszawa, 1996, p. 52-53, 65, 69, 69-70.)

⁴⁵ That occurred when he was 17-20 years old, during his stay at the Habsburg court. This time frame was established by Jan Krajcar, on the basis of a manuscript from the History of the Society of Jesus in Poland from 1571-79, which is contained in: [ARCHIVUM ROMANUM SOCIETATIS IESU (ARSI), PROVINCIAM POLONIAE (PROV. POL.), vol. 50: *Annuae et Historia poloniae: 1555-1600. Historia Societatis Iesu in Polonia ad annum 1578, in qua plura praesertim de Collegio Posnaniensi (1571-1579)*, f. 16^v. See in his article: J. KRAJCAR, *Jesuits and the genesis...* [see n. 15], p. 145-146.

⁴⁶ Corroboration of such a conflict between Kostiantyn Vasyl' and Januś may be based on a reference by the Nuncio Bolognetti's secretary, Horatius Spannocchi, in his report of 1583, that prince Ostroz'kyj refused to see his son for several months after he found out about Januś's conversion to Catholicism (*Monumenta Ucrainae Historica* (MUH), coll. P. Athanasius G. WELYKYJ OSBM. T. I: *1075-1623*. Romae, 1964, N 100, p. 52-53.) and also, a possibly exaggerated story about the father's oppression of Januś for leaving Orthodoxy, after his return from Vienna: the son was imprisoned and there was an apparent attempt to kill him by sword (K. NIESIECKI, *Herbarz Polski*. T. VII. Lipsk, 1841, p. 187).

spiritual matters, for which he was ready to suffer greatly, even denoting it as a sign of Divine Providence, with a view to the father doing the same.⁴⁷

Thirdly subsequent events revealed that Prince Ostroz'kyj was not interested in such insignificant plans for a regional Church union at all, but was interested in more ambitious projects in the political and religious sphere, on a more grandiose scale.

Therefore the Prince not only refused the Polish Jesuit's suggestions, but ordered Arian Motowiłło to write an answer.⁴⁸ Skarga wrote in 1590 in the preface to the second edition of his book, perhaps, hinting at the attitude of Prince Ostroz'kyj, that after the first edition came out, "wykupiła je bogatsza Ruś i spaliła [it was bought up and burnt by the richer Ruthenians]".

2. The Jesuit Possevino and Prince Ostroz'kyj: why did the attempt at Church union fail (1538-1584)

The Jesuit Antonio Possevino

Prince Kostiantyn Vasył' Ostroz'kyj's next direct contact with representatives of the Society of Jesus involved negotiations with an outstanding Italian Jesuit, Antonio Possevino,⁴⁹ in 1583-1584. It is important to note that Prince Ostroz'kyj's position in the negotiations may have been influenced by two events that gave him wider playing space in both the religious and political spheres. The first event was the death, in May 1583, of Prince Andrej Kurbskij, a prolific Orthodox writer and staunch critic of the Jesuits.⁵⁰ The second event was his recent establishment of good rela-

⁴⁷ P. SKARGA, *O jedności Kościoła Bożego...* [see n. 16], sz. 230-231.

⁴⁸ Ostroz'kyj protected Arians, who had houses of worship in four of his estates, including Ostroh, and dedicated their works to him; some of the Arians thought the Prince was their secret follower. What is more, in 1574, the Prince's daughter Hał'ska was married to the main protector of Lithuanian Arians, Jan Kiszka. (O. LEVICKIJ, *Socynianstvo v Pol'se i Južo-Zapadnoj Rossii*. Kiev, 1882, p. 37; *Arxiv Južo-Zapadnoj Rossii*, č. 1, t. 6. Kiev, 1883, p. 136.)

⁴⁹ About Antonio Possevino (1533-1611), see Barbara WOLF-DAHM, *Possevino Antonio*, in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, t. 7, c. 857-862, Herzberg, 1994; *Antonio Possevino. I gesuiti e la loro eredità culturale in Transilvania*. Atti della Giornata di Studio Cluj-Napoca, 4 dicembre 2007, a cura di Alberto CASTALDINI (Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.I., 67), Roma, 2009.

⁵⁰ Prince Andrej Kurbskij himself and his collaborators were engaged in getting books, in particular the Bible, printed in Ostroh. Members of Kurbskij's circle were Catholics in the majority. They translated the Fathers' works, which

tions with an old competitor, Chancellor Tomasz Zamojski. Negotiations with Possevino started in Kraków in June 1583, where Ostroz'kyj and his three sons arrived on the occasion of the wedding of Zamojski and Gryzelda Batorówna.

As to Ostroz'kyj's contact with Possevino, it is worth pointing out the Jesuit's very high status. Possevino, "*l'uomo universale* in the best Renaissance tradition,"⁵¹ was an official representative of the Pope, his ambassador to Sweden, Muscovy, and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, a mediator at negotiations between Stefan Batory and Ivan IV the Terrible, and Batory's advisor, as well as a mediator at his negotiations with Rudolph II. In contrast to Possevino, Skarga was only a Vice-Rector of the Wilno college in 1577, descending from the Masovian petty nobles (the so-called *zaściankowa szlachta*) or even, as they were regarded by some nobles of the day, from rich peasants. That fact was known to Prince Ostroz'kyj who, actually, disdainfully, called his Volhynian nobles *Hryci*,⁵² a nickname for persons of plebeian origins, despite the fact that his clients were representatives of the most powerful Volhynian aristocracy.⁵³

Possevino and the Prince were linked by mutual educational interests, because the legate was the organizer of Papal seminaries under the auspices of the Jesuit colleges in Braniewo, Wilno, Riga, Dorpat and Kolozsvár.

Skarga took the first initiative in contacting Prince Ostroz'kyj,⁵⁴ but in Possevino's case, the initiative was suggested by a third party, the Nuncio in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Anto-

could be used against Protestantism. And when rigorist Kurbskij got a copy of Skarga's book from Ostroz'kyj, with Motowiłło's answer, he severely criticized Ostroz'kyj, who entrusted heretics with the defense of the Orthodox Church and kept those "venomous dragons" in his home. (I. Z. Myc'ko, *Oseredky kul'tury...* [see n. 35], p. 531-539.)

⁵¹ J. KRAJCAR, *Jesuits...* [see n. 15], p. 143.

⁵² *Hryc'* (singular) and *Hryci* (plural) were the diminutive forms of the name *Hryhorij*, i. e. Gregory.

⁵³ N. JAKOVENKO *Polityčna kul'tura elit*, in: *Ukrajins'ka kul'tura...* p. 370-371.

See typical examples of the Princes' disdain for these subordinate court officials-nobles, and for judicial authority and law in general, in: N. JAKOVENKO, *Ukrajins'ka šljachtá...* [see n. 3], p. 115-117.

⁵⁴ Skarga got permission from the Provincial and the General of the Order before publishing his book. Jan Krajcar has shown clearly that the Polish Jesuit had no "special task" from the superior authority in Rome and that the call to union was his private initiative. Therefore, it is possible that Skarga might have

nio Bolognetti. It was he who brought Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ to Possevino to discuss the matter of union.⁵⁵ At that time, Possevino and Bolognetti together had been contacting the Ostroz'kyjs on various issues. Bolognetti informed the Holy See about the course of negotiations with the Ostroz'kyj Princes collectively, as well as each individually, and, finally with the most influential persons of the Ostroz'kyjs' milieu.⁵⁶ Bolognetti was also responsible in helping Prince Ostroz'kyj find proper lecturers for his academy,⁵⁷ supervising ongoing correspondence with the Patriarchs on the matter of the new calendar,⁵⁸ and managing estate matters of the Ostroz'kyjs at the Emperor's court.⁵⁹

The main topics were "helping the soul" of Prince Ostroz'kyj and "spreading the Catholic religion".⁶⁰ That was how Bolognetti diplomatically defined the initial expectations of the Roman Church, resulting in the conversion of Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ and thence, with his support, to spreading Catholicism throughout Ruthenian lands.⁶¹ However, after personal conversations with Ostroz'kyj, Bolognetti had his doubts about converting him personally, and so hoped that Ostroz'kyj would "at least" accept a union of the Churches.⁶² Bolognetti's supposed that sending proper lecturers from Rome to the Ostroh academy and a positive decision concerning Ostroz'kyjs' estate, Makovica, in Slovakia, the landholdings of Januś's wife Zuzanna, and the estate, Raudnica, in Bohemia, and Januś's mother's landholdings, might help make Prince

run into obstacles from the authorities of the Polish Province in publishing *O jedności Kościoła Bożego* (J. KRAJCAR, *Jesuits...* [see n. 15], p. 146-149).

⁵⁵ S. ZAŁĘSKI, *Jezuici w Polsce*. T. I (1). Lwów, 1900, p. 328-329.

⁵⁶ *MPV...* T. 6. N 205, p. 361-366, N 245, p. 422; T. 7. N 273, p. 413; *Monumenta Ucrainae Historica (MUH)*, coll. metropolita A. ŠEPTYCKYJ, ed. metropolita J. SLIPYJ. T. IX-X: *1075-1632*. Romae, 1971, N 44, p. 101-106; N 50, p. 111-112.

⁵⁷ *MPV...* T. 6. N 111, 114, p. 198, 201, N 205, p. 361-366; *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 55, p. 115-116.

⁵⁸ *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 43, p. 99-101, N 224, p. 384.

⁵⁹ *MPV...* N 224, p. 386; *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 44, p. 101-106, N 55, p. 115-116, N 63, p. 121-122.

⁶⁰ *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 40, p. 97-98.

⁶¹ *MPV...* N 220, p. 381-382.

⁶² *Rossija i Italija. Sbornik istoričeskix materialov i issledovanij, kasajuščixsja snošenij Rossii s Italiej*, izd. E. ŠMURLO. T. 2, č. 1. SPb, 1913, p. 339-340; *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 55, p. 115-116.

