

The Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine

**Protestants in the Ukrainian Lands
of the Polish-Lithuanian
Commonwealth**

George Hunston Williams



Harvard University Ukrainian Studies Fund

The Millennium Series

Booklets now available as part of the Millennium Series:

- From Kievan Rus' to Modern Ukraine: Formation of the Ukrainian Nation
- Ukrainian Churches Under Soviet Rule: Two Case Studies
- The Ukrainian Catacomb Catholic Church and Pope John Paul II
- Byzantine Roots of Ukrainian Christianity
- The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla
- Religion and Nationalism in Soviet Ukraine After 1945
- The Ukrainian Orthodox Question in the USSR
- The Greek Catholic Church and Ukrainian Society in Austrian Galicia
- When and Where was Ol'ga Baptized?
- History, Culture, and Nation: An Examination of Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian History Writing
- Ukrainian Catholics and Orthodox in Poland and Czechoslovakia
- Protestants in the Ukrainian Lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth
- Two Orthodox Ukrainian Churchmen of the Early Eighteenth Century: Teofan Prokopovych and Stefan Iavors'kyi

Harvard University
Ukrainian Studies Fund
1583 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 495-7835

Advisor to the Millennium Series • Frank E. Sysyn
Managing Editor • Tamara Hutnik Nary

*Protestants in the Ukrainian Lands of the
Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*

The Millennium Series

Protestants in the Ukrainian Lands
of the Polish-Lithuanian
Commonwealth

George Hunston Williams

Ukrainian Studies Fund
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts



All rights reserved - 1988
ISBN 0-940465 -

Printed in the United States of America

The Ukrainian Studies Fund, Inc. was established in 1957. Its purpose is to raise funds for the establishment and support of Ukrainian scholarly centers at American universities. The organization has endowed three chairs in Ukrainian studies (history, literature, and linguistics) at Harvard University and is in the process of completing the endowment of Harvard's Ukrainian Research Institute.

The Friends of HURI was established by a group of young professionals concerned about the cultural development of Ukraine and committed to the advancement of Ukrainian scholarship. The founding principle of this organization was twofold: to seek financial support for HURI in the Ukrainian community and to draw the community into the academic and social life of Harvard University.

CONTENTS

reword by the Ukrainian Studies Fund

i

Protestants in the Ukraine during the Period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth	41-72
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

*Harvard Ukrainian Studies, vol. II, no. 1
March 1978
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University*

Protestants in the Ukraine during the Period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (continued)	184-210
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------

*Harvard Ukrainian Studies, vol. II, no. 2
June 1978
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University*

I Francis Stancaro's Schismatic Reformed Church, Centered in Dubets'ko in Ruthenia, 1559/61 - 1570	931-957
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------

*Harvard Ukrainian Studies, vol. III/IV, part 2
1979-1980
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University*

FOREWORD

The Ukrainian Studies Fund prepares for the Millennium.

In 1988 Ukrainians throughout the world are celebrating the Millennium of the Christianization of Rus'-Ukraine. An important part of these observances is the promotion of scholarly inquiry on the process of Christianization and on the thousand-year Christian Ukrainian spiritual and cultural tradition. The Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University has undertaken a number of projects, including the sponsorship of an international scholarly conference, the publication of a multivolume source series and a comprehensive history of the Ukrainian church, and the establishment of a chair at the Harvard Divinity School devoted to the religious history of Ukraine. In addition to providing financial assistance to the Institute for the realization of these plans, the Ukrainian Studies Fund supported a position at Keston College, Kent, the United Kingdom, for a Ukrainian researcher, whose sole task was to examine the present status of religion in Ukraine. In cooperation with the Friends of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, the Fund has also initiated the Millennium Series of seminal studies on topics of Ukrainian religious and ecclesiastical history.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Protestant Reformation won the support of numerous Western and Eastern Christians in Ukrainian lands. Protestant religious leaders wrote in the Middle Ukrainian language and initiated religious discussions that challenged and inspired Ukrainian Christians. At times, Protestants and Orthodox joined in cooperation against the dominant Catholics and the Union of Brest. In reprinting two articles by Professor George Hunston Williams published previously in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, the Millennium Series seeks to provide an account of Protestant activity in Ukraine. Professor Williams, a noted scholar of the Reformation, and of Unitarianism in particular, also deals with Protestants in Ukraine in works such as *The Polish Brethren: The Documentation of the History and Thought of Unitarianism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and in the Diaspora, 1601-1685* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1980) and his forthcoming translation and annotation of Stanislas Lubieniecki, *History of the Polish Reformation, (1685)* (Cambridge, 1988).

