

# **The Role and Place of the “Secular Element” in the Process of Preserving the Ecclesiastic and Religious Life of Orthodox Believers in the Post-brest Period**

Mykola SHKRIBLIAK, *Ph.D. cadidate,*  
*assistant professor*  
*Chernivtsi National University, Ukraine*  
*@yahoo.it*

## **Abstract**

*The article analyzes the role and place of the “secular element” in the process of preserving ecclesiastic and religious life of Orthodox believers in the post-Brest period and provides a historical and theological analysis of the phenomenon of church brotherhoods as beyond the hierarchical structures of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church.*

*The author pays a considerable attention to the effect of church brotherhoods as beyond the hierarchical structures on the ecclesiastic and religious life of Orthodox believers in the post-Brest period, visualizes forms and methods of their struggle for the restoration of Orthodox hierarchy and the legalization of its activity in the XVIIth century. The author provides conceptual objectivation of ideological, religious, social and political transformational processes that greatly affected the further destiny of Kyiv Orthodox Metropolitanate in XVII century.*

**Keywords:** *Secular Element, Church Brotherhoods, Sodality, Beyond Hierarchical Structures, Kyiv Metropolitanate, Orthodox Hierarchy.*

The inner life of the Kyiv Metropolitanate both in pre- and post-Brest periods is characterized by a serious crisis of ecclesiastic and hierarchical order. After the Union of Brest (1596), all the bishops of the Metropolitanate found themselves under the jurisdiction of a “new” – “Uniate Church” and only two eparchies – the eparchies of Przemyśl and Lviv – headed by the bishops Hedeon Balaban and Mykhailo Kopystensky who were anti-Uniates, remained Orthodox nearly a century, however were unable to function properly. That is to say that in 1596 these bishops, actively supported by Prince Konstanty Ostrojski called anti-Uniate council in Brest that had no results except a disclosure of its members. Therefore, the hierarchs of Kyiv Metropolitanate instead of helping the Russian Orthodox Church to overcome the crisis, they only aggravated it. During these

quite complex confessional and political transformations in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth Ukrainian Orthodox laity was uniting into church brotherhoods that became major centres of social and religious life. Now their main task is a struggle for preserving the centres of Orthodoxy (first post-Uniate generation), the restoration of hierarchy (20s of XVII century) and the legalization of its activity (30's of XVII century).

*The topicality* is determined first of all by the fact that most scholars consider the activity of church brotherhoods in the context of a struggle between the representatives of the official ecclesiastic power (usually local bishops and even a metropolitan), usually emphasizing on the influence of the fraternal movement on the inner life and order of the Kyiv Metropolitanate, and also on its determinant role in enlightenment, education, book printing and also in the process of preserving the national and religious consciousness. However, a lot of historians think that perhaps the greatest merit of the brotherhoods is a struggle against the Union on its territory. This thesis is a cross cutting theme in the Soviet historiography, where, in our opinion, the struggle for the spheres of influence, the minimization of the brotherhoods' role and the spiritual power of bishop or metropolitan inside the church became the key factors of the Union of Brest in 1596. This approach caused the disfigurement of the idea about a peculiarity of church brotherhoods' functioning and their role in the social and religious life of Orthodox believers in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Despite a great number of specialty literature concerning this problem, the efficient aspect of church brotherhoods in the context of social and religious transformations at the beginning of XVII century so far was not objectively and deliberately evaluated.

Thus, the actualization of the issue of brotherhoods' movement and the role of "secular element" in the preservation of centres of church and religious life of Orthodox Christians in post-Brest period is objectively determined, that gives ground to deem actual the topic of the research. Moreover, the statements and conclusions formulated in the article shed some light on separate fragments of both ecclesiastic and secular history of Ukraine.

The aim of our research lies in an attempt to reveal and objectively interpret the role of brotherhoods' movement in the social and religious life of Orthodox Christians under the conditions of absence of state government and foreign religious and political influence by reference of thorough analysis of historical realities (available through reference base) and of historiographic materials.

The realization of the aim and logic of research determines to find the solution to the following tasks:

*The Role and Place of the “Secular Element” in the Process of Preserving the Ecclesiastic and Religious Life of Orthodox Believers in the Post-brest Period*

- illustrate the social and historical background of church brotherhoods’ creation;
- analyze the specific of functioning of church brotherhoods and the forms of their cooperation with hierarchical structures of Ukrainian Orthodox Church;
- clarify the role and place of church brotherhoods in legal actions aiming to legalize the church and religious life in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

*The objects* of our research are the forms of church brotherhoods’ influence as beyond hierarchical structures on ecclesiastic and religious life of Orthodox Christians of first post-union generation and the methods of their struggle for the restoration of the Orthodox hierarchy and the legalization of its activity in the XVII<sup>th</sup> century. The object of the research also includes ideological, religious, social and political transformations that determined the further destiny of Kyiv Orthodox Metropolitanate in XVII century.

*The subject* of the research is presented by the theological and historiosophic discourse of church brotherhoods’ role in the process of preservation of centres of ecclesiastic and religious life of the Orthodox Christians under the conditions of foreign spiritual, religious and political influence.

The complexity of approaches used to outline a complicated specter of questions that point out social and historical determinants of church brotherhoods’ creation, demonstrating the specific of functioning and allowing to interpret their role in social and religious role of Orthodox Christians in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the beginning of XVII<sup>th</sup> century, incited the author to use more general scientific methods of historical and theological research, namely the actualization, as well as the chronological, simultaneous, analytical and hermeneutic research.

Traditional principles of modern theological knowledge such as the principle of historicism, objectivity, external confessionalism and poly-methodism became *methodological bases* for the research.