Kostiantyn Vasyl' more favorable in the matter of the Ruthenians' union with Rome.⁶³

The key issue in these negotiations, which the Jesuits had been promoting with the greatest interest, was the Prince's assistance in gaining approval for the new Roman calendar by Eastern Patriarchs. The issue of mediation in the negotiations with the Emperor concerning the Ostroz'kyjs' estates in Bohemia and Slovakia (that property issue was turned over to the Apostolic Nuncio in Vienna at a certain stage),⁶⁴ and Prince Ostroz'kyj's personal involvement in the union were mentioned less often in Possevino's correspondence, but they were no less important. At the same time, the Italian Jesuit tried to organize the printing of Catechisms in the Ruthenian and Muscovian languages in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Possevino's main motivation in the negotiations with the Ostroz'kyjs was the realization of his famous personal plans for providing conditions favorable for the propagation of Catholicism in Eastern Europe. First of all, by "combining the Orthodox Christians with God", and creating an anti-Turkish league of Christian states. Being absorbed by this idea of religious union between Moscow and Rome, Possevino reached the conclusion that the way to union with Muscovy lay in union with Ruthenia, because Muscovy had been dependent regarding religious issues on Ruthenia's Metropolitane of Kyjiv, which had been consecrating Muscovian bishops until quite recently. So "maximi vero ponderis futurum sit ad Moscoviam convertendam, si Episcopi, sive Vladycae regiae Russiae se Catholicae Ecclesiae aggregarent [that the bishops of the Kingdom Ruthenia join the Catholic Church would be of great importance for the conversion of Muscovy]".⁶⁵

The process of unification of the Ruthenian Orthodox Church with the Roman Church was planned and based on the subordination of the Ruthenian hierarchy to pontifical authority, the unity of the faith, and a temporary tolerance of the Eastern rite. Possevino proposed realizing his plan by converting influential Ruthenian magnates to Catholicism, by founding papal seminaries and

⁶³ *MPV...* N 111, 114, p. 198, 201, N 224, p. 386, N 227, p. 396-397.

⁶⁴ *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 54, p. 114-115.

⁶⁵ Quoting from: K. ЧОДУНИЦКИ, *Kościół Prawosławny...* [see n. 42], p. 233; S. ZALEŃSKI, *Jezuici...* [see n. 55], p. 328.

by printing Catholic books in the Ruthenian language.⁶⁶ In June 1583, Nuncio Bolognetti negotiated the issue of conversion with the Ostroz'kyj Princes and Prince Jurij Slu'kyj (Polish *Jerzy Słucki*). The latter was inclined to adopt Catholicism due to the Nuncio's influence, although the Eastern liturgical rite was to be preserved intact. Bolognetti wanted to influence Prince Ostroz'kyj in a similar way, especially through his contacts with Possevino.⁶⁷

Evidently, Prince Ostroz'kyj's potential influence on the Orthodox world was highly regarded, for it was he who was chosen as a mediator to convince the Patriarch of Constantinople to embrace the new Roman calendar. An analysis of Prince Ostroz'ky's mediation reveals that the Prince voluntarily reproduced the positions held by the Holy See on the issue, as expressed by the Jesuits. Nor was the Prince discouraged by Patriarch Jeremiah II's March prohibition against Orthodox Christians' embracing the new calendar, an action personally directed at the Prince,⁶⁸ nor by the stiffworded synod letter which he, too, received in June 1583, from the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Patriarch of Alexandria.⁶⁹ Ostroz'kyj had coordinated the contents of his letters to the Patriarch concerning the calendar issue with Possevino,⁷⁰ sending him the originals received from both the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria.⁷¹ He also signed his own name and sent replies to the Eastern Patriarchs that were previously prepared by Possevino and reviewed by other Jesuits: Roberto Bellarmino and Cristoforo Clavio, and approved by the General, Claudio Aquaviva in Rome.⁷²

Possevino insisted that the answers should be translated into the Eastern vernaculars and sent to the Orthodox lands in thousands of exemplars. That idea, however, was disapproved of by the Holy See, which had entered into diplomatic relations with the Patriarch

⁶⁶ K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny...* [see n. 42], p. 233-235, 241.

⁶⁷ K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny...* [see n. 42], p. 233-234, 243-245.

⁶⁸ T. CHYNCZEWSKA-HENNEL, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrojski*, in: *PSB*. T. XXIV. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk, 1979, p. 492.

⁶⁹ *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 52, p. 29-33.

⁷⁰ A. THEINER, *Annales Ecclesiastici*. T. III. Romae, 1856, p. 436-437; *MPV*, ed. E. KUNTZE. T. VII. Cracoviae, 1948, N 38, p. 50.

⁷¹ *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 46, p. 107-108.

⁷² *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 92, p. 49-50; *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 49, p. 110-111; N 71, p. 127; J. KRAJCAR, *Konstantin Basil Ostrojskij...* [see n. 29], p. 206.

of Constantinople in early 1584 and had no desire to irritate him with the sensitive matter of the new calendar.⁷³

Prince Ostroz'kyj demonstrated the same mutual understanding with Possevino in the matter of printing books in the Ruthenian language. In January 1583, the Jesuit suggested a plan for organizing a printing house in Kraków to publish Catechisms and other religious books for Ruthenians and Moscovites,⁷⁴ but the plan failed for several reasons. Firstly, Possevino could not get from Rome the Cyrillic types that had been used recently for the printing of the Slavic Catechism. Secondly, with Prince Ostroz'kyj's assistance, Possevino compared a leaf of the Slavic Catechism from the Roman press with one from the Bible from the Ostroh press and found that the types from the Roman press were quite suitable for Wallachians, Moldavians, Serbians and Slavonians, but not for Ruthenians and Moscovites.⁷⁵ Obviously, Ostroz'kyj and Possevino were quite interested in a collaboration, for the Prince proposed sending his man to Rome in order to help in making proper types for Ruthenia, and Possevino presented a plan for printing Ruthenian Catechisms not only in Wilno, but also in Volhynia, in the Ostroh printing house.⁷⁶ Despite untruthful encouragements of the Holy See by Possevino and the Nuncio (maybe at Possevino's suggestion), who were assuming that the Ostroh Bible had been published mainly on the basis of a manuscript sent from Rome several years earlier,⁷⁷ their proposals did not meet with the Holy See's approval.

Additionally, the Society of Jesus could not itself be of help to Pope Gregorius XIII in keeping his promise to Prince Ostroz'kyj of finding two lecturers for the Prince's academy, who would be well versed in Greek, Slavonic, or at least in Latin.⁷⁸ No qualified persons were found in the Pontifical Greek College of St. Athanasius,

⁷³ S. ZAŁĘSKI, *Jezuici...* [see n. 55], p. 330; J. KRAJCAR, *Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij...* [see n. 29], p. 206.

⁷⁴ We may assume, that he was going to publish so called *Minor Catechism* of the Jesuit Petrus Canisius, *Parvus catechismus catholicorum* (1556), which had been translated into Polish by the Polish Jesuit Jakub Wujek and was reprinted forty times in the Polish and Latin languages. The first Polish edition was published in 1560 or 1566 in Kraków.

⁷⁵ J. KRAJCAR, *Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij...* [see n. 29], p. 197-198.

⁷⁶ *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 52, p. 113.

⁷⁷ *MPV*, ed. E. KUNTZE. T. 6. Cracoviae, 1938, N 245, p. 422.

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, N 229, p. 401.

leded by Jesuits, which prepared priests for the East.⁷⁹ Possevino's and the Nuncio's mediation in the estate matters of the Ostroz'kyjs at the Habsburg court in Vienna also failed.

Although Possevino supposed that it would be possible to spread Catholicism and overwhelm the Reformation in Hungary using the influence of Prince Januš Ostroz'kyj, the Ostroz'kyjs were unable to recover either of their landholdings: Makovica in Slovakia, nor Raudnica in Bohemia.⁸⁰

It seems that Rome itself was always ready to sacrifice Possevino's plans, which might have facilitated the conversion of the most powerful Orthodox Prince, out of higher political motives (as had been the case as to printing and spreading the replies to the Ecumenical Patriarch concerning calendar reform), for the sake of saving money (this was an official reason for refusing the organization of a printing house with the Ruthenian press in Kraków),⁸¹ and for other unknown purposes or even intrigues (as was the case in refusing the assistance of a typographer from Ostroh, or in the matter of organizing printing houses in Wilno and in Volhynia).⁸²

The issue of union in the negotiations of 1583-84

Although Possevino wrote repeatedly about his expectations that the Ruthenian Prince would join the Roman Church, it seemed that he failed to put any pressure on Ostroz'kyj. Nuncio Bolognetti even blamed the Jesuit before the Roman Curia, saying that he had only grudgingly discussed the union issue with the Prince at all.⁸³ Good relations between Possevino and Ostroz'kyj,

⁷⁹ *Ibidem*, N 300, p. 532.

⁸⁰ K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny...* [see n. 42], p. 249; T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski wobec katolicyzmu i wyznań protestanckich*, in: *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, XL (1996), p. 24.

⁸¹ J. KRAJCAR, *Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij...* [see n. 29], p. 197.

⁸² Possevino had very high-ranking ill-wishers among the Jesuit officials such as, General Vicarious Oliverio or Cardinal Francisco Toletus, as well as among the high church clergy, such as Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius, the Prince-bishop of Warmia, and Nuncio Bolognetti. Skarga was also one of Possevino's severe critics. (S. ZAŁĘSKI, *Jezuici...* [see n. 55], p. 335-337; L. BORATYŃSKI, *Studia nad nuncjaturą polską Bolognettiego (1581-85)*, in: *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejności. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny*. 1907, t. 49, p. 76-88; *Z dworu Stanisława Hozjusza. Listy Stanisława Reszki do Marcina Kromera 1568-158*. Wstęp, przekł. i koment. J. A. KALINOWSKIEJ. Olsztyn, 1992, N 178, p. 223-224; N 191, p. 242.)

⁸³ K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny...* [see n. 42], p. 249.

who was unlikely to react positively to direct pressure, were in all evidence in favour of Bolognetti's suggestions.

We can assume that Possevino had chosen discreet tactics, not only because he had taken the fiasco of Skarga's approach into consideration, but also thanks to the advice of his old acquaintance, Dionysius Ralli Paleologus, whom he had become acquainted with many years earlier in France.⁸⁴ Paleologus, Archbishop of Cyzius, became a "gran favorito del signor duca [a big favorite of the lord Prince]"⁸⁵ and had lived in Ostroh since his arrival there around 1578-79 from Rome, carrying the Bible manuscript for Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl.⁸⁶ He became a leading candidate for the mission to the Eastern Patriarchs concerning the introduction of the new calendar. The creation of a philo-Catholic atmosphere in Ostroh and exerting influence on the second Prince's son, Kostiantyn's, conversion decision were ascribed to Paleologus. Possevino willingly consulted with him about the Ruthenian problem.⁸⁷ Maybe it was Paleologus who Prince Ostroz'kyj mentioned ten years later as "presbyters" who had held counsel with him in his appeal to the Pope: "...ważyłem z Possewinem papieża rzymskiego o niektórych potrzebnych rzeczach Pisma św. nie sam, ale ze swoimi starszemi i presbyterami radzić i dysputować [Possevino and I decided, not alone, but with my superiors and presbyters, to seek advise and discuss about some necessary matters from the Holy Scripture with the Pope]".⁸⁸

Despite amicable relations with Possevino, the Ostroz'kyjs in first instance discussed their large scale political actions with the Nuncio Bolognetti. For instance, in July of 1583 Dionysius Ralli presented the Nuncio with a proposal for the transfer of the Patri-

⁸⁴ *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 46, p. 107-108.

