

Tomasz Kempa

**KYRILLOS LOUKARIS AND THE CONFESSIONAL
PROBLEMS IN THE POLISH-LITHUANIAN
COMMONWEALTH AT THE TURN OF THE
SEVENTEENTH CENTURY***

Kyrillos (Constantine) Loukaris (1572–1638) is arguably the best known and at the same time the most controversial figure from among the patriarchs of Constantinople who held this post during the ‘Turkish Captivity’ (to use the term coined by Steven Runciman).¹ His fame has less to do with his genuine efforts to strengthen the patriarch’s position on the domestic arena, but rather with his participation in confessional disputes that took place in contemporary Europe, and his close contacts with Western European Protestants. In 1629, Loukaris published a new Orthodox confession, which was visibly inspired by the Calvinist doctrine.² Hence no wonder that Loukaris’s biographers have usually focused their attention on the time when he headed the patriarchate of Alexandria, and then that of Constantinople, and on his contacts with the European Reformation.³

* The present article is an enlarged version of a text earlier published in Polish ‘Wizyty protosyngla Cyryla Lukarysa w Rzeczypospolitej’, in Antoni Mironowicz, Urszula Pawluczuk and Wojciech Walczak (eds.), *The Orthodox Church in the Balkans and Poland: Connections and Common Tradition* (Białystok, 2007), 87–103.

¹ Loukaris held the post of the ecumenical patriarch in the years 1620–35 and 1637–8.

² Symptomatically, its first edition appeared in Latin (1629) and only the second edition was in Greek (1633), both printed by the same publisher in Geneva, see Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (Cambridge, 1968), 276; George P. Michaelides, ‘The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lucaris’, *Church History*, xii, 2 (1943), 118–29.

³ We still lack a biography of Loukaris that could be described as fully scholarly. The extant books devoted to this personage are not devoid of errors, and sometimes

Ever since his death, there has been an ongoing dispute as to what extent were his ideals influenced by Calvinist propaganda. A vivid discussion (especially on internet fora) broke out recently, in 2009, after Theodoros II, the patriarch of Alexandria, announced Loukaris to be a saint.⁴

At the same time, the earlier period of Loukaris's life, covering the years prior to his accession to the Alexandrian patriarchate in 1601, is much less known. Most Western authors, who have written on his youth and early career, only mention his studies in Venice and Padua. Few of them also notice his participation in the anti-unionist synod convened in Brest, in October 1596, in parallel with the unionist synod which convened at the same time and place and resulted in the Union of Brest. On the other hand, East European historians are perfectly aware of Loukaris's activity in the Commonwealth, but one finds a number of errors and inconsistencies in their works.⁵ Therefore

one can even suspect conscious distortions of the truth. Among the older studies on Loukaris one can mention Thomas Smith, *Collectanea de Cyrillo Lucario, patriarcha constantinopolitano ...* (London, 1707); Evgraf Ovsyannikov, *Konstantinopol'skiĭ patriarkh Kirill Lukaris i ego bor'ba s rimsko-katolicheskoiĭ propagandoĭ na Vostoke*, 2 pts (Novocherkassk, 1903); Richard Schlier, *Der Patriarch Kyrill Lukaris von Konstantinopel: sein Leben und sein Glaubensbekenntnis* (Marburg, 1927); Germanos, Metropolitan of Thyateira, *Kyrillos Loukaris 1572–1638: A Struggle for Preponderance Between Catholic and Protestant Powers in the Orthodox East* (London, 1951); Georg A. Hadjiantoniou (Georgios A. Chatzeantoniou), "Protestant patriarch": *The Life of Cyril Lucaris 1572–1638, Patriarch of Constantinople* (Richmond, 1961). From among the more recent studies, devoting much attention to Loukaris as the patriarch of Constantinople, it is worth mentioning Gunnar Hering, *Ökumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik 1620–1638* (Wiesbaden, 1968); Runciman, *The Great Church*, 238–87; Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821). Die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens* (Munich, 1988); Keetje Rozemond, 'Patriarch Kyrill Lukaris und seine Begegnung mit dem Protestantismus des 17. Jahrhunderts', *Kirche im Osten*, 13 (1970), 9–17.

⁴ The decision was also recognised in other autocephalous Orthodox Churches and St Loukaris Kyrillos was entered in the local diptychs of the saints. An analogous decision was taken on 1 December 2009 by the council of the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

⁵ In a recently published monograph on the relations of Loukaris with Protestantism, more attention has been devoted to his activity in the Commonwealth. However, also this study does not explore the subject in full, especially as its author has not used all the extant sources and has made but a limited use of the recent secondary literature. The book also contains a number of errors, especially in its

it is worth shedding more light on this period in the life and career of the young Greek clergyman, which must have been formative for his subsequent views and his attitude towards other Christian denominations. The present article aims to provide more data and correct some errors regarding the activity of Loukaris in Poland-Lithuania. It will also focus on the attitude of the future patriarch towards the Union of Brest and the Roman Catholic Church, expressed at this early stage of his public activity.

Loukaris was born in 1572, in Candia on the Crete island, which then belonged to the Venetian Republic. Among his teachers, in Crete and in Venice, were the renowned Orthodox theologians, Meletios Vlastos and Maximos Margunios (the future Orthodox bishop of Cythera). The latter one greatly influenced Loukaris and aroused his interest in the Western culture. The young Greek then continued his studies in Padua (1589–93), but the most decisive for his future career were the relations with his uncle, Meletius Pigas (1549–1601), one of the most enlightened Orthodox intellectuals of the period. From the mid-1570s, Pigas performed various functions in the chancelleries of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople, to finally assume the dignity of the patriarch of Alexandria, in 1590. Having invited Loukaris to Alexandria, Pigas ordained him a deacon and then a priest (1593). Soon afterwards, Loukaris ascended the post of *protosynkellos*, the patriarch's principal deputy (1594). Apart from their blood relationship and common place of origin (i.e., Candia), also similar curricula (Pigas had studied in Venice and Padua too) probably contributed to the promotion of the young priest. The uncle and the nephew must have shared similar religious and political views,⁶ and the career perspective of Loukaris seemed promising.

In the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the last decade of the sixteenth century brought the rise of unionist feelings. A number of Orthodox bishops, whose sees were dispersed in the eastern, Ruthenian territories of the Commonwealth, entered negotiations with the representatives of the Latin Church and discussed the conditions of

description of various aspects of the Polish Reformation; see Viktoriya Lyubashchenko, *Kirill Lukaris i protestantizm. Opyt mezhtserkovnogo dialoga* (Odessa, 2001).

⁶ Viktoriya Lyubashchenko, 'Poiski al'ternativnoi unii: pravoslavnye i protestanty v kontekste Beresta (Kirill Lukaris i Ukraina)', in Johann Marte and Oleh Turij (eds.), *Die Union von Brest (1596) in Geschichte und Geschichtsschreibung: Versuch einer Zwischenbilanz* (Lviv, 2008), 281 f.

subjecting the Orthodox metropolitanate of Kiev to Rome. When the disturbing news reached Alexandria by the way of Constantinople, Pigas resolved to address Prince Constantine Ostrogski, the palatine of Kiev and the most powerful Orthodox magnate in the Commonwealth, who also acted as the informal lay leader of the Polish king's Orthodox subjects. In his letter from 8 March 1594, Pigas summoned the prince to remain firm in his Orthodox faith and to defend it from any danger caused by the activity of 'papists and luther[an]s' in the Ruthenian lands. The patriarch notified the addressee that he was sending his *protosynkellos*, Kyrillos, as his personal envoy.⁷

As the matter of fact, the Orthodox metropolitanate of Kiev was formally subject to the jurisdiction of the ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople. Yet, his authority over the Orthodox subjects of the Polish king was largely fictitious. Contacts between the metropolitanate of Kiev and the patriarchate of Constantinople, or any other ancient Orthodox patriarchate, were very weak in the sixteenth century.⁸ Nonetheless, precisely at the end of the century, these contacts intensified due to the visits of Joaquin, the patriarch of Antiochia, in 1586, and – especially – of Jeremiah II, the ecumenical patriarch and the most outstanding Greek hierarch of Constantinople in the sixteenth century. The latter travelled through Poland-Lithuania in 1589, after his visit in Muscovy, where – at the insistence of Boris Godunov – he agreed to establish a new patriarchate in Moscow.⁹ In the Commonwealth, Jeremiah intervened in an internal conflict within the local Orthodox hierarchy and, having secured the consent of King Sigismund III, deprived Onisifor Devochka, the metropolitan of Kiev, of his function, on the premise that the latter had violated the canon law. The decision had no precedent in the early modern history of

⁷ Athanasius G. Welykyj (ed.), *Documenta unionis Berestensis eiusque auctorum* (hereafter: DUB) (Analecta OSBM II-3, Rome, 1970), no. 13, pp. 27–30; *Monumenta Confraternitatis Stauropigianae Leopoliensis* (hereafter: MCSL), ed. Wladimirus Milkowicz, vol. i, pt. 2 (Lviv, 1895), no. 308, pp. 509–12.