By analyzing the *historiography* of the above mentioned issues, we may conclude that ecclesiastic historians, theologians and scientists who were researching the internal life of Ukrainian Orthodox Church at the beginning of XVII<sup>th</sup> century and the laity’s attempts to take it out of the deep crisis outlined a circle of the most important questions connected with the brotherhood’s movement. The historiography dedicated to church brotherhoods is in fact rich, although their appearance and functioning at the early stages suffers from the lack of reference sources. The issue which public associations that existed attached to

Orthodox churches (parishes, bishoprics) – whether the latter can be labeled as brotherhoods<sup>1</sup> – remains a controversial reality.

A. Papkov states that brotherhoods genealogically originate from ancient Russian “bratchyn” that according to his interpretation are Orthodox unions (societies) of secularism.<sup>2</sup> The famous scientist, ecclesiastic and religious figure I. Ohienko shares the same opinion. Relying on the ancient historic sources, he proves that “ the beginning of our church brotherhoods is hidden in the hoary antiquity – in Ipatiev’s chronicles the “bratchyny” churches are already mentioned connected with 1134 and 1159 years, for example, in Polotsk they are mentioned as old-established ones”.<sup>3</sup> The contemporary Russian researcher M. Dmitirev is convinced that in the context of the interpretation of this problem, the assiduously founded conclusion of the academician Y. Isaevich<sup>4</sup> is substantially important. The main idea which it comprises is that brotherhoods, according to the terminology of historical sources, can be called only those organizations that spread in Western Ukraine since 80s-90s of the XVI<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>5</sup> On the contrary, the authors of “History of Orthodox Church in Ukraine” avoid the topic of territory of brotherhoods’ origination. However, it is claimed that they “appeared in the last third of the XVI<sup>th</sup> century”.<sup>6</sup> At the same time, if we are to take into account Y. Isevich’s determinations, unlike chronological measures, only the geographical ones coincide. Thus, the first organization that, according to Y. Isaevich must be called “brotherhood”, if we take into account only the first criteria, is the Lviv Svyato-Uspensk brotherhood. Nevertheless, it originated much earlier, namely in 1439, and not at the end of the XVI<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>7</sup> Needless to mention that this very brotherhood served as an example for the creation of analogical centres of

---

<sup>1</sup> Михаил Дмитриев, *Между Римом и Царьградом: Генезис Брестской церковной унии 1595 –1596 гг.* (Between the Rome and Tsargrad: Genesis of the Brest Church Uniat in the period of 1595 –1596 ) (Москва, 2003), 83-84.

<sup>2</sup> Папков, Александр, *Древнерусский приход. Краткий очерк церковно-приходской жизни в Восточной России до XVIII и в Западной России до XVII в.* (Ancient Russian church. The short essay of the church-ecclesiastical life in the East Russia until the period of XVIII c. and West Russia until the period of XVII c.) (Сергиев Посад, 1897), 394-395.

<sup>3</sup> Огієнко, Іван, *Українська Церква* (The Ukrainian Church) (Упоряд., авт. передмови М. С. Тимошик. – Київ, 2007), 197.

<sup>4</sup> Details look: Дмитриев, Михаил, *Work of reference*, 93.

<sup>5</sup> Исаевич, Ярослав, *Братства та їх роль в розвитку української культури XVI – XVIII ст.* (The Brotherhoods and their role in the development of Ukrainian Culture in the XVI – XVIII c.), (Київ, 1996), 39.

<sup>6</sup> *Історія православної Церкви в Україні* (The History of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine: Compilation of the works), (Київ, 1997), 93.

<sup>7</sup> Кущинський Антін, *Коротка історія Української православної церкви* (The short history of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church) (Чикаго, 1971), 35.

*The Role and Place of the “Secular Element” in the Process of Preserving the Ecclesiastic and Religious Life of Orthodox Believers in the Post-brest Period*

religious, educational, spiritual and cultural life in Vilnius (Svyato-Duhiv), in Lutsk (Chesno-Hresensk), in Kyiv (Bohoyavlensk). Alongside with these well-organized church unions of laity, ten less famous church brotherhoods operated in many cities and villages of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

In contemporary science the time of brotherhoods' appearance is still widely discussed. We consider that the starting point is the last quarter of XVI century when the activity of brotherhoods was legalized by the highest church and state power.<sup>8</sup> At that very time, as B. Gudzyak fairly points out “the crucial moment in the process of transformation of non-formal unions of Russian laity into formally organized brotherhoods” came.<sup>9</sup> Here we can see a division of history of church brotherhoods into two periods: before and after legalization. The result of the latter was actually the usurpation of the ecclesiastic power in the Church by the secular “element” that was inevitably leading to the deterioration of the crisis, the best solution to this had to be the alteration of the church jurisdiction. In this context, the activity of church brotherhoods and laity in the religious sphere is the characteristic feature which became an active intervention into the inner life of the Church, and we consider that a crisis in the traditional system of secular protectorship in the Kyiv Metropolitanate incited the episcopacy to initiate the search at the end of the XVI<sup>th</sup> century.

Considering the fact that the article is dedicated to the situation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and to the functioning of beyond-hierarchical structures in post-Brest period, the author didn't stop to interpret events and phenomena that had place in their life till the Union of Brest in 1596. At the same time we want to mention that all the Orthodox brotherhoods on the Ukrainian and Belarusian territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the end of the XVII<sup>th</sup> century had a specific meaning for the Kyiv Metropolitanate. Their ideology and practice of massive civil movement for strengthening the church discipline and for preserving the religious purity were approved by Eastern patriarchs: Joachim of Antioch (1586) and Jeremias of Constantinople (1588 – 1589). Brotherhoods were considered as an instrument for the Orthodox Church reform, and for this reason, the patriarchs, by means of their blessings, provided

---

<sup>8</sup> Ісаєвич, Ярослав, *Братства та їх роль в розвитку української культури XVI – XVIII ст.* (Brotherhood and their role in the development of Ukrainian culture) (Київ, 1996), 40.