⁸⁵ Nuncio Bolognetti referred to him in a letter to his brother on 8 June, 1583 (*MUH...* [see n. 56], N 44, p. 105.).

⁸⁶ In Ostroh, Paleologus took part in preparing the Church Slavonic Bible and was given the title of Archimandrite of the monastery of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary at Dorohobuż in Volhynia thanks to Ostroz'kyj (I. Z. МУС'КО, *Ostroz'ka...* [see n. 26], p. 107-108.).

⁸⁷ *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 100, p. 52-53; *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 50, p. 111-112; J. KRAJČAR, *Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij...* [see n. 29], p. 200-201; B. GUDZIAK, *Kryza i reforma: Kyjiv's'ka mytropolija, Carhorods'kyj patriarhat i geneza berestejs'koji uniji*, L'viv, 2000, p. 200-202.

⁸⁸ A quotation from: T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrožski wobec...* [see n. 80], p. 22.

archate from Constantinople to Ostroh or the founding there of a new one which would preserve the Orthodox rite, while subordinating it to the Pope. Paleologus, who was suspected by the Nuncio of the ambitious intention of becoming a head of that Patriarchate, was convinced that that would be merely “the most proper and shortest way” to reconciliation of the Ruthenian Church with Rome and would immediately bring Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ Ostroz’kyj into the union.⁸⁹

Bolognetti and the Holy See were very skeptical about the Ostroh project. Nevertheless, in a year’s time, once relations with the Prince were on the verge of failing, the representatives of Rome themselves proposed to the Prince that he put the proposal of transferring the Patriarchate to Ruthenia before the Patriarch of Constantinople. Rome’s decision arose in reaction to the internment of that Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremiah II, by the Turks on the island of Rhodes. The project was sent to Possevino by way of the Secretary of State of the Holy See, Cardinal Tolomeo Galli. He offered to help in obtaining Jeremiah II’s freedom, so as to make him the only Slavic Patriarch, and to settle him in Muscovy or the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, in that way facilitating the independence of the Orthodox Ruthenians and Moscovites from “Byzantium”, and thus making their unification with the Catholic Church easier. Possevino strongly objected to Moscow, supposing that a proper capital of the Patriarchate would be Kyjiv or, ideally, Rome, where the Patriarch could work for the unification of the Churches.⁹⁰

In June-August of 1584, Bolognetti and Possevino discussed how to expeditiously conceal the initial stage of the “Pontifical blessing” of the Patriarch from Orthodox believers, including Princes Ostroz’kyj and Sluc’kyj. However, Ostroz’kyj thought the Patriarch was imprisoned because of his sympathies toward the Church union (actually, the facts did not correspond to those presumptions) and

⁸⁹ T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyľ Ostrogski...* [see n. 4], p. 128; K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny...* [see n. 42], p. 233.

⁹⁰ There were other variants, such as Ostroh, the residence of Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ Ostroz’kyj, who was expected to join the union in the near future, and Luc’k (Polish *Łuck*). (K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny...* [see n. 42], p. 250-251; T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyľ Ostrogski...* [see n. 4], p. 129.)

even tried his best to liberate him.⁹¹ In late August 1584, Possevino presented Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ with a Papal brief with gifts and discussed projects for the Church union and transfer of the Patriarchate. The Jesuit described to the Prince perspectives for union with the Catholic Church, not only of the Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but also of that in Moscovy and the Ottoman Empire, as well as plans for transferring the Patriarchate to Wilno or L'viv. Ostroz'kyj promised to support those plans.⁹² The plans nevertheless failed for a number of reasons: because papal diplomacy was not able to liberate Jeremiah II, who did not consent to transferring the Patriarchate to Ruthenia and also had no intention of embracing the principles of the Florentine Union.

In fact, the Prince was interested in a positive resolution of two issues in his negotiations with the Holy See. There were the intervention regarding his estates in Habsburg territory and the reception of lecturers for the Ostroh academy. On the periphery was the third issue concerning the printing of Catechisms in the Ruthenian language. None of them was settled. Via the Prince's mediation, Possevino succeeded neither in getting approval for use of the new calendar nor in organizing the printing house. Nor did he succeed in persuading "the pillar of Orthodoxy" to join the union. All these failings were mainly due to third person interventions, i.e. the Patriarch of Constantinople, representatives of the Holy See's Secretariat of State and the Emperor Rudolph Habsburg.

The only issue which was dependent on Ostroz'kyj alone was his entrance into the Catholic Church. The Catholic party to negotiations no doubt had the right idea, that the Prince's joining was possibly based on the basic principles of the Florentine Union, which allowed him to embrace the dogmas of the Catholic Church, while at the same time preserving use of the Orthodox rite. If Prince Ostroz'kyj did not attach great importance to dogmatic matters, why did he finally reject the union in 1583-84? Moreover, he declared emotionally in his letter to Pope Gregorius XIII in July

⁹¹ MVP. T. 7, N 206, 258, p. 308-309, 385; T. KEMPA, *Unijne koncepcje Konstantego Wasyla Ostrogskiego*, in: *Czterechsellecie zawarcia Unii Brzeskiej 1596-1996. Materiały sesji naukowej zorganizowanej w Toruniu w dniach 28-29 listopada 1996*, pod red. S. ALEXANDROWICZA, T. KEMPY. Toruń, 1998, p. 37.

⁹² K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny...* [see n. 42], p. 251.

1583 that he was ready to give his life to unify Christendom,⁹³ and in August the Nuncio Bolognetti informed Rome that the Prince had said in public, that “if his Patriarch does not come to agreement with the Holy See, then he would come to agreement without the Patriarch”.⁹⁴

Firstly, Ostroz’kyj hesitated precisely because he was not an expert on dogmatic-ecclesiological problems and therefore needed to refer to the authority of the Patriarch and his decision.

Secondly, the Catholic party had no accurate plan for the union and thus all its efforts were directed to the Prince’s conversion to Catholicism, but not to the union.

Thirdly, as a politician, Prince Ostroz’kyj of course wanted to get some political dividends from embracing the union. If we assume that Prince Ostroz’kyj had a “Constantine complex”,⁹⁵ then those dividends might have been gained by two Ostrohian proposals. The first proposal envisaged the transfer of the Patriarchate from Constantinople to Ostroh or, in the worst case scenario, to another Ruthenian town. The creation of the Patriarchate in Ruthenian lands might bring representatives of the Ostroz’kyj family, who were already the de facto sovereigns of their estates, to the coronation of Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl’ by the Patriarch, with a Kingdom, as king or emperor. The second proposal envisaged the formation of a ‘military order of the Emperor Constantine’ in which the title of grand master should be bestowed upon Kostiantyn Vasyl’ and his eldest son Januš.⁹⁶ An implementation of those proposals might have been construed as some kind of logical institutionalization of an irrational-mystical perception of the Ruthe-

⁹³ MPV. T. 6. N 229, p. 401-402.

⁹⁴ A. WELYKYJ, *Litterae nuntiorum apostolicorum historiam ucrainae illustrantes (1550-1850)*. Vol. I-II. Romae, 1959, p. 210.

⁹⁵ This term was introduced by the Jesuit scholar Krajcar to explain such projects of the Ostroz’kyj Princes as the founding of the Patriarchate in Ostroh and the Knights’ order of the Emperor Constantine: J. KRAJCAR, *Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij...* [see n. 29], p. 207-214.

⁹⁶ These plans were presented to the Nuncio Bolognetti by Krzysztof Kazimirski, the secretary and chaplain of Januš Ostroz’kyj. Contrary to the Nuncio, Cardinal Tolomeo Galli took the proposals more seriously and adopted a sympathetic attitude towards the establishment of the new order of St. Constantine and expressed his hope that it would not be difficult to obtain the approval of the King of Poland (J. KRAJCAR, *Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij...* [see n. 29], p. 207-208.).

nian Princes as bearers of the highest law, giving them their specific sacral aura of highness by Divine providence.⁹⁷ Although the formula *Dei gratia* had only been used by sovereigns, there existed a perception that Prince Ostroz'kyj himself was a ruler "by the mercy of God",⁹⁸ or "by the grace of God".⁹⁹ He used the formula *Dei gratia* not only in his signatures, but also on his own seal: *Constantinus Constantini D[ei] G[ratia] Dux Ostrogoiae*.¹⁰⁰

The Princes' clients, both Orthodox (like Herasym Smotryč'kyj) and Catholic alike (such as Szymon Pękala), clearly described the Ostroz'kyjs as God's chosen people in their printed works. The Catholic Pękala stressed this further by likening the Ostroz'kyjs to the anointed sovereigns, the Emperor Constantine the Great, Volodymyr Svjatoslavyč and Jaroslav the Wise, calling them "monarchae [monarchs]" or even "semidei [demigods]".¹⁰¹ It is interesting to note that the Orthodox author of the *Volynskyyj korolkij litopys* [Volhynian brief chronicle] wrote in a panegyric addressed to Kostiantyn Ivanovyč, Kostiantyn Vasyl's father, that he was "not only worthy to occupy the local capital cities, but also to sit on a throne of God's city of Jerusalem".¹⁰²

Fourthly, the Patriarch of Constantinople did not agree to founding a Patriarchate in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

⁹⁷ For understanding the irrational aura of highness surrounding Princes in Ruthenia-Ukraine see in: N. JAKOVENKO, *Ukrajinska šljaxta...* [see n. 3], p. 81, 296; N. JAKOVENKO, *Topos zjednanyx narodiv u panehiryckax knjazjam Ostroz'kym i Zaslavskym (bilja vytokiv ukrajinskoji identyčnosti)*, in: N. JAKOVENKO, *Paralelnyj svit...* [see n. 13], p. 233-257.

⁹⁸ This is how Kostiantyn Vasyl' signed one of his letters to Silesia: "By the mercy of God, the Prince in Volhynia". See: N. JAKOVENKO, *Ukrajinska šljaxta...* [see n. 3], p. 110.

⁹⁹ "Blahodattju Božozu knjaz' Ostroz'kyj... u Bohospasajemomu i domonačal'nomu gradi mojemu Ostrozi [By the grace of God Prince Ostroz'kyj... in my God-blessed and ancestral town of Ostroh]". This is how the Prince introduced himself in a foreword to the Ostroh Bible (N. JAKOVENKO, *Ščo za vijnu opysuje Šymon Pekalid u poemi "De bello Ostrogiano" (1600)*, in: N. JAKOVENKO, *Paralelnyj svit...* [see n. 13], p. 177).