⁸ On the relations between the Ruthenian Orthodox Christianity (including Muscovy) and the ecumenical patriarchate, see Borys A. Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest* (Cambridge, MA, 1998), chpts iii, vi, x.

⁹ Borys A. Gudziak, 'The Sixteenth-Century Muscovite Church and Patriarch Jeremiah II's Journey to Muscovy 1588–1589: Some Comments Concerning the Historiography and Sources', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 19 (1995), 200–25.

the Kievan metropolitanate. The election of the new metropolitan, Michael Rohoza, went smoothly and received royal consent, but Jeremiah's other decisions, such as placing the Orthodox brotherhoods and the relevant monasteries in Vilna (Wilno) and Lviv (Lwów) under the direct jurisdiction of Constantinople (i.e., granting them the status of *stauropegia*) and thus removing them from the control of local bishops, provoked discontent among the local Orthodox hierarchy.¹⁰ This discontent proved decisive in pushing some local Orthodox bishops towards a reconciliation with the Latin Church. On the other hand, the visits of Joaquin and Jeremiah II in the Commonwealth initiated a period of vivid interest on the part of the Eastern patriarchs in the situation of the Kievan metropolitanate.

The above interest is best reflected by the decision of Meletius Pigas to send Kyrillos Loukaris to the Commonwealth. Loukaris arrived for the first time around mid-1594, provided with the aforementioned letter of the patriarch, addressed to Ostrogski. Apparently with Pigas's consent, the *protosynkellos* remained almost one year in Ostrog, the main seat of the Ostrogski family, situated in the province of Volhynia. Constantine Ostrogski made use of his guest's learning and appointed him the teacher of Greek in his Orthodox college (sometimes alternatively referred to as an academy) in Ostrog.¹¹ Renowned for its college and printing house, in which the first complete edition of the Church-Slavonic Bible was published in 1581, Ostrog was at that time the most important Orthodox intellectual centre in the Commonwealth. According to a later testimony of a Polish Protestant author, Andrzej Węgiński (Andreas Wengerscius), Loukaris even temporarily held the post of the college's rector.¹² Although this testimony is not confirmed by other, especially Orthodox, sources, it cannot be entirely dismissed

¹⁰ On the decisions, taken by Jeremiah II during his visit in the Commonwealth, see Andrzej Borkowski, 'Patriarcha konstantynopolitański Jeremiasz II Tranos w Rzeczypospolitej (1588–1589)', in Mironowicz, Pawluczuk and Walczak (eds.), *The Orthodox Church*, 55–75.

¹¹ On the college in Ostrog, see Igor Mits'ko, *Ostroz'ka slov'yano-greko-latyns'ka akademiya* (1576–1636) (Kiev, 1990); Tomasz Kempa, *Akademia i Drukarnia Ostrogska* (Biały Dunajec and Ostróg, 2006); Henryk Chałupczak, Justyna Misiągiewicz and Eduard Balashov (eds.), *Akademia Zamojska i Akademia Ostrogska w perspektywie historyczno-kulturowej. Współczesne implikacje dla współpracy transgranicznej* (Zamość, 2010), 185 f.

¹² *Andrae Wengerscii libri quattuor Slavoniae reformatae* (hereafter: Wengerscius), ed. Janusz Tazbir (Warsaw, 1973), 470; cf. Mits'ko, *Ostroz'ka*, 39.

given the role of Ostrogski, as the college's founder and patron, in the appointment of its rectors.

During his stay in Ostrog, in the second half of the year 1594, Loukaris maintained correspondence with Gavriilo Dorofeevich, a member of the stauropegial brotherhood in Lviv and a teacher in the school maintained by this brotherhood.¹³ They exchanged scholarly literature and the *protosynkellos* invited his correspondent to come to Ostrog in order to learn Greek.¹⁴ They kept in touch over the whole period of Loukaris's stay in the Commonwealth.

In mid-1595, the *protosynkellos* arrived at Vilna and assumed a teaching post in the school of the local Orthodox brotherhood, affiliated with the church of Holy Trinity (like the Lviv brotherhood, also the Vilna brotherhood enjoyed the status of *stauropedia* since 1589). He was elected the rector of the school, as we learn from a letter of its students addressed to Meletius Pigas.¹⁵ According to Loukaris's earliest seventeenth-century biographers, the two Protestant authors Antoine Léger and Thomas Smith, his stay in Vilna lasted twenty months,¹⁶ hence he must have remained in the Lithuanian capital until the beginning of 1597. We also know that he travelled several times between Vilna and Ostrog, maintaining close contacts with Constantine Ostrogski.¹⁷ Loukaris also participated in theological

¹³ Stauropegial brotherhoods were directly subject to the patriarch of Constantinople. In that period there were two such brotherhoods in the Commonwealth, in Vilna and Lviv, being simultaneously major intellectual centres of the Orthodox Church. They attracted not only laymen – townsmen as well as nobles – but also some prominent clergymen who were their members. Both brotherhoods, especially the Vilna one, initiated internal reforms in the metropolitanate of Kiev and strongly opposed the union with the Catholic Church.

¹⁴ Emile Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs au dix-septième siècle*, iv (Paris, 1896), 219–21; Konstantin Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie pravoslavnye shkoly XVI i nachala XVII v., otnoshenie ikh k inoslavnym, religioznoe obuchenie v nikh i zaslugi ikh v dele zashchity pravoslavnoi very i tserkvi* (Kazan', 1898), 264–5; Lyubashchenko, 'Poiski', 286.

¹⁵ Ivan I. Sokolov, 'Pro vidnosyny Ukraïns'koï Tserkvy do grets'kogo Skhodu naprykintsi XVI ta na pochatku XVII st. za novovydanymy materialamy: Istorychnyi narys', *Zapysky istorychno-filologichnogo viddilu Ukraïns'koï Akademii Nauk*, 1 (1919), 64–6; Kazimierz Chodyncki, *Kościół prawosławny a Rzeczpospolita Polska. Zarys historyczny 1370–1632* (Warsaw, 1934), 322, fn. 3; cf. Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie*, 265 f.

¹⁶ Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie*, 265; Runciman, *The Great Church*, 264.

¹⁷ Legrand, *Bibliographie*, iv, no. 54, p. 228; Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie*, 266 f.

disputes, organised in Vilna with the participation of the Jesuit and Franciscan friars (unfortunately we know neither the content of these debates nor the views expressed by the Greek clergyman). Moreover, Loukaris prepared a selection of works of his protector, Meletius Pigas, for publication in the printing house of the Vilna brotherhood.¹⁸

In the meantime, the union between the Latin Church and the Kievan metropolitanate came to fruition, whereas neither Loukaris nor other opponents of the union were able to prevent it. The sources are silent in regard to the issue whether he actively opposed its conclusion before the unification synod in October 1596. In that period, the most active opponent to the union in Vilna was Stefan Zizaniï (Tustanovskii), a preacher originating from Lviv and affiliated with the Lviv stauropegial brotherhood, who was accused by his Roman Catholic and Uniate opponents of crypto-Protestant views.¹⁹

On the invitation of Constantine Ostrogski, in 1596, the Commonwealth was visited by Nikephoros Parasios, the *protosynkellos* and principal assistant of Jeremiah II, the patriarch of Constantinople, who had died shortly before. The late patriarch had provided Nikephoros with full powers to settle religious affairs in the territories subject to Constantinople's jurisdiction. The main reason for Nikephoros's visit was to prevent the conclusion of a union between the metropolitanate of Kiev and Rome, expected to be solemnly announced at the synod, summoned by King Sigismund III to be held in Brest, in October 1596.²⁰ The act was preceded by a visit of two Orthodox bishops – the

¹⁸ Lyubashchenko, 'Poiski', 287.