<sup>9</sup> Гудзяк, Борис, *Криза і реформа: Київська митрополія, Царгородський патріархат і генеза Берестейської унії* (Crisis and reforms: Kyiv Metropolitanate, Tsargorod patriarchate and genesis of Brest Uniat) (Пер. з англ., 2000), 426.

them with a status of *europiegias* that granted autonomy in their activity and served as a reliable immune from influence of the local hierarchy.<sup>10</sup>

The new course and the moral support of patriarchs stimulated the reform of brotherhoods' movement, the expansion of the socially significant activity. Apart from the inner ecclesiastic regulation, brotherhoods also were developing schools, printing, charity, were supporting clinics etc. In this activity, they were usually supported by church hierarchs.<sup>11</sup> The strong partnership of brotherhoods' members with nobility imposed the brotherhoods' influence on *sejm*'s struggle for the rights of the Orthodox Christians in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Church brotherhoods delegated their representatives at provincial *sejmiks*, took part in conclusions of instructions at central *sejms*.<sup>12</sup> In addition to general statutes about the provision of freedom of conscience for Orthodox Christians, it also contained demands to preserve the right of brotherhoods itself, especially their *stavropegias*. Sometimes it had some effect on the decisions of *sejms*. Brotherhoods took an active part in the preparation of *sejms* at the beginning of XVII century. Lviv members were present at the Warsaw *sejm* in 1600, where they tried to influence officials, though without succeeding in it.<sup>13</sup> The delegates of brotherhoods, together with the nobility, took part in a well-known Sandomyr synod (1606) where the demands for "soothing of Greek religion" were formulated. And one of the points of the synod's constitution of 1607 about "the Greek religion" concerned brotherhoods directly. "Church brotherhoods of Greek religion can still preserve their rights and privileges" – was mentioned in the document.<sup>14</sup>

The clergy also realized the role of brotherhoods as a peculiar form of religious oppression that possessed a broad social basis. It was clearly felt in the first decade of the XVII<sup>th</sup> century, where the Orthodox hierarchy didn't exist first of all in some newly formed brotherhoods. In "older" brotherhoods (Lviv, Vilnius, Lublin, Przemyśl), the attitudes of secular part were highly intense: the ideology of control over clergymen dominated there. For the most part such policy caused

---

<sup>10</sup> *Історія православної Церкви в Україні* (History of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine), 95.

<sup>11</sup> *Книга протоколів братства при церкві Воздвиження Хреста Господнього в Дрогобичі за 1678 – 1828 pp.* (The Book of the Brotherhoods' Protocols in the church of God Christ Vozdizhennya in Drohobych in 1678 – 1828) // ЦДДА України у м. Львові. – Ф. 129. – Оп. 3. – С. 65. – sh 1-2.

<sup>12</sup> *Історія православної Церкви в Україні* (History of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine), 97.

<sup>13</sup> The same source, 96.

<sup>14</sup> Details look: Грушевський, Михайло, *Історія України–Руси. – Т. 5. Суспільно-політичний устрій і церковний устрій і відносини в українсько-руських землях 14 –17 віків* (History of Ukraine and Rus – Vol. 5. Social-political modes and ecclesiastical mode and relations in Ukrainian and Russian territories in 14 – 17 c.) (Львів, 1905), 157.

*The Role and Place of the “Secular Element” in the Process of Preserving the Ecclesiastic and Religious Life of Orthodox Believers in the Post-brest Period*

negative results. At the same time, as exemplified by brotherhoods formed at the beginning of the XVII<sup>th</sup> century, we can see some signs of the priority consolidation of the clergy. Thus, there could be clearly traced a “pro-church” tendency alongside with some attempts to free brotherhoods from their unnecessary – according to spiritual archbishops’ view – immunity and “laicity”. It was already mentioned the piety before clergy that was demonstrated while forming a list of Lutsk brotherhood, according to the Statute, later confirmed by the patriarchs Theophanes of Jerusalem (1620) and Kyrylo of Constantinople (1621-1623) – the older is the presbyter of a church of Feast of the Cross. This particular church (not a brotherhood), according to scientists, preserved a stavropepic status.<sup>15</sup> The priesthood (mainly the Kyiv-Pechersk clergymen) also tried to maintain an initiative while forming the Kyiv brotherhood in 1615-1616 and concluding its “Upys”, although funds for its formation were taken from a foundation that a laic person – the landlady Halsha (Elizabeth) Hulevychivna – left for the construction of an Orthodox monastery, a school and a hospital.<sup>16</sup>

The Kyiv brotherhood was formed under the conditions according to which the cultural and political centre of Ukrainian lands was moving to Kyiv. Under the protectorate of the Kyiv clergy, nobility, local magistracy, the Cossack layer had at its disposal considerable cultural forces, that Kyiv possessed in 1615-1620 (first of all, the migration of intelligentsia from Halychyna to Kyiv that started in a time of Eliseus Pletenetsky, Kyiv-Pechersk archimandrite in 1599-1624). The brotherhood school, formed on the model of a Lviv one, became a centre of church education, and brotherhood’s consolidation of religious and political opposition began to create a real threat for adherents of pro-Uniate policy. The Uniate Kyiv metropolitan Joseph Veliamyn Rutsky thought that the main obstacle for introduction of the Union in Kyiv is the presence of “new brotherhood, established by schismatics three years ago without the king’s privilege...It’s difficult to think about something good until this brotherhood exists and it can be quashed either by voyevoda’s authority or by a claim to royal king’s court”.<sup>17</sup>

The aspiration of different layers of Orthodox community for joining the brotherhoods’ movement as the only recognized centre of traditional

---

<sup>15</sup> *Історія православної Церкви в Україні* (History of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine), 97.