¹⁰⁰ The same concerned the Prince's sons, who were addressed according the analogical formula, as "Princes by the grace of God". (N. JAKOVENKO, *Ščo za vijnu opysuje...* [see n. 99], p. 177-178.)

¹⁰¹ See for details: N. JAKOVENKO, *Topos zjednanyx narodiv...* [see n. 97], p. 235-251; N. JAKOVENKO, *Ščo za vijnu opysuje...* [see n. 99], p. 174-188.

¹⁰² See: N. JAKOVENKO, *Topos zjednanyx narodiv...* [see n. 97], p. 237-238.

Fifthly, in early June 1583, in Kraków, before negotiations between the Ostroz'kyjs and the Nuncio had gotten under way, the Prince's son Kostiantyn informed Bolognetti about his intention of converting to Catholicism, unbeknownst to his father.¹⁰³ A chronicler of the Jesuit college in Jaroslav reported in 1583 that after his eldest son's conversion, Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl' obliged his other son, Kostiantyn, not to give up the Orthodox faith and even "uxoremque ei dedit, quae matrem haberet Ruthenicam [gave him a wife, whose mother was a Ruthenian]".¹⁰⁴ In September 1583, another Jesuit from the Jaroslav college, "an apostle of Ruthenia," Benedykt Herbest¹⁰⁵, reported to the Provincial of the Order that Prince Kostiantyn the younger and his wife had joined the Roman Church and confessed to Benedykt's brother, Jan Herbest. (Earlier, in late July 1583, the Archbishop of L'viv, Solikowski, also reported to Gregorius XIII about Jan Herbest's role in Prince Kostiantyn's conversion.¹⁰⁶ The Nuncio's version of Dionysius Paleologus's role might also be truthful. Possibly, Paleologus did his best in working for this conversion.) Benedykt Herbest visited Prince Kostiantyn and his wife in their Podolian residence in Snjatyn during his mission to Podolia and Pokutia. According to Herbest, the couple asked him insistently to accompany them on their trip to Lithuania in November in order to help them during "congressio acerrima [a sharp meeting]" with the Prince's father and the Princess's mother, and to try to convert their parents to the Catholic Church. Some others had asked Herbest to accomplish that task too, with the Archbishop of L'viv, Dymytr Solikowski, the first among them.¹⁰⁷ The father's reaction, as described by the Jaroslav chronicler, confirmed Kostiantyn the younger's fears as not having

¹⁰³ MPV. T. 6. N 205, p. 361-366; A. WELYKYJ, *Litterae nuntiorum apostolicorum...* [see n. 94], N 181, p. 168; MUH... [see n. 56], N 44, p. 101-106.

¹⁰⁴ Collegium Iaroslaviense 1583, in: *Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu, anni MDLXXXIII* [1583]. Romae, 1585, p. 92.

¹⁰⁵ About Benedykt Herbest (1531-1593), see R. AUBERT, *Herbest (Benedykt)*, in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, 23 (1990), Paris, c. 1374.

¹⁰⁶ See: T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski wobec...* [see n. 80], p. 27.

¹⁰⁷ *Ex literis P. Herbesti e Podolia in Septembri datis*, in: N. N. LJUBOVIĆ, *K istorii iezuitov v litovsko-russkix zemljax*. Varšava, 1888, p. 27-28. Probably, Gregorius XIII knew about the feelings of the young Prince Kostiantyn Ostroz'kyj, because in November 1583 the Pope sent him a congratulatory letter on the occasion of his union with the Catholic Church, contrary to his father's will

been groundless. The old Prince was very angry at his son and forbade him to appear in his presence.¹⁰⁸ Later Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ laid the blame for his son's conversion on the shoulders of the Archbishop of L'viv.¹⁰⁹ Perhaps, Ostroz'kyj had learned about the son's contacts with the Catholic hierarchs of L'viv and blamed Solikowski for thinking about his own prestige, because he did not want to associate the conversion of a representative of "God's chosen family" with the activity of members of "a plebeian Order" (that was just the reputation the Jesuits had in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth)¹¹⁰ or their relatives.

Another reason for Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ's irritation toward Solikowski resulted from events at the end 1583, when, on Christmas Eve in L'viv, the Archbishop, whose jurisdiction the Orthodox Bishop of L'viv Gedeon Balaban was formally under,¹¹¹ closed the Ruthenian churches in which Christmas services were being celebrated according to the old style. Ostroz'kyj took over the defense of Bishop Balaban and all Orthodox inhabitants of L'viv. He brought charges to the Senate and later bitterly complained to the Nuncio against Solikowski and his Jesuit supporters' actions,¹¹² acquiring the characteristic of being "osservantissimo della scismatica superstitione Rutena [the most zealous in schismatic Ruthenian superstition]" as described by Nuncio Bolognetti's secretary, Horatius Spannocchi.¹¹³ Subsequently, "a calendar conflict" in L'viv was resolved by Prince Ostroz'kyj's vigorous efforts at the royal court and Senate, and the Prince gained the support not only of the King, but also of the Nuncio, with whom he agreed to refrain from violence, as well as from any introduction of a new

(A. WELYKYJ, *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia*. Vol. I. Romae, 1953, N 127, p. 229-230.).

¹⁰⁸ Collegium Iaroslaviense 1583... [see n. 104], p. 92.

¹⁰⁹ J. KRAJCAR, *Konstantin Basil Ostroz'skij*... [see n. 29], p. 206.

¹¹⁰ T. ŠEVČENKO, *Jezuits'ke škil'nyctvo*... p. 165-167. Brother Herbests originated from a bourgeois family with German roots from Halyčyna (Polish *Galicja*). They were born in Nove Misto (Polish *Nowe Miasto*) in the L'viv region.

¹¹¹ Sigismundus I had given the Catholic Bishops of L'viv the privilege of confirming the nominations of Orthodox Bishops of L'viv. Hence it was a constant source of conflict between the Catholic and Orthodox Bishops of L'viv. (K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny*... [see n. 42], p. 132-134.)

¹¹² *MPV*. T. 7. N 273, p. 413.

¹¹³ *MUH*... [see n. 56], N 100, p. 52-53.

calendar until both Pope and Patriarch came to an agreement. Yet the effect of Ostrogski's policy of goodwill with regard to the calendar question faded with time, and later the calendar controversy became "a combat slogan against the Union of Brest".¹¹⁴

3. The Project of Union: the Patriarch in Ostroh and the Royal throne of Ruthenia in Moscow (1593) against the Union of Brest (1595)

The Jesuit Benedykt Herbest

Thus, whereas Kostiantyn Vasyľ Ostroz'kyj had maintained friendly relations with an Italian Jesuit and discussed with him their most grandiose religious-political plans of mutual interest, it appears that the Polish Jesuits did their best to turn the Prince against union with the Roman Church as well as against their Order. In 1586, in L'viv, Jesuit Benedykt Herbest published *Wiary Kościoła Rzymskiego wywody i greckiego niewolnictwa historia* [Arguments of the faith of the Roman Church and the history of the Greek slavery]. Briefly setting forth historical facts to prove the origin of papal authority in Christ, Herbest described the low moral and intellectual level of Orthodox Christians, interpreting it as God's punishment, and comparing Greeks and Ruthenians to Jews, who "had also been rejected by God".

Obviously, the last thesis angered Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ in particular, because in the next year the printing house in Ostroh published an answer, entitled *Ključ carstva nebesnoho* [The Key to the Kingdom of Heaven] and *Kalendar ryms'kyj novyj* [The new Roman calendar], written by the rector of the academy Herasym Smotryc'kyj. Both polemical works contained attacks on papal authority, the new calendar and the Jesuits, especially Skarga and Herbest. Thus Smotryc'kyj's biting irony concerning the Jesuits' tactics involuntarily revealed the subject of his patron's indignation: "Što juž nylenešnix mnohomjatežnyx i bohoprotyvnyx časov na tom sxyľku svita, až i do skargov i herbestov pryšlo, tož pak tyje vže po-svoemu počaly tuju katedru nosyty až pod nebesa, da i ruskije narody napered bludamy, hlupstvom i oščepenstvom počtyvšy i z žydamy zrovnjavšy, tož teper ukazujuť im tuju stolycu, jak xoroša, a na nej pak sydjačoho snat' i v nohy celujuť, a on ne

¹¹⁴ J. KRAJČAR, *Konstanlin Basil Ostrožskij...* [see n. 29], p. 207.

hnivajetsja, ta i našym kažuť, ano ne xoćetsja [It happened to Skargas and Herbests in our very restless and impious times, at the end of the world. Hence they again began praising this cathedral to the skies, as is their way. And, firstly, Ruthenian nations were honored with labels of immorality, foolishness and apostasy, and were equated with Jews. Thus they now show them the See and how fine it is. And they kiss the feet of the one who sits there, and he is not angry. And they tell us [to do the same], but we do not want to.]”¹¹⁵

Ostroz’kyj himself kept a jealous eye on any eventual contacts of his relatives with Jesuits. For instance, in 1585, in his famous letter to his grandson Januś, he warned his Calvinist son-in-law Radziwiłł: “Iesli iego mość Pan Woiewoda Wileński, Ociec W. Mości, iezdzi... do zboru, w którym są prawdziwi wyznawcy Krystusowi y pod dwiema osobami sakramentów, tak iako y my wostoczni używamy, to iego Mość dobrze działa..., ale iesli do iezuitow nowych iezusowcow iambym nie za dobrze miał Panu Oycu W. Mości y W. Mości samemu [If His Worship, Voivode of Wilno, father of Y[our] Worship, goes... to a house of worship, where Christ is really acknowledged and [partakes] of both species of the Holy Eucharist in the same manner that we Easterners use to commune, then His Worship does well... nevertheless if he [goes] to Jesuits, new Jesusians, then I would not consider that a good thing for His Worship, Your father, nor for Your Worship himself.]”¹¹⁶

Ostroz’kyj’s enmity towards the Jesuits became one against the Pope as well, whom he called “Antichrist”, in accordance with the Protestant tradition, in his letter to his son-in-law in 1587.¹¹⁷ The

¹¹⁵ H. SMOTRYČKYJ, *Ključ carstva nebesnoho*, in: *Ukrajins’ka literatura XIV - XVI st.*, pod red. L. V. MYKYTAŠJA. Kyjiv, 1988, p. 223.

¹¹⁶ S. GOLUBEV, *Petr Mogila i ego spodvižniki. Opyt isoričeskogo issledovanija. Priloženija: Materialy dlja istorii zapadno-russkoj cerkvi*. T. I. Kiev, 1883, p. 27-28.