¹⁹ See the letter by Michael Rohoza to Stefan Zizaniï dated 30 Sept. 1595, in which the metropolitan of Kiev ordered Zizaniï to cease preaching in Orthodox Churches, in *Akty, otnosyashchiesya k istorii Zapadnoï Rossii sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoi Komissii* (hereafter: AZR), iv (St Petersburg, 1848), no. 88, pp. 121 f.; cf. the letter of Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł and Stanisław Radziwiłł to Sigismund III of 28 Aug. 1595, in Tomasz Kempa, 'Nieznane listy dotyczące genezy unii brzeskiej (1595/1596)', *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, 44 (2000), 117 f.; Lyubov' V. Levshun, "'Eresi" osuzhdennye novogradskim 1596 g. cerkovnym soborom (k voprosu ob obryadovykh i dogmaticallykh nestroyeniakh v VKL nakanune unii)', in Aleksandr B. Bendin *et al.* (eds.), *IV Mezhdunarodnye Kirillo-Mefodievskie chteniya, posvyashchennye Dnyam slavyanskoï pis'mennosti i kul'tury (Minsk, 24–26 maya 1998 g.): Materialy chteniï* (Minsk, 1999), 78–96.

²⁰ Tomasz Kempa, 'Proces Nicefora na sejmie w Warszawie w 1597 roku', in Zbigniew Karpus, Tomasz Kempa and Dorota Michaluk (eds.), *Europa Orientalis. Polska i jej wschodni sąsiedzi od średniowiecza po współczesność. Studia i materiały*

bishop of Volodymyr and Brest, Ipatii Potiï, and the bishop of Lutsk and Ostrog, Cyril Terlecki – in Rome, during which Clemens VIII issued a bull, dated on Christmas Eve 1595 and confirming the union on behalf of the pope.

Before entering the Commonwealth, in August 1596, Nikephoros convened a meeting with the Moldavian Orthodox bishops at the Moldavian capital in Jassy. A jointly issued manifest, addressed to the Orthodox bishops in Poland-Lithuania, urged them to remain firm in their faith.²¹ Shortly after his arrival in the Volhynian estate of Prince Ostrogski, Nikephoros sent a letter to Loukaris, dated 16 September 1596, in Dubno, in which he proposed to meet in one of Ostrogski's domains in Volhynia in order to discuss a common stand to be taken in regard to the 'bishops-renegades' and the Jesuits – the main Catholic promoters of the union, in the face of the approaching synod.²² Obviously, the meeting was to be attended by Constantine Ostrogski, whose political and economic position predestined him to become the leader of the anti-Uniate Orthodox opposition in Poland-Lithuania. Still, we do not know whether the planned meeting eventually took place or if Nikephoros and Loukaris met only shortly before the synod, in Brest.

At the same time, in distant Alexandria, Meletius Pigas issued a letter dated 30 August 1596, in which he urged Prince Ostrogski and the whole Orthodox community in the Commonwealth to defend their faith. He also gave practical advice to ordain new bishops in order to replace the current ones if the latter turned renegades.²³

Ostrogski, Loukaris and Nikephoros arrived at Brest on the eve of the formal opening of the synod, i.e., on 5 October 1596, apparently in order to discuss the common tactics.²⁴ Two Orthodox synods were

ofiarowane Profesorowi Stanisławowi Alexandrowiczowi w 65 rocznicę urodzin (Toruń, 1996), 150.

²¹ MCSL, vol. i, pt. 2, no. 382, pp. 658 f.

²² Legrand, *Bibliographie*, iv, no. 51, pp. 221–5; Oskar Halecki, *From Florence to Brest (1439–1596)* (Rome, 1958), 360; Kempa, 'Proces', 150; Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie*, 266 f.

²³ DUB, no. 222, pp. 321–32; Izydor Szaraniewicz, 'Patrijarchat wschodni wobec Kościoła ruskiego i Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej', *Rozprawy i Sprawozdania Wydziału Historyczno-Filozoficznego Akademii Umiejętności*, 8 (1878), 311 f.

²⁴ Marcin Broniewski, *Ekthesis albo krótkie zebranie spraw, które się działy na partykularnym, to jest pomiastnym Synodzie w Brześciu Litewskim*, ed. Janusz Byliński and Józef Długosz (Wrocław, 1995), 35.

simultaneously convoked to Brest, one attended by the supporters of the union, who solemnly announced the reconciliation between Kiev and Rome, the other attended by the opponents who resented the subjection of the Orthodox Church to the pope. More or less official messengers kept circulating between the two synods, reflecting the apparent hope of some of their members to convince the opponents – especially those most influential and prominent – to change their mind. During the synod, Loukaris remained in the shade of Nikephoros,²⁵ firstly because of the traditional hierarchy between the ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople and the patriarch of Alexandria, and consequently between their representatives; secondly, the difference in age probably mattered as well since Nikephoros was over 50 years old²⁶ while Loukaris was only 24. Most of the steps, taken during the synod by the opponents of the union and based on the Orthodox canon law, were initiated by Nikephoros, while their real weight depended on the posture of Constantine Ostrogski. What counted here was not only the prince's position within the Commonwealth's political elite, but also the authority which he enjoyed among his co-religionists. As to Nikephoros, his position was seriously affected by an accusation formulated by Crown Chancellor Jan Zamoyski, who accused the *protosynkellos* of being a 'Turkish spy'. The accusation was upheld by King Sigismund III while the royal commissioners present at the synod demanded from Ostrogski to deliver Nikephoros to the royal justice. The prince refused but instead agreed to bring the *protosynkellos* to the approaching Diet, where his case was to be heard.²⁷ Nikephoros did not object as he wanted to prove his innocence. During the trial, which took place at the Diet, in March 1597, Nikephoros was not found guilty. Nonetheless, he was detained

²⁵ Some cursory relations from the synod (even those written by Orthodox authors) did not even mention Loukaris's presence in Brest; see, e.g., 'Barkulabovskaya letopis', ed. Aleksandr N. Mal'tsev, *Arkheograficheskiĭ Ezhegodnik za 1960 god* (1962), 302–5.

²⁶ Kempa, 'Proces', 146; Nicolae Iorga, 'Nichifor Dascălul. Exarh patriarhal și legăturile lui cu țările noastre (1580-1599)', *Analele Academiei Române*, seria II, vol. xxvii (1905), 184.

²⁷ See the letter by Jan Dymitr Solikowski, Bernard Maciejowski, Stanisław Gomoliński, Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł, Lew Sapięha, and Dymitr Chalecki to Sigismund III of 19 Oct. 1596, in Kempa, 'Nieznane listy', 127–8; cf. 'Barkulabovskaya letopis', 304.

in the fortress of Marienburg while Jeremy Movilă, the hospodar of Moldavia and at the same time Zamoyski's protégé, was asked to provide additional evidence that would prove Nikephoros's guilt. As such evidence had never been found, the trial was not resumed, but Nikephoros remained imprisoned in Marienburg where he soon died (in ca. 1600).²⁸ Zamoyski's accusations also had domestic political background as the chancellor was in a sharp conflict with the Ostrogski family.²⁹

For the supporters of the union, charges against Nikephoros offered a handy tool to discredit their opponents. These charges were also used during the trial at the Diet. Already earlier, immediately after the October synod, the Uniates began to spread gossip that Nikephoros was an impostor who only pretended to have been sent by the patriarch of Constantinople. The obvious motive was to discredit the decisions taken by the opponents of the union in Brest. It is in the context of the above campaign, in which the Uniates questioned Nikephoros's right to represent the ecumenical patriarch, where the presence of the second *protosynkellos*, Loukaris, became crucial for proving that the anti-unionist synod and its decisions were legitimate. In fact, although the unionist synod in Brest was attended by the majority of Orthodox bishops from the Ruthenian provinces of Poland-Lithuania,³⁰ not a single hierarch from beyond the borders appeared, which pointed to the union's particular and local character. On the other hand, the anti-unionist synod was attended by only two local bishops – Gedeon Balaban of Lviv and Michael Kopystenski of Przemyśl – and nine heads of local Orthodox monasteries, but its participants could invoke the support of the highest authorities of the Eastern Church evidenced by the presence of Kyrillos Loukaris and Nikephoros Parasios.