<sup>16</sup> Грушевський, Михайло, *Історія України–Руси* (History of Ukraine and Rus History of Ukraine and Rus), Vol. 5, 160.

<sup>17</sup> *Боротьба Південно-Західної Русі проти експансії Ватикану та унії (X – XVII ст.): Збірник документів і матеріалів* (The Opposition of the South-West Russia and expansion of Vatican and its Uniat in X – XVII c. Compilation of documents and materials) (Упоряд. Є. А. Гринів та ін., Київ, 1988), 210.

ecclesiasticism during the period of absence of high ecclesiastic hierarchy received an impulse in 1616. It happened due to the fact that Zaporozhian Cossacks, under the command of Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny, joined the Kyiv brotherhood as a collective member. Since then, Cossacks were constantly asserting the rights of Kyiv brotherhood and its schools in the petition to sejms.

However, the significance of the brotherhoods' movement as a driving force of preservation and restoration of Orthodox Church organization in post-Brest period reached a culmination point in 1620. That year, the Kyiv brotherhood became the major partner of Cossacks headed by hetman P. Sahaidachny. In the restoration of Orthodox hierarchy, the hetman acted as the voice of brotherhood being its member and protector. The patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem in 1620 honoured deserts of brotherhood with 3 charters for the active part in the construction of churches and preservation centres of Orthodox ecclesiastic and religious life: the first charter provided legitimization for the establishment of brotherhood and blessed the foundation of "younger" union of laity, others two provided stavropegic status and outlined the main instructions for future activities. The patriarch Theophanes also paid attention to church brotherhoods in other cities and villages. He confirmed ancient rights and provided churches and brotherhoods of Lutsk, Vilnius, Slutsk and Lviv with stavropegias.<sup>18</sup>

The historians fairly claim the beginning of 20s in the XVII<sup>th</sup> century to be "the time of the biggest revival of brotherhoods' movement in ecclesiastic and social life." Church brotherhoods, at that time, had a sizable reputation among Orthodox Christians of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth for the following deserts: the preservation of centres of the Orthodoxy and church traditions in the post-Brest period; the social struggle for rights of Orthodox congregation; the restoration of Orthodox hierarchy. They also possessed a convincing social basis: by all means they were supported by the nobility. Moreover, the newly departed hierarchs mostly came for brotherhoods' movement. Yet, the main factor that produced a positive impression on the consolidation of secular church movement became a Cossacks' collective membership in Kyiv brotherhood. By this reason V. Lipinskii had written: "the Orthodox Church restored in XVII c, not by the means of polemic with Catholics, but by the restoration of th Orthodox ascetic monastery and moral, warring for their faith Orthodox brotherhoods".<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Ісаєвич, Ярослав, Work paper, 52.

<sup>19</sup> Липинський, Вячеслав, Листи до братів-хліборобів (Letters to the farmer brothers) (Київ-Філадельфія, 1945), 125.

*The Role and Place of the “Secular Element” in the Process of Preserving the Ecclesiastic and Religious Life of Orthodox Believers in the Post-brest Period*

In the mean time, the years ‘20 of the XVII<sup>th</sup> century are characterized by the peak of aggravation of antagonisms in the Orthodox Church with brotherhoods being their initiators and carriers. In the last quarter of the XVI<sup>th</sup> century, the brotherhoods’ opposition against episcopacy pushed hierarchs to a closer union with secular authorities and Roman Catholic Church. The hierarchs of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Kyiv Metropolitanate) were looking for salvation from this “secular element” in the Union. This element was interpreted by the Soviet historians as “the rule of the people” (although very often the “rule” was going far beyond the scope of canonic ecclesiastic dictates). Even those who remained under the jurisdiction of the Constantinople patriarchy had conflicts with brotherhoods; for instance, the bishop of Lviv, Gedeon. Sources testify that the relations between him and the local Svyato-Uspensk brotherhood were always disloyal. Even the cooperation in a struggle against the Union could not reconcile them.<sup>20</sup>

Brotherhood members’ mistrust to hierarchs and protracted conflicts only interfered with a mutual case. Owing to the aggressiveness of the Lviv brotherhood in 1607-1608, the Lviv cathedral nearly passed into Uniates’ hands. Consecrated by a patriarch and affirmed by the king henchman of late Gedeon Balaban – his relative Isaiah – it caused the opposition of the Lviv brotherhood; the procedure of the bishop’s throne replacement got complicated, Uniates also bid for it; the Orthodox believers obtained it due to Jeremias Tyssarovsky who, in order to gain king’s trust, pretended an adherent to Uniate ideas. This and many other facts give us ground to speak about serious brotherhoods’ movement threat to the church unity.<sup>21</sup>

It is worth mentioning that during the first two decades of the XVII<sup>th</sup> century, the brotherhoods’ claims to domination over ecclesiastic life strengthened and “the rule of the people” expanded its competence in church by means of bishops’ authority. We can find plenty of evidences speaking of the excessiveness of brotherhoods’ people power. However, its greater part is mentioned only in the statements of the Uniate clergy or those of Orthodox clergy who embraced the Uniate Church. For example, Cassian Sakowicz wrote: “While living in Lublin brotherhood, I saw some heavy-drinkers, innkeepers deliver popes’ robes, vessels, crosses, Gospel, carry them to shrines on their own, touch with filthy hands things that they don’t even worth look at, and when I tried to make suggestions, I saw

---

<sup>20</sup> Наталія Полонська-Василенко, *Історія України* (History of Ukraine) Vol.1 (Київ, 1989), 132.