¹¹⁷ See a quotation from the letter of Kostiantyn Vasyl’ to Krzysztof Radziwiłł about the conversion of his son Kostiantyn in: P. S. ŻUKOVIČ, *Sejmovaja bor’ba pravoslavnogo zapadnorusskogo dvorjanslva s cerkovnoj uniej (do 1609 g.)*. Spb, 1901, p. 102: “Póki się Antichristowi był nie oddał, póty mi był przyiacielem, a przyiacielem przeciwko kazdemu ze mna przestawiającym. Iakosz tym poturnakiem został, wszitko się zinaczyło... [Until he did not give himself up to Antichrist, he was my friend and a friend for everyone who kept up an acquaintance with me. When he became a poturnak, everything changed.]”.

following year, during the visit of Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah II to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Prince forbade his 35 year old son Januś, a Catholic, to visit the Pope with an ambassadorial delegation sent by Sigismundus III, intended to show the newly elected King's respect and obtain a blessing. Ostroz'kyj explained the reason for his decision: possible accusations might be levelled against he himself, who might be seen as wavering in the Orthodox faith.

The new plans for Church unification devised by Kostiantyn Vasył' Ostroz'kyj

In early 1590, a few months after Jeremiah II had visited the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, a new series of contacts between the Orthodox and Rome was established. Two of the Prince's protégés for the sees raised the union question, namely the Bishop of Luč'k Kyrylo Terlec'kyj (Polish *Cyryl Terlecki*), who became the newly appointed exarch of the Patriarch, and from 1593 Ipatij Potij (Polish *Hipacy Pocij*), the Bishop of Brest, a former Calvinist. The mediators from the Catholic side were one of the most active Jesuit protectors among the Catholic clergy, the Bishop of Luč'k, Maciejowski, and the Archbishop of L'viv, Solikowski.¹¹⁸ Although the issue of Ostroz'kyj's joining the union was not mentioned, he was nevertheless, undoubtedly, quite well informed about the course of negotiations taking place or he was even their secret initiator.¹¹⁹

So the Prince accepted the invitation from local Jesuits to visit their college while passing through Jaroslav in 1590 or 1591.¹²⁰ The

Poturnak (a Turkified person) was a name for people of Ruthenia, who were captured by Turks and forced to settle and live among the Turks.

¹¹⁸ O. HALECKI, *Od unii Florenckiej do unii Brzeskiej*. T. 2. Lublin, 1997, p. 54-79.

¹¹⁹ The Russian scholar Mixail Dmitriev holds the same opinion of Ostroz'kyj's role (M. V. DMITRIEV, *Mezdu Rimom i Car'gradom: geneziz Brestskoj cerkownoj unii 1595-1596 gg.* Moskva, 2003, p. 215).

¹²⁰ It is impossible to establish an exact date, because the fact was published in the "Litterae annuae", covering both 1590 and 1591, and the manuscripts for those years have been lost. (*Collegium Iaroslaviense 1590-91*, in: *Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu, duorum annorum MDXC [1590] et MDXCI [1591]*. Romae, 1594, p. 193-194.) Scholars have paid almost no attention to this fact. It is mentioned just once in the historiography by Jan Krajcar (J. KRAJCAR, *Jesuits and the genesis...* [see n. 15], p. 136.).

Jesuits invited Ostroz'kyj "officii causa [because of his office]" as "the head of Schismatics", but the Prince himself had a more practical motivation in mind. He was probably travelling to Jaroslav for an inspection visit, because in the upcoming year of 1592, his youngest son, Oleksandr, was to be married to one of the owners of Jaroslav, 17 year old Anna Kostka, daughter of the previously mentioned Zofia Odroważówna, who was a foundress of the Jesuit Order. The Jaroslav estates, obtained by the Ostroz'kyjs, acted as a bridge between their estates in Ruthenia and Little Poland. As for the marriage, it was the most successful among the arranged marriages of the Prince's children, from the property point of view.

It is known that Kostiantyn Vasyl' Ostroz'kyj discussed the issue of papal authority with the Jesuits and visited the college library where he was interested in the works of Greek authors. Finally, the Prince asked for an explanation of a fragment of the 139th Psalm in the Church Slavonic language. As the Jesuit chronicler relates it, without any superfluous modesty, his brethren "commode ac modeste responderunt [answered duly and advisedly]", as opposed to the Thessalonian monk from Ostroz'kyj's retinue who was unable to do so. In the next two months, this same monk sent a reply which was "plenas conviciorum in Romanam Ecclesiam [full of reproaches against the Roman Church]" without a word about the fragment from the Psalm. Finally, the Prince blamed the monk.¹²¹

Probably, the Jesuit's erudition had impressed the old Prince. After the wedding of Oleksandr, who remained with his wife in Jaroslav, Kostiantyn Vasyl' sent an application to the L'viv Confraternity, in which he was a member, asking them to take care of Oleksandr, who "meždu zubamy zapadnyx ljudej viry i nauky i vsego naboženstva usel [stayed in the teeth of people of the Western faith, with their eruditions and all their divine services]".¹²²

Nonetheless, Kostiantyn Vasyl's personal lack of sympathy for the Jesuits had no impact on his attitude to the Roman Church in general, and the idea of Church union in particular. In the early 1590s, the union project was connected with the intensification and increase in political weight exerted by the Ostroz'kyj Princes in the

¹²¹ *Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu...* [see n. 120], p. 193-194.

¹²² *Monumenta Confraternitatis Stauropigianae Leopoliensis. Diplomata et epistolae Confraternitatis Stauropigianae Leopoliensis ab anno 1518 usque ad annum 1600*, wyd. W. MILKOWICZ. T. I. Leopoldis, 1895, N CCLVII (257), p. 51.

Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the early 1590's, with their support from Sigismundus III in his confrontation with Chancellor Tomasz Zamojski.

Thus in 1590 Januś Ostroz'kyj, Voivode of Volhynia, obtained two strategically important starostwos for defending Ruthenian lands — the starostwo of Bohuslav (Polish *Bogusław*) and the starostwo of Bila Cerkva (Polish *Biała Cerkiew*), and in 1593 became the Castellan of Kraków, the highest secular official in the Kingdom, after the post of Voivode of Volhynia was transferred to his brother, 23 year old Oleksandr, who was also granted the starostwo of Perejaslav. Thus, when Emperor Rudolf II initiated the formation of the anti-Turkish league due to Turkish threats in the south of the Empire, Prince Januś took a most active part in recruiting Cossacks to the Emperor's service. Clement VIII approved a plan by Pietro Cedulini, the Croatian Bishop of Nona, a visitor to Catholic churches in Constantinople, who envisaged the formation of an anti-Turkish league that would include the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Holy Roman Empire and Muscovy.¹²³ In the spring of 1593, Muscovy promised the Emperor's ambassador to support the Habsburgs against the Porte.

Prince Ostroz'kyj's plan for the union, set forth in his letter to the Bishop of Brest, Potij, in June of 1593, before the synod of the Eastern Orthodox bishops in Brest, was likely to have been elaborated under the influence of this Habsburgian initiative. Discussing reform within the Orthodox Church, the Prince intended mediation efforts to search out a mutual understanding with the Catholic Church, and thus, proposed meeting with the Pope during his trip to Italy. It is important that Ostroz'kyj stress his previous discussions with Possevino and at the same time adopted Possevino's "political vector" for the union. For example, Possevino thought that the unification of the Kyjivan Metropolitanate with the Catholic Church would promote union with the Muscovite Orthodoxy and, together with the influence of Prince Ostroz'kyj, would bring the Orthodox Churches in Moldavia and Wallachia¹²⁴ into unity

¹²³ See about attempts to realize this plan in 1594, particularly in the Polish Lithuanian Commonwealth, during the mission of legate Alexander Komulowicz, in: O. HALECKI, *Od unii Florenckiej...* [see n. 118], p. 80-99.

¹²⁴ The Orthodox Churches in Moldavia and Walachia, and likewise the Kyjivan Metropolitanate, depended canonically on the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and had been using the Church Slavonic language in their liturgy.

with Rome: "...da questo signore dipende la conversione della Russia et l'apertura ad altre cose, come della Moldavia et Valacchia [the conversion of Ruthenia and overtures to other things, such as Moldavia and Wallachia, depend on this lord]."¹²⁵

Ostroz'kyj wanted to involve the Eastern Patriarchs, Muscovy and Wallachia in a future union with Rome, suggesting to the Bishop of L'viv, Balaban, that he go to Wallachia for negotiations¹²⁶. It is traditionally considered that being the Prince's client and owing him his see, nevertheless Potij did not want to promote his patron's plan of the universal union due to its impracticability. Nevertheless, subsequent events in Wallachia showed that the plan of Ostroz'kyj, who maintained a close contact with Wallachia, was on solid ground. Mihai Viteazul the Brave, who in September 1593, with help of Patriarch Jeremiah II, had negotiated with the Ottomans to support his accession to the Wallachian throne, turned against them in the next year and joined the aforementioned Christian alliance, formed by Pope Clement VIII, against the Turks, and initiated friendly relations with Muscovy¹²⁷.

Why did the Prince mention Muscovy, as well as asking Potij to go there for negotiations after receiving the King's permission? At that time, the throne of Muscovy was occupied by the last representative of the Rurikid dynasty, Fiodor I Ivanovič, reputedly mentally retarded. The tsar left the task of governing the country to his able brother-in-law, Boris Godunov, who was the *de facto* regent of Russia from 1584 to 1598 and then the first non-Rurikid tsar from 1598 to 1605. The end of Godunov's reign led Russia into the Time of Troubles. At the same time, in the last quarter of the 16th century, a genealogical legend of the Ostroz'kyj Princes devel-

¹²⁵ *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 46, p. 107-108.

¹²⁶ Actually "a religious part" of the union consisted of the preservation of the Eastern Church tradition, the equal social status of the Orthodox and the Catholic clergy, the access of the Uniate bishops to the Senate, the reform of the Church, the creation of seminaries, and the prohibition of any forcible conversion to Catholicism. See Ostroz'kyj's letter in: *Akty, odnosjašiesja k istorii Zapadnoj Rossii*. T. IV (1588-1632 gg.). Spb, 1851, N 45, p. 63-66.