George Hunston Williams is Hollis Professor of Divinity emeritus, Harvard University.

I

PROTESTANTS IN THE UKRAINE DURING THE PERIOD OF THE POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH*

GEORGE H. WILLIAMS

INTRODUCTION

In the decade between 1638 and 1648, Volhynia and the palatinate of Kiev constituted, in all the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, virtually the main refuge of the most radical form of Protestantism — the Unitarian Brethren. Yet there were also Calvinist churches in these and adjacent palatinates. Often, rather cordial relations prevailed between the Orthodox Ukrainian princes, magnates, and lords, the Calvinists, and particularly the Unitarians, who established their churches and schools on lands they owned or leased.

It is of some interest to note, by way of comparison, the Protestant situation in the Grandy Duchy of Lithuania, which in the late Middle Ages extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea and was in language, religion, and political institutions in some sense a mutation of the Kievan state. After a considerable loss of southern territory to the vassals of the Ottoman Turks, followed, in 1569, by the cession of extensive regions to the Kingdom of Poland in the Union of Lublin, there came to be much

* A portion of this paper was read at the Symposium of the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University on "The Ukrainian Religious Experience," held in June 1977. The article is dedicated to my maternal grandmother, Isabelle Cater Blancheflower Pease (1859-1954). Although herself a strict Congregationalist Calvinist, she would, in all likelihood, have felt a spiritual affinity with the Polish-Lithuanian-Ukrainian Unitarians, by virtue of their common moral rectitude and suffering.

I wish to express my appreciation for their help in the preparation of this paper to the following persons: Mr. Gary Bisbee, Mrs. Pamela Chance, Mrs. Maria Horváth-Krisztinkovicha, Mr. Edward Kasinec, Professor Edward L. Keenan, Dr. Zenon E. Kohut, Dr. Vasyl Lencyk, Dr. Paul R. Magoesi, Mrs. Olga K. Mayo, Professor Omeljan Pritsak, Miss Oksana Procyk, Miss Uliana Pasicznyk, Professor Ihor

related to Reformed Christianity, especially in Little Poland, and the unusual schism within the Reformed Church based on the espousal of a minority (therefore, the Minor Church) of Unitarianism. We shall then return (III) to the Ukraine, notably Volhynia, and conclude (IV) with a brief discussion of the presence on Ukrainian lands of Czech Brethren, Mennonites, and Hutterites, who, although arising elsewhere earlier and domiciled in Poland (in the case of the Czech Brethren, well before the Lutherans and the Reformed), did not become part of the religious mix in the Byzantine-rite parts of the Commonwealth until later.* We shall also note several efforts to bring the Protestants and the Orthodox closer together.

1. POSSIBLE EASTERN INFLUENCES IN THE EMERGENCE OF PROTESTANTISM IN BELORUSSIA AND THE UKRAINE BEFORE THE RISE OF PROTESTANTISM

An unanswered question is the extent to which indigenous trends in the two-thirds of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth under the Byzantine rite and in Muscovy account for the development of Protestantism, notably in its extreme form of Unitarianism, in all the palatinates now part of the Soviet Ukraine. Other questions are the extent to which Protestantism, whether Calvinist or Unitarian, was in Byzantine-rite territory as (1) an aspect of aristocratic Polonization, (2) the result of the colonization of Ukrainian lands by ethnic Poles of Calvinist or Unitarian persuasion, (3) a consequence of indigenous and émigré Russian heretical influences, and (4) the yearning of highborn Ukrainians not only for the culture, but also specifically for the theology, discipline, and moral code of one or another of the two branches of Reformed Protestantism. In the present section, we shall skirt all but the third question, to concentrate on indigenous changes and trends from Muscovy.

Three groups have been commonly advanced as having possibly prepared the way for Protestantism, particularly Unitarianism, in the Ukraine.⁵ We shall make it four. The first of these groups in point of

* Parts III and IV of Professor Williams's article will appear in the next issue.