<sup>21</sup> Грушевський, Михайло, *Історія України–Руси* (History of Ukraine and Rus History of Ukraine and Rus), Vol. 5, 160.

neither improvements nor corrections, moreover, I brought down their anger on myself. An odd thing is that they entrust clergy with their conscience, but can't entrust with vessels, crosses, Gospel!"<sup>22</sup> – in this way Sakowicz criticizes the members of the brotherhood. This ecclesiastic polemicist also writes about Vilnius brotherhood: "You keep clergy and monks in your authority, elect them on your own volition and accept to your brotherhood, judge them and expel those you don't like... You praise them till they dance to your pipe, fawn, roll over for you and if someone stops rising in the service, he must fend for himself; you must remember well when brotherhoods' foremen, brothers-laity, having convicted one clergyman, consecrated their hands in Presviter's beard"<sup>23</sup>.

In this context, the historians' thesis according to which "the expression of extreme opposition to episcopacy was a widespread among brothers idea which bore nearly protestant character" becomes quite objective.<sup>24</sup> Brothers convinced themselves and others that "neither popes, nor archbishops, nor metropolitans can save us, but the sacrament of the Orthodoxy with a protection of Ten Commandments!"<sup>25</sup> Undoubtedly, orders introduced by brotherhoods (especially those of the oldest ones, because above-mentioned evidences were registered particularly there), contradicted the traditions of episcopal authority in the Church. While establishing new brotherhoods in the XVII<sup>th</sup> century, the clergymen tried to ensure a status worthy church traditions. Nevertheless, this collision sharpened after the restoration of Orthodox hierarchy. Historians fairly point out that "new archbishops, with all due respect to brotherhood's institution and will all acknowledgement of its deserts before the Church, couldn't help feeling greatly and bitter how difficult it was to cope with brotherhoods' people power".<sup>26</sup> The situation was even more complicated because the brotherhoods' stavropegic immunity, their own mechanism of jurisdiction – brothers' court – in a period of few decades became an example of efferent tendencies for other ecclesiastic institutions, especially monasteries. After the restoration of the Orthodox hierarchy, the brotherhoods found themselves in a danger of regulation of

---

<sup>22</sup> Quote on: Орест Левицький, *Внутрішній стан Західно-руської Церкви в Польсько-литовській державі в кінці 16 ст. та Унія* (The internal condition of the West-Russian church in the Polish-Lithuanian state in the end of 16<sup>th</sup> c and the Uniat) (Розвідки про церковні відносини на Україні-Руси XVI – XVIII ст., Львів, 1900), 18.

<sup>23</sup> Орест Левицький, *Внутрішній стан Західно-руської Церкви*, 20-21.

<sup>24</sup> *Історія православної Церкви в Україні* (History of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine), p. 100.

<sup>25</sup> *Акты, относящиеся к истории Южно-Западной Руси* (The Acts related to the History of the South – West Rus). – Изд. А. Петрушевичем (By A. Petrushevich), (Львов, 1868), 210.

<sup>26</sup> Грушевський, Михайло, *Ілюстрована історія України* (Illustrated History of Ukraine) (Київ, 1990), 72.

*The Role and Place of the “Secular Element” in the Process of Preserving the Ecclesiastic and Religious Life of Orthodox Believers in the Post-brest Period*

ecclesiastic life on the territory of the Kyiv Metropolitanate, ensuring local jurisdiction of metropolitan and diocesan bishops. Such changes, however, were always an encumbrance for both government’s opposition and local Catholic congregation.

The years ‘20 of the XVII<sup>th</sup> century – is a time of first decisive actions of higher clergy aimed at reaching the centralization of authority that, first of all, touched the activity of brotherhoods and couldn’t help provoking an adequate reaction of the latter. Such a remarkable event (1624 – 1626) was a trip of Meletius (Smotrytsky), archbishop of Polotsk to the East, to Orthodox patriarchs. Without specifying some aspects of this mission, we must point out that the Ukrainian archbishop, perhaps, by order of the Kyiv metropolitan Job Boretsky, cared for the patriarch of Constantinople to abolish ancient privileges concerning Orthodox monasteries and brotherhoods (the bishop Meletius brought an appropriate charter).<sup>27</sup> This decree caused a resolute protest against the new hierarchy not only of church brotherhoods but also for stavropegic monasteries, first of all a Kyiv-Pechersk one. The Metropolitan Job was forced to justify himself.<sup>28</sup>

But brotherhoods seemed to be not fully satisfied. The leaders of Lviv and Vilnius brotherhoods in 1626 sent their representatives to Constantinople. The latter brought a new charter with a compromise according to which stavropegias of Lviv and Vilnius brotherhoods, “the ancient ones” that were granted by patriarch Jeremias remained valid and new ones, presented by patriarch Theophanes in 1620 were cancelled.<sup>29</sup>

The decision of Constantinople patriarch was vague. Partially it can be explained by the fact that the decision was made under the influence of different flows of Orthodox environment of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Researchers state that “it, obviously, represented, first of all, the tension of relationships between brotherhoods, stavropegic monasteries and hierarchy, and, secondly, witnessed dissimilarity of the brotherhoods’ movement itself, the presence of hidden contradictions between «older» and «newer» brotherhoods which differed by principles of their attitude to clergy and the level of autonomy in relation to ecclesiastic hierarchy.”<sup>30</sup> Objectively, this decision was aimed against

---

<sup>27</sup> Степан Голубев, *Киевский митрополит Петр Могила и его сподвижники. Опыт исторического исследования*. В 2-х тт. (Kyiv metropolitan Petro Mohyla and his associates. The experience of the historical research in 2 volumes), Київ, 1883 – 1898, Vol. 1, 124-125.