¹²⁷ C. COTAN, *The Role of the Orthodox hierarchs in the foreign political life of the Romanian Principalities. The political relations with Poland from 1450 to 1750*, in: *The Orthodox Church in the Balkans and Poland. Connections and common tradition*, ed. A. MIRONOWICZ, U. PAWLUCZUK, W. WALCZAK. Białystok, 2007, p. 27-28.

oped, according to which they were purported to be descendants of the Halyč-Volhynian branch of the Rurikids.¹²⁸

Thus we can hypothetically suggest that Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ Ostroz'kyj might have laid claim to the Muscovy throne, and for that reason, needed the Pope's support and was ready to help him via his participation in the anti-Turkish league. This idea fits in perfectly with two previous Ostroz'kyjs' projects presented to Rome, i.e. transferring the Patriarchate of Constantinople to Ostroh and the creation of the military order of the Emperor Constantine under the leadership of Kostiantyn Vasyľ and his oldest son Januš. The first wanted to discuss the details of his plan with Clement VIII, personally, in Italy without mediators, promising to accept the Church union in return for the Pope's assistance. Potij probably understood that the Ostroz'kyjs' plans were quite realistic, and therefore refused to aid them.¹²⁹ Potij wanted to reform the Church in accordance with the Catholic model so as to assure the independence of the Church hierarchy from secular patrons in issues of *ecclesiastical* politics and limit the influence of Church confraternities that were also managed by secular patrons. Also it is not inconceivable that Potij did not believe in the sincerity of Ostroz'kyj's intentions of joining the union.¹³⁰

¹²⁸ However, according to the representatives of the modern Ukrainian historiography the Ostroz'kyj family was descended from the Gediminids (Narymuntids) dynasty of Turiv-Pins'k branch. See: N. JAKOVENKO, *Ukrajins'ka šljaxta...* s. 83-84, 88, 91-94, 98, 304-308; N. JAKOVENKO, *Topos zjednanyx narodiv...* s. 246; N. JAKOVENKO, *Ščo za vijnu opysuje...* s. 163; N. JAKOVENKO, *Šljaxtyč "latyns'kyj" čy "latynizovanyj"? Notatky na poljax poemy "Epicedion" (1585 rik)*, [in] N. JAKOVENKO, *Paralel'nyj світ...* s. 149.

¹²⁹ Konstanty Lewicki also asserted the possibility of the implementation of Ostroz'kyj's proposal due to the latter's immense authority. (K. LEWICKI, *Książę Konstanty Ostrogski a Unia Brzeska 1596 r.* Lwów, 1933, p. 73.)

¹³⁰ Later, in 1604-1605, in correspondence with Nuncio Rangoni and the Pope, the Ostroz'kyjs skillfully used the trick of Kostiantyn Vasyľ's "joining the union" in order to obtain from the King the title of Archimandrite of the Kyjivan Metropolitanate for Orthodox candidate Pleteneč'kyj, but not for the Uniate Metropolitan Potij. When, in 1605, the King granted an advantageous charter to Pleteneč'kyj at the Diet, all negotiations between the Ostroz'kyjs and the Holy See were severed immediately. Kostiantyn Vasyľ justified his act by the Patriarchs' failure to agree to join the union. (*MUH...* [see n. 56], N 356, 357, p. 234, N 360, p. 235, N 366, p. 236-237, N 371, p. 240, N 373, p. 241, N 374, p. 241, N 376-378, p. 242-243; *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 203, p. 271-272, N 205, p. 273, N 208-210, p. 276-278, N 212, p. 279, N 216-218, p. 282-284, N 223-225, p. 287-289, N 227, p. 290-291.)

At that time, Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ Ostroz'kyj's plans for the union harmonized with the politics of his only Orthodox son, Oleksandr, toward the Jesuits. Jesuit sources testify that Prince Kostiantyn Vasyľ's fear was reasonable, for he worried that his son Oleksandr would follow the way of his middle son, Kostiantyn, and convert to Catholicism. For example, Oleksandr agreed with his wife in helping create her parents' foundation for the local Jesuits, allotting them a monetary allowance to build the church of St. John and, in 1594, an allowance for the college¹³¹, and later, for the bursa. In 1593-96, the Jesuits of Jaroslav recorded that Prince Oleksandr "etsi Schismaticus [despite being Schismatic]", visited their college, and was on friendly terms with father Benedykt Herbst¹³². Oleksandr took part in the Corpus Christi procession organized by the Jesuits, together with his entourage in 1593¹³³. Furthermore, in 1596, during the Easter celebrations, he ordered the firing of a salute¹³⁴. However the last optimistic account of Oleksandr's favorable attitude towards the Jesuits and their desire "to turn him aside from a Schism" was recorded by local Jesuits in January of 1595¹³⁵.

This fact concurred with a radical breakdown in the union process. In late 1594 and early 1595, all Orthodox bishops signed the union plan in Brest, and appealed to Chancellor Zamojski, an old opponent of the Ostroz'kyjs, for his protection¹³⁶. The Ostroz'kyjs learned about the bishops' independent plan at least by late

¹³¹ H. KOWALSKA, *Ostrogska z Kostków Anna*, in: *PSB*. T. XXIV. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk, 1979, p. 478.

¹³² J. WIELEWICKI, *Dziennik spraw Domu Zakonnego OO. Jezuitów u św. Barbary w Krakowie*. T. I: *Od r. 1579 do r. 1599* (włącznie), Kraków, 1881, p. 178.

¹³³ The Jesuits' special pride aroused Prince Oleksandr's awe: a great technical achievement by the Jesuits, the covering an extremely wide nave of Jesuit church by one arch in 1593. See: J. PASZENDA, *Budowle jezuickie w Polsce*, Kraków, 1999, t. 1, p. 68.

¹³⁴ ARSI. PROV. POL., vol. 50: *Annuae Provinciae Poloniae. Collegium Iaroslaviense 1596*, f. 150^v.

¹³⁵ ARSI. PROVINCIA GERMANIAE, vol. 172: *Epistolae Assistentiae Germaniae. Petrus Fabritius ad P. Generalem, Iaroslaviae, 3 IV 1594*, f. 124^v; *Petrus Fabritius ad P. Generalem, Iaroslaviae, 10 VII 1594*, f. 288^v; *Petrus Fabritius ad P. Generalem, Iaroslaviae, 15 I 1595*, f. 41^v.

¹³⁶ About relations between the Ostroz'kyjs and Zamojski at the first half of the 1590's see: K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny...* [see n. 42], p. 284-289; T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski...* [see n. 4], p. 202-204, 218-220.

January — or early February 1595¹³⁷. From that time on, Prince Kostyantyn Vasyl Ostroz'kyj adamantly opposed the idea of union with Rome, calling the bishops' action "a disgraceful betrayal".¹³⁸ In May 1596, papal Nuncio Malaspina, referring to Terlec'kyj's words, stated that in spite of unanimity among bishops and clergy regarding the union (which was an exaggeration), only Prince Ostroz'kyj posed obstacles, threatening the bishops. He occupied their estates and mistreated all the priesthood.¹³⁹ From then on, relations between Ostroz'kyj and Sygismundus III deteriorated, and after a representative of the Ostroz'kyjs took part in the Toruń synod in 1595, a political and religious alliance with Protestants appeared on the horizon.

4. The Jesuits and the Ostroz'kyjs in Brest in 1596 and after

There is no trace of relations between Ruthenian bishops and Skarga in the years before the union. The exception is Skarga's petition to the King to obtain some financial help for Potij and Terleckyj before their journey to Rome. Later, among the participants at two rival synods, were Kostiantyn Vasyl' Ostroz'kyj, together with his sons Januš and Oleksandr, guarded by an armed escort on one side, and the Jesuits Piotr Skarga, Justus Rab and Martin Laterna, on the opposite side. The Jesuit Gaspar Nahaj accompanied Bernard Maciejowski, Bishop of Luc'k and one of the head promoters of the union from the Catholic party.

The Ostroz'kyjs met directly with Skarga, who was included in the royal-senatorial delegation.¹⁴⁰ Although Skarga used theological arguments that were related to papal primacy and drawn from all the teachings of the Roman Church, we can assume that the Princes were indignant not only at doctrinal "blasphemies" against the Orthodox faith, but at reminders of the Greek Patriarchs' dependence on the Turkish "tyrant", whom they paid a regular tribute, thereby rendering them unable or unwilling to help the Ruthenian Church. Skarga contrasted the Patriarchs' insouciance with Papal

¹³⁷ I. Z. МУС'КО, *Ostroz'ka...* [see n. 26], p. 58.

¹³⁸ See the Prince's letter to Krzysytof Radziwiłł in: K. LEWICKI, *Książę...* [see n. 128], p. 133-135.

¹³⁹ *Documenta Unionis Berestensis eiusque auctorum (1590-1600)*. Ed. A. G. WELYKYJ, Romae, 1970, N 35, p. 56.

¹⁴⁰ J. KRAJCAR, *Jesuits...* [see n. 15], p. 149-151.

kindness and care for poor and forgotten Ruthenians, for whom Clement VIII had organized a seminary at his own expense.

However, Skarga's arguments were all for naught, because Prince Ostroz'kyj's interests were ignored and he received no satisfactory counter-proposals. The aforementioned Protestant, Marcin Broniewski, Kostiantyn Vasyl's client, wrote an answer to Skarga, entitled *Ekthesis* (Kraków, 1597), in which he described the course of the Orthodox synod in Brest and proved its canonical validity in pointing out the presence of Nicefor Kantakuzen, a protosyngel of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Cyril Lucaris, a representative of the Patriarch of Alexandria. Skarga quickly replied in his work called *Synod brzeski i jego obrona* [The Synod of Brest and its defense] (Kraków, 1597). Further polemics were continued in Broniewski's *Apokrysis* (Wilno 1597) which was acknowledged as the most prominent of Orthodox polemical works, and for which its Protestant author was granted a town and some villages by the Prince.¹⁴¹

Oleksandr Ostroz'kyj took part in his father's anti-Catholic action, in cooperation with the Protestants, although Oleksandr stayed in the background as long as his father took an active part in public life. For example, the father and son participated in a joint synod of the Protestants (Calvinists, Lutherans and Czech Brethren) and the Orthodox Christians in Wilno in 1599, where another union project was announced by Kostiantyn Vasyl' Ostroz'kyj. The project proposed a religious union with the Protestants or, at least, a close political cooperation. As in the case of previous attempts at union, this one permitted the Prince to play the role of mediator between the Patriarch (in this case the Patriarch of Alexandria) and non-Orthodox believers (in this case the Evangelicals). The Evangelicals sent their letter to the Patriarch's deputy, Meletius Pegas, with a list of eighteenth common dogmatic standpoints of the Eastern Orthodox and the Evangelical Churches, and an appeal to the Patriarch to support the new union. This plan failed, however, due to refusal by the Patriarch and his representative Cyril Lucaris, who had been visiting the Polish-

¹⁴¹ J. RZOŚCA, *Klienci Konstantego Wasyla Ostrogskiego w walce z unią brzeską na sejmach przełomu XVI i XVII wieku*, in: *Patron i dwór. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI-XVIII*, pod red. E. DUBAS-URWANOWICZ, J. URWANOWICZA, Warszawa, 2006, p. 316-318.

Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1600-1601.¹⁴² When Kostiantyn Vasyl health deteriorated in the years 1600 to 1603, his son Oleksandr began to take his father's place in the Diet and as well as in the local diets.¹⁴³

After the 1596 Union of Brest and during an increase in anti-union activity by the Ostroz'kyjs, the Jesuit chronicle of Jaroslav college records nothing about Oleksandr's sympathy toward the Jesuits or their hopes concerning his conversion, nor do they mention the Prince's name at all. At the same time, the college's documents for internal usage reveal that during this period Oleksandr practically stopped his support for the construction of the Jesuit bursa house for poor students (*bursa pauperum*).¹⁴⁴ In May of 1600, the Jesuits' financial status in Jaroslav worsened because of a fire that burnt most of the town, the houses of the Jesuit college and the church.

After this disaster, Prince Oleksandr refused to help the Jesuits,¹⁴⁵ and moreover prohibited their felling trees in forests or else put obstacles in the way of doing so, although the Jesuits had a right to such activity, granted by the founders.¹⁴⁶ The Jesuits of Jaroslav called the Prince "Schismatic" and "infensissimus nobis [the most hostile for us]", whose "filii et haeredes possent esse

¹⁴² K. CHODYNICKI, *Kościół Prawosławny...* [see n. 42], p. 352-356.

¹⁴³ T. KEMPA, *Wobec Kontrreformacji. Protestanci i prawosławni w obronie swobód wyznaniowych w Rzeczypospolitej w końcu XVI i w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku*, Toruń, 2007, p. 528; T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski...* [see n. 4], p. 165-167.

¹⁴⁴ See: *Liber rationum Collegii Iaroslaviensis id est pecuniarum undequaue provenientium, earumdemque expensarum in bonum Commune eiusdem Collegii [1582-1640]*, in: *Biblioteka Uniwersyteku Jagiellońskiego*, rkps. 270; ARSI. PROV. POL., vol. 7: *Catalogus brevis 1564-1572, 1601-1602 et Catalogus triennalis 1587-1603*. [Catalogus rerum]. *Collegium Iaroslaviense* [1599 mense Augusto], f. 299; PROV. POL., vol. 72 II: *Fundationes Provinciae Poloniae. Rationes ne Collegium Iaroslaviense transferatur alio*, f. 442; *Rationes pro transferendo Collegio Iaroslaviensi* SI, f. 449.

¹⁴⁵ According to Jesuit records, the second owner of the town, Hieronim Sienawski, husband of Katarzyna, a sister of Anna Kostka, simply had no money. Thus the Jesuits did not lay hopes on his help (ARSI. PROV. POL., vol. 72 II: *Fundationes Provinciae Poloniae. Rationes ne Collegium Iaroslaviense transferatur alio*, f. 441, *Rationes pro non transferendo Collegio Iaroslaviensi* SI, f. 445).

¹⁴⁶ ARSI. PROV. POL., vol. 72 II. *Informatio de Collegio Iaroslaviensi Premissiam transferendo*, f. 437^v; *Rationes ne Collegium Iaroslaviense transferatur alio*, f. 443.

peiores [sons and descendants might be worse]”.¹⁴⁷ They were displeased by Oleksandr’s patronage of the local Eastern Orthodox Christians,¹⁴⁸ and even wrote about the failures in “converting Schismatics” as well expressing their fear that the Prince might transfer the buildings of their church, college and school over to the Orthodox in the future,¹⁴⁹ and that he wanted and even pushed the Jesuits to leave Jaroslav. Using the above-mentioned facts as arguments, some of the Jesuits demanded the transfer of the Jaroslav foundation to Peremyśl’. Despite some of these facts having been exaggerated, it was clear that relations between Oleksandr and the Jesuits were strained.¹⁵⁰ The transfer of the foundation, however, was canceled because of a lack of agreement among the Jesuits and the untimely death of Oleksandr, which the Jesuits anticipated as signaling a turn for the better.¹⁵¹

Nuncio Claudio Rangoni wrote in his reports to Rome in 1601-1603 that Prince Oleksandr was an enemy of the union and “scismatico peggior del padre, Palatino di Chiovia [a Schismatic, who was worse, than his father, Voivode of Kyjiv]”, describing him as one of the opponents of the Jesuits of L’viv during their conflict with a Jewish community within the city.¹⁵² Actually, during that same period, 1601-1603, Oleksandr Ostroz’kyj actively defended the Orthodox citizens of L’viv in their conflict with its Catholic citizens.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁷ ARSI. PROV. POL., vol. 72 II. *Informatio de Collegio Iaroslaviensi Premislum transferendo*, f. 437^v.

¹⁴⁸ The Prince took care of the local Orthodox Church and the Orthodox townsmen’s confraternity. In 1596 he reserved for himself the right to elect four supervisors of this confraternity. Oleksandr was probably a member of this confraternity (K. GOTTFRIED, *Anna Ostrogska wojewodzina Wołyńska*, Jarosław, 1939, p. 18-19.).

¹⁴⁹ A complex of Jesuit buildings was constructed on the grounds that were dispossessed from the Eastern Orthodox Christians and where an Orthodox wooden church had once stood.

¹⁵⁰ See Jesuit letters of information about the transfer of the foundation from Jaroslav to Peremyśl’ in: ARSI. PROV. POL., vol. 72 II. *Informatio de Collegio Iaroslaviensi Premislum transferendo*, f. 437-438, *Rationes pro non transferendo Collegio I, II, III, IV*, f. 439-449^v.

¹⁵¹ ARSI. PROV. POL., vol. 72 II. *Rationes pro transferendo Collegio Iaroslaviensi* [se] *SI. Solutiones earundem*, f. 449^v.

¹⁵² *MUH...* [see n. 56], T. I: 1075-1623, N295, p. 201-202; T. II: 1550-1850, Romae, 1959, N 724, p. 181; N 732, p. 186-188, N 734 p. p. 190-192; N 737 p. 192-195; N 781 p. 222.

¹⁵³ M. KAPRAL’, *Nacional’ni hromady L’vova XVI-XVII st.* (social’no-pravovi vzajemny), L’viv, 2003, p. 120-121.

In the last year of his life, Prince Oleksandr together with his father, played a significant role in the defense of the rights of Eastern Orthodox Christians during the March Diet of 1603. The Ostroz'kyjs managed to obtain the King's agreement to have the Archimandrite of the Kyjiv Monastery of the Caves elected by the Monastery's monks and secular aristocrats of the Kyjiv region. They also received the King's promise to stop suits against Eastern Orthodox Christians that had been initiated against them by the Uniates. In July 1603, in response to the request of Sigismundus III, Pope Clement VIII annulled the bull in which the titles of the Archimandrite of the Kyjiv Monastery of the Caves and the Metropolitan of Kyjiv were to be merged, but demanded an appropriate compensation for the Metropolitan and wanted to see a real Catholic be elected Archimandrite. It was the first victory for the Orthodox Christians at the Diet.¹⁵⁴

Oleksandr Ostroz'kyj died suddenly on January 13, 1603 in the village of Krasne, in the Ternopil' (Polish *Tarnopol*) region during an inspection of his estates. This date was recorded by the Jesuit Jan Wielewicki in *Dziennik Domu św. Barbary w Krakowie*. The Jesuit wrote that it was rumored that Oleksandr was poisoned and before he died had wanted to see a Catholic priest, who of course was not summoned.¹⁵⁵

Nuncio Rangoni, who was in Kraków as well as Wielewicki, specified the cause of Oleksandr Ostroz'kyj's death as poisoning « d'alcune streghe Ruthene [by one of the Ruthenian witches]” due to “la potione come amatoria [a love potion]” in the village of Krasne.¹⁵⁶ At the same time, Rangoni called the Prince « ostinatissimo scismatico et colonna de nemici di Dio, anzi ignorantissimo et superbissimo atheista [the most obstinate Schismatic and supporter of God's enemies, moreover the biggest ignoramus and most haughty atheist]”, and did not even mention the Jesuits' intentions of converting him, but assumed that his death was a just punishment, for Oleksandr was inspecting estates he had unfairly taken from his brother Januś.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁴ P. S. Žuković, *Sejmovaja...* [see n. 4], p. 425-432.

¹⁵⁵ J. WIELEWICKI, *Dziennik spraw...* [see n. 131], T. II: *Od r.1600 do r. 1608 (włącznie)*, Kraków, 1886, p. 47.

¹⁵⁶ *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 200, p. 270.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, N 198, p. 268-269, N 200, p. 270. In 1600-1603 Januś and Oleksandr divided their father's estates up between themselves, during which time

The 1603 Jaroslav college chronicle, written by people who had an interest in reporting the results of their efforts over so many years, mentions neither Oleksandr's request to see a Catholic priest or even his death.¹⁵⁸ This seems strange if we take into the consideration the fact that the Jesuit chronicles always recorded even the minutest details that might emphasize they were in favour with the power that be, especially non-Catholic ones. Thus, the rumour, introduced by the Jesuit Jan Wielewicki, is highly untrustworthy.

A probable source of the rumour was the Prince's wife Anna Kostka, the cousin of the Blessed Jesuit Stanisław Kostka,¹⁵⁹ and a distant relative of the Dominican Saint Jacek (Latin *Hyacinthus*) Odrowąż. Anna could not endure the fact that her husband had not converted to Catholicism despite her efforts and the Jesuits'. So rumours were spread that he had become a Uniate before his death. Anna also ordered priests to hold annual masses for her husband's soul in Jaroslav and to emphasize his benevolent attitude towards the Jesuits in their sermons.¹⁶⁰ However, nothing is

an armed conflict was threatening to break out. Januś emphasized that his persecution had begun because he was a Catholic and had the intention of spreading the union into his lands after his father's death. However, Januś's accusation turned to be false, because the next Nuncio Simonetta reported to Rome after Kostiantyn Vasyl's death that the Prince's son Januś "intorno al negotio dell'Unione, intendo, che conserva tuttavvia l'humore del padre et segue li medesimi vestigi di favorire gli scismatici Ruteni [as to negotiations for union, about which I have heard that he supports his father's whim and follows in his father's footsteps by supporting Schismatic-Ruthenians]", especially since he obstructed the appointment of the Uniate bishop in Luc'k. See: *MUH...* [see n. 56], N 196, p. 266-267, N 240, p. 302, N 248, 249, 251, 252, p. 308-314.

¹⁵⁸ *Collegium Iaroslaviense 1603*, in: *Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni MDCIII* [1603], Duaci, 1618, p. 676-680.