What then can be said about the activity of Loukaris during the anti-unionist synod in Brest? He addressed the meeting as one of the

²⁸ For more details on this issue and the charges against Nikephoros, see Kempa, 'Proces', 145–68.

²⁹ Cf. Tomasz Kempa, 'Konflikt między kanclerzem Janem Zamoyskim a książętami Ostrogskimi i jego wpływ na sytuację wewnętrzną i zewnętrzną Rzeczypospolitej w końcu XVI wieku', *Sotsium: al'manakh sotsial'noi istorii*, 9 (2010), 67–96.

³⁰ From among the eight bishops of the Orthodox metropolitanate of Kiev six – including Metropolitan Michael Rohoza – supported the union, while two were opposed.

first discussants, choosing Latin rather than Greek as those present in the audience understood the former much better than the latter. This observation was true not only in regard to Ruthenian laymen, but also Ruthenian clergymen, whereas Loukaris did not have enough time to acquire adequate fluency in Ruthenian or Polish. The *protosynkellos* observed that the metropolitan of Kiev, Michael Rohoza, and other bishops who supported the union, did not explain their decision to the faithful. He also argued that the acts of the metropolitan and his supporters brought so much confusion to the Orthodox community that the culprits deserved to be punished according to the canon law.³¹ By this statement, he explicitly demanded that Rohoza and other bishops who supported the union should face excommunication. In consequence, the procedure was set in motion and a delegation of Orthodox clergymen was dispatched to the metropolitan and other 'renegade' bishops – who were gathered at the parallel synod in Brest – to summon them to repent and reject the union. They presented Rohoza with the letters signed by Nikephoros and Loukaris.³² The admonitions did not change the course of events; likewise, the efforts of the other side to persuade Constantine Ostrogski to change his mind and accept the union proved equally fruitless. Finally, those present at the anti-unionist synod placed their signatures below the act of excommunication of the metropolitan of Kiev and other bishops who agreed to subordinate the Orthodox Church in Poland-Lithuania to the pope.³³ Among the document's signatories was also Loukaris.

In the subsequent years, some Catholic supporters of the Union of Brest favourably contrasted the conduct of Loukaris with that of Nikephoros during the synod of 1596, although such opinions might have been ex-post influenced by Loukaris's stand taken during his second visit in the Commonwealth (see below). Nonetheless Piotr Skarga, a prominent Jesuit preacher and the fiercest proponent of the union among the Roman-Catholic clergymen of Poland-Lithuania, maintained that there had been outright opposition between Loukaris and Nikephoros during the synod of Brest.³⁴ According to other

³¹ Broniewski, *Ekthesis*, 37; DUB, no. 229, p. 348.

³² Broniewski, *Ekthesis*, 42 f.; DUB, no. 229, pp. 346–51.

³³ Broniewski, *Ekthesis*, 66–70; DUB, no. 229, pp. 351–38; AZR, iv, no. 104, p. 141; Michael Harasiewicz (ed.), *Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenae* (Lviv, 1862), 226–8.

³⁴ Leonid V. Tymoshenko, *Berestejs'ka uniya 1596 r.* (Drohobych, 2004), 98 f.

reports, Loukaris was to declare in Brest that the Orthodox Christians would gladly unite with the Latin Church if only the entire Orthodox Church, most notably all the patriarchs, reached a consensus in this matter, and if an agreement was reached in regard to the dogmas and the organisation of the two great Churches.³⁵ He thus clearly described himself as an advocate of universal union, a vision to which he would return during his second stay in the Commonwealth. A somewhat different picture is offered by Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł ‘Sierotka’ (lit.: ‘the Orphan’), a prominent Lithuanian magnate and patron of counterreformation, who recalled his conversation with Loukaris (December 1600). The latter reportedly confessed that during the synod he and Nikephoros had tried to reconcile with the supporters of the union, but these efforts had been ‘*manifeste* frustrated by the heretics’.³⁶ The term *heretics* here referred to the Protestant clients of Constantine Ostrogski, who had arrived at Brest along with their patron. One can doubt whether the opinions of Skarga and Radziwiłł reflected the genuine intentions of Loukaris, but it seems that his attitude towards the Union of Brest had been less critical than that of Nikephoros or the majority of anti-unionist opposition in the Ruthenian lands of Poland-Lithuania.

A less rigid stand of Loukaris probably resulted from his earlier experience, including the years of studies in Venice and Padua, which made him more open to dialogue with Western Christianity, Catholic as well as Protestant. Besides, a study of his later career suggests that his religious views were subject to fluctuations.

What we know for sure is that, also after the synod, Loukaris did not actively participate in the struggle against the Union, even though he remained in the Commonwealth for over a year. He spent some time in Vilna and then, on the renewed invitation from Constantine Ostrogski, again arrived at Ostrog where he continued his teaching activity.³⁷ In the meantime, Meletius Pigas confirmed all the decisions taken at the anti-unionist synod in Brest in a *tomos* issued on 4 August

³⁵ Rozemond, ‘Patriarch Kyrill’, 11.

³⁶ ‘... ale heretycy *manifeste* przeszkodzili’, quoted after Kazimierz Lewicki, *Książę Konstanty Ostrogski a unia brzeska 1596 r.* (Lwów, 1933), 176, fn. 1.

³⁷ Cf. the letter by Gavriilo Dorofeevich to Kyrillos Loukaris dated 13 June 1597, in Legrand, *Bibliographie*, iv, no. 55, p. 229; Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie*, 267; Runciman, *The Great Church*, 264.

1597.³⁸ Accordingly, the patriarch nominated three exarchs to act on the territory of the Commonwealth. Their main task was to ordain new bishops in the place of the bishops who had adopted the union. One of the exarchs was Loukaris, another one was Gedeon Balaban, the Orthodox bishop of Lviv, and the third one was Constantine Ostrogski.³⁹ Loukaris did not have time to fulfil his mission as he left the Commonwealth in the winter of 1597/8. In August 1598, he was in Constantinople, and then he went to Crete where he spent Christmas with his family.⁴⁰

He reappeared in Poland-Lithuania in the early spring of 1600 and his arrival was linked with the project of cooperation, and perhaps even a prospective religious union between the Orthodox and Protestant (i.e., Calvinists, Bohemian Brethren, and Lutherans) inhabitants of the Commonwealth. The idea developed in the entourage of Constantine Ostrogski, who had sent his representatives to the Protestant general synod in Toruń already five years earlier, in August 1595.⁴¹ This was a double response on the part of the Orthodox and Protestant milieus to the Union of Brest and the anti-Protestant politics of Sigismund III. Their rising worry was that the king, an ardent supporter of counterreformation, did not react or reacted in an unsatisfactory manner to anti-Protestant religious tumults stirred with increasing frequency in large royal towns. Most of the perpetrators

³⁸ Pigas then additionally performed the function of the patriarch of Constantinople as the latter post was vacant.

³⁹ Szaraniewicz, 'Patrijarchat', 312 f.; Halecki, *From Florence*, 409; Chodynicki, *Kościół*, 347; Lyubashchenko, 'Poiski', 288. In spite of the above efforts, this first initiative to reconstruct the Orthodox hierarchy in the Ruthenian lands after the Union of Brest proved unsuccessful.

⁴⁰ Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie*, 267; Runciman, *The Great Church*, 264.