<sup>28</sup> Степан Голубев, *Киевский митрополит Петр Могила и его сподвижники*, 126.

<sup>29</sup> Акты (Acts), изд. А. Петрушевичем, 91.

<sup>30</sup> *Історія православної Церкви в Україні* (History of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine), 100.

the autonomy of lower ecclesiastic institutions, first of all, the Kyiv brotherhood became for a long time a ground of this brotherhood's prepossession to the activity of Ukrainian Orthodox Church higher clergy.

We may presume that this preconception completely marked the position of brotherhoods to half-way measures of Orthodox hierarchs that wanted to come to terms with Uniates at the end of 20's. The Vilnius brotherhood, according to archbishop Meletius' testimony, during 1626 – 1627 “participated in that redemptive activity”, although later evaded despite the efforts of archbishop of Polotsk. We can state about brothers' active oppression by archbishop Meletius' allusions about the council in 1628. It was vividly illustrated in the allusions a dissatisfaction of “secular element” - lower middle class citizens and Cossacks – with Uniate plans that were being hatched by church brotherhoods.

To tell the truth, this opposition was not equally felt on the whole territory of the Kyiv Metropolitanate. The passivity is being traced especially in Right-bank Ukraine, more particularly – in Halychyna. There are some examples. Thus, the representatives of Lviv Svyato-Uspensk brotherhood showing loyalty to king's orders even participated in the Lviv (Uniate) council in 1629. One more example of brotherhoods' irreverent attitude to hierarchs is a letter of Job Boretsky to the Lviv brothers (1627), where metropolitan reproaches addressees for elementary disrespect to him and for the non-performance points of P. Sahaidachny's spiritual Will. The hierarch sadly indicates that for his work in the Church's favor he could expect more sympathy: “if only this gratitude... could be better...”<sup>31</sup>

However, the emersion of hierarchy and its attempts to renew the jurisdiction on the territory of the Kyiv Metropolitanate meant “beginning of the end” of brotherhoods' movement hegemony. After the metropolitan Job Boretsky's death, his successor Isaiah Kopynsky also tried to take brotherhoods under his pastoral guardianship. For instance, in 1632, the archbishop blessed the establishment of “youth” brotherhood at “older” one in Lutsk. He confirmed the Regulations of the new brotherhood and formulated a chain of wishes and instructions for the future. The confrontation between church brotherhoods as beyond hierarchical structures of the Kyiv Metropolitanate and clergy didn't stop until the beginning of downfall and stagnation of brotherhoods' movement. The metropolitan Petro Mohyla

---

<sup>31</sup> *Лист київського митрополита Борецького Іова та гетьмана Голуба Оліфера до братства з повідомленням про пожертвування гетьманом Сагайдачним Петром 1500 золотих на братську школу* (The letter of the Kyiv metropolitan Iov Boreckiy and hetman Golub Olifer to the brotherhood with message about the offering of 1500 golds for brotherhood school by Petro Sahaidachny). Оригінал. 24 липня 1622 р, sh. 3.

*The Role and Place of the “Secular Element” in the Process of Preserving the Ecclesiastic and Religious Life of Orthodox Believers in the Post-brest Period*

managed to cut brother down to size in the 30's that was impossible to do without the legalization of the Orthodox hierarchy.

It is worth mentioning that brotherhoods intensified their activity together with other layers of Orthodox society once again over the “kingless” period. After the death of Sigismund III, the Vilnius brotherhood sent to the convocational sejm a special request to senators and nobility to provide rights for Orthodox peasants. Brotherhoods also took part in agitation. The Lviv stavropegic and “younger” brotherhoods were raising some funds for sending deputies to provincial Vilnius sejm. Directions and instruction on ensuring the freedom of conscience, given in May 1632 to ambassadors elected at this sejm, were created under the influence of the brotherhoods' deputies.<sup>32</sup> Half-way formulas of convocational and election sejms including “Paragraphs for soothing” by Vladyslav IV contained allowance for functioning of old and formation of new brotherhoods' schools, seminaries, hospitals, free access to magistrates positions. Moreover, after his election, the Polish king Vladyslav founded individual charters for brotherhoods.<sup>33</sup>

The recognition of brotherhoods' activity by secular authority alienated them from ecclesiastic hierarchs even more. Some conflicts and confrontation caused by the brothers' struggle for spheres of influence in church continued. The long-running conflict between the Lviv brotherhood and the metropolitan of Kyiv, Petro, concerning the publishing activity in which even Parthenius, the patriarch of Constantinople was dragged, serves as a bright example. New milestones in the history of Ukrainian Orthodox Church was marked by the Petro Mohyla's election as the metropolitan of Kyiv who immediately started the reformation of ecclesiastic and religious life in the Kyiv Metropolitanate.<sup>34</sup> As to brotherhoods, a new metropolitan strived for finding a reasonable compromise in relations between clergy and brothers. In fact, the matter lied in the necessity to balance the administrative system which meant that brothers had to be cut down to size. The Kyiv metropolitan managed to do it. However, it did not happen because he turned out to be a better church shepherd than his predecessor. A crucial role in it played the legalization of Orthodox hierarchy on the 30's of the XVII<sup>th</sup> century.

---

<sup>32</sup> Папков, Антон, Work paper, 307-311.

<sup>33</sup> Ісаєвич, Ярослав, Work paper, 100.