¹⁵⁹ The cult of veneration of Stanisław Kostka (1550-1568) was actively promoted by Piotr Skarga, who included Kostka's hagiography in his book "Żywoty świętych [Saints' lives]" in 1610, and by Jaroslav college from 1609. In 1611, Stanisław Kostka was proclaimed a patron of Kraków, and after the battle of Xotyn (Polish *Chocim*), in 1621, was honoured as a patron of Polish knighthood. See: A. P. BIEŚ, *Stanisław Kostka*, in: *PSB*. Warszawa-Kraków, 2002, t. XLI, p. 589-593; T. ŠEVČENKO, *Jezuitske škil'nyctvo...* p. 114.

¹⁶⁰ H. KOWALSKA, *Ostrowska z Kostków Anna*, in: *PSB*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk, 1979, t. XXIV, p. 478; R. PELCZAR *Działalność dobroczynna właścicieli Jarosławia dla Kościoła Rzymskokatolickiego w II poł. XVI - I poł. XVII w.*, in: *Kobiety i kultura religijna. Specyficzne cechy religijności kobiet w Polsce*, pod red. J. HOFF, Rzeszów, 2006, p. 102.

alluded to in sources on the Orthodox side, that one of the powerful protectors of the Orthodox Church was converted.¹⁶¹

After Prince Oleksandr's death, his father became a tutor of his underage children and wife. Therefore Anna Kostka only dismissed the Orthodox teacher of her sons: Adam Kostiantyn (Polish *Adam Konstanty*) and Januś Pawło (Polish *Janusz Paweł*) after Kostiantyn Vasyl's death in 1608. That teacher was Lavrentij Zyzanij Tustanovs'kyj, an Orthodox polemicist, preacher and author of the first handbook of the Church Slavonic language. In 1610 both boys accepted the Catholic confession of faith, were confirmed by the Catholic Bishop of Peremyśl' and began to study in the Jesuit college of Jaroslav. The young Princes died at an early age (in 1618 and 1619).¹⁶² Later the Metropolitan of Kyjiv, Petro Mohyla, would interpret the death of Oleksandr Ostroz'kyj's sons as God's punishment of the Princely family's abandonment of Orthodoxy because of Jesuit intrigue.¹⁶³

Conclusions

The activity of the most powerful magnate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and *uncrowned king of Ruthenia*, Eastern Orthodox Prince Kostiantyn Vasyl' Ostroz'kyj, is primarily considered to be of a political nature, rather than of a cultural and religious character. Solely for political purposes, and within his own residence, Prince Ostroz'kyj founded and financed the academy, the translation circle and the publishing house printing the Bible in the Church-Slavonic language, actively following the example of the Protestants and involving them in that activity. These measures evidence the Prince's attempts to reform the Orthodox Church according to the Protestant example, "turning Ostroh into an Orthodox Geneva". The further breakdown of all of these cultural and religious undertakings testifies to the fact that for Ostroz'kyj, they were only a tool for increasing his own political importance.

¹⁶¹ S. GOLUBEV, *Petr Mogila...* [see n. 116], p. 182.

¹⁶² J. KUS, "Wielkie, ale krótko trwałe oyczyzny nadzieie...". *Adam Konstanty i Janusz Paweł księżęta Ostrogscy, wojewodzice wołyńscy*, in: *Zeszyty Muzealne*, (1997/1998), R. II, z. 2, p. 7-17.

¹⁶³ *Arxiv Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii, izdavaemyj vremennoj Komissiej dlja razbora drevnix aktov*, Kiev, 1886, p. 94.

In 1577, the Polish Jesuit Piotr Skarga, passionate about the idea of uniting the Churches and indignant over the tolerance of Orthodox Ruthenians to heretics, appealed to Prince Ostroz'kyj with a proposal for union, which he intended would involve the latter's conversion to Catholicism. The idea was flatly rejected by Ostroz'kyj, who, had he followed such a proposal, would have lost his political and economic prerogatives as the informal head of the Orthodox Church.

Ostroz'kyj's dialogue about such union with the Italian Jesuit, papal legate Antonio Possevino, also failed in 1583-84. Possevino, intending to bring the Muscovites into the Roman Church, considered it preeminently necessary to join the Eastern Orthodox Church of the Kyjivan Metropolitanate (and through it also the Orthodox Church of Moldavia and Walachia) to Rome. It had to begin with an embrace of Catholicism (or at least the principles of the Florentine Union) by leading Ruthenian magnates. Initially, Prince Ostroz'kyj not only expressed his readiness to join the union, but also actively tried to persuade Eastern patriarchs to embrace the Gregorian calendar and offered Rome collaboration in printing religious literature. Prince Ostroz'kyj's position here is explained by his plans, and the intentions of his entourage, to increase the importance of the Ostroz'kyj family with the help of the Holy See. These Princes considered themselves to be the rulers of Ruthenia, chosen by God. This became obvious through their initiative for transferring the patriarchate from Constantinople to Ostroh, or for founding a new one, which would preserve the Eastern rite and be subordinate to the Pope. But Rome's skepticism towards these plans, as well as papal diplomacy's inability to help the Ostroz'kyjs recover their Holy Roman Empire located estates, the impossibility of finding the appropriate lecturers for the Ostroh Academy in Rome, the rejection of Ostroz'kyj's help in book printing, the conversion of Ostroz'kyj's second son to Catholicism and a conflict over the calendar with the Archbishop of L'viv all brought both parties' union negotiations to naught.

Prince Ostroz'kyj's contacts with Rome were renewed after 1589, when the Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah legalized the activity of the Moscow Patriarchate which later had to consecrate the tsar's regent, Boris Godunov, to the Moscow throne. Moreover, those contacts were linked to a great increase in the Ostroz'kyjs political influence in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth since

1590, and the Habsburgs' and the Holy See's efforts to create an anti-Turkish league. In his 1593 letter to the Bishop of Brest, Potij, Ostroz'kyj suggested the idea of a union, which would envisage joining to Rome not only the Eastern Orthodox Church of the Kyjivan Metropolitanate, but also Muscovy, Walachia, and the Eastern patriarchs. Ostroz'kyj intended to discuss the details of the union personally with the Pope. Such an idea of a universal union corresponded to Ostroz'kyj's previous plans relating to the promotion of his family. In particular, the idea of joining Muscovy to the union and requesting that Bishop Potij go there for negotiations, enables us to make a hypothesis as to Ostroz'kyj's possible claims (considering himself to be a descendant of the Rurikids) to the Moscow throne, which at that time was occupied by the last representative of the Rurikid dynasty, the mentally retarded Fiodor I Ivanovič. Ostroz'kyj's plans were hindered here by the opposition of Orthodox bishops of the Kyjivan Metropolitanate, including his protégé to the sees. The latter wanted reforms in the Orthodox Church according to the Catholic example, and first of all desired to get rid of the influence of secular patrons and Church confraternities supported by them, as to ecclesiastical matters. Such a position of the Ruthenian episcopate finally resulted in secret negotiations with Rome, behind Ostroz'kyj's back and led to the conclusion of the Union of Brest, against which Prince Ostroz'kyj expressed his adamant opposition. He began fighting for the restoration of the rights of the Orthodox Church as an instrument of his influences and initiated a political and religious union with Protestants. It was ignoring the position and interests of the head of the *Ruthenian people* that resulted in the fact that the union, instead of giving rise to reconciliation, rather gave rise to confrontation and division among Orthodox Christians of the Kyjivan Metropolitanate.

The concept of the union had by the Polish Jesuits, who viewed it as a mere joining of Ruthenian aristocrats to the Roman Church, became a reality through a conversion to Catholicism of the descendants of the old Prince Ostroz'kyj.

*St. Thomas Aquinas Institute of
Religious Sciences in Kyjiv*

13 Yakira Str.
UA-04119 KYJIV
UKRAINE

Tetiana SHEVCHENKO

Summary. — The article suggests a new approach to the analysis of unionist projects and contacts between some of the most prominent Jesuits of the time (such as the Italian Jesuit Antonio Possevino and the Polish Jesuit Piotr Skarga) and the leader of Eastern Orthodox Ruthenians, the richest magnate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Prince Kostiantyn Vasył Ostroz'kyj. The difference between the unionist proposals of Possevino and Skarga, as well as their approach to the contact with Prince Ostroz'kyj is researched in this article. Ostroz'kyj's plans of 1583-84 regarding the union between the Orthodox Church of the Kyjivan Metropolitanate and the Roman Church, the change of the Prince's position during the dialogue with the representatives of the Holy See, as well as his proposal of the so-called universal union of 1593 are analyzed, first of all, from the standpoint of dominance of the political interests of the Ostroz'kyj's family, who considered themselves the rulers of Ruthenia "chosen by God".

Résumé. — Cet article propose une nouvelle approche des projets unionistes et des contacts entre quelques-uns des plus éminents jésuites de ce temps (comme l'italien Antonio Possevino et le polonais Piotr Skarga) et le leader des Ruthènes orthodoxes, le plus riche magnat de la frontière polono-lituanienne, le Prince Kostiantyn Vasył Ostroz'kyj. Les différences entre les propositions unionistes de Possevino et Skarga, ainsi que leur approche des contacts avec le Prince Ostroz'kyj sont étudiées dans cet article. Les plans formés par Ostroz'kyj en 1583-1584 pour unir l'Église orthodoxe de la Métropole Kyjivan et l'Église romaine, le changement de position du prince au cours du dialogue avec les représentants du Saint-Siège, ainsi que sa proposition de la soi-disant union universelle de 1593 sont analysés, tout d'abord, du point de vue de la domination des intérêts politiques de la famille Ostroz'kyj, qui se considéraient comme les dirigeants de la Ruthénie « choisis par Dieu ».

Zusammenfassung. — Der vorliegende Artikel wirft neues Licht auf die Analyse de Unionsprojekte und -kontakte zwischen manchen sehr prominenten Jesuiten jener Zeit (unter anderem dem italienischen Jesuiten Antonio Possevino und dem polnischen Jesuiten Piotr Skarga) und dem Führer der ost-orthodoxen Ruthenen, dem sehr reichen Großgrundbesitzer der polnisch-litauischen Republik, Prinz Kostiantyn Vasył Ostroz'kyj. Die Unterschiede zwischen dem Verständnis der Union bei Possevino und Skarga gehören ebenso zum Inhalt des Artikels wie ihre Einstellung bezüglich des Kontakts mit Prinz Ostroz'kyj. Analysiert werden ebenfalls Ostroz'kyjs Pläne von 1583-84 bezüglich der Union zwischen der Orthodoxen Kirche im Erzbistum Kyjivan und der Römischen Kirche, der Wandel in seinen Positionen während des Dialogs mit den Vertretern der Heiligen Stuhls, und sein Vorschlag einer sogenannten universalen Union im Jahre 1593. All dies wird betrachtet vom Standpunkt der Familie Ostroz'kyj aus, für die politische Interessen ausschlaggebend waren und die sich selbst als « von Gott auserwählte» Herrscher der Ruthenen ansah.