⁴¹ Cf. Leszek Jarmański, *Bez użycia siły. Działalność polityczna protestantów w Rzeczypospolitej u schyłku XVI wieku* (Warsaw, 1992), 106–26; Tomasz Kempa, 'Prawosławni a synod protestancki w Toruniu w 1595 roku. U początków współpracy dyzunitów z dysydentami', *Zapiski Historyczne*, lxii, 1 (1997), 39–52; Wojciech Sławiński, 'Projekty politycznej współpracy protestancko-prawosławnej i unii religijnej obu wyznań w świetle obrad toruńskiego synodu generalnego 1595 roku i późniejszych planów braci czeskich', in Jacek Staszewski, Krzysztof Mikulski and Jarosław Dumanowski (eds.), *Między Zachodem a Wschodem, i: Studia z dziejów Rzeczypospolitej w epoce nowożytniej* (Toruń, 2002), 348–64; Tomasz Kempa, *Wobec kontrreformacji. Protestanci i prawosławni w obronie swobód wyznaniowych w Rzeczypospolitej w końcu XVI i w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku* (Toruń, 2007), 74–92.

of the acts of violence, directed against the Protestants or their churches had remained unpunished. Moreover, Sigismund III openly preferred Catholics in his promotional policy and nominated them to the highest senatorial posts in the Commonwealth.⁴² Facing political marginalisation, both the Orthodox and the Protestant nobles had many reasons to cooperate. Such political cooperation was apparent at the successive Diets, dating from 1596.⁴³

A further step towards broadening this cooperation onto the field of religion was a common assembly of Orthodox and Protestant representatives held in Vilna, in May 1599. However, it turned out that from among the Orthodox delegates only Constantine Ostrogski was genuinely interested in a religious rapprochement, while even his closest cooperators from among the clergy remained overly skeptical. Also the Protestants did not favour a doctrinal compromise but rather hoped to persuade the other side to accept their standpoint. The most active in these efforts was Simon Teofil Turnowski (Turnovius), a senior representative of the Bohemian Brethren (Latin: *Unitas Fratrum*).⁴⁴ He was the main author of a project of confessional union and political alliance between the Protestants and Orthodox in Poland-Lithuania, entitled *De colloquio Wilnensi cum Graecis*.⁴⁵ The project prescribed in a detailed way the mode of proceeding during the assembly in Vilna. In order to prevent future acts of violence directed against non-Catholics, the author proposed to appoint a number of supervisors who would monitor developments in various parts of the Commonwealth. With the prospective religious union in mind, a series of disputes was to be organised in Vilna between theologians representing the Orthodox Church and, on the other side, the three main branches of Protestantism in Poland-Lithuania – the Lutherans, the Calvinists, and the Bohemian Brethren. The professed goal

⁴² Tomasz Kempa, 'Religious Relations and the Issue of the Religious Tolerance in Poland and Lithuania in the 16th and 17th Century', *Sarmatia Europaea. Polish Review of Early Modern History* (<www.sarmatia-europaea.pl> [Accessed 17 Nov. 2011]), 1 (2010), 47–9.

⁴³ Kempa, *Wobec kontrreformacji*, 102 ff.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, 149–72; Jarmiński, *Bez użycia siły*, 233–42; Sławiński, 'Projekty', 348–64.

⁴⁵ Poznań, Biblioteka Raczyńskich, ms. 46, pp. 28–33; published with some errors and shortenings in Józef Łukasiewicz, *Dzieje kościołów wyznania helweckiego w Litwie*, i (Poznań, 1842), 117–23.

of these disputes was a doctrinal rapprochement, which was to be prepared by the means of successive common synods. Yet, a deeper analysis of Turnowski's project leads to the conclusion that its author, in fact, hoped to persuade his Orthodox partners to adopt a Protestant confession, preferably in a version favoured by Bohemian Brethren or Calvinists.⁴⁶

It is evident that from the doctrinal point of view a religious union between the Orthodox and Protestant Churches could only be attained at the price of abandoning some fundamental elements of their creed by one of the negotiating sides. In fact, neither of them was ready for such a sacrifice. During the assembly in Vilna, Orthodox clergymen repeatedly dismissed the proposals of Protestant ministers, saying in excuse that they could not make any commitment in regard to confessional issues without prior consent of their patriarchs. In result, the gathering did not bring any decisive effects. Although it certainly strengthened the political cooperation between the Orthodox anti-Uniates and the Protestants (especially Calvinists and Bohemian Brethren), the efforts to reach a religious union ended in fiasco.⁴⁷

In the face of resistance, encountered from the side of Orthodox clergymen, Protestant ministers, encouraged by Ostrogski, resolved to send letters directly to the patriarch of Constantinople, Matthew II, and to Meletius Pigas. Such letters, probably separately addressed to the two patriarchs, were sent by the leading Protestant clergymen: Simon Turnowski, Daniel Mikołajewski, Erasmus Gliczner, Martin Janicki (Janitius), Gregory of Żarnowiec, and Laurence Piotrowski. Their letter addressed to Pigas was dated on 6 June 1599, in Vilna.⁴⁸ A separate letter to the patriarch of Alexandria was sent by Turnowski, the aforementioned senior minister of the Bohemian Brethren and at the same time the greatest advocate of a Protestant-Orthodox

⁴⁶ For a detailed discussion of the project, see Kempa, *Wobec kontrreformacji*, 150–5; Jarmański, *Bez użycia siły*, 235–7; Sławiński, 'Projekt', 360–3.

⁴⁷ The participants only wrote down eighteen vague articles of creed that could be accepted by all the sides; see [Martin Janicki], *Artykuły, w których zgadzają się ewangelicy z ludźmi Greckiego nabożeństwa i z Kościoły orientalnymi w nauce zbawiennej* (n.p., n.d., probably ca. 1599); their text is republished in Kempa, *Wobec kontrreformacji*, 160 f.

⁴⁸ An early seventeenth-century copy is provided with the date of 4 June, see St Petersburg, Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheski Arkhiv, fond 823, opis 3, delo 64, pp. 1–2; published with the date of 6 June, in Wengerscius, 491–4.

religious rapprochement among the Polish Protestants.⁴⁹ The Protestant ministers wrote that their aim was to fulfil the Lord's words calling the faithful to live in brotherly love and therefore they endeavoured to attain the unity of all true Christians. Like in the former debate with Orthodox theologians in Vilna, they stressed common points in the Protestant and Orthodox doctrines, although they also admitted differences. Having recounted the discussions and decisions taken in Vilna, they also invoked the patronage of prince Ostrogski in order to make their offer more trustworthy. Finally, they asked Pigas to consent for a detailed theological debate with the participation of Orthodox clergymen.

Given their rigid stand taken in the debate, it is doubtful whether the Orthodox participants of the Vilna assembly resolved to address the patriarchs with similar letters which would contain a request for authorisation of a doctrinal dispute.

Another letter was sent to Patriarch Pigas by Martin Broniewski (Bronovius),⁵⁰ a Polish nobleman and Bohemian Brother, who as a client of Constantine Ostrogski acted as a link person between the palatine of Kiev and the most powerful Protestant leaders in the Commonwealth: the palatine of Vilna, Krzysztof Radziwiłł 'Piorun' (Ostrogski's son-in-law), and the palatine of Brześć Kujawski, Andrzej Leszczyński. In fact, a success in the building of an Orthodox-Protestant political alliance largely depended on the posture of the above three magnates. By using their clients and local prestige, they could influence the atmosphere on the provincial dietines which elected and sent deputies to the general Diet and could also provide these deputies with binding instructions.⁵¹ To return to Broniewski, he was a noble intellectual and the author of two important pamphlets – *Apokrysis*, published in 1597 under the penname of Christophor Philaleth and *Ekthesis*, published in the same year anonymously.

⁴⁹ The letter dated 4 June 1599 is published in Wengerscius, 495–6.

⁵⁰ See his biography by Janusz Byliński, *Marcin Broniewski – trybun szlachty wielkopolskiej w czasach Zygmunta III* (Wrocław, 1994). On his role in the struggle against counterreformation and his efforts to built an Orthodox-Protestant alliance in the Commonwealth, see also Kempa, *Wobec kontrreformacji*, 80 ff.

⁵¹ Cf. Tomasz Kempa, 'Animatorzy współpracy protestancko-prawosławnej w okresie kontrreformacji', in Tomasz Ciesielski and Anna Filipczak-Kocur (eds.), *Rzeczpospolita państwem wielu narodowości i wyznań. XVI–XVIII wiek* (Warsaw and Opole, 2008), 321–41.