<sup>34</sup> Details look: Шкрібляк Микола, *Митрополит Петро Могила і провідні тенденції «золотої доби» Київської митрополії: церковно-релігійний та національно-культурний контексти* (Metropolitan Petro Mohyla and lead tendencies of the “Gold Age” of Kyiv Metropolitan: ecclesiastical-religious and national-cultural contexts) // *Філософсько-богословська спадщина мислителів XVII – XX ст.: колект. монографія / За наук. ред. член.-кор. НАПН України В. О. Балуха, Чернівці, 2013), 166 – 185.*

Fence-mending and closer cooperation between clergy and laity Petro Mohyla started from Lviv Svyato-Uspensk brotherhood whose patrons traditionally were representatives of Mohyla's family and that is why Lviv brothers were especially disposed to Kyiv metropolitan. The Przemyśl church brotherhood also sympathized the metropolitan with his struggle for the legitimization of the Orthodox clergy and for this reason partially made common cause with him. However, a decisive moment in the consolidation of metropolitan's authority became the subordination of the Kyiv brotherhood to ecclesiastic authority. Shortly before his election, being a Kyiv-Pechersk archimandrite, under Cossacks pressure, Mohyla managed to become not only a guardian but also the eldest among brothers. Since then, a steady subordination of brotherhoods' movement to higher ecclesiastic clergy has begun.<sup>35</sup>

The integration of brotherhoods into one hierarchic structure became an important aspect of the church reform of Mohyla's period that weakened social and political basis of brotherhoods' movement and, undoubtedly, strengthened the influence of renewed Orthodox hierarchy which once and for all soothed former brotherhoods' claims. The Kyiv metropolitan carried out his arch-flamen's activity in a way brotherhoods mostly sought his protection and help from the governmental oppression; they resorted to him in case of inner problems demonstrating their loyalty and obedience, "having accepted him as shepherd and father in God's Church."<sup>36</sup> Petro Mohyla extended his influence on stavropegic brotherhoods having prohibited them to interfere with the inner life of the Church. The first Hierarch of the Kyiv Metropolitanate took charge of functions concerning sending representatives on internal matters of church brotherhoods; he organized fundraising for them and carried out control over its exploitation.

In the second part of the XVII<sup>th</sup> century, the church brotherhoods completely lost both political independence and the one within the ecclesiastic institution, having turned into an ordinary element of the Church hierarchic structure. And although Petro Mohyla invited brotherhoods to the Kyiv council in 1640, they began to look more and more like a symbol of original local tradition and less like a manifestation of former grass-roots democracy. Such institution as brotherhoods seemed to steadily drain its resource. Records of the 50's – 90's about elections of brotherhoods' elders and Father Superiors of the monasteries subdued to them, witness about the stagnation of brotherhoods' movement that faced serious crisis

---

<sup>35</sup> Климов, Віталій, Колодний, Анатолій, Жуковський, Аркадій, *Феномен Петра Могили* (Phenomenon of Petro Mohyla) (Київ, 1996), 67-70.

<sup>36</sup> The same source, 68.

*The Role and Place of the “Secular Element” in the Process of Preserving the Ecclesiastic and Religious Life of Orthodox Believers in the Post-brest Period*

phenomena: the discipline reduced dramatically, the former staff scattered, the cooperation between secular and ecclesiastic members of brotherhoods was gradually lost.

*Conclusions*

Thus, interpreting the role and place of “the secular element” in the preservation of ecclesiastic and religious life of Orthodox Christians in the post-Brest period, it is clear that the functioning of church brotherhoods as a specific form of beyond hierarchical structures of Ukrainian Orthodox Church (the Kyiv Metropolitanate) is quite specific. Their activity possesses a rather controversial character and therefore, it leads to vague consequences.

With the emergence of church brotherhoods, the collisions between clergy and laity sharpened. The latter strived for taking charge of functions of Orthodox Church representatives. Such ambitions brothers formed long before the Union of Brest, although their active realization was carried out in the 1620’s – the time of Orthodox hierarchy’s renewal by Theophanes of Jerusalem. The traditions of supremacy of the “secular element” in the ecclesiastic issue, the autonomy from the episcopal authority and its own jurisdiction, cherished in the bosom of the oldest stavropegic brotherhoods, contradicted the principles of the church order. The grass-roots democracy and the immunity of the brotherhoods that helped to preserve Orthodox centres under extreme, unfavorable social and religious conditions became an obstacle for integrity and structuredness of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the course of renewal of traditional structures.

The ecclesiastic leadership of the Kyiv Metropolitanate (especially the metropolitan Petro Mohyla) who conducted the system of inner ecclesiastic reforms aimed at the steady integration of brotherhoods into local ecclesiastic structures, as well as at a process of subordination to the local bishop’s jurisdiction, which lasted starting from the middle of the 20’s to the middle of 70’s in a form of specific action of Orthodox hierarchy and certain decision of authoritative structures. In the XVII<sup>th</sup> century, their activity aimed mostly at solving local tasks and internal regulation which caused such a peculiar feature of Ukrainian Orthodox ecclesiasticism as “sobornopravnist”. Brotherhoods’ rule of the people represented one of the models of secularism’s participation in the ecclesiastic life. However, this was not enough for a full value existence of brotherhoods and for the preservation of their influence on the ecclesiastic, religious, spiritual and cultural life in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. On

the background of the growth of spiritual power in the Church, the authority of laity's church unions (regardless a form and a status of existence) was rapidly falling. As a consequence, the stagnation of brotherhoods' movement and the eventual stop of its historical existence took place.

### **Bibliography:**

1. Berger, Daniel. *History of the Church of the United Brethren*. Dayton, 1897.
2. Higgins, Alfred. *A History of the Brotherhood Church*. Stapleton, 1982.
3. Isajewicz, Jaroslav. *Bractwa cerkiewne w diecezjach przemyskich obrzqdku wschodniego w XVI – XVIII wieku* (Church brotherhood of Peremyska eparchy of oriental rite during 16 – 17 century). Polska – Ukraina. 1000 lat sąsiedstwa. Przemyśl, 1996.
4. Lewicki, Kazimierz. *Książę Konstanty Ostrogski a Unja Brzeska 1596 r.* (Prince Constantine Ostrozhsky end Union of Brest). Lwów, 1933.
5. *Акты, относящиеся к истории Южно-Западной Руси* (The Acts related to the History of the South – West Rus). – Изд. А. Петрушевичем (By А. Petrushevich), Львов, 1868.
6. *Борьба Південно-Західної Русі проти експансії Ватикану та унії (X – XVII ст.): Збірник документів і матеріалів* (The Opposition of the South-West Russia and expansion of Vatican and its Uniat in X – XVII c. Compilation of documents and materials.) / Упоряд. Є. А. Гринів, 1988.
7. Гарасевич, Михайло. *Історична відомість про минуле і сучасне становище ієрархів руської з'єднаної церкви у Великій, Білій і Червоній Русі* (Historical work about the past and present condition of hierarchs of Rus united Church in Great, White and Red Rus). м. Відень, 1826 р. // Відділ рукописів Львівської наукової бібліотеки імені Василя Стефаника НАН України, Ф. 3, Оп. 1, С. 811, 58 sh.
8. Голубев, Степан. *Киевский митрополит Петр Могила и его сподвижники. Опыт исторического исследования*. В 2-х тт. (Kyiv metropolitan Petro Mohyla and his associates. The experience of the historical research in 2 volumes), 1883 – 1898.
9. Грушевський, Михайло. *Ілюстрована історія України* (Illustrated History of Ukraine), Київ, 1990.
10. Грушевський, Михайло. *Історія України–Руси* (History of Ukraine and Rus). Т. 5. Суспільно-політичний устрій і церковний устрій і відносини в українсько-руських землях 14 – 17 віків (Social-political mode and

*The Role and Place of the “Secular Element” in the Process of Preserving the Ecclesiastic and Religious Life of Orthodox Believers in the Post-brest Period* ecclesiastical-religious mode and relations in Ukrainian and Russian territories), Львів, 1905.

11. Гудзяк, Борис. *Криза і реформа: Київська митрополія, Царгородський патріархат і генеза Берестейської унії (Crisis and reforms: Kyiv Metropolitanate, Tsargorod patriarchate and genesis of Brest Uniat)* / Пер. з англ., Львів, 2000.
12. Дмитриев, Михаил. *Между Римом и Царьградом: Генезис Брестской Церковной Унии 1595 –1596 гг. (Between the Rome and Tsargrad: Genesis of the Brest Uniat in 1595 – 1596)*. Москва, 2003.
13. Ісаєвич, Ярослав. *Братства та їх роль в розвитку української культури XVI – XVIII ст. (The Brotherhoods and their role in the development of Ukrainian Culture in the XVI – XVIII c.)*, Київ, 1996.
14. *Історія православної Церкви в Україні (History of the Orthodox church in Ukraine: Compilation of research works)*, Київ, 1997.
15. Климов, Віталій, Колодний, Анатолій, Жуковський, Аркадій. *Феномен Петра Могили (Phenomenon of Petro Mohyla)*, Київ, 1996.
16. *Книга протоколів братства при церкві Воздвиження Хреста Господнього в Дрогобичі за 1678 – 1828 рр. (The Book of the Brotherhoods' Protocols in the church of God Christ Vozdizhennya in Drohobych in 1678 – 1828)* // ЦДІА України у м. Львові, Ф. 129, Оп. 3, С. 65, 64 sh.
17. Кущинський, Антін. *Коротка історія Української православної церкви (The short history of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church)*, Чикаго, 1971.
18. Левицький, Орест. *Внутрішній стан Західно-руської Церкви в Польсько-Литовській державі в кінці 16 ст. та Унія (The internal condition of the South-Russian Church in the Polish-Lithuanian state in the end of 16th c. and the Uniat)* // Розвідки про церковні відносини на Україні–Руси XVI – XVIII ст., Львів, 1900.
19. Липинський, Вячеслав. *Листи до братів-хліборобів (Letters to the farmer brothers)*. Київ-Філадельфія, 1945.
20. *Лист київського митрополита Борецького Іова та гетьмана Голуба Оліфера до братства з повідомленням про пожертвування гетьманом Сагайдачним Петром 1500 золотих на братську школу (The letter of the Kyiv metropolitan Iov Boreckiy and hetman Golub Olifer to the brotherhood with message about the offering of 1500 golds for brotherhood school by Petro Sahaidachniy)*. Оригінал. 24 липня 1622 р.
21. Огієнко, Іван. *Українська Церква (The Ukrainian Church)*. Упоряд., авт. передмови М. С. Тимошик, Київ, 2007.

22. Папков, Александр. *Древнерусский приход. Краткий очерк церковно-приходской жизни в Восточной России до XVIII и в Западной России до XVII в.* (Ancient Russian Church. The short essay of ecclesiastical-church life in the East Russia until XVIII c. and the West Russia until XVII c.). Сергиев Посад, 1897.
23. Полонська–Василенко, Н. *Історія України* (History of Ukraine). Київ, 1989.
24. Шкрібляк, Микола. *Митрополит Петро Могила і провідні тенденції «золотої доби» Київської митрополії: церковно-релігійний та національно-культурний контексти* (Metropolitan Petro Mohyla and lead tendencies of the “Gold Age” of Kyiv Metropolitan: ecclesiastical-religious and national-cultural contexts) // *Філософсько-богословська спадщина мислителів XVII – XX ст.: колект. монографія / За наук. ред. член.-кор. НАПН України В. О. Балуха, Чернівці, 2013.*