⁵ This view is expressed, for example, in *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia*, ed. by Volodymyr Kubijovyč, 2 vols. (Toronto, 1963, 1971), 2: 208a. It is also represented in the pioneering work on radical Protestantism in the area by Orest Levytskyi, published in a series of articles, "Socinianstvo vo Polshe i Iugo-Zapodnoi Rusi," *Kievskaiia starina* 2 (1897): 35, 57, 102, 211, 401, 502; reprinted in *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rusi*.

venerability were the *Stryhol'nyky* (Russian: *Strigol'niki*) of Novgorod, first noted ca. 1375 and called "the first Russian sect."⁶ Out of revulsion from sacerdotal venality, they did not recognize a priesthood and therefore had only a spiritual eucharist, mutually practicing penance and zealously studying the Scriptures. They were lay spiritualizers. Condemned as they spread from Novgorod, some escaped to Ruthenia and Volhynia.⁷

Second, there were the *Bychivnyky* or *Pokutnyky*, sometimes mistakenly taken to be forerunners of Protestantism. These flagellants or penitents wandered through the Ukraine as elsewhere during the late Middle Ages.

Not commonly counted or easily documented for the Ukraine is the third group, who were the Hussites, Czech Brethren, or Moravian Brethren, the designation depending upon the period. In the fifteenth century Czech was considered the most elegant Slavic language and was spoken widely in the palaces and manor houses of the Polish palatinates, Ruthenia, and Volhynia. For the actual settlement of Czech Brethren in the fifteenth century, we have only the substantial evidence of Great Poland. It seems highly likely, however, that the proponents of communion in two kinds and a married clergy would have had reason also to be drawn to the Byzantine-rite part of the Commonwealth, where their own recovered practices had been preserved from apostolic times.⁸ In any case, the fact that the Belorussian, Francis Skaryna (Skoryna), a native of

A portion of the series with a preambulatory summary of the preceding sections, translated into Polish, now appears also as "Socinianism in Poland and South-West Rus'," *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 3 (1953): 495-508. The translation makes no more of an attempt to distinguish between ethnic Polish and Ukrainian families than does the wholly Polonized version of the same in *Reformacja w Polsce* (hereafter *RwP*) 2 (1922): 204-234. A largely superseded study is that of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi in *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, vol. 6 (Kiev and L'viv, 1907), pp. 412-35, dealing with Ukrainian Unitarianism; it was used by Sztripszky for "Ukrania és az unitarizmus." Besides the latter, the most recent studies include those of A. Kossowski, "Zarys dziejów protestantyzmu na Wołyniu XVI-XVII w.," *Rocznik Wolyński* 3 (1933): 233-58 and Janusz Tazbir, "Antytrynitaryzm na ziemiach ukraińskich w XVI wieku," *Z polskich studiów slawistycznych*, ser. 4, Historia, of the Seventh International Congress of Slavists (Warsaw, 1973), pp. 91-120.

⁶ G. P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind*, vol. 2, ed. by John Meyendorff (Cambridge, 1961), ch. 3.

⁷ Kubijovyč, *Ukraine*, 2: 209a. See Part I: B, below.

⁸ One of the values of the article by Sztripszky, "Ukrania és az unitarizmus," is that, although without giving the presumably full documentation in his thesis, it makes a compelling case for the view that the Bohemian influence—Catholic, Hussite,

Polatsk (Polotsk) who was a philosopher, physician, botanist and engraver, published the Prague Bible with his own woodcuts (*Bibliia Ruska*, Prague, 1517-19), is clear evidence of Czech influence in the Orthodox two-thirds of the Commonwealth, for his Bible found general acceptance until replaced by the Ostroh Bible of 1582.⁹

The fourth group comprised the various kinds of "Orthodox" Judaizers that arose in Novgorod and Muscovy in the last two decades of the fifteenth century and who, though locally suppressed, appeared here and there in the Ukraine.

Of the four movements — two Russian, one pan-European, and one Bohemian in origin — only one will henceforth be discussed as preparing certain princes, lords, and members of the West Ukrainian gentry (*shliakhta*) for a later espousal of Calvinism and Unitarianism. This group constituted, among others, the so-called Protestantizing Judaizers.

There is no doubt that a congeries of movements, often indiscriminately called "Judaizing," sprang up all over Christendom in the late fifteenth century, appearing in various mutations from Moscow to Madrid, from Messina to Münster, well into the eighteenth century (comparable but not genetically continuous modalities have also cropped up in the most modern sects). For our purpose it is helpful to remark, first, that the term applies wholly to persons of Christian origin, and, second, that in the three centuries and in the regions under review "Judaizers" was commonly used as a pejorative term, although, as in so many instances of this kind, the hostile term could occasionally have been appropriated by the devotees (cf. "Puritans," "Quakers," "Methodists"). Although applicable to Christians (or former Christians), the term does

⁹ I have not been able to ascertain which of three Utraquist Bibles, based on the Vulgate, Skaryna used for his translation of the Czech Bible into Ruthenian: that of Prague (1506), with woodcuts like his own, of Kutná Hora, or of Venice. It was most probably the first.