The pamphlets, whose authorship was attributed to Broniewski only recently, contained an Orthodox response to the Union of Brest and a polemic with its greatest advocates – Piotr Skarga and Ipatii Potii.⁵² Both pamphlets written by none other than Protestant Bronovius were published on the initiative of Ostrogski which disclosed the prince's little faith in the intellectual capacities of the contemporary Orthodox elites in the Commonwealth. It was also a telling proof of Ostrogski's open attitude in regard to Protestant influences.⁵³ Even before the Union of Brest, when the prince urged the Orthodox bishops to undertake internal reforms in the Church, he advised them to follow the example set by the Protestants who had reformed their educational systems.⁵⁴ Ostrogski's tolerant attitude towards other confessions and religions was well visible in allowing the non-Orthodox inhabitants of his estates to construct and use their temples (Catholic, Calvinist, and Polish Brethren churches, Jewish synagogues, and Tatar mosques).⁵⁵

Broniewski's prominent position in Ostrogski's entourage perhaps explains why Pigas's response to his letter was voiced in a very friendly manner. At the heading, the patriarch referred to the addressee as a 'learned man' and in the following lines continued to treat him with utmost respect, adding that he had heard of his qualities from his *protosynkellos* and exarch, Kyrillos Loukaris. The author expressed his hope that the Heavenly Father himself will terminate Christian disunity and will reunite all Christians in one Church.⁵⁶ Interestingly, the patriarch's answer addressed to Turnowski was much colder and brief. Pigas firmly rejected any possibility of an Orthodox-Protestant union and, visibly irritated by the proposals of the Protestant minister, retorted that there was nothing in the teaching of the Orthodox

⁵² For the latest editions, see Marcin Broniewski, *Apokrysis abo odpowiedź na książki o synodzie brzeskim*, ed. Janusz Byliński and Józef Długosz (Wrocław, 1994); *idem, Ekthesis*.

⁵³ Cf. Tomasz Kempa, 'Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski wobec katolicyzmu i wyznań protestanckich', *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, 40 (1996), 17–36.

⁵⁴ This infatuation with Protestant models was resented by the supporters of the union, see the letter by Ipatii Potii to Constantine Ostrogski from 25 March 1595, in AZR, iv, no. 63, p. 90.

⁵⁵ Cf. Tomasz Kempa, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski (ok. 1524/1525–1608), wojewoda kijowski i marszałek ziemi wołyńskiej* (Toruń, 1997), 111–17.

⁵⁶ The letter by Meletius Pigas to Martin Broniewski [24 Nov. 1599], sent from Egypt, in Wengerscius, 498.

Church that needed to be corrected by Protestants.⁵⁷ The patriarch's answer to the letter signed collectively by the Protestant ministers was probably similar in tone.⁵⁸ Like the former two letters, it was taken to Poland-Lithuania by Loukaris, who arrived in the early spring of 1600, but it was never delivered to the addressees. As we learn from Pigas's letter to the Latin archbishop of Lviv, Jan Dymitr Solikowski, Loukaris resigned from delivering the patriarch's letter or making its contents public when he realised that his contacts with the Protestant opposition may compromise him in the eyes of King Sigismund III.⁵⁹ He apparently did not want to further jeopardise the already difficult position of the Orthodox Church in the Commonwealth. Besides, there was no point in making the patriarch's reply public as it was negative anyway.

In the context of the above correspondence between Pigas and Solikowski, one should dismiss the information later current in German Protestant circles, according to which the letter of Pigas, entrusted to Loukaris and addressed to the Polish-Lithuanian Protestants, was confiscated at the Polish border.⁶⁰ There was no reason for such confiscation as the exarch travelled with formal royal consent⁶¹

⁵⁷ The letter by Meletius Pigas to Simon Teofil Turnowski dated 23 Nov. 1600 [1599], sent from Egypt, in Wengerscius, 497.

⁵⁸ Such a conclusion can be drawn from the letter by Kyrillos Loukaris to Jan Dymitr Solikowski dated 24 Jan. 1601; see Athanasius G. Welykyj (ed.), *Litterae episcoporum historiam Ucrainae illustrantes, i: 1600–1640* (Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii M. Series II. Sectio III. Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in Terris Ucrainae et Bielarusiae, Rome, 1972), no. 6, pp. 7–10; cf. Kai E. Jordt Jørgensen, *Ökumenische Bestrebungen unter den polnischen Protestanten bis zum Jahre 1645* (Copenhagen, 1942), 323.

⁵⁹ The letter in its original Latin version is published in Welykyj (ed.), *Litterae episcoporum*, i, no. 6, pp. 7–10; a contemporary Polish translation by Piotr Skarga is published in *idem*, *Na threny i lament Theopila Orthologa do Rusi greckiego nabożeństwa przestroga* (Wilno, 1610); republished in Skarga, 'Obrona synodu brzeskiego' in *idem*, *O jedności Kościoła Bożego pod jednym pasterzem ... oraz Synod brzeski i obrona synodu brzeskiego* (Cracow, 1885), 230–4; cf. Wengerscius, 497.

⁶⁰ See Marian Bendza, 'Prawosławno-protestanckie tendencje unijne w XVI wieku ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem terenu ziem Rzeczypospolitej', *Rocznik Teologiczny*, xxv, 2 (1983), 193.

⁶¹ This is apparent in the light of the letter by Constantine Ostrogski to Sigismund III sent on 28 July 1600 from Ostrog; for the original see Kórnik, Biblioteka Polskiej Akademii Nauk (hereafter: BKórn.), ms. 1398, pt. II, no. 17, p. 287; it is published in Ioan Bogdan (ed.), *Documente privtoare la istoria românilor*,

and was provided with many other letters of the patriarch, addressed to the king,⁶² Constantine Ostrogski, Jan Zamoyski,⁶³ Prince Bohdan Solomerecki, Teodor Skumin Tyszkiewicz, the stauropelial brotherhoods in Vilna and Lviv, and other recipients. At least some of these letters have safely reached their addressees.⁶⁴

What matters most here is that the attitude of Pigas towards an Orthodox-Protestant union was clearly negative as it is evident from his letters. In such circumstances, probably the most important task entrusted to Loukaris in his second mission to the Commonwealth was to strengthen Constantine Ostrogski in the Orthodox faith. Pigas was probably alarmed by the prince's inclination towards a union with the Protestants, especially as the patriarch did not know him in person and could not appreciate his remarkable commitment towards the Orthodox Church. Already in 1583, Ostrogski, who then maintained close contacts with the papacy and papal legates in the Commonwealth,⁶⁵ tried to persuade Patriarch Jeremiah II to introduce the Gregorian calendar reform. Yet, when the latter, along with other patriarchs, rejected the new calendar, Ostrogski suddenly turned into its ardent critic⁶⁶ and his printing house in Ostrog published a number of pamphlets against the calendar reform.⁶⁷ From the ex-post perspective one may conclude that Ostrogski would not do anything that would deviate from the line taken by the patriarch. Indeed, shortly later Loukaris could assure Pigas that the prince would remain loyal

Suplement II, i: (1510–1600): Documente culese din arhive și biblioteci polone (Bucharest, 1893), no. 335, p. 628.

⁶² The letter by Meletius Pigas to Sigismund III from 1599, in Wengerscius, 467–9.

⁶³ The letter by Meletius Pigas to Jan Zamoyski from 1599, Warsaw, Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych (hereafter: AGAD), Archiwum Zamoyskich, ms. 139, 1.

⁶⁴ See the letter by Yurii Rohatyniec (from Rohatyn) to the Vilna brotherhood dated 26 Feb. 1603, sent from Cracow, Kiev, Natsional'na Biblioteka Ukraïny im. V. I. Vernads'kogo, Instytut Rukopysiv, fond 2, delo 21039; Chodynicky, *Kościół*, 353–4.

⁶⁵ For more information on these contacts, see Jan Krajcar, 'Konstantin Basil Ostrožskij and Rome in 1582–1584', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, xxxv, 1 (1969), 193–214; Kempa, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski*, 119–30.

⁶⁶ Kempa, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski*, 124 f.

⁶⁷ Cf. Gerasym Smotryts'kyi, *Klyuch tsarstva nebesnogo* [Ostrog, 1587]; Vasil' Suraz'skiï, *Knizhitsya 'O edinoï istinnoï pravoslavnoï vere, i o svyatoï sobornoï apostol'skoï tserkvi'* [Ostrog, 1588].

to his directives. After the second visit of Loukaris, Ostrogski discontinued his earlier efforts to build a union with the Protestants.

Loukaris's visit in the Commonwealth, in 1600, seriously alarmed the head of the Uniate Church, Ipatii Potii, who had ascended the post of the metropolitan of Kiev after the death of Michael Rohoza in 1599. He feared that the visit's main target was the mobilisation of opposition against the union. Hence the metropolitan asked the king to expel the Greek clergyman from the Commonwealth. In his later correspondence with the protector of the Uniate Church, Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł 'Sierotka', Potii recalled that the king indeed had ordered to arrest Loukaris.⁶⁸ On Potii's insistence, also the Roman Curia and the papal nuncio in Poland, Claudio Rangoni, demanded from Sigismund III the expulsion of Loukaris from Poland-Lithuania.⁶⁹ The king, in fact, undertook certain steps in order to expel the Greek hierarch. He first wrote to Ostrogski, under whose protection Loukaris stayed in Ostrog, and asked to send him away as soon as possible. He also wrote to Loukaris expressing his doubts concerning the actual reasons of his visit and suggesting that it was not an auspicious moment for the exarch's visit, as the Commonwealth was at war with the Wallachian hospodar, Michael the Brave. As an Orthodox ruler the latter enjoyed some appeal among the Orthodox inhabitants of Poland-Lithuania, whose mobilisation at the occasion of the exarch's visit might have been inopportune.⁷⁰

Ostrogski tried to defend Loukaris against the royal accusations. In a letter to Sigismund III, dated 28 July 1600, the prince complained that there had been efforts to arrest his guest, even though the king had earlier authorised his visit. Ostrogski asked the monarch to enable

⁶⁸ The letter by Ipatii Potii to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł from 9 Sept. 1600, see Platon Zhukovich, *Seimovaya bor'ba pravoslavnago zapadno-russkogo dvoryanstva s tserkovnoi uniyei (do 1609 g.)* (St Petersburg, 1901), *prilozhenye*, no. 6, p. 592.

⁶⁹ *Monumenta Ucrainae historica* (hereafter: MUH), i, ed. Andreas Šeptycky (Rome, 1964), nos 281–2, pp. 192–3 (the dispatches by Cardinal Aldobrandino sent to Nuncio Claudio Rangoni on 16 and 30 Sept. 1600); cf. DUB, nos 346–7, pp. 503–4; Jordt Jørgensen, *Ökumenische Bestrebungen*, 323.

⁷⁰ See the letter by Sigismund III to Loukaris sent from Warsaw apparently in 1600 (no date provided), AGAD, Archiwum Radziwiłłów, Rękopisy biblioteczne, V–92, p. 271; cf. Zhukovich, *Seimovaya*, 439 f., fn. 915; the letter by Constantine Ostrogski to Sigismund III sent on 28 July 1600 from Ostrog, in Bogdan (ed.), *Documente*, Supl. II, i, no. 335, p. 628; Tomasz Kempa, 'Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka a unia brzeska', *Czasy Nowożytne*, ii (1997), 54 f.

Loukaris to fulfil his mission and deliver the letter of his patron, patriarch Pigas, addressed to the king.⁷¹ The palatine of Kiev was willing to vouch for the behaviour and deeds of his guest,

this honest man [who as] the great envoy will not do anything beyond his instruction, worded in his letter, neither does he undertake or will undertake anything apart from the fulfillment of his mission.

The prince promised that the *protosynkellos* would not stay in Poland for long and asked the king to set a date for a royal audience and to send a safe conduct that would allow his guest a safe travel to the royal court.⁷²

Ostrogski's words were true as, during his stay in the Ruthenian provinces, Loukaris did not develop any anti-unionist activity⁷³ and did not try to harm the Commonwealth in any other way. We only learn that he tried to mediate the conflict between the stauropelial brotherhood in Lviv and the local Orthodox bishop, Gedeon Balaban. He also intervened on behalf of his friend, Gavriilo Dorofeevich, who had supported Balaban in the conflict and for this reason had been deprived of the membership in the brotherhood.⁷⁴

No official meeting was held between the Greek hierarch and representatives of Protestant Churches. According to Loukaris's own statement, only in Volhynia, where he resided for most of the time

⁷¹ Eventually Loukaris was not admitted to the royal court so he left the letter (or letters) of Patriarch Pigas addressed to Sigismund III with Constantine Ostrogski, see the letter by Kyrillos Loukaris to Jan Dymitr Solikowski dated 24 January 1601, in Welykyj (ed.), *Litterae episcoporum*, i, 8.

⁷² Bogdan (ed.), *Documente*, Supl. II, i, no. 335, p. 628.

⁷³ Admittedly, after his departure from the Commonwealth, Loukaris sent a letter to the Lviv brotherhood, in which he urged its members to reconcile with Bishop Balaban and to bravely keep the Orthodox faith in the face of the 'wolves' who endeavoured to destroy the Church; yet, even in this letter he did not mention the Union of Brest by name; see the letter by Loukaris to the Lviv brotherhood dated 26 March 1601, sent from Jassy, in Ambrosii S. Krylovskii, *L'vovskoe Stavropigial'noe bratstvo: Opyt tserkovno-istoricheskogo issledovaniya* (Kiev, 1904), *prilozhenye*, no. 3, pp. 15 f.

⁷⁴ Denis I. Zubritskii, *Letopis' L'vovskogo Stavropigial'nogo bratstva* (Lviv, 1926), 173; Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie*, 388; Leonid V. Tymoshenko, 'Z istorii kul'turnykh vzaemyn Ukraïny u XVII stolitti (misiya Kirila Lukarisa v Ukraïnu v 1600–1601 r.)', in *Zbirnyk na poshanu profesora Marka Gol'berga: Do 50-richchya naukovoï diyal'nosti ta 80-richchya vid dnya narodzhennya* (Drohobych, 2002), 296.

of his visit, he informally met a few Protestants.⁷⁵ On the contrary, quite unexpectedly, he met a number of Catholic senators, including Jan Zamoyski, to whom he delivered a letter from Pigas, Jan Dymitr Solikowski, the archbishop of Lviv, and Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł ‘Sierotka’, the palatine of Troki (Trakai) and one of the main protectors of the Union of Brest in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Only the last meeting left some traces regarding the discussed problems. From a book of expenses, preserved in the Radziwiłł archives, we learn that the meeting with Loukaris took place on 11 December 1600, in Nesvizh, the main residence of Mikołaj ‘Sierotka’.⁷⁶ Radziwiłł explained to Nuncio Rangoni that he met the Greek clergyman in order to dissuade him from any anti-unionist activity in Vilna, where Loukaris had paid a short visit before. The meeting was arranged through the mediation of the rector of the Jesuit College in Nesvizh, Melchior Ditus, and the Roman-Catholic parish priest in Nesvizh. Loukaris was to assure the latter, even before the meeting with Radziwiłł, that he was an *amator concordiae et organum unionis* between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches. By his visit at Nesvizh, the exarch dispersed Radziwiłł’s worries concerning his possible anti-unionist activity.⁷⁷ In fact ‘Sierotka’ was so impressed by their conversation that he presented Loukaris a farewell gift of 20 florins.⁷⁸ In the meantime, also Potii adopted a less hostile attitude in regard to the Greek guest.⁷⁹

⁷⁵ Welykyj (ed.), *Litterae episcoporum*, i, no. 6, pp. 8 f.

⁷⁶ Minsk, Natsional’nyy istoričeskiy archiv Belarusi, fond 694, opis 2, delo 4959, p. 126.

⁷⁷ A relation from their meeting, composed by Radziwiłł and probably intended for Nuncio Rangoni, was held in the former Krasieński Library in Warsaw (mss. 3819 and 4018) but unfortunately perished during WWII. It was used by K. Lewicki, K. E. Jordt Jørgensen, and S. Bodniak, who made a short excerpt from the manuscript, see BKórń., ms. 11617, no pagination (a note by S. Bodniak); cf. Lewicki, *Książę*, 208, fn.1; Jordt Jørgensen, *Ökumenische Bestrebungen*, 323; Kempa, ‘Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł’, 55.

⁷⁸ Minsk, Natsional’nyy istoričeskiy archiv Belarusi, fond 694, opis 2, delo 4959, p. 126.

⁷⁹ In a note addressed to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł, Potii wrote: ‘As regards Kyrillos, I inform you that he is probably still with the palatine of Kiev. I do not know what he thinks and what he will do’ (‘O Cyrillu się Wasz Mości oznajmuję, że jest i teraz snać przy panu wojewodzie kijowskim. Nie wiem, że co myśli i co będzie działał’). Hence the metropolitan became less decisive in his accusations

Loukaris left the Commonwealth at the end of January 1601.⁸⁰ On the eve of his departure, he wrote a letter to Archbishop Solikowski, in which he presented himself as an ardent supporter of the unity between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches. He named a number of elements that were common for the Orthodox and Catholic confessions, although he deemed improbable bringing a union in the contemporary geopolitical realities. In his opinion, a union required many prayers from the two sides. At the same time, he harshly commented on the Protestants, whose teachings – as he wrote – only in some most basic aspects conformed with the teaching of the Orthodox Church, but the same could be said about the links between Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. He also blamed the Reformation for having brought chaos to Europe and having contributed to the disruption of morality.⁸¹

The negative opinion on the Protestants, expressed at that time by Loukaris, continues to be a mystery, considering the fact that in the subsequent period he was clearly influenced by the Reformation, most notably the Calvinist doctrine. No wonder that the authenticity of his letter addressed to Solikowski has been questioned, especially as it was published for the first time by the Jesuit writer, Piotr Skarga, in his work entitled *Na Threny y Lament Theopila Orthologa do Rusi Greckiego nabożeństwa przestroga*. The fact that it happened in 1610, almost ten years after Loukaris had left Poland, could further increase the doubts.

However, today there is no more reason to question the authenticity of the letter. It is attested by the favourable opinion of Mikołaj

of the Greek exarch regarding his supposed anti-unionist activity; see the note from the letter by Ipatii Potii to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł dated 31 Nov. 1601, in Zhukovich, *Seimovaya*, 592.

⁸⁰ Loukaris thus described the reasons of his departure in his letter to Jan Dymitr Solikowski: 'Sed cum ab eius Maiestate benignissime admonitus essem, ut tempore hoc Reipublicae turbato, ne quam occassionem praesentia mea novis exasperationibus inter hos homines praeberet (etsi hoc minime cogitarem, nec omnino vellem) ad meos reverterer, parendum mihi puravi. Ne tamen existimationem meam, mihi ut omnibus viris bonis est, esseque debet charissima, in medio relinquerem, hoc scriptum meum praesens in manibus Illustrissimi ac Reverendissimi Archiepiscopi Leopoliensis, cuius humanitatem erga me perspectam habebam, reliqui', in Welykyj (ed.), *Litterae episcoporum*, i, no. 6, p. 8.

⁸¹ The letter by Kyrillos Loukaris to Jan Dymitr Solikowski dated 24 Jan. 1601, in *ibidem*, no. 6, pp. 7–10; Kempa, 'Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł', 55; Rozemond, 'Patriarch Kirill', 10 f.

Krzysztof Radziwiłł ‘Sierotka’, expressed after his meeting with Loukaris. Further proof is provided by the enthusiastic reactions of Ipatii Potii, the leader of the Uniate Church in Poland-Lithuania, and of the Roman Curia at the news of the election of Loukaris to the post of the patriarch of Alexandria after the death of Pigas, in September 1601.⁸² In a letter to Sigismund III, Potii described the new patriarch⁸³ as ‘a worthy man and a great friend of the Catholic Church, especially in favour of unity’. He expressed his hope that while Loukaris held the patriarchal dignity a rapprochement would be possible between the Latin and Orthodox Churches. He especially counted on the appeasement of the enemies of the Union of Brest in Poland-Lithuania by the new patriarch. The Uniate metropolitan also advised the king to write a letter to the elect.⁸⁴ This change in attitude towards Loukaris should be seen precisely in the context of the letter, sent earlier by the exarch to Archbishop Solikowski. Not accidentally, Potii referred to this very letter in his correspondence with the king. A similar change in attitude could be observed at the Roman Curia. The news on Loukaris’s election to the patriarchal dignity were received with enthusiasm in Rome. One could even observe the revival of hopes in the conclusion of a universal union between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches.⁸⁵

A few years later, it seemed that the fulfilment of these hopes was still closer. In November 1608, Loukaris sent a letter to Pope Paul V,

⁸² After his departure from Poland and a short stay in Moldavia, Loukaris arrived in Egypt on the request of Meletius Pigas. Pigas died two days after his arrival, on 11 September 1601, but before his death designated his favourite nephew as his successor. A formal election by the local council confirmed this decision and elevated the former *protosynkellos* to the post of the patriarch of Alexandria, which he was to hold until 1620; see Runciman, *The Great Church*, 265 f.

⁸³ Initially, Ipatii Potii assumed by mistake that Loukaris advanced to the patriarchal seat in Constantinople, and not Alexandria.

⁸⁴ See the letter by Ipatii Potii to Sigismund III sent on 22 April 1602 from Volodymyr, BKórń., ms. 1401, no. 22, pp. 75–6; published in Tomasz Kempa, ‘Nieznane listy metropolity kijowskiego Hipacego Pocieja – ważne źródło do początków unii brzeskiej’, *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, 54 (2010), 204–6; *idem*, ‘Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł’, 62, fn. 72; Tymoshenko, ‘Z istorii’, 296.

⁸⁵ See the letter by Claudio Rangoni to Cardinal Cyntio Aldobrandini from 10 May 1602, MUH, i, no. 303, p. 207; the letter by Clemens VIII to Sigismund III from 24 Jan. 1603, BKórń., ms. 1401, no. 30; Kempa, ‘Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł’, 56 f.

in which – according to Georg Hofmann – he indirectly admitted his subordination to Rome. The patriarch namely invoked the fact that St Mark, the first bishop of Alexandria, was a disciple of St Peter and wrote his Gospel following Peter's advice.⁸⁶ This was nonetheless the last friendly gesture towards the head of the Catholic Church, as shortly afterwards Loukaris took a clear course towards a rapprochement with Protestantism.

Given the subsequent development of events and the future harsh treatment of the Catholic learning and the activity of successive popes by Loukaris, it is worth asking whether his friendly gestures displayed towards Roman Catholics were sincere. Some historians have suggested that the letter sent to Solikowski had been the price for freeing Loukaris from an arrest in Lviv and letting him depart from the Commonwealth.⁸⁷ He certainly might have feared the lot of Nikephoros who died imprisoned in Marienburg. However, we do not have any information that would confirm Loukaris's arrest, either in Lviv or in any other place. The difference in the standing of Kyrillos Loukaris and Nikephoros Parasios during their respective stays in the Commonwealth is also worth noting. Although, in 1596, they both attended the synod in Brest as the representatives of Orthodox patriarchs, Loukaris did not engage so visibly in the struggle against the union and his performance was limited to the synod. On the contrary, Nikephoros's activity was so intense that it prompted the Uniates to try to compromise him by questioning his identity as the patriarch's deputy. Nikephoros was also accused of spying for the Turks and his trial at the Diet of 1597 had a purely political character. No similar charges were raised against Loukaris, it is therefore questionable whether he really faced the danger of imprisonment. The existence of several independent sources, already listed above, which attest to his then favourable attitude towards the Latin Church, leaves no doubt that the words contained in his letter to Solikowski were sincere. Their sincerity is further confirmed by the contents of the letter which Loukaris – already as the patriarch of Alexandria – addressed to Pope

⁸⁶ See the letter by Kyrillos Loukaris to Paul V dated 7 Nov. 1608, in Georg Hofmann, 'Patriarch Kyrillos Lukaris und die Römische Päpste', *Orientalia Christiana*, xv, 1 (1929), 446; cf. Kempa, 'Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł', 56.

⁸⁷ Mykhailo Grushevs'kyi, *Istoriya ukraïnskoï literatury*, vi (Kiev, 1995), 35, fn. 1; Lyubashchenko, 'Poiski', 293.

Paul V. One must thus conclude that it was in the later period when his religious views underwent such a deep transformation that he chose to side with the Protestants against the Catholics.

In the concluding paragraph, it is worth stressing that the second visit of Kyrillos Loukaris in Poland-Lithuania (1600–1) had a deep impact on the further development of inter-confessional relations in the Commonwealth. First of all, it ultimately terminated the idea of an Orthodox-Protestant religious union. The fiasco was not so far caused by personal deeds of Loukaris, but rather by the uncompromising stand of Patriarch Pigas, presented in his letters addressed to Polish-Lithuanian Protestants. In result, the idea was abandoned by its most ardent supporter, Constantine Ostrogski. At the same time, Loukaris could reassure himself and his patron of the prince's loyalty towards the Orthodox faith, which was perhaps the most important content of his mission. On the other hand, the activity of Loukaris did not diminish the distance between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, both in the Commonwealth and in the relations between Rome and Alexandria, despite some short-term symptoms of improvement. Consequently, contrary to expectations nourished by Constantine Ostrogski, the second visit of Loukaris in Poland-Lithuania could not restore the position of the Orthodox Church, enfeebled due to the Union of Brest.

trans. Dariusz Kołodziejczyk