

“True Faith” and Salvation

In the works of Ipatii Potii, Meletii Smotryts'kyi, and in early-modern
Ruthenian testaments

« La juste foi » et le salut dans les travaux d'Ipatij Potij, de Meletij Smotryc'kyj
et dans les premiers témoignages ruthènes

Liliya Berezhnaya



Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/monderusse/10103>

DOI: [10.4000/monderusse.10103](https://doi.org/10.4000/monderusse.10103)

ISSN: 1777-5388

Publisher

Éditions de l'EHESS

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 July 2017

Number of pages: 435-464

ISBN: 978-2-7132-2697-7

ISSN: 1252-6576

Electronic reference

Liliya Berezhnaya, ““True Faith” and Salvation”, *Cahiers du monde russe* [Online], 58/3 | 2017, Online since 01 July 2019, connection on 06 January 2021. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/monderusse/10103> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/monderusse.10103>

2011

LILIYA BEREZHNYAYA

“TRUE FAITH” AND SALVATION

In the works of Ipatii Potii, Meletii Smotryts'kyi,
and in early-modern Ruthenian testaments¹

Ipatii Potii (1541-1613), a Polish-Lithuanian senator and—after 1592—theologian,² polemicist, and later Uniate Metropolitan of Kiev, was one of the main protagonists of the Church Union of Brest. Meletii Smotryts'kyi (ca. 1577-1633) belonged to the next generation, was an archbishop, and the author of a popular Slavic grammar and a series of polemical works. Their biographies reflect the hesitations of both generations. Their writings show the tension between polemics and the pursuit of theological re-conceptualization which was characteristic of an early-modern borderland society. Despite differences in origin, both were united not only by years of uneasy personal relations, but also some similarities in their biographies. Mostly, it was their conversion to the Union that brought these two men together.

Their conversions became the objects of many contradictory and confessionally charged studies. Almost everyone who has dealt with the theological heritage of Potii and Smotryts'kyi has posed the question of why two hierarchs of the Ruthenian Orthodox Church decided to convert to the Union. Which factors influenced the formation of religious self-consciousness of such people? And what did conversion normally mean at that time? Answers to these questions often exhibit the high level of emotional involvement of scholars. Many of those who wrote about Potii

1. Some parts of this research have previously been published in Ukrainian in: Лілія Бережна, “Шукаючи ‘третій шлях.’ Есхатологія і спасіння в творах Іпатія Потія та Мелетія Смотрицького [Liliya Berezhnaya, Finding the third path. Eschatology and salvation in the works of Ipatii Potii and Meletii Smotryts'kyi],” *Київська Академія*, no. 6, (2008): 19-36. I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for valuable comments.

2. Potii's contribution in Christian theology was recently summarized in: Mieczysław Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pocięja podstawy unickiej teologii pozytywno-polemicznej* [Ipatii Potii's bases of the positive-polemical Union theology] (Warszawa: UKSW, 2012).

awarded him grandiloquent epithets ranging from the “apostle of the Union”³ to the “fatal figure in Russian history.”⁴ The majority of scholarship emphasizes Potii’s crucial role in the Union movement before and shortly after the Union of Brest. Indeed, Potii’s place in this process could not be overestimated. Yet his literary activity has remained mostly outside of scholarly interest. Except for a few nineteenth-century critical overviews,⁵ Potii’s theological ideas are poorly studied.

Smotryts’kyi’s conversion to the Union gave birth to various interpretations even during his lifetime. It seems that recent studies, including David Frick’s groundbreaking and insightful monograph,⁶ also put the question of conversion in the foreground.⁷ Only a few impartial studies also deal with Potii’s and

3. *Ювілейна книга в 300-літні роковини смерті митрополита Іпатія Потія, видана заходом Товариства св. Ап. Павла* [Publication to the 300th anniversary of the metropolitan Ipatii Potii’s death, published by the Saint Peter Apostle society], (Львів, 1914) contains several articles highly praising Potii’s efforts to unite two Christian confessions. Among the recent publications exhibiting the same approach is Іван Паславський, “Іпатій Потій – апостол унії [Ipatii Potii – apostle of the Union],” in Іван Паславський, *Між Сходом і Заходом. Нариси з культурно-політичної історії Української церкви* [Ivan Paslavs’kyi, Between East and West. Outlines of the cultural and political history of the Ukrainian Church] (Львів: Стрім, 1994), 69-106. Paslavs’kyi’s interpretation was criticized by Siamion Padokshin in Сямён Падокшын, *Іпатій Пацей: царкоўны дзеяч, мысліцель, пісьменнік на пераломе культурна-гістарычных эпох* [Ipatii Potii: Church activist, thinker, writer from the turning point of cultural-historical epochs] (Мінск: Беларуская навука, 2001), 21-24.

4. Антон Карашев, *Очерки по истории Русской Церкви. В 2-х т.* [Anton Karashev, Outlines of the history of the Russian Church. In 2 volumes], 1 (М.: YMCA-PRESS, 1991), 235. On Potii’s apology of the Union, see: Borys Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform: The Kievan Metropolitan, the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Genesis of the Union of Brest* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 217-219; Софія Сенік, “Два митрополити – Потій і Рутський” [Sofija Senyk, Two metropolitans – Potii and Ruts’kyi], in Борис Гудзяк, Олег Турій, ред., *Історичний контекст укладення Берестейської унії і перше поунієне покоління: матеріали Перших “Берестейських читань,” Львів – Івано-Франківськ, 1-6 жовтня 1994* [Borys Gudziak and Oleh Turii, eds., Historical context of the Brest Union signing and the first post-Union generation] (Львів: Інститут Історії Церкви, 1995), 137-148; Albert Maria Ammann, “Der Aufenthalt der ruthenischen Bf. Nupathius Pocij und Cyrillus Terlecki in Rom im Dezember und Januar 1595-96 [The sojourn of the Ruthenian bishops Ipatii Potii and Cyrillus Terlecki in Rome in December and January 1595-96],” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 11 (1945): 103-140.

5. Орест Левицький, “Іпатій Потей, киевський униатський митрополит [Orest Levitskii, Ipatii Potii, Kyivan Uniate metropolitan],” in *Памятники русской старины в западных губерниях* [Monuments of the Russian antiquity in Western regions], 8 (СПб., 1885), 342-274; Михайло Грушевський, *Історія української літератури в 6-ти томах* [Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyi, History of Ukrainian literature], 5, part 2 (Київ, 1927), 380-402. On Potii’s sermons, see Николай Трипольский, “Униатский митрополит Ипатий Потий и его проповедническая деятельность [Nikolai Tripolski, The Uniate metropolitan Ipatii Potii and his preaching activity],” *Труды Киевской Духовной Академии* [Proceedings of the Kyivan Theological Academy], no. 9 (Київ, 1877): 512-576; no. 10 (1877): 123-181; no. 11 (1877): 294-372; no. 12 (1877): 588-645; no. 2 (1878): 377-413.

6. David A. Frick, *Meletij Smotryc’kyj* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995).

7. For the most recent historiographical overview of Smotryts’kyi studies see: Сергій Бабич, *Творчість Мелетія Смотрицького у контексті раннього українського бароко* [Serhii Babych, Works of Meletii Smotryts’kyi in the context of early Ukrainian baroque] (Львів: Свічадо, 2009), 31-44. See also: *Collected works of Meletij Smotryc’kyj*. With an Introduction by David A. Frick (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts, vol. 1) (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), xvi-xviii.

Smotryts'kyi's views on salvation and the "true faith." Yet the answer to the question "which road leads to heaven?" determined for both Potii and Smotryts'kyi the search for compromise, or the reasons for dialogue. It also influenced the ethical norms and modes of behavior propagated by Potii and Smotryts'kyi.

This study follows the abovementioned historiographical path. Yet it does not aim at answering the question why Potii and Smotryts'kyi decided to convert. Its object is rather to ascertain what both Church hierarchs understood by the term "true faith" and how their respective interpretations influenced their preaching. Furthermore, it aims at finding out whether the ideas popularized in Potii's and Smotryts'kyi's polemics and preaching found resonance among the Eastern-rite believers at that time. The key issues are the notions of sin, repentance, and forgiveness (thus the problems involved in the concept of soteriology, the ways of salvation). The main related problem is how these concepts fitted into the general theological discourse around the Brest Union of 1596.

This article consists of three parts. It starts with biographical overviews of the two Church hierarchs, followed by an analysis of Potii and Smotryts'kyi's views on soteriological perspectives. The article finishes with an excursus on the reflection of these concepts in early modern Ruthenian testaments. Since testaments display not only formal but also individual characteristics, they can provide answers to the question of the extent to which theological debates found resonance in believers' religious practices.

Two ways to the Union: A senator and an archbishop

Adam (Ipatii) Potii was born on April 12, 1541 in Rozhanka, in the Podlachia region to a Ruthenian Orthodox nobleman.⁸ Raised at the Polish royal court in Cracow, he attended a Calvinist school run by the Chancellor Prince Mikołaj Radziwiłł "the Black." Following his education (presumably he graduated from Cracow University), Potii entered the service of King Zygmunt II August. After several years in Brest he became an influential political leader, who rose from being a judge, tax collector, and castellan to senator.

During these times Potii became involved in religious and educational affairs. Like many nobles, both Catholic and Orthodox, he had been attracted to the new faiths propagated in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and had turned Calvinist. Prince Radziwiłł's entourage presumably played the crucial role in this conversion. However, around 1573-1574 as the Catholic revival gained strength, Potii gave up Calvinism for the "faith of his forefathers." The reasons for this decision are still unclear. One of Potii's biographers found the explanation for the return to Orthodoxy in pressure from his family, general disappointment in the Reformation

8. See the detailed biographical account and bibliography in Jan Dziegielewski, "Pociej Adam Hipacy (1541-1613) [Potii Adam Hipatii (1541-1613)]," in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* [Polish biographical dictionary], vol. XXVII (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo PAN, 1983), 28-34; Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pocięja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 17-38.

among magnate circles, and the progress of the Catholic Reform.⁹ Potii himself wrote in his memoirs that the decision was determined by the spread of the Protestant sects, namely, the Arians (Polish Brethren), which pushed him away from the Lutherans.¹⁰ One of the possible explanations was also Potii's friendship with the Orthodox Prince Kostiantyn Ostroz'kyi. It was he who later began strongly to urge Potii to accept the vacant episcopal see in Volodymyr.¹¹ Ostroz'kyi promised to seek the royal charter of nomination for the widowed Potii, in whom the Ruthenian Orthodox Church would obtain a well-educated and influential hierarch. Potii accepted this offer in 1594, although it meant a diminished social status.

Already before the consecration, Potii became actively involved in the pro-Union movement. For Potii it was one of the measures aimed at the renewal of the Orthodox Church through keeping peace with the Catholics. In 1588 he urged the Catholic bishop Maciejowski of Luts'k to promote a meeting involving all the parties potentially interested in theological discussions about the Union with Rome.¹² He was also active in the renewal of church life, founding a brotherhood in Brest on the model of the one in L'viv and promoted the "Ruthenian School" it supported.

Potii was a fervent defender of the Union idea. Largely because of his activity it was finally realized in December 1595 in Rome, when the Volodymyr bishop, together with Bishop Cyrill Terlec'kyi of Turov-Pinsk, signed the protocol concerning unification with the Catholic Church. Potii's later activity as the first Uniate metropolitan was aimed at building up the new Church. He persecuted its opponents "with the energy of a neophyte"¹³ and often relied on the support of the state. Although the Union of Brest caused a deep split in the Ruthenian church and society, reflected in a sizable polemical literature and struggles over the control of bishoprics and church properties, Potii remained deeply convinced of the viability of Union to the end of his life. For him it was not just a way to guarantee his personal future, but the only possibility to save his flock from eternal damnation. Potii died in 1613 at the age of 72, and was buried in the Volodymyr-Volyns'kyi City Cathedral.

Meletii (Maksym) Smotryts'kyi was twenty years younger than Potii. Smotryts'kyi was born c. 1577 into the family of the famous Orthodox writer and polemicist Herasim Smotryts'kyi. Maksym's birth place is unknown: either it was

9. Падокшын, *Інацiй Пацей*, 14.

10. *Акты Юго-Западной Руси* [Acts of South-Western Russia], 4 (СПб., 1851), 203. Later, in his polemical works, Potii zealously attacked Protestant teaching in general and Arianism in particular.

11. P. Athanasius G. Welykyj, ed., *Documenta Unionis Berestensis eiusque auctorum (1590-1600)* (Rome, 1970), 14-16.

12. *Monumenta Ucrainae historica*, 1 (Rome, 1964), 68-70. On Potii's vision of the Union, see Михаил Дмитриев, *Между Римом и Царьградом: Генезис Брестской церковной унии 1595-1596 гг.* [Mikhail Dmitriev, *Between Rome and Tsar'grad: The genesis of the Church Union of Brest 1595-1596*] (Москва: Издательство Московского Университета, 2003), 214-224.

13. Serhii Plokyh, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 89.

Smotrych, or Kamenets'-Podil's'kyi.¹⁴ Smotryts'kyi first studied at the Ostrih School, then in 1594-1600 at the Wilno Academy, and afterwards attended classes at the Universities of Leipzig, Wittenberg, and Nuremberg. He received the degree of Doctor of Medicine, most probably abroad. Among his teachers was Cyrill Lucaris, who was to become Patriarch of Constantinople at various times between 1620 and 1638.

Around 1608 Smotryts'kyi arrived in Wilno where he started teaching in the Orthodox Brotherhood School. Under the pen-name of Theophil Ortholog he published a famous polemical treatise *Thrēnos or the Lament for the One Holy Universal Apostolic Eastern Church* (1610). For the popularization of the work, its publisher, Longin Karpovych (the future archimandrite Leontii of the Holy Spirit Monastery), had to go to jail. Here, in Wilno, the paths of Potii and Smotryts'kyi finally crossed. At that time, however, they stood on different sides of the barricades: Smotryts'kyi was the author of various Orthodox polemical works written in response to Potii's pro-Union treatises.¹⁵

Around 1615 Smotryts'kyi started to teach Latin and Church Slavonic in the Kyivan Orthodox Brotherhood School, and soon thereafter he became its rector. Later on, he returned to Wilno to take holy orders in the Holy Spirit Monastery under the name of Meletii. In 1620 Smotryts'kyi was consecrated as the Archbishop

14. Екатерина Прокошина, *Мелетий Смотрицкий* [Ekaterina Prokoshina, Meletii Smotryts'kyi] (Минск: Наука и техника, 1966); Порфирий Яременко, *Мелетий Сторицкий. Жизнь и творчество* [Porfirij Iaremenko, Meletii Smotryts'kyi: Life and works] (Киев, 1986); Владимир Короткий, *Творческий путь Мелетия Смотрицкого* [Vladimir Korotkii, Meletii Smotryts'kyi's working path] (Минск: Наука и техника, 1987); Василь Німчук, "Кієво-Могилянська академія і розвиток української лінгвістики XVII-XIX ст. [Vasyl' Nimchuk, Kyivan Mohyla Academy and the development of Ukrainian linguistics, 17th-19th centuries]," in *Роль Києво-Могилянської академії в культурному єднанні слов'янських народів* [The role of the Kyivan Mohyla Academy in cultural unity of Slavic peoples] (Київ, 1988); Ігор Мицько, *Острозька слов'яно-греко-латинська академія (1576-1636)* [Ihor Myts'ko, The Slavic Greek Latin Academy of Ostrih (1576-1636)] (Київ, 1990); Валерія Нічик, Володимир Литвинов, Ярослава Стратій, *Гуманістичні і реформаційні ідеї на Україні* [Valeriia Nychuk, Volodymyr Lytvynov, Iaroslava Stratii, Humanistic and reformation ideas in Ukraine] (Київ: Наукова Думка, 1991).

15. Мелетій Смотрицький, *ΘΡΗΝΟΣ To iest Lament iedyney S. powszechney apostolskiewy Wschodniy Cerkwie...* [Thrēnos or Lament of the Holy United Apostolic Eastern Church] (Wilno, 1610) His most popular text – 'Αντίγραφη albo odpowiedz na script uszczypliwy przeciwko ludzium starozytniej religiey greckiey od apostatow cerkwie wschodniyey wydany, ktoremu tytuł: "Heresiae, Ignorantiae y Polityka popow y mieszczan bractwa wileńskiego," tak też y na książkę rychło potem ku obiasnieniu tegoż scriptu wydaną, nazwiskiem "Harmonia," przez iednego brata bractwa cerkiewnego Wileńskiego religiey starozytniej Greckiey w poryczą dana, w Wilnie roku 1608. See the reprint in: Студинський Кирило, "АНТИГРАФИ," полемічний твір Максима (Мелетія) Смотрицького з 1608 р. [Kyrylo Studyns'kyi, ANTIGRAF, polemic work of Meletii Smotryts'kyi from 1608]," *Записки Наукового товариства імені Шевченка*, [Proceedings of the Shevchenko Scientific Society] 141 (Київ, 1925), 1-40. On polemical debates between Potii and Smotryts'kyi, see Руслан Ткачук, "Полемика Мелетія Смотрицького із Іпатієм Потієм у контексті суспільно-культурних обставин кінця XVI-початку XVII століть [Ruslan Tkachuk, The polemics of Meletii Smotryts'kyi with Ipatii Potii in the societal and cultural context of the end of the 16th to the beginning of the 17th centuries]," *Наукові записки національного університету Острозька Академія: Серія «Філологічна»* [Scientific proceedings of the National University Ostrih Academy. Philosophy Series], 4 (2008): 95-104.

of Polotsk, Vitebsk and Mstislavl. At that time he also released his translation of the *Homiliary Gospel* (attributed to Patriarch Kallistos), several pioneering works in the field of Slavic grammar, and various polemical treatises.

Eventually, it was these polemical works that caused the anti-Uniate violence resulting late in 1623 in the murder of Iosaphat Kuntsevych, Smotryts'kyi's Uniate counterpart as the Archbishop of Polotsk. As a result, Smotryts'kyi decided to leave Kyiv in 1624 to make the pilgrimage to the Near East (Constantinople, Palestine, Egypt). There he met with his former teacher, Patriarch Cyrill Lucaris and was very disappointed by Lucaris' pro-Calvinist doctrines and judgments. Most probably it was in this period that Smotryts'kyi decided to convert to the Uniate Church. The official conversion took place in 1627, when he was already back in Kyiv, and caused numerous conflicts with the local Orthodox Church hierarchy. Toward the end of his life Smotryts'kyi published a series of anti-Orthodox polemical treatises. He died in 1633 as the Archimandrite of the Uniate Derman' Monastery.¹⁶

Potii's and Smotryts'kyi's conversions to the Uniate Church resonated with Ruthenian elites at the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th centuries. Their literary works from the Uniate period, saturated with polemical motifs, were often the subjects of debates. Potii's and Smotryts'kyi's texts, in particular sermons and polemical treatises, serve as the source basis for the current study. They deserve, however, a short preliminary explanation.

Potii's sermons raise doubts about their authenticity.¹⁷ Unfortunately they are all available only in a late 18th-century edition in the Polish translation of Leon Kishka, bishop of Volodymyr and Brest. This edition comprises 21 sermons, as well as the same number of "homilies," starting from the week of the Publican and Pharisee and finishing with the Day of the Holy Spirit. There is no extant original with which to compare the translation. At the beginning of the 20th century, the Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi expressed some doubts about the authenticity of Kishka's translations. He nevertheless accepted the possibility of using these texts as a single bloc of Potii's literary heritage on the basis of similarities in content and style.¹⁸ Kishka's translations remain the most used texts by the scholars of Potii's heritage.¹⁹ This article is based upon the analysis of the 1788 edition which also

16. *Українська література XVII ст.: Синкретична писемність. Поезія. Драматургія. Белетристика* [The 17th century Ukrainian literature: Syncretic writing. Poetry, dramaturgy, belles lettres], comp. by Віктор Крекотень [Viktor Krekoten'] (Київ, 1987), 522-523; Яременко, *Мелетій Сторицький*; О. Мелетій Соловій, *О. Мелетій Смотрицький як письменник* [Father Meletii Solovii, Father Meletii Smotryts'kyi as a writer] (Toronto, 1977-1978); Tadeusz Grabowski, "Ostatnie lata Melecjusza Smotryckiego. Szkic do dziejów literatury unicko-prawosławnej wieku XVIII [Last years of Meletii Smotryts'kyi. Outline to the history of the Orthodox-Uniate literature in the 17th century]," in *Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Bolesława Orzechowicza* [Memorial volume in honor of Bolesław Orzechowicz] (Львів, 1916), 318-320.

17. Hipacy Pocij, *Kazania i homilie od niedzieli Przedapustney do niedzieli i Poniedzalku Uslania Ducha S.* [Sermons and homilies from preindulgence Sunday to the Pentecost Sunday and Monday], translated by Leon Kiszka (Pochajów: Drukarnia oo. Bazylianów, 1788).

18. Грушевський, *Історія української літератури*, 216, 198.

19. Józef Krukowski, *Krytyczny rozbiór kazań i homilij Hipacyusza Pocijja metropolity kijowskiego, halickiego i całej Rusi, biskupa włodzimierskiego i brzeskiego* [Critical analysis of

contains sermons of Basilian monks on the remaining Sundays and Church feasts of the year.

The situation with Smotryts'kyi's texts from his Uniate period seems to be even more complicated. My analysis is mostly based upon three works: *Apologia*, *Parænesis*, and *Ekthesis*.²⁰ It turned out to be quite difficult to explore Smotryts'kyi's soteriological and eschatological views in these texts since they have been the subjects of highly speculative debates among historians. It is possible to avoid this problem by focusing only on concepts in the context of usable practices. In addition, the three treatises exhibit a clear polemical character. Yet it is hard to attribute Smotryts'kyi's texts to any literary genre. After all, Smotryts'kyi here enters into discussion with his earlier self. These texts are a sort of "psychological reckoning" with himself either as an Orthodox, or as a "crypto-Calvinist." In fact, the positions of Church hierarchs, *szlachta*, and the brotherhoods (i.e., *narodu ruskiego posłuszeństwa wschodniego*),²¹ to whom Smotryts'kyi addresses his official appeal, play only a secondary role. Smotryts'kyi appears in these texts not only as a polemicist and archimandrite, but also as a private person trying to defend himself against abuses and persecutions.

Despite any difficulties in genre attribution, all the sources used here have a polemical taint, even the sermons. Mieczysław Ozorowski, one of Potii's biographers, defines the major method of argumentation in such writings as "positive-polemical." Constant references to Holy Scripture and patristic writings are enlarged by reflections on differences between Christian confessions. Polemics with the anti-Uniate camp were interpreted as a feature of theological apology.²² Both Potii and Smotryts'kyi were moved in their Uniate periods by the idea of the Church Union's viability. They interpreted the problems of salvation, the "true faith," and eternal life for the flock only through the prism of the Union. In that, they saw their role as pastors of the faithful.

Both Potii and Smotryts'kyi regarded salvation as a process entailing ecclesiological and individual aspects. They gave priority first and foremost to the conditions of the general salvation of the Church, and only afterwards to ethical premises

the lectures and homilies of Ipatii Potii, the Kyivan, Halych and the whole Rus' metropolitan, bishop of Volodymyr and Brest] (Львів, 1899).

20. Unfortunately, the first text from this period that could be revealing for this study is his catechism, which is not preserved. There are some testimonies that Smotryts'kyi worked on it after 1621 in the texts of *Apologia* and *Ekthesis*. It is reported that after returning back home, Smotryts'kyi showed the catechism to other Ruthenian Church hierarchs, namely to Iov Borets'kyi, Petro Mohyla, and Joseph Veljamyn Ruts'kyi. The further fate of the catechism is unknown; see Маргарита Корзо, *Українська і белорусська катехитическая традиция конца XVI - XVIII вв.: становление, эволюция и проблемы заимствования* [Margarita Korzo, *Ukrainian and Belorussian catechetical tradition from the end of the 16th-18th centuries. Formation, evolution and problems of borrowings*] (М. : Канон+, 2007), 407-409.

21. Meletii Smotryts'kyj, "Apologia peregrynacji do krajów wschodnich [Apologia for peregrination to Eastern countries]," *Collected works of Meletij Smotryc'kyj*, comp. by David A. Frick (Harvard Library of early Ukrainian literature, Texts: 1), (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), 523.

22. Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pocięja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 47.

which are obligatory for every faithful person in order to reach the path to Heaven. My further analysis will follow this division.

Salvation in the Church and the problem of the “true faith”

... in Potii's interpretation

One of the key arguments put forward by Potii was that papal primacy was the only possibility of salvation for the Ruthenian Orthodox believers. The Polish historian Alexander Naumow argues that the Uniate metropolitan was the first of the seventeenth-century Ruthenian Church hierarchs to identify this condition as crucial.²³ Potii emphasized this position in almost every text. He argued that neither saints, nor sacraments, nor even Jesus Christ Himself could help the Orthodox if they did not accept the leading role of Rome.²⁴ Some of his arguments could be classified according to certain main topoi, namely: The decline of the Greek Church, the translation of the center of salvation from Jerusalem to Rome, and the primacy of St. Peter among the other Apostles. Here, I shall briefly outline his opinion on these issues.

In all his major treatises Potii underlined adherence to the Holy Eastern Church and the effort to restore concordance with the Roman Catholics. “Do you want to stay in the true church, then do not separate Greek from Roman; since it has always been a united Catholic church, not two.”²⁵ One expert in Ukrainian baroque culture, Archbishop Ihor (Isychenko), defined Potii's position on this issue as follows:

23. Aleksander Naumow, “Przemiany w ruskiej kulturze unitów [Changes in Ruthenian culture of the Uniates],” *Krakowskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze* [Cracow Ukrainian Studies proceedings], 5-6, (1997): 143. See also, Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pocięja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 174-189. On Papal primacy in religious polemics around the Union of Brest, see Edward Ozorowski, “Eklezjologiczna polemika unijna w Polsce w XVII wieku [Ecclesiological Uniate polemics in Poland in the 17th century],” in Jan Sergiusz Gajek, ed., *Unia Brzeska z perspektywy czterech stuleci (Materiały Międzynarodowego Sympozjum Naukowego Unia Brzeska po Czterech Stuleciach, Lublin, 20-21 IX 1995 r.)* [The Union of Brest from the perspective of four centuries (Proceedings of the international symposium “The Union of Brest after four centuries,” Lublin 20-21 IX 1995)] (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 1998), 141-147; idem, “Eklezjologia unicka w Polsce w latach 1596-1720 [Ecclesiology of the Union in Poland in 1596-1720],” *Wiadomości Kościelne Archidiecezji w Białymstoku* [Church News of the Białystok Archdiocese] 4, 4 (1978): 51-112; 5, 1 (1979): 47-106.

24. Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pocięja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 160.

25. Ипатий Потий [Иpiracy Pocięj], “Гармония, альбо согласие веры, сокраментов и церемоний святое Восточное церкви с костелом Римским [Harmony, or the unity of faith, sacraments and ceremonies of the Holy Eastern Church with the Roman Church],” *Памятники полемической литературы в Западной Руси* [Monuments of the polemic literature in Western Rus'], 2 (СПб., 1899), 189; idem, *Antirresis abo Apologia przeciwko Krzysztoforowi Philaletowi, który niedawno wydał ksiązki imieniem starożytnej Rusi religiej greckiej przeciw ksiązkom o synodzie brzeskim, napisanym w Roku Pańskim 1597* [Antirresis or apologia against Krzysztof Philalet, who published a book in the name of ancient Rus' Greek religion against the books about the Union of Brest, written in the year of God 1597], ed. by Janusz Byliński and Józef Długosz (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1997), 197. See also, Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pocięja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 155-157.

Patii Potii sought legitimation of the Kyivan Metropolitanate's union with Rome in the paradigm of patristic culture and in the conciliar consciousness during the period of Church unity.²⁶

Potii devoted special attention to those who contested the Union idea. For him these were the Greeks, who "do not know the Gospel in Turkish captivity." They were "heretics and turncoats," who had seceded from the "Roman capital."²⁷ Potii argued that the Apostles had not even heard about Constantinople;²⁸ therefore, Ruthenia should bring obedience to St. Peter's feet in order to avoid hellish sufferings.²⁹

While addressing the necessity of the restoration of Church unity, Potii also pondered the role of Jerusalem for Orthodox Christians.³⁰ He regarded Jerusalem mostly as a mere "real," "earthly place"³¹ of Christ's sermons and passions and the residence of one of the Orthodox Patriarchs. Potii exalted the role of Rome as residence of St. Peter whom he considered to be Christ's deputy on earth.³² In this way, the Capital of Salvation was translated from Jerusalem to Rome. One of his key arguments was an appeal to the authority of the Union of Ferrara-Florence.³³ In this logic, Constantinople also lost its title as the Christian capital after Ottoman conquest. Its fall should be interpreted as a punishment for the refusal to accept the Union of Ferrara-Florence.³⁴ Rome remained the only City of Salvation.

Potii was not alone in his understanding of soteriological perspectives. Among his followers in the seventeenth-century Uniate church were metropolitan Joseph Veljamyn Ruts'kyi who wrote that "there is no salvation beyond the Roman Church";³⁵ and the archimandrite of the Derman' monastery, Jan Dubowicz,

26. Архієпископ Ігор (Ісиченко), "Полемічна література перед викликом нескінченності [Archbishop Ihor (Isichenko), Polemic literature in front of the eternity challenge]," *Дивослово* 12 (2008): 33-36.

27. "Patryarchowie wschodni, nie znają przy Tureckiej niewoli, Ewangieliej." "Heretycy i odszczepieńcy przeciwko Rzymskiej Stolicy." Потий, "Гармония," 119, 116.

28. "Konstantynopol, o którym any słyszeli Apostołowie." *Ibid.*, 118.

29. *Ibid.*, 109, 115.

30. I have dwelt upon this issue more in detail in: Liliya Berezhnaya, "Topography of Salvation. 'Kyiv – the New Jerusalem' in the Ruthenian Literary Polemics (end of the 16th. beginning of the 17th century)," in David Frick, Stefan Rohdewald, Stefan Wiederkehr, eds., *Litauen und Ruthenien. Studien zu einer transkulturellen Kommunikationsregion (15.-18. Jahrhundert)/ Lithuania and Ruthenia. Studies of a Transcultural Communication Zone (15th-18th Centuries)* (Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 2007), 263-265.

31. Pocij, *Antirresis*, 252-253.

32. *Ibid.*, 254. On the Ruthenian Orthodox-Uniate debates on the primacy of the Apostle Peter, see Іван Саверчанка, *Aurea mediocritas: книжна-письмовая культура Беларусі: адраджэнне і ранняе барока* [Ivan Saverchanka, Written culture in Belarus. Renaissance and early baroque] (Мінск: Тэхналогія, 1998), 118-124.

33. *Ibid.*, 252. Importantly, Potii's emphasis on the legacy of the Florentine Union (in contrast to the Council of Lyon, 1274) was grounded on the principle of equal rights for both Churches.

34. Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pocijeja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 164, 169.

35. Cf. Naumow, "Przemiany w ruskiej kulturze unitów," 143.

the author of the polemical treatise *Hierarchy or on the primogeniture in God's Church*.³⁶ The preacher Cyprian Żochowski also addressed this issue in the introduction to the Wilno *Missal* (1692) passionately appealing for the “Roxolano-Slavic monarchs” to accept papal leadership.³⁷

However, any direct equation of Potii's (as well as his followers') soteriological conception with Catholic notions would be an oversimplification or even a mistake. Potii never declared himself a Roman Catholic, but rather an adherent of the united Catholic Church headed by the Pope. Potii even distanced himself from the Pope, arguing that the latter had enough scholars to defend his dignity, which in fact was not Potii's intention.³⁸ Subordination to Rome should not, according to him, separate the Orthodox Church from its Greek roots. In the letter to Prince Kostiantyn (Vasyl') Ostroz'kyi (1596) he argued:

We decided for this unity, which means: we did not do anything new, but kept firmly and untouchably all the ceremonies of our Eastern Greek Church for all coming centuries in the old tradition.³⁹

Moreover, Potii often placed the accent upon the Byzantine and Greek Fathers' tradition as the only point of reference, noting, however, that the Eastern Church had unfortunately lost the Holy wisdom of many Church Fathers it has possessed earlier.⁴⁰ The Union had to bring this wisdom back home, without destroying established Church practices. As Serhii Plokhly put it,

Potii saw the union as a joining together, but by no means an amalgamation of his Church with that of Rome.⁴¹

36. Jan Dubowicz, *Hierarchia albo o zwierzchności w Cerkwi Bożej* [Hierarchy or about the authority in the God's Church] (Львів, 1644), 167-191. Jan Dubowicz was also an author of a polemical treatise on the Gregorian calendar (1652) and of several funeral sermons; see Michał Nowodworski, *Encyklopedyja Kościelna, według teologiczney encyklopedji Wetzer'a i Weltego z licznemi jej dopełnieniami* [Encyclopedia of the Church according to the theological encyclopedia of Wetzer and Welt with a lot of appendices], 4 (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Czerwinkiego i Spółki, 1874), 361.

37. Naumow, “Przemiany w ruskiej kulturze unitów,” 144.

38. Іпатій Поцей, “Унія альбо выклад преднейших артыкулов, ку зодноченью Греков с костелом Римским належацих [Ipatii Potii, The Union, or an Exposition of the articles for the Union of Greeks with the Catholic Church],” in *Русская историческая библиотека* [Russian Historical Library], 7 (СПб., 1882), 145.

39. Іпатій Потій (Іпатій Поцей), “Лист до князя Константина Константиновича Острозького [Ipatii Potii, Letter to Prince Konstantyn (Vasyl') Ostroz'kyi],” in Валерія Нічик, ed., *Українські гуманісти епохи Відродження. Антологія* [Valeriia Nychuk, ed., Ukrainian humanists in the age of Renaissance. Anthology], 2 (Київ: Основи, 1995), 133-134.

40. Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pocięja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 172-173.

41. Plokhly, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*, 77.

... in Smotryts'kyi's interpretation

Smotryts'kyi was no exception in this sense. While writing *Thrēnos*, he passionately debated with the Uniates on the possibility of salvation in the Roman Catholic Church. Twenty years after, in his Uniate treatises, Smotryts'kyi unambiguously joined the point of view of his former opponents. In general, Smotryts'kyi wrote extensively on universal salvation after his conversion. But he did it first and foremost as a priest, who bore the double responsibility for himself and for the spiritual condition of the flock. Smotryts'kyi made the major arguments in favor of the Union as if he stood in front of an imagined archbishop's pulpit. Soteriological arguments dominated the introduction to *Apologia*, where Smotryts'kyi explained his reasons for composing the treatise.

I did this on account of the lamentable state of our Ruthenian Church; and in part to demonstrate and destroy the errors and heresies with which our new writers have made bold for more than thirty years to besmirch our Ruthenian Church.⁴²

Smotryts'kyi's key concept in this context remained the idea of the Church as the New Jerusalem. He maintained that without unity with the Roman Catholics the Orthodox Church ceased to be the place of salvation. This idea ran across all the three tracts from the Uniate period. The major accent rested upon the harm the native "authors-schismatics" did to the Eastern Church by trying to move the "Mother Church" away from "brotherly Rome."

Do, et concedo [I grant, and I concede] that these are not the errors and heresies of your schismatic Church nor of the Greek one, but of those individuals who placed them in your Church and in the Greek Church. The Church is in itself pure, but it has become unclean through the placing in it of those errors and heresies.⁴³

His concept, according to Władysław Hryniewicz and Mirosław Melnyk, could be classified as soteriological exclusivism in its Catholic version.⁴⁴ Smotryts'kyi

42. Smotryts'kyj, "Apologia," 522. English translation cited from David Frick, transl. and ed., *Rus' Restored: Selected Writings of Meletij Smotryc'kyj (1610-1630)* (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian literature. Engl. Trans., 7) (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 383.

43. Meletij Smotryts'kyj, "Exęthesis abo Expostulatia," in *Collected works of Meletij Smotryc'kyj*, 702. English translation cited from *Rus' Restored*, 700.

44. Waław Hryniewicz, "Soteriologiczny ekskluzywizm u podstaw uniatyzmu [Soteriological Exclusivism as the basis of Uniatism]," *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia*, 29, no. 2 (1991): 47-59; idem, *Przeszłość zostawić Bogu. Unia i uniatyzm w perspektywie ekumenicznej* [Leave the past to God. The Union and the Uniatism in ecumenical perspective] (Opole: Wydawnictwo Św. Krzyża, 1995); Marek Melnyk, *Spór o zbawienie. Zagadnienia soteriologiczne w świetle prawosławnych projektów unijnych powstałych w Rzeczypospolitej (koniec XVI-półowa XVII wieku)* [Soteriological questions in view of the Orthodox Uniate projects in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (end of the 16th-mid of the 17th century)] (Olsztyn: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego, 2001), 134-136.

also dwelt upon the problem of the “true faith” that originates from Jerusalem. He maintained that the Orthodox Church had lost its “Jerusalem/Greek past” and therefore all the rights of a bearer of the “true faith.” Even Constantinople, the center of Orthodoxy, had turned out to be a nest of crypto-Calvinists (Smotryts’kyi meant the Patriarch Cyrill Lucaris). As a result, the Heavenly Jerusalem did not any longer belong to the Ruthenian Orthodox Church.

Most of the Ruthenian Uniate Church hierarchs at that time, including Potii and Smotryts’kyi, endeavored to develop original approaches, which had to differ both from the Catholic and the Orthodox interpretations. The general tendency was to find a common platform for the Catholic and Orthodox concepts. However, the paths were seen differently. This is particularly evident in Potii’s and Smotryts’kyi’s interpretation of individual salvation.

On sins, satisfaction, and good works

... in Potii’s texts

Preserving the “true faith” was, according to Potii, the major precondition for salvation. The next ones were repentance, fasting, and praying.⁴⁵ However, Potii did not invent a new “recipe for salvation,” since this set of requirements was commonly accepted in Christian soteriology. The peculiarity of Potii’s approach was the attempt to combine the “pure” Catholic *topoi* with Orthodox notions. Revealing examples are his interpretations of the role of good works for the purposes of salvation, the notion of sinfulness, and the importance of repentance for the purification from sins.

As Potii stated, salvation was impossible without good works.⁴⁶ He also argued that original sin had polluted and predisposed human nature to evil (here Potii completely subscribed to the Catholic doctrine on the issue).⁴⁷ In his sermons, Potii reflected very much in the spirit of St. Augustine on “our polluted nature,” “infected with sin.”⁴⁸ For that reason, he estimated the general chances to be saved as quite low for the believers. At the same time, following the other patristic tradition, Potii

45. “Post to to jest woz ognisty, który porwał do Raiu Eliasza”; “Pokuta, i postem i modlitwa, czarta pedza z ziemi do piekla, temiz zrodlami na ziemie z nieba wabia ludzie Boga,” Pociiej, *Kazania i Homilie*, 94, 99.

46. “Bo iak proźna lampa na nic się nie przyda, tak też wiara bez uczynków, choć by była naylepsza, nikogo nie zbawi,” *Ibid.*, 429. For more detailed overview of Potii’s interpretation of good works, see Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pociēja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 312-321.

47. Frederick Robert Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903); Norman P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin: A Historical and Critical Study* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927); Andrew Louth, *Introducing Eastern Orthodox Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2013), 66-81.

48. Pociiej, *Kazania i Homilie*, 609, 67. He also writes about a “week human nature, inclined for evil and corporal greediness.” Cf. Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pociēja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 242.

affirmed that "sin has always been individual."⁴⁹ It is necessary to underline that the Greek Fathers generally refused to use the expression "original sin." The rebellion of Adam and Eve against God could be conceived, according to them, only as the personal sin of the forefathers. There was no place in such a conception for the "inherited guilt" of all mankind, for Adam's descendants should not suffer for the sin of their forefathers. The Greek Fathers usually used the phrase "ancestral sin."⁵⁰ Potii therefore opted for the combination of two approaches in patristic tradition. The logic of salvation propagated by him includes the importance of good works and the Lord's mercy.

Repentance was obviously the most necessary and perhaps the most complicated element of this system. Potii effectively applied the combination of the Catholic and Orthodox approaches here. Along with the Catholic scholastics, he insisted upon the importance of what they called satisfaction. This theory was first formulated by one of the founders of Scholasticism, St. Anselm of Canterbury (1033/34-1109). According to this, a finite man has committed a crime against the infinite God. An offender is required to make recompense, or satisfaction, to the one offended according to that person's status. Since a man could never make satisfaction to the infinite God, he could expect only eternal death. The instrument for bringing man back into a right relationship with God, therefore, had to be Christ, by whose infinite merits man is purified in an act of cooperative re-creation. This ability also belongs to saints who performed more pious deeds than was necessary for their personal salvation. They possess a certain surplus they can share. This theory, born within Scholasticism, reflects a medieval perception of dignity which requires satisfaction.⁵¹

Potii addressed this theory in sermons:

It is hard to believe that the fall has been totally erased by penitence and purified by confession that would bring ... to the Lord's satisfaction (*ukontentowania Boga*).⁵²

49. "Ze zaś i w szczególności grzeszyło i grzeszy wiele, tychże nie już za grzech Adamów, ale za właśnie, osobiste Bóg sprawiedliwie surowo karał i karze," Pocij, *Kazania i Homilie*, 509. On Orthodox theological interpretations of original sin, see John Meyendorff, *The Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), 143.

50. Jean-Claude Larchet, "Ancestral Guilt according to St. Maximus the Confessor: a bridge between Eastern and Western conceptions," *Sobornost, incorporating Eastern Churches Review*, 20, 1 (1998): 26.

51. Richard William Southern, *St. Anselm and His Biographer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963); John McIntyre, *St. Anselm and His Critics: A Re-interpretation of the Cur Deus Homo* (Edinburgh, 1954).

52. "Przeto s trudnością przychodzi, aby występki na świętey wynurzone Spowiedzi, serdeczną, do ukontetowania Boga, wygładzone zostały, przy pokucie skruchą: ale więcey Boska, tych musi liczyć wszechność, którzy na wiek przyszły Czyśćcową za grzechy zachowują odplątę," Pocij, *Kazania i Homilie*, 186.

At the same time, Potii affirms that the

Lord's mercy exceeds in punishment the feeling of justice, and sins will be absolved.⁵³

Therefore, the righteous life and repentance

will bring us to the lands of Israel, and accompany us, like angels, on the staircase to the Heavenly Kingdom.⁵⁴

... in the Uniate writings of Smotryts'kyi

The idea of Unity and reconciliation was also dominant in the pro-Uniate texts of Smotryts'kyi. He reached a compromise in a different way from that of Potii. As argued by Smotryts'kyi, an Orthodox believer can reach the Heavenly Kingdom by getting rid of sins and by winning the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. More detailed explanations revealed the peculiarities of the late Smotryts'kyi's soteriological views. Specifically, he opted for leveling the differences between the Orthodox and Catholic interpretations. In fact, Smotryts'kyi equated Orthodox dogmas with Catholic notions. He argued that the Catholic soteriological concepts corresponded completely with Orthodox tradition. The true difference existed only between the Catholic and the Protestant interpretation. Smotryts'kyi blamed the latter as unconditionally heretical.⁵⁵

Typical for Smotryts'kyi's mode of equation of Catholic and Orthodox concepts were his interpretations of the role of merits and pious deeds for individual salvation, the problem of satisfaction, and the differentiation between mortal and venial sins. According to him, mere repentance does not suffice for the absolution of sins. Quite in the spirit of the Catholic tradition, Smotryts'kyi affirmed that merits are indispensable for the future salvation. To this category he attributed "fasts, alms, early risings, long standings at prayer, and the various mortifications of the body of pious people."⁵⁶

The concept of merits is one of the pillars of the Catholic theology of salvation. It is based upon the theory that pious deeds that exceed what is demanded by God compensate moral guilt for sins committed and increase the chances for salvation.⁵⁷ It is needless to say that the Orthodox tradition also regards fasts, alms, and the need to attend early liturgies as pious deeds. However, these are not placed in the

53. Ibid., 546. Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pocieja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 301-311.

54. Pocij, *Kazania i Homilie*, 94.

55. Smotryts'kyj, "Apologia," 615.

56. Ibid., 555, 624. English translation in *Rus' Restored*, 444.

57. Konrad Baumgartner and Walter Kasper, eds., *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* [Lexicon of theology and Church], 10 (Freiburg: Herder, 2006), 614.

category of merits, but are instead considered the ordinary obligations of believers (particularly, fasts and alms).⁵⁸

Alongside the merits needed for salvation, Smotryts'kyi also enlisted the sacrament of penance that "consists in heartfelt contrition, auricular confession, and the satisfaction of pious corporeal deeds."⁵⁹ This very gradation of penance was typical for the Catholic tradition of that time and was canonically accepted by the Council of Trent (1545-1563) (Canon 4).⁶⁰ The key notion in this list was the abovementioned concept of satisfaction, directly connected to the Catholic doctrine of original sin and the idea of Purgatory.

As argued by Smotryts'kyi, this theory belonged both to the Catholic and the Orthodox tradition. Moreover, he condemned the denial of this concept by the author of the *Thrēnos* (i.e., early Smotryts'kyi himself) as the "heresies ... that are vain and unnecessary to our Church." Further, Smotryts'kyi declared that,

there is Purgatory in the Eastern Church as well, not different in words from the Roman one, and one and the same as to the thing itself. Not to recognize this is necessarily both to throw satisfaction out of the Church and to destroy the difference between mortal and venial sins.⁶¹

It is noticeable that satisfaction and the stratification of sins were placed by Smotryts'kyi on the same level. He could not imagine individual salvation without accepting both concepts. However, Smotryts'kyi's own reflections on the categories of sins were rather scant. The archbishop of Polotsk mentioned the concept of original sin only within the context of the Catholic doctrines defined by the Council of Trent. For him it coincided entirely with the teaching and spirit of the Orthodox Church. On the gradation of sins he also provided little information. Basically, Smotryts'kyi dwelt upon the issue of the destructive force of mortal sins and why heresies are grievous acts that do not deserve Lord's forgiveness:

For one heresy suffices for perdition; two, three, and so on, for greater perdition, and it is immeasurably more harmful for a man than the heaviest mortal sin.⁶²

The emphasis upon heresies seems to be almost inevitable in polemical tracts of that time. It is interesting that Smotryts'kyi's earlier Orthodox texts put the emphasis elsewhere, namely, on the clear differentiation between mortal and venial sins. For

58. On the Orthodox teaching on salvation, see Архимандрит Сергей (Страгородский), *Православное учение о спасении* [Archimandrite Sergii (Stragorodskii), Orthodox teaching on salvation] (M.: Издательский отдел Московского Патриархата, Иосифо-Волоцкий монастырь, 1991).

59. Smotryts'kyj, "Apologia," 556. English translation in *Rus' Restored*, 444-445.

60. Baumgartner, ed., *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2, 850.

61. Smotryts'kyj, "Apologia," 597. English translation in *Rus' Restored*, 518.

62. *Ibid.*, 530. English translation in *Rus' Restored*, 397.

instance, Smotryts'kyi's short catechism attached to the *Thrēnos* defined mortal sin as that which “drives off the mercy and the belief in the Holy Spirit.” While referring to the authority of St. Basil the Great (329/330-379), the Orthodox Smotryts'kyi affirmed that both mortal and venial sins “are erased by Christ's mercy and by heartfelt contrition.”⁶³ The *Thrēnos* also elaborated on the effectiveness of pious deeds for the sake of salvation, with the usual reference to St. Augustine. As suggested by the contemporary Russian historian Margarita Korzo, such references to Augustine's authority appear in Smotryts'kyi's catechism precisely when the author “attempts to balance on the edge of different traditions.”⁶⁴ Such balancing was generally characteristic of Smotryts'kyi's works from both periods. David Frick's observation that Smotryts'kyi

sought all his life to define at some particular level—in language, faith, and nation—that “third, middle thing,” partially borrowing from the other two confessions and cultures, which were better defined,⁶⁵

seems to be quite correct. Smotryts'kyi's variant of the “third way to salvation” in the Uniate period was an attempt to assign peculiar Catholic concepts to Orthodox soteriology.

From polemics to the everyday religious practices: What remained

The historian of early modern Ruthenia, Kyivan professor Natalia Iakovenko, has repeatedly warned her colleagues against judging everyday religiosity and consciousness only on the basis of the texts coming from elite Church circles. For her, these were only tiny parts of multifaceted mosaics of worldviews and preferences. There were cardinal differences between the official declarations from the pulpit, polemical statements, and everyday religious practices.⁶⁶ “Historians should be cautious with the loud declarations of intellectuals and polemicists of the 17th century.”⁶⁷ This warning applies not only to the lower strata of society, but

63. “Wszakże iż obadwa daremną Chrysta Pana łaską bywają głądzone, w tych którzy szczyrze u prawdziwie pokutują, z Bazyliszem wyznawam,” Smotryts'kyj, “Thrēnos,” in *Collected works of Meletij Smotryc'kyj*, 228.

64. Корзо, *Українська и белорусская катехитическая традиция*, 289.

65. Frick, *Meletij Smotryc'kyj*, 254.

66. Наталія Яковенко, “Релігійні конверсії: спроба погляду зсередини [Natalia Iakovenko, Religious conversions: an attempt at a view from within],” in eadem, *Паралельний світ: Дослідження з історії уявлень та ідей в Україні XVI-XVII ст.* [Parallel World: Research in the history of notions and ideas in Ukraine in the 16th-17th centuries] (Київ: Критика, 2002), 13-63.

67. Eadem, “Життєпростір versus ідентичність руського шляхтича XVII століття (на прикладі Яна/Йоакима Єрлича) [Living space versus the identity of a 17th century Ruthenian nobleman (on the example of Ioakim Ierlych)],” in eadem, *Дзеркала ідентичності: Дослідження з історії уявлень та ідей в Україні XVII- початку XVIII століття* [Mirrors

also to the nobility, which was often the addressee of the Church hierarchs' admonitions. It is therefore worth asking whether Potii's and Smotryts'kyi's messages about the "third ways" of salvation in the United Church reached their audience. Were their texts read and popularized and did they affect liturgical and everyday devotional practice? Or, did Smotryts'kyi lose the game he was playing? As argued by David Frick,

he seems really to have believed that through his power of persuasion, either in person or through his polemical works, he would be able to make the elite—secular as well as religious—see the "truth," and once the elite were all heading in the right direction, the rest would follow.⁶⁸

Unfortunately, appropriate sources which could testify to any success or failure are scarecely available. There are some insightful studies on how Smotryts'kyi's life, writings, and conversion were perceived by contemporaries on the basis of religious polemics and hagiography. Serhii Babych highlighted "the idiosyncrasy of the readers" in this context, meaning that interpretations of Smotryts'kyi's legacy by contemporaries were always ideologically and confessionally charged. In addition Babych argued for the "ritual perception" of Smotryts'kyi's writings, pointing out that both the Orthodox *Thrēnos* and the Uniate *Apologia* were not only criticized or praised, but also symbolically eulogized or annihilated by the Church hierarchs. *Apologia*, for instance, was officially anathematized and burned at the Kyivan Orthodox Synod of 1621.⁶⁹ As to Potii, there is even less evidence for the influence of his writings upon everyday religious life of early-modern Ruthenia. Still, the Ukrainian historian Ruslan Tkachuk researched Potii's impact upon liturgical texts and religious polemics, noting that many of the homilies were used in Uniate liturgical praxis for some hundred and fifty years after Potii's death.⁷⁰

All this evidence, however, does not go beyond the level of religious polemics and Church elites, mostly leaving aside the perceptions of the laity. There is some testimony that the fragments of Smotryts'kyi's texts from the "Orthodox period" were repeated verbatim in the so-called *Supplication* submitted to the Polish-Lithuanian Sejm on behalf of the Orthodox nobility in 1623.⁷¹ Most probably

of identity: Research in the history of notions and ideas in Ukraine in the 17th-beginning of 18th centuries] (Київ: Laurus, 2012), 104.

68. Frick, *Meletij Smotryc'kyj*, 257.

69. Бабич, *Творчість Мелетія Смотрицького*, 33-41.

70. Руслан Ткачук, *Творчість митрополита Іпатія Потія та полемічна література на межі XVI – початку XVII ст. Джерела. Риторика. Діалог* [Ruslan Tkachuk, The works of Ipatii Potii and the polemical literature at the end of the 16th- and beginning of the 17th century. Sources. Rhetorics. Dialogue] (Київ: Видавничий Дім Дмитра Бураго, 2011).

71. Наталія Яковенко, "'In libertate nati sumus': життєві стратегії української шляхти і православних ієрархів напередодні та в перше десятиліття козацьких воєн (1638-1658)" [Natalia Iakovenko, "In libertate nati sumus": life strategies of Ukrainian szlachta and Orthodox hierarchs on the eve and in the first decade of the Cossack wars (1638-1658)], in eadem, *Дзеркала ідентичності*, 379.

it will never be possible to answer the question of the direct influence of Potii's and Smotryts'kyi's writings upon everyday religiosity. Rather, the question should be put in another way: did their views on salvation and the United Church find resonance in the perceptions of the Ruthenian laity? Were Potii's appeals to accept the leading role of Rome or Smotryts'kyi's attempts to eliminate theological differences between Catholic and Orthodox soteriologies ever heard? The answers are to be found in sources for popular religiosity from the 17th century.

Particularly appealing in this sense are testaments. They form a peculiar genre of material, as distinct from both edifying literature and other notarial documents found in municipal and monastery archives, with a specific feature: Their "individual character." Two famous testaments of Ipatii Potii (1609 and 1613) are the best illustrations. Both texts constitute the final reckoning with opponents and counterparts, in which Potii defends the legacy of the Uniate Church. Confessing prior to death his commitment to the Christian faith, Potii transformed his first testament into a justification of the Union of Brest:

First, I confess that I believe, according to the Greek rite, in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Trinity. I also acknowledge all the tenets of the Holy Apostolic Universal Church without a single doubt under the leadership and authority of the ecumenical archbishop of ancient Rome, thus following the heritage of the Holy Eastern Church Fathers and our Holy Liturgies. I leave this world in peaceful accord with the Roman Church, as our Holy Church Fathers did, in unity with the See of the Supreme Christ Apostle Paul, paying tribute to His Provosts... Although some of our enemies dare to insinuate that we signed this agreement for our personal sake, I confess before God, Who is aware of all that is hidden, and bare my soul to all the people, that it was not made to humiliate the Holy Eastern Church and its Most Honorable Patriarchs but for the salvation of my soul and the souls of my parishioners, while remembering the will of Jesus Christ, My Savior, who appealed for mutual and fraternal love.⁷²

Potii's testament is a religious manifestation addressed to the supporters of the Uniate movement. This document is his last order and justification of this way of life. What is more, such statements were not just idioms which belonged officially to a preamble but symbols of Christian fidelity fixed in written form. Potii clearly stated, "I compiled this testament, for death does not take me unprepared, and in order to strengthen my faith."⁷³

72. Testaments of Ipatii Potii (1609 and 1613), *Архив Юго-Западной России* [Archive of the South-Western Russia], part I, vol. VI, no. CLIII (СПб., 1883), 392; Wioletta Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unici w Rzeczypospolitej XVI-XVIII wieku wobec życia i śmierci w świetle testamentów* [Attitude of the Orthodox and Uniates in the 16th and 17th century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth towards life and death in the light of testaments] (Warszawa: Neriton, 2012), 136-137, 332.

73. Testaments of Ipatii Potii (1609 and 1613), *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part I, vol. VI, no. CLIII (СПб., 1883), 392.

Extended devotional sections are also characteristic of the testaments of other Uniate church leaders at that time:

I hereby attest that during my lifetime I was a true son of His Catholic Church, expressing unity with the Holy Roman Church in the Apostolic Capital while daily praying to God for those who unanimously glorify His Blessed Name (Bishop Ioakym Morokhovs'kyi of Volodymyr [1631]);⁷⁴ I attest before God and the whole Church that I remained thus with the Holy Roman Church as I did during my entire life. With this I approach the dreadful judgment of the Lord God, confessing what the Holy Ecumenical Council of Florence instructs us to believe, which I truly accept and to which I hereby testify (Bishop Ieremiia Pochapovs'kyi (Poczapowski), of Luts'k-Ostrih [1637]).⁷⁵

The Polish historian Otto Hedemann called testaments "human documents,"⁷⁶ which implement the will of people facing death, and provide a kind of summary of their lives. A testament is the final account of a mortal being, a settling of all affairs before crossing the threshold of eternity. It is clear, however, that various social, legal, and economic limitations were in effect whenever testaments were compiled. For example, few archival collections contain wills drawn up by the poor.⁷⁷ Certain limitations also have to be considered when dealing with women's wills, since women did not enjoy equal rights with men. Nonetheless, testaments provide a lot of valuable information. For most scholars it is a vital source—indeed, the primary one—for the study of so-called "serial history." Besides, testaments shed light on the perception of the world beyond, allowing for an "accounting of the afterlife."⁷⁸ Pierre Chaunu considered the testaments to be the main historical source for

74. *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part IV, vol. I, no. CCLIII (СПб., 1867), 623-30. Wioletta Zielecka-Mikołajczyk notices that Morokhovky's testament contains "just the confession of faith" omitting open contemplation of other confessions to be found in the testaments of several other Ruthenian Uniate hierarchs (for instance, of Antoni Sielawa (1651)). Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unici*, 138, 331.

75. Михайло Довбищенко, ed., *Пам'ятки, Архів української церкви. Документи до історії унії на Волині і Київщині кінця XVI – першої половини XVII ст.* [Mykhailo Dovbyshchenko, ed., *Monuments. Archive of the Ukrainian Church. Documents on the history of the Union in Volhynian and Kyivian lands at the end of the 16th century-1st half of the 17th century*], vol. 3 (Київ: Український державний науково-дослідний інститут архівної справи та документознавства, 2001) 238-240. Confessional affiliation is also clearly stated in the last wills and testaments of lay Uniates. For instance, Anna Owłoczymśka, a judge's daughter and the wife of a *rotmistrz* (captain), affirms in her testament (1626): "I confess my affiliation with the Holy Catholic Church in which I die and hope that God Almighty will accept my soul to His Heavenly Glory, and the Holy Blessed Virgin will not deprive me of her mercy." Довбищенко, ed., *Пам'ятки*, 177.

76. Otto Hedemann, *Testamenty brasławsko-dziśnieńskie XVII–XVIII wieku jako źródło historyczne* [The testaments of the Brasław and Dziśnieński regions of the 17th and 18th century as a historical source] (Wilno, 1935), 5.

77. For a study of Polish peasants' testaments, see, Tomasz Wiślicz, "Peasant Funerals in Early Modern Poland," *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 82 (2000): 49-80.

78. Jacques Chiffolleau, *La comptabilité de l'au-delà, les hommes, la mort et la religion dans la région d'Avignon à la fin du Moyen Âge, vers 1320-vers 1480* (Rome: EFR, Collection de l'École française de Rome, 1980).

the study of attitudes towards death and perspectives of salvation in Western Europe until 1770-1780. Subsequently, they lost their particular research value in this regard.⁷⁹

Testaments could also be useful for the analysis of more complex problems of “religious acculturation,” which is unquestionably connected with the development of religious self-consciousness and has mainly to do with inter-confessional confrontations after the Union of Brest. Testaments can provide answers to the question of the extent to which theological debates found resonance in believers’ religious practices. Recently several studies have shed new light upon the forms of religiosity and self-perception reflected in early modern Ruthenian testaments.⁸⁰

An interesting approach to the study of the Ruthenian Orthodox and Uniate testaments has been recently suggested by Wioletta Zielecka-Mikołajczyk.⁸¹ Her source base consists of some 600 last wills from all territories of the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and includes the testaments of both nobles and burghers. Zielecka-Mikołajczyk argues that, in contrast to the Polish-Lithuanian Catholic and Protestant testaments from the same period, the Orthodox and Uniate last wills often lack the introductory confession of faith, or present it in a rather abridged form. This was the case particularly in the eastern parts of the Great Duchy of Lithuania with its predominantly Orthodox population. Zielecka-Mikołajczyk

79. Pierre Chaunu, *Histoire quantitative, histoire sérielle* (P.: Armand Colin, 1978), 242.

80. Most recent studies are: Оксана Вінниченко, “‘Своя смерть’: річпосполитський шляхтич перед обличчям вічності (за ранньомодерними тестаментами)” [Oksana Vynnychenko, Own death. A Polish-Lithuanian nobleman in front of eternity],” in Віктор Горобець, ed., *Повсякдення ранньомодерної України. Історичні студії в 2-х томах. 2. Світ речей і повсякденних уявлень* [Viktor Horobets, ed., *Everyday life of early modern Ukraine. Historical studies in 2 volumes*] (Київ: Інститут історії України НАН України, 2013), 272-296; Наталя Яковенко, *Українська шляхта з кінця XIV до середини XVII століття. Волинь і Центральна Україна* [Natalia Iakovenko, *Ukrainian nobility from the end of 14th century to the mid 17th century*] (Київ: Наукова Думка, 1993); eadem, *Паралельний світ*; eadem, “‘Освоений простір’, або Де заповідали ховати себе волинські шляхтичі [Domesticated space: Burial places of Volhynian nobility (mid-16th to mid-17th centuries)],” in eadem, *Дзеркала ідентичності*, 146-164; Сергій Горін, “Заповіти як джерело дослідження історії монастирів Волині XVI-першої половини XVII стст. [Serhii Gorin, Testaments as a source for the studies of Volhynian monasteries of the 16th-1st half of the 17th centuries],” *Наукові записки. Збірник праць молодих вчених і аспірантів* [Scientific proceedings. A collection of papers of young scholars and PhD students], 19, 1 (2009): 19-35; Олена Кривошея, “Тестаменти як джерело до історії духовенства [Olena Kryvosheia, Testaments as a source for the clergy studies],” in *Гілея Історія, Політологія, Філософія. Науковий вісник НПУ ім. Драгоманова* [Gileia. History. Political sciences. Philosophy. Scientific herald of the NPU named after Dragomaniv], 18 (Київ: НПУ, 2008), 126-131; eadem, Володимир Кривошея, “Заповіти козацької старшини гетьманщини: кількість, географія [Testaments of the Hetmanate Cossack elites: quantity, geography],” in *Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького національного університету* [Scientific works of the History Department of the Zaporizhzhia National University], 28 (Запоріжжя: ЗНУ, 2010), 435-442; Наталя Білоус, *Тестаменти киян XVI - 1 пол. XVII століть* [Natalia Bilous, Testaments of the Kyivan burgers of the 16th-1st half of the 17th centuries] (Київ: “Простір,” 2011); David Frick, *Kith, Kin, and Neighbors: Communities and Confessions in Seventeenth-Century Wilno* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013), 356-399.

81. Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unici*.

explains this difference by the lack of "felt danger," coming from another confession. These data refer mostly to the first half of the 17th century.⁸²

In contrast to the introductions to the testaments, their donative parts provide considerable information about religious practices and inter-confessional relations. Zielecka-Mikołajczyk maintains that the seventeenth-century donation preferences among the Orthodox and Uniate magnates testify to a predominant adherence to the "faith of the forefathers," and a negative attitude to conversions. "Religious practices had to draw some noble Orthodox believers away from interest in other confessions."⁸³ The gentry, however, was mostly preoccupied with the support of local cathedral and sanctuaries. The gentry's Uniate believers, according to Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, also started to donate to Roman Catholic monasteries from the second half of the 17th century onwards.⁸⁴

Zielecka-Mikołajczyk's conclusions have found further support in the recent studies of David Frick on everyday life in 17th-century Wilno.⁸⁵ Based upon significant numbers of archival documents including testaments, his publications prove that local burghers of various confessions were constantly entangled in networks across ethnic and confessional lines. Wilnians remained during the whole 17th century "the society that stays together."⁸⁶ Even the Muscovite occupation of Wilno (1655–1661) could not break these networks and finally bound the burghers together in exile regardless of their ethnic or religious affiliation. Everyday life determined the views on salvation and religious practices.

Another multifaceted picture of religious attitudes arises from the studies of Mykhailo Dovbyshchenko based upon 900 testaments from Volhynia in the 16th and 17th centuries.⁸⁷ Dovbyshchenko traces changes in the attitude towards the idea of the Union and personal salvation among the representatives of different confessions. As to the Orthodox nobility, he defines three groups of testators according to their donations and declared religious belonging. The first one, called "the Kyivo-Christian group" understood itself as the heirs of the Ruthenian spiritual tradition by assigning a particular role to Kyiv as a sacral center. The second group, defined by Dovbyshchenko as "regional Orthodox patriots," encompassed those Vohlynian noblemen who donated mostly to the regional shrines and Orthodox cathedrals, as well as to the local brotherhoods and charity institutions. The third Orthodox group included the so-called "pro-Uniates" who in their preferences did not posit any differences between Orthodox and Uniate sanctuaries. A prominent example

82. *Ibid.*, 139-140.

83. *Ibid.*, 150-151.

84. *Ibid.*, 151.

85. Frick, *Kith, Kin, and Neighbors*; idem, *Wilnianie. Żyoty siedemnastowieczne* [Vilnans. Seventeenth-Century Lives] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Przegład Wschodni, 2007).

86. Frick, *Kith, Kin, and Neighbors*, 274.

87. Михайло Довбищенко, *Волинська шляхта у релігійних рухах (кінець XVI – перша половина XVII ст.)* [Mykhailo Dovbyshchenko, *Volhynian nobility in religious movements at the end from the 16th-1st half of the 17th centuries*] (Київ: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2008).

for such an attitude is the testament of Adam Kysiel (Kysil), a Kyivan voivode who served the Polish king for many years. During his whole life, he tried to erase the contradictions between the two Eastern-rite Ruthenian Christian confessions.⁸⁸

Dovbyshchenko also differentiates among the Uniate testators according to donation preferences. He finds out that there was a “conservative group” that followed Uniate traditions. Its religiosity was mostly defined by the celebration of the Theotokos cult in local Uniate cathedrals. Another group of nobility, labeled by Dovbyshchenko as “double-rited,” did not show preference to any confessional belonging. Along with some of their Orthodox counterparts, these noblemen and noblewomen donated to the Uniate as well as to the Catholic and Orthodox sanctuaries. Dovbyshchenko, however, differentiates this group from the third one, “the Uniate ecumenical” who openly declared in their testaments religious indifference to interconfessional contradictions.⁸⁹

My own research into the history of some 200 Catholic, Orthodox, and Uniate early modern Ruthenian testaments (40% from nobility, 50% from burghers, and 10% from clergy), although not fully representative, allows some preliminary observations. The early modern Ruthenian testaments reveal a highly complex mixture of personal motivations and preferences as reflected in donations to church institutions.⁹⁰ A total of 47.7% of testators decided to bequeath part of their properties to the church or charitable needs. This coincides with the average Polish-Lithuanian data for the 16th-17th centuries.⁹¹ The number of legacies to charitable and church needs is equal to that of requests for memorial services. The picture is roughly the same for all the wills, regardless of the testator’s confessional affiliation.⁹² Despite occasional fluctuation, these figures demonstrate a relatively high proportion of

88. On Kysiel’s life and political activity, see Frank Sysyn, *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil 1600-1653* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1985).

89. Михайло Довбищенко, “Вплив релігійних рухів на розвиток національної свідомості православного та уніатського нобілітету Волині кінця XVI – першої половини XVII ст. (українознавчий аспект) [Mykhailo Dovbyshchenko, The influence of religious movements upon the development of national consciousness of the Volhynian Orthodox and Uniate nobility at the end of the 16th-1st half of the 17th centuries],” *Українознавчий альманах* [Almanac of Ukrainian studies], 2, 2 (2010), 210-213; idem, *Волинська шляхта*, 210-308.

90. See Liliya Berezhnyaya, *Death and the Afterlife in Early Modern Ukrainian Culture* (forthcoming); Iakovenko, *Parallelny svit*, 47.

91. According to Andrzej Karpiński, it is 57%. Andrzej Karpiński, “Zapisy ‘pobożne’ i postawy religijne mieszczanek polskich w świetle testamentów z 2 połowy XVI i XVII w. [“Divine” records and religious attitudes of Polish townswomen in the light of testaments of the second half of the 16th and 17th centuries],” in Maria Bogucka, ed., *Triumfy i porażki. Studia z dziejów kultury polskiej XVI-XVII w.* [Triumphs and fails. Studies of Polish culture in the 16th and 17th centuries] (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1989), 213.

92. According to Karpiński, the number of the Polish Catholic women devotional legacies peaked in the early seventeenth century (72%) and declined slightly by the end of that century (60%); see Karpiński, “Zapisy ‘pobożne,’” 212-213. He also noticed that women usually bequeathed bigger sums than men in their testaments, see Andrzej Karpiński, *Kobieta w mieście polskim w drugiej połowie XVI i w XVII wieku* [Woman in a Polish city in the second half of the 16th century and in the 17th centuries] (Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN, 1995), 253.

devotional legacies in Ruthenian testaments. In a way, these indicators demonstrate a relative stability of mental structures, considering the changes that transpired in the political, social, and religious life of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Confessional diversity was, however, a dividing factor in the distribution of devotional legacies. Most of the Uniate testators bequeathed their property to local parish churches or cathedrals. Orthodox donations, meanwhile, were almost equally distributed between monasteries (48.27%) and local churches (41.38%). The rest went to religious brotherhoods (10.34%). One of the most generous Uniate benefactors was Bishop Ioakym Morokhovs'kyi. He donated 1,000 złoty for the decoration of the miraculous Mother of God icon in the Volodymyr Cathedral, numerous valuable church plates, and 1,500 złoty for a bell for the cathedral. The total amount of his donations was approximately 9,350 złoty (=3,116 silver thalers), a considerable amount in those days. Ioakym's only condition was that his name be engraved on the cathedral bell and a marble gravestone be erected for him.⁹³ Another famous Uniate benefactor, Prince Lev Voronets'kyi (Woroniecki), bequeathed his manors in the villages of Tatarynivka, Krasna Oskivka, Iakymivka, and Zahirka, as well as a Gospel and various silver plates to Holy Trinity Church in the vicinity of Kremianets'. The prince was the founder of that church.⁹⁴

The founding of churches was also a frequent theme of Orthodox testaments. Quite often, the funding of a new construction was part of the devotional legacy. For example, Samuil Vasylevych Soltan (Sołtan) left money for the construction of the Holy Cross Church in Luts'k, as well as for a church hospice and school.⁹⁵ One of the most generous donors, Prince Fedor Andreevych Sangushkovych (Sanguszkó), left all his assets for the construction of a St. Nicholas Church at his manor, Mieltsi, and to the Orthodox monastery near the Turia River. A few years later, he changed his mind and asked his wife and children to provide enough funds for these constructions. He also made several donations to other Ruthenian Orthodox monasteries (including a gold chain to the Kyivan Cave Monastery), as well as to the monastic community of Mount Athos, which embodied the moral and spiritual integrity of Eastern Christianity.⁹⁶ Fedor Sanguszkowicz's testaments serve as a prime example of popular endowments to monasteries.

On the basis of the analyzed testaments it is hard to judge whether the lack of legacies in the Eastern-rite believers could be a sign of the "non-confessionality"

93. *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part IV, vol. I, no. 253 (СПб., 1867), 623-30. Dovbyshchenko argues that these benefactions were preceded by Morokhovs'kyi's generous donations to the Volodymyr Brotherhood hospital and patronage of local schools. Some references to his charitable activities may be found in Jacob Susha's treatise *De laboribus unitorum*; see Довбищенко, ed., *Пам'ятки*, 86.

94. Довбищенко, ed., *Пам'ятки*, 113-14; Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unici*, 95, 218, 315.

95. *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part I, vol. VI, no. 153 (СПб., 1883), 504-10; Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unici*, 328.

96. *Archiwum książąt Lubartowiczów Sanguszków w Sławucie* [Archive of Princes Lubartowicz Sanguszkó in Sławuta] (hereinafter – *Archiwum Sanguszków*), vol. IV (Lwów: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1890), 562-65; Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unici*, 80, 127, 129, 146, 244.

of their authors. Rather, it is clear that the relatively high number of believers who did not openly declare their confessional belonging in testaments remained stable across the centuries. This seems to be a characteristic feature of such Eastern-rite documents, despite the later progress of confessionalization in Ruthenian lands.⁹⁷

For Ruthenian Catholics, local monasteries were particular objects of “devotional legacies.” Nearly 80% of Catholic testators chose various monasteries as places to which their testacies were to be transferred. The greatest proportion of Catholic legacies went to the mendicant orders, among which the greatest popularity was enjoyed by the Franciscans, Carmelites, Bernardines, and Benedictines. These calculations coincide with Western European data from the same period⁹⁸ to provide further evidence of the relative uniformity of the post-Tridentine Catholic Europe at that time.

In spite of the variety of places to which offerings were assigned, most of the devotional legacies shared a common trait. For instance, some testators provided detailed descriptions of how financial bequests were to be distributed. Vasył Zahorovs'kyi (Zahorowski) earmarked his assets for the construction of the Orthodox Ascension Church. He specified that its roof and entrance had to be built in such a way that in winter neither snow nor rain would fall into the church.⁹⁹ Prince Bogush Fedorovych Korets'kyi (Korecki) bequeathed funds for the perpetual maintenance of three Orthodox monasteries in Marynyn, Korets, and Horodyshe.¹⁰⁰ Prince Hryhorii Chetvertyns'kyi was predominantly concerned with providing sufficient food for the Orthodox monastery situated on his ancestral lands. Besides a generous financial endowment for the monastery, he granted it six peasants with neighbors, a fisherman, vestments for the monks, three barrels of salt, and a barrel of honey. He also left detailed instructions on how to pay the deacon's salary.¹⁰¹

Long-term, enduring bequests for church institutions and charitable organizations were privileges of the rich. The lesser estates, such as burghers or parish clergymen, satisfied their charitable needs by bequeathing a single financial gift or valuable presents. This was common to all confessions. The Uniate Anna Ovlochym's'ka (Owłoczymśka) left an annual payment of 300 złoty for the manor church to cover the priest's food expenses.¹⁰² The Catholic Agnieszka Łyskowa from L'viv donated to the local Carmelite monastery five silver spoons and a small silver belt for the Virgin's icon, two icons with gilded crowns, a crucifix,

97. See also, Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unicy*, 139.

98. Karpiński, “Zapisy ‘pobożne’,” 233.

99. *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part I, vol. I, no. 16 (СПб., 1883), 67-94.

100. *Ibid.*, part I, vol. I, no. 17 (1883), 95-116.

101. П. Викторовский, *Западно-русские дворянские фамилии отпавшие от православия в конце 16 и в 17 вв* [P. Viktorovskii, *West Russian noble families, who fell away from Orthodoxy at the end of the 16th-17th centuries*] (Киев, 1912), 269-72. Prince Hryhorii Chetvertyns'kyi changed his confession several times. By the time he composed this testament (1642) he had converted back to Orthodoxy from the Uniate faith and became one of the leaders of the Volhynian Orthodox nobility, see Довбищенко, ed., *Пам'ятки*, 48.

102. Довбищенко, ed., *Пам'ятки*, 178; Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unicy*, 313.

and a candelabrum.¹⁰³ The Orthodox believer Dmytrii Stepanovych Biloshyds'kii donated a certain amount of grain for the needs of the local priest.¹⁰⁴ Theological books were also bequested objects. For example, Princess Maria Iurievna Kurb-skaia (Golshanskaia), the wife of Prince Andrei Kurbskii, offered her Gospel to the Orthodox church in Dubrovysia.¹⁰⁵ This type of bequest illustrates the testator's wish to be associated with the sacred essence of the Church by donating personal, often domestic, items to religious institutions.¹⁰⁶

Importantly, there were several Ruthenian Uniate, Orthodox, and Catholic wills in which the legacies went to a "foreign church," i.e., to religious institutions of other confessions. Iakovenko lists several such cases from the history of Ruthenian nobility.¹⁰⁷ Dovbyshchenko also mentions several prominent cases from the Volhynian testaments.¹⁰⁸ Other examples come from the testaments of L'viv burghers, who decided to legate their property both to the Catholic and Orthodox hospitals and churches.¹⁰⁹

This was due not only to the spirit of religious tolerance in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth but also because of the legal obligation of patronage (so-called *ktitorstvo*).¹¹⁰ In such cases, the traditional, "hereditary" principle was favored. It is extremely difficult, therefore, to define the confessional affiliation of a testator on the basis of offered legacies. The same applies to the requests for memorial services.

103. ЦДІАЛ (Центральний державний історичний архів України, м. Львів – Central State Historical Archive of the City of L'viv), f. 52, op. 1, d. 341, l. 23-27. Agnieszka Łyskowa was twice married: with Stanisław Łyski, and later with Matias Bigoski. Her testament was compiled under the first name, see Bożena Popiołek, *Woli mojej ostatniej testament ten... Testamenty staropolskie jako źródło do historii mentalności XVII–XVIII wieku* [According to my last will, this testament... Old Polish testaments as sources of the history of mentality in the 17th and 18th century] (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego, 2009), 83, footnote 320. Jadwiga Krzysztofowicowna bequeathed pearls and corals to the icon of the Virgin Mary in L'viv, see ЦДІАЛ, f. 52, op. 2, d. 341, l. 40-42. Havryil Bokii-Pechykh-vosts'kyi bequeathed to the Orthodox church in his manor Mioletiske "a silver incensory, a Gospel with gilded binding, a surplice decorated with pearls and some money for bells' renovation," see Людмила Демченко, "Волинські тестаменти XVI ст.: Дипломатичний аналіз [Liudmyla Demchenko, Volhynian testaments of the 16th century: diplomatic analysis]," in: *Наукові записки. Збірник наукових праць молодих учених та аспірантів НАНУ* [Scientific proceedings. A collection of scientific works of NANU young scholars and PhD students], 2 (Київ, 1997), 40.

104. *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part IV, vol. I, no. XLVIII (1867), 165-66.

105. Николай Иванович, *Жизнь князя Андрея Михайловича Курбского в Литве и на Волыни* [Nikolai Ivanishev, *Life of Andrei Kurbski in Lithuania and Volhynia*], vol. 1 (Київ, 1849), 72-79. On bequests in late medieval Central Europe, see Thomas Krzenck, "Books in Late Medieval Wills in Bohemia," *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU*, 7 (2001): 187-232.

106. See M. Makó, "Item lego...", *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU*, 7 (2001): 177.

107. Яковенко, *Паралельний світ*, 45-47.

108. Довбищенко, *Волинська шляхта*, 213, 272.

109. Ярина Кочеркевич, "Побожні формули в заповітах мішан м. Львова другої половини XVI-XVII століть: дипломатичний аналіз [Iaryna Kocherkevych, *Devote formula in the testaments L'viv burghers in the 2nd half of the 16th-17th centuries: diplomatic analysis*]," *Архіви України*, 5 (2010): 55-56.

110. I am grateful to Prof. Hubert Łaskiewicz for this insight.

Uniate priests in the 17th century, for example, continued to commemorate deceased Orthodox parishioners if the cathedral or monastery had formerly belonged to the Orthodox Church; the Uniate heirs paid for the Orthodox memorial services.¹¹¹ Mentioning the Pope, however, in Uniate testaments at that time was quite exceptional. Moreover, even in the mid-17th century, the Uniate clergy, including bishops, did not pray for the Pope in the Sunday liturgy. That was done only by the Metropolitan on behalf of the whole Uniate Church.¹¹² The same applies to other dogmas of the Catholic and Uniate theory of salvation: Except for the Catholics and some Armenians,¹¹³ none of the testators presented here mentioned Purgatory and the idea of satisfaction. The Uniate hierarchs also avoided direct allusions to Purgatory in their wills.¹¹⁴ Apparently, theological debates did not have much influence upon the Uniates' and Orthodox perception of the afterlife.

Another possible confessional "marker" found in testaments is the choice of burial place.¹¹⁵ As a whole, some 25% of testators wanted to be buried in monasteries close to prestigious "sacral places"; 26% expressed their wish to find final repose in local churches; whereas almost a half of them (49%) did not make any decision on this issue. Yet social boundaries made a difference.

Obviously, the majority of *szlachta* of all Christian denominations decided to be buried in the "home" church or monastery. Sometimes, they preferred to be buried in small village churches, far away from large monasteries and devotional places (usually at one of the churches in their hereditary lands). After a pilgrimage to view the icon of the Holy Blessed Mother of God in Mozyr, Dmytrii Stepanovych Biloshyds'kyi became ill, and called a priest for confession and communion. While preparing for death, he decided to compile a testament in which he expressed a wish to be buried in the village church of Skorodne.¹¹⁶ A similar request is expressed

111. Довбищенко, ed., *Пам'ятки*.

112. *Ibid.*, 76.

113. Оксана Вінниченко, "Структура та формуляр тестаментів львівської вірмен XVII-першої половини XVIII століть [Oksana Vinnychenko, Structure and the formular of the L'viv Armenian testaments of the 17th-1st half of the 18th centuries]," in *Крізь століття. Студії на пошану Миколи Крикуна з нагоди 80-річчя* [Across the centuries. Studies in honor of Mykola Krykun on the occasion of his 80th birthday] (Українознавча наукова бібліотека Наукового Товариства імені Шевченка, 33) (Львів: Видавництво Наукового Товариства імені Шевченка, 2012), 459.

114. Zielecka-Mikołajczyk found no traces of the *filioque* dogma in the Uniate testaments, which was another polemical issue of the time. Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unici*, 125. David Frick in his analysis of the seventeenth-century Wilno testaments observed a similar tendency: the Catholics used the word "Purgatory" in their last wills, whereas the Orthodox, Uniates, and Protestants avoided it. He presumes, however, that both the Uniates and the Orthodox "nonetheless thought in terms of some intermediary place or stage between death and consignment to hell or reception in heaven." Frick, *Kith, Kin, and Neighbors*, 371.

115. For the analysis of the 18th-century burial ceremonies in the Hetmanate, see Олена Замура, *Великий шаленець: смерть і смертність в Гетьманщині XVIII ст.* [Olena Zamura, Forceful madman: Death and mortality in the 18th century Hetmanate] (Київ: КІС, 2014), 156-174.

116. *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part IV, vol. I, no. 48 (1867), 165-166.

in the testament of Illia Kubylyns'kyi, who wanted to be buried at St. Michael the Archangel Church in the village of Meleny.¹¹⁷

The magnates, some church hierarchs and Kyiv burghers often chose a prestigious place of sepulture instead, like the Kyivan Cave Monastery or St. Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery, Volodymyr Cathedral in Luts'k, Pochaiv Dormition Monastery,¹¹⁸ or Częstochowa Monastery. The amount of such requests exceeds 20% of all testaments. Evidently, the juxtaposition of two factors influenced such a decision. On the one hand, this disposition had an obvious protective meaning for the body and the soul (the reference to the overpowering defensive force of the holy relics is very clear in this regard). On the other, close family and social linkages also played an important role. In his second testament (1547), Prince Fedor Andreevich Sangushkovich (Sanguszko) asked to be buried in the Kyivan Cave Monastery, near his ancestors' graves.¹¹⁹ Prince Bogush Fedorovich Korets'kyi (Korecki) (1576), voivode of the Volhynian and Luts'k regions and the starosta of the Braclaw and Vinnytsia regions, wished to be buried "close to my parents' graves in Kyiv, in the Cave Monastery of the Holy Blessed Mother of God, according to our Greek rite."¹²⁰ Princess Hanna Shymkivna (Szymkówna-Kapuścina), also wanted her grave to be close to her husband's burial place, in the shadow of the Kyivan relics. However, she indicates a precise place of burial, a chapel that was built with her spouse's donations.¹²¹ For Prince Andrei Mikhailovich Kurbskii, spiritual unity was even more important than family ties. He asked to be buried in Kovel's Holy Trinity Monastery, close to his confessor Father Alexander's grave.¹²²

In fact, the number of such requests among the magnates declined in the course of the 17th century, as shown by Natalia Iakovenko. It remained, however, relatively stable among the high-ranking clergy and the Kyivan burghers. The latter, in comparison to other Ruthenian burghers, were in the relatively "privileged" situation of having many burial places from which to choose. Even so, a half of them refused to specify a place.¹²³

Burghers of other cities, as a rule, decided for parish churches, and the testators were members of the local community. In the case of Ewa Kalecka, it was Przemyśl

117. *Ibid.*, part IV, vol. I, no. 43 (1867), 147-148. See also the testament of Tymish Loikovych Yermakovych-Moshkovs'kyi, *ibid.*, part IV, vol. I, no. 28 (1867), 111-113.

118. On donations to the Pochaiv Monastery, see Довбищенко, *Волинська шляхта*, 219.

119. *Archiwum Sanguszków*, vol. IV, 562-565; Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unici*, 49, 80, 298.

120. Testament of Prince Bogush Fedorovich Korets'kyi (Korecki) (1579), *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part I, vol. I, no. 17 (1883), 95; Zielecka-Mikołajczyk, *Prawosławni i unici*, 65, 144, 150, 201, 296.

121. A desire to be buried in the proximity of family graves characterizes the majority of the testaments. See the testaments of Princess Hanna Vasylyvna Koshyrs'ka-Sanguszkowa, *Archiwum Sanguszków*, vol. IV, 418-20, and Mihal Bogusz Bogowitinowicz, *Архив Юго-Западной России*, vol. 1, no. 91, 95-97.

122. Іванишев, *Жизнь князя Андрея Михайловича Курбского*, 191-200.

123. Білоус, *Тестаменти киян*, 66.

Holy Trinity Church;¹²⁴ for Demetrii Melon, it was simply a “L’viv Ruthenian church.”¹²⁵

In contrast to the Orthodox and Uniate testaments, the Catholic wills impress the reader with their variety of burial places, resulting from the diversity of monastic orders in the Roman Catholic tradition. Since well into the Middle Ages, Polish-Lithuanian monasteries had enjoyed *liberam sepulchram*, the right to bury the bodies of those who have chosen specific graveyards as their places of final repose.¹²⁶ The Catholics of L’viv and Przemyśl mostly chose burial places in the monasteries of the mendicant orders and local parish churches. Many testators requested burial in the city cathedral.¹²⁷

It is clear that for all the testators, regardless of their confessional affiliation, two factors were determinative in the selection of a burial place. One was proximity to the graves of relatives or patrons, and the other was proximity to church relics. Hence the “salvational” meaning of the burial was the most crucial.

What do these studies reveal about the popularity of Potii’s and Smotryts’kyi’s soteriological views among the Ruthenian believers? Firstly, they demonstrate that there were groups of the Uniate and Orthodox nobility and burghers who combined Catholic, Uniate, and Orthodox religious practices. Some of them even openly denied theological differences in their testaments. In this sense, the idea of Church unity, so cherished by the late Smotryts’kyi and his counterparts, was not foreign in early modern Ruthenia. Secondly, these data also testify to a considerable number of people who preserved their adherence to the religious practices of their forefathers and did not want to change religious affiliation (mostly, these were the groups of the Orthodox magnates, but in some cases also of the Uniate clergy). For them, soteriological exclusivism was natural and inherited. Thirdly, the idea of Papal primacy, crucial for Potii’s and Smotryts’kyi’s soteriological views, was generally neglected both by the Uniates and the Orthodox at that time.

To sum up, I return to the question why there was a need to provide universal definitions for such notions as salvation, sin, or penitence. The answer probably lies in the attempts of the Ruthenian Church hierarchs to codify the local Orthodox tradition to accord with Catholic models. Only this way could one conduct the appropriate polemics with the opposite side by challenging it. Such attempts are typical for Christian theological traditions in periods of confessional formation. Moreover, they reflect the situation on the borderlands, where the cultural fronts

124. Jacek Krochmal, “Przemyskie testamenty staropolskie [Old Polish testaments from Przemyśl],” *Rocznik Historyczno-archiwalny*, VI (1989): 155.

125. ЦДДАЛ, f. 52, op. 2, d. 341, l. 47-51.

126. Walenty Wójcik, “Prawo cmentarne w Polsce do XVI wieku [Cemetery law in Poland till the 16th century],” *Polonia Sacra*, 2 (1958): 176.

127. In the Przemyśl region it was 41% of testators. See Krochmal, “Przemyskie testamenty staropolskie,” 141.

were blurred. Both Potii and Smotryts'kyi were certainly “men of the borderland” in this sense.

Their input into the field of soteriology was not particularly original.¹²⁸ Potii's and Smotryts'kyi's merits lay rather in their attempts to bring different soteriological concepts together while denying dogmatic differences between the Catholic and Orthodox interpretations. The two Church hierarchs paved different paths towards this aim. Smotryts'kyi claimed that all the Catholic tenets were also recognized by the Orthodox theologians, whereas Potii aspired to combine the two interpretations. What both Church hierarchs also shared was the logic of argumentation and the attempt to combine individual salvation with Church unity.

Early modern Ruthenian testaments allow to trace the extent to which the ideas of salvation and Union, as interpreted in the writings of Potii and Smotryts'kyi, enjoyed popularity among nobility, clergy and burghers. This study demonstrates that the idea of Church unity was not totally foreign to some Eastern-rite believers. However, most of the testators did not share the soteriological views of Potii and Smotryts'kyi in their interpretations of Papal primacy. Other common pillars of Potii's and Smotryts'kyi's visions of the “true faith” – the concept of satisfaction, the differentiation of mortal and venial sins, etc. – were even less important in the eyes of the testators. Significantly, the very idea of the Union as the way of salvation was challenged in the decades to follow, with the beginning of the Cossack wars. From that time on, at least in relation to the nobility, the arguments of theologians were effective only in combination with the claims of political elites, including those of the Ukrainian Cossack hetmans.

lbere_01@uni-muenster.de

Cluster of Excellence “Religion and Politics,” University of Muenster, Germany

128. Mieczysław Ozorowski estimates Potii's contribution differently. For him, Potii was one of the first Uniate bishops who “laid the theological foundation of the Union, providing an example of original theological work.” Ozorowski, *Hipacego Pocieja podstawy unickiej teologii*, 15.