The most recent account of Skaryna is that of Ściapan Maikrovich, *Heorhij Skaryna* (Minsk, 1966). On the basis of a programmatic interpretation of *egregius*, Russian and Soviet scholars have given the translator the more eastern name of George and minimized his extensive travels in the West. Skaryna was, moreover, a Czech Brother, working for a Catholic bishop in Lithuania, and not Orthodox. For an account of his Bible, see G. Pichura, "The Engravings of Francis Skaryna in the *Bibliia Ruska* (1517-1519)," *Journal of Byelorussian Studies* 1, no. 3 (1969): 146-67.

For the influence and colonization of Hussites in the Ukraine, see several titles listed by Jarold K. Zeman, *The Hussite Movement... (1350-1650): A Bibliographical Study Guide* (Ann Arbor, 1977), pp. 247-49. A work which should be added for Moldavia is C. C. Giurescu, "Cauzele refugierii husitilor in Moldova," *Studii si articole de istorie*

not exclude our speaking, in the pan-European context, of either direct Jewish or converted Jewish-Marrano influence upon these various Judaizers, or even, in a few instances, of active Jewish proselytizing.

Again speaking most broadly or schematically, there were, *first*, humanistic or mystical Judaizers, in contact with rabbis or Cabbalists, who were eager to get at the Hebrew text of the Old Testament or at Jewish mystical writings. *Second*, there were those who, as the Old Testament became accessible to them, were impressed by its generally high concern for social and individual justice; while accepting Jesus as a prophet with teachings of comparable or even greater eloquence and exactitude than those of ancient prophets, they, by stages or suddenly, reverted to the idea of one God and became non-adorants of Jesus Christ. Among them there came to be a *third* group, of still more extreme Judaizers, sometimes called Sabbatarians, who were virtually converts to Judaism. Each of these three types of Judaizers appeared in a Russian Orthodox, in a Calvinist, and in an Anabaptist context, even if in some cases some of these types, depending on the region, were represented by only a few individuals. Theoretically, assuming that none of the types appeared indigenously in the Ukraine (which cannot be demonstrated conclusively either way), three times three kinds of Judaizers could have shown up at some time in the Ukraine. Of course, this did not happen. Moreover, several of the groups that might have been called "Judaizers" by their most hostile Christian opponents were, in fact, not so designated. But it is well to have the schema in mind as we enter upon the particulars, first: the Judaizers in the Novgorod-Muscovite, i.e., in an Orthodox Christian, setting.

A. Judaizers in Novgorod and Muscovy, 1470-1516¹⁰

The loose congeries of Russian priests and monks called Judaizers is best,

¹⁰ See George Vernadsky, "The Heresy of the Judaizers and the Policies of Ivan III of Moscow," *Speculum* 8 (1933): 436-54; idem, *A History of Russia*, vol. 4: *Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age* (New Haven, 1968), vol. 5, pt. 1: *The Tsardom of Moscow (1547-1682)* (New Haven and London, 1969); see also the résumé of a forthcoming study by Shmuel Ettinger on the Judaizers published in the *Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies held at Harvard University* 7 (1976-77): 86-88. The most recent survey of Judaizers as a European phenomenon, with special reference to the Slavic lands and with all the literature, including Soviet studies and new sources, is that of Jan Juszczyk, "O badaniach nad judaizantyzmem," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 76 (1969): 141-51. We shall have specific occasion to refer also to Mikhailo Yermak, *Judaiz*

if incompletely, understood as: (1) a continuation of the kind of anti-clericalism and iconoclasm of the *Strigol'niki*; (2) in part, a group of humanists, influenced by Italians and Jews in Novgorod and at the Grand Ducal Court in Moscow, who were seriously concerned with translating the Old Testament from the Hebrew; (3) in part, a group of dissident but religious intellectuals attracted not only by Jewish learning, but also by Cabbalistic mysticism; and (4) proselytes to Judaism (these were very few). We have already noted that among the East Slavic peoples there was no translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew (as distinguished from the Old Slavonic based on the Septuagint) and that there was, in fact, no complete Bible in one volume or set of volumes even in that language, while the first complete Bible in the Cyrillic script was the already mentioned Prague Bible of 1517. The attempt among the Russian humanists — remote and lesser counterparts of Cardinal Francisco Ximénez, Desiderius Erasmus, and John Reuchlin — to establish a new scriptural text earned for all, in whatever town, the pejorative appellation "Judaizers" from the Orthodox clergy. To be sure, it seems that in all Russian Judaizing circles, although most considered themselves Christian and indeed Orthodox, there was an antitrinitarian tendency, which perhaps increased with the years. Some of the Judaizers, indeed, went so far as to teach that Jesus had only paved the way for the Messiah, did not allow icons because they believed the Decalogue forbade them, and therefore stayed away from institutional churches, studying Scripture in conventicles usually gathered in homes.

The first Judaizers made their appearance in Great Novgorod shortly before the huge Hanseatic republic was subdued by Muscovy. Others arrived from Kiev in Novgorod on 8 November 1470, in the company of Prince Michael Olel'kovich (actually a Gedyminovich) and several Jews, led by Zechariah (Shariya) ben Aaron Ha-Kohen. Zechariah had belonged to the Kievan circle of Rabbi Moses ben Jacob, who wrote a commentary on a Jewish astronomical manual, *Six Wings*.

War broke out between Novgorod and Muscovy, and in June 1471 the

ukrainischen Literatur, vol. 2: 16. bis 18. Jahrhundert (Giessen, 1975), pp. 23–28, and Albert M. Ammann, S. J., *Abriss der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna, 1950), "Die Judaisanten" and "Der Einbruch des Humanismus," pp. 107–179. I have shown a Marrano and hence ethnically Jewish influence in the schism within Italian Anabaptism against the background of Laelius Socinus and Faustus — undifferentiated, or in the form of Valdesianism (Juan de Valdés) — in "Two Social Strands in Italian Anabaptism c. 1550," in *The Social History of the Reformation*, ed. by Laurence P. Buck and Jonathan W. Zophy (Columbus, 1972), pp. 156–207.

victorious Ivan III (1462–1505) entered Novgorod, which thereafter was politically and ecclesiastically dependent on Moscow. In the meantime Prince Michael, the Jews, the Judaizers, and the Lithuanians escaped to Lithuania. However, two Judaizing Novgorod priests, Alexis and Dionysius, so impressed Basil IV (1505–33) that he gave them leading positions in Moscow's cathedrals; partly for commercial reasons, they came under the protection of the Muscovite secretary for foreign affairs, Theodore Kuritsyn. Other Judaizers who had come to the attention of Archbishop Gennadius of Novgorod in 1487 subsequently fled to Archpriest Alexis and to Kuritsyn in Moscow for protection. The protracted toleration of Jews and Judaizers can be understood only against Kuritsyn's foreign and economic policy toward the Black Sea region (which cannot be gone into here). Also only against the background of another religious controversy in Russia can their views as allegedly "Orthodox" appear plausible.

In 1503 the famous dispute concerning the monastic ownership of lands, with which the development of the Judaizers became implicated, broke out. The Possessors, whose spokesman was Abbot Joseph Sanin of Volokolomsk (Volotskii) (1439–1515) — hence their alternate name of Josephites — stressed social responsibility, the establishment of schools, orphanages, hospitals, and the care of the poor in the tradition of St. Basil. They therefore insisted on adequate endowments and justified their philanthropic holding of properties against the claims of temporal lords. Their most formidable ascetic critics were the Non-Possessors, led by Nil Maikov of Sora (Sorskii) (ca. 1433–1508) and Paisii Iaroslavov, who, having become acquainted with Hesychasm at Mt. Athos, stressed an ascetic spirituality that espoused poverty and life in forest hermitages ("beyond the Volga") rather than in large monastic complexes. The Non-Possessors, who came into conflict with the grand duke Ivan III the Great, were eventually suppressed and their centers closed. With respect to the Judaizers, Abbot Joseph and the Possessors were particularly vehement at several synods presided over by two successive metropolitans of Moscow, the second being Zosima (1490–94). Both metropolitans tended to be moderate in their strictures until forced to act decisively; even then Zosima, although he finally condemned the Judaizers, was himself deposed.

The Non-Possessors and the utopian and prophetic Judaizers had in common a concern for non-liturgical piety and a revulsion against private property. Under Basil IV Ivanovich the Judaizers lost ground rapidly

demanded death for the Judaizers against the energetic protests of Paisii and Nil. Some were in fact burned at the stake, a method of dealing with heresy the Muscovites had learned from the imperial envoys in 1490. Among those burned were the brother of Kuritsyn and the son-in-law of Alexis. In 1516, under Basil, the Josephites brought the Renaissance-minded monk Maximus the Greek (Maksim Grek), until then beloved by the Non-Possessors, from Mt. Athos to combat the Non-Possessors and the remnants of the Judaizers, some of whom escaped from monastic imprisonment to Lithuania.

B. Judaizers in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (ca. 1530-69/77)

During the reign of Ivan IV the Terrible (1533-84), five or six persons known to regard themselves as defenders of Orthodoxy fled to Belorussia and the Ukraine: Prince Andrew Mikhailovich Kurbskii (ca. 1528-83), who, failing to rally the boyars against the tyranny of the tsar,¹¹ had arrived in Mylianyovychi near Kovel' in 1563 or 1564; and four Judaizers, namely, Hegumen (Archimandrite) Artemius of St. Sergius's Holy Trinity monastery in Radonezh (Moscow), the priest Isaiah, and the monks Theodosius Kosoy (Kosy, Krivoi) and Ignatius. The four arrived in Vitsebsk (Vitebsk) and later (ca. 1575) moved south to Volhynia. Another person, unidentified but perhaps a local Ukrainian monk named

¹¹ On Kurbskii in Lithuania, see Oswald P. Backus, "A. M. Kurbsky in the Polish-Lithuanian State (1564-1583)," *Acta Balto-Slavica* 6 (1969): 29-50. This is based on archival research and retains much of its value, although the author presupposes the prince's authorship of the whole Kurbskii corpus, having written before Edward L. Keenan demonstrated to the satisfaction of many that the alleged correspondence between Kurbskii and Ivan IV is a seventeenth-century forgery; *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971). Keenan shows that the still important correspondence, ideologically, was first joined to letters definitely dating to the late sixteenth century by Vasili Vasilevich Golitsyn in Moscow in 1679. For the single or collective authorship of these letters addressed to Ukrainian aristocrats, I use the designation "Pseudo-Kurbskii." The term may, in fact, refer to a circle of Orthodox printers, perhaps belonging to a brotherhood, who were concerned with the inroads of the émigré Muscovite Judaizers and Protestants that in their theological anxiety they also called by the unpopular name. For the Reformed were doing within the Catholic context what the Judaizers of Novgorod and Moscow had been doing: stressing new translations of the Bible from the original languages, removing pictures, and doing away with monasticism. The characterization of the more than a dozen such letters, provisionally withdrawn from Kurbskii, as dealt with by Backus and others in works to be cited, presents no serious difficulty: for the letters were really exchanged, significant

Motovylo, was also in their company. To explain the anxiety among the Orthodox population in the Grand Duchy before the arrival of the Russian Judaizers, it should be observed that they were preceded by active Jewish proselytism.¹²

In Muscovy Prince Kurbskii had tended to side with the Possessors. In exile in Lithuania he seems to have been especially involved in possessions given him by Sigismund II Augustus and those he had gained otherwise, some in litigation. Kurbskii, a student of Maximus the Greek, had left Moscow for Florence and Venice and returned more impressed with the ascetic ideal of Jerome Savonarola than with the glories of the Renaissance. Yet Maximus himself had been drawn to Italy precisely because of his humanistic interests. These same interests were shown by the Judaizing hegumen Artemius, with whom Kurbskii also studied. Kurbskii's fame and disgrace resulted from more than his leadership of the boyars against Ivan or the military defeat which occasioned his exile. Although a soldier more than a man of culture, it is possible that he was concerned with making vernacular Slavic, against the background of the pan-Slavic but archaic Old Slavonic of the Orthodox liturgy, the basis for a new literature. Thus, even in exile from Muscovy, Kurbskii, or, as is much more likely, a Pseudo-Kurbskii, had philological reasons to be suspicious of the exiled Judaizers (Hebraists, as well). This spokesman of an Orthodox brotherhood wrote to aristocrats in the Ukraine,¹³ including Kadian Chaplych-Shpanovs'kyi,¹⁴ the count of Kerdey who protected Artemius and others, and Prince Constantine Ostroz'kyi of Ostroh.

It is, in any case, Pseudo-Kurbskii's letter from Kovel' of 21 March 1575/76,¹⁵ a reply to Chaplych's letter, subsequently lost, requesting certain theological books, that supplies us with much of our information about this "free-thinking" ancestor of several Unitarian Chaplyches whom we shall encounter later. At this time, however, Protestantism and

¹² Wacław Sobieski, "Propaganda żydowska w 1530-1540," *Przegląd Narodowy* 21 (1921): 24-42.

¹³ The possibly thirteen letters from the sixteenth century allegedly written to or by Kurbskii while in the Grand Duchy were edited by G. Z. Kuntsevich, *Sochineniia kniazia Kurbskogo*, Russkaia Istoricheskaia Biblioteka, no. 31 (Petersburg, 1914), Epistles 7-26. The ones of interest in the present article are explained by Backus, "A. M. Kurbsky," pp. 48-50, and by Vozniak, *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury*, p. 24, both of whom assume that the correspondence was related to Prince Kurbskii.

¹⁴ *Polski słownik biograficzny* (hereafter *PSB*) (Cracow, 1935-), 4: 171 ab; for other members of the family see also under Czaplitz.

¹⁵ Epistle 17, cols. 437-44; summarized by Vozniak, *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury*, p. 24.

Catholicism were making headway in the largely Byzantine-rite Grand Duchy and in the Ukrainian lands ceded to the Crown in 1569. The "free-thinking" of which the author(s) — the letter's "I," "we," etc., seem to refer interchangeably to the actual writer and the Orthodox brotherhood in Kovel' he represented — was accused consisted of having accepted the Protestant principle of *sola scriptura* and of thereby disavowing the accumulated consensus of the Fathers, the conciliar creeds, and long tradition. Rather than sending Chaplych the requested books, in accordance with the sanction of Matthew 7:6 of not throwing pearls before swine, the author chose to warn him, according to the sanction of Ezekiel 3:18-21: "If you warn the wicked and he does not turn from his wicked way, he shall die . . . but you will have saved your life." In reproving Chaplych, the Orthodox author said acerbly of the lord's proffer of counsel that St. Peter had no need of Simon Magus, nor St. Athanasius of the Arians, Macedonians, Apollinarians, etc.

Besides the Protestants¹⁶ (expressly the Zwinglians, followers of the "pseudo-prophet" Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon, and the Calvinists) and the Armenians, the letter assailed, in particular, Ignatius, one of the three monastic Judaizers, who was housed and protected by Chaplych. Ignatius was a companion of Theodosius Kosoy, who was protected by another nobleman. The obscure "Arian" Motovylo was domiciled with Prince Basil Constantine Ostroz'kyi.

From the letter of the Orthodox brotherhood of Kovel' to Chaplych, it would appear that the lord had earlier met with the writer and others at Korets' (Korzec) in Volhynia midway between Luts'k and Zhytomyr, where he had argued in the presence of many for his increasingly heretical views. The writer accused Theodosius and Ignatius of being Judaizers, of having adduced, in consequence, new interpretations of various passages of Scripture, of expressing themselves blasphemously about several dogmas and sacred things, of accusing Orthodox bishops and monks of exploiting their properties for personal gain, and of reproaching the

¹⁶ Pseudo-Kurbskii was clear about the distinctions in theology among Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Calvin, and manifestly used "Judaizer" for any who had emerged from an Orthodox setting. Yet he must have been writing after a unitarian party had emerged within the Reformed Church, i.e., a "Judaizing" group after 1565. Some of the Pseudo-Kurbskii correspondence specifies Unitarians. See further A. S. Arkhangel'skii, *Ocherki iz istorii zapadno-russkoi literatury XVI-XVII vv.* (Moscow, 1888).

On Prince Ostroz'kyi, see below. The most recent monograph about him is by Metropolitan Ilarion of Winnipeg, *Kniaz' Kostiantyn Ostroz'kyi i ioho kul'turna pratsia* (Winnipeg, 1958).

Church Fathers, notably John of Damascus, perhaps with special reference to his defense of icons. The writer chided the "humble," exiled, "Judaizing" Non-Possessors for professing concern for the poor while enjoying the splendid hospitality of great Ukrainian landlords on rolling estates and showing their piety as former monks by marrying! He charged that in "mixing honey with their poison" as self-proclaimed authoritative interpreters of "Scripture alone," they led Orthodox patrons "into the several caverns" of Protestantism like so many "poison-breathing devils," undermining the "fortress" of the One True Church. However, the writer expressly excluded from his attack Maximus the Greek, "the great sufferer," and Archimandrite Artemius, "the new confessor," regarding the latter, in fact, as a hermit saint (*starets*).

Of the four Judaizers in Volhynia known to have had friendly contact with Kadian Chaplych, the most information is available on Theodosius Kosoy. Of peasant origin, he escaped from his Russian master by becoming a monk in the environs of Moscow in 1540. Kosoy was declared a heretic in 1554/55 for disavowing the Trinity. He maintained that the whole world is a kingdom of injustice and therefore disavowed all earthly governments while awaiting the direct rule of "God the Father" over his people. Escaping from Moscow, Kosoy spread his ideas along the Lithuanian-Muscovite border. In Vitsebsk he married a Jewess. One known convert of either Kosoy or his follower Ignatius was Stephen Lowan, judge of Mozyr in Belorussia; another convert, Lord Wołoski of Siewierz in Little Poland, made a former Orthodox priest from Moscow, Isaiah, his pastor. It is not clear how Judaizing and free-thinking consorted together, but Pseudo-Kurbskii, in the aforementioned letter, suggested that both ideologies were infecting the Chaplyches, through exiles from Muscovy escaping via the Grand Duchy. Kosoy is later recorded as a member of the Minor Church.¹⁷

From the same letter of Pseudo-Kurbskii and from other sources it is known that Kadian Chaplych-Shpanov's'kyi (brother of a Peter with his own descendants whom we will discuss later) was remembered for his prowess in 1528, when he showed up with his brother at the Lithuanian military exercises with five horses. By 1572 he is known to have gotten into litigation with Kiev's Monastery of the Caves. Kadian Chaplych-Shpanov's'kyi shared Ignatius's criticism of John of Damascus and took an interest in the writings of Martin Luther. He is reported to have jested

17. There is a section on Kosoy and his companions in Juszyuk "O hadaniach nad

publicly, over good wine, about the inferior education and low motivations of the Orthodox priests and bishops at gatherings of fellow nobles, among whom were many Unitarian Brethren.¹⁸ Kadian had four sons — Theodore, John, Nicholas, and Gregory. We shall have occasion (Part III: A) to mention the first two, of whom Theodore remained actively Orthodox.

While we are still with the four Judaizing Muscovite exiles, however, we must say a further word about the Archimandrite Artemius, even though the relevant episode slightly disorders our chronology. It is well known that Calvinism had penetrated the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, mostly north of the Prypiat' River, by the time of the exchange of letters between Pseudo-Kurbskii and Prince Chaplych-Shpanovs'kyi in 1575/76. In the Kurbskii part of the correspondence, Artemius was untouched by the charges leveled at the other refugee Judaizers in Volhynia. While in the Holy Trinity Monastery, Artemius had encouraged the activity of Maximus the Greek. Condemned in 1554, Artemius had settled in Lithuania and there, confronting Calvinism and stiffening his Orthodoxy, he became its defender in nine letters. He did not abandon his text-critical views, but now clearly warned against the danger of the Protestant heresy. Two of his letters were to the Belorussian theological scholar Simon Budny (1533-90), at the time still a general Protestant.¹⁹ In 1559 Budny was appointed pastor of the new Reformed Church at Klets'k by Nicholas VI Radvila the Black. Budny sent Artemius his Ruthenian translation of a *Katechesis* into Cyrillic (Nesvezh, 1562), which had made many converts from among the Belorussian population in the palatinate of Nowogródek (Navahrudak). Upon receipt of the work, in 1564, Artemius wrote that the editor had indeed laid down a featherbed, but that whoever lay on it would break his bones; he sought to refute the work provisionally and promised to write more. Budny thereupon sent

¹⁸ Juszczuk, "O badaniach nad judaizantyzmem," pp. 145-48.

¹⁹ The most recent study of Budny is an amplified second edition by Iakob Ilich Paretski, *Simon Budny* (Minsk, 1975), who lists 27 of Budny's known works in Latin, Polish, and Ruthenian (10 were in Ruthenian), p. 156, with a full bibliography, pp. 157-60. Robert Wallace, *Antitrinitarian Biography*, 3 vols. (London, 1850), 2: 244, says that the *Katechism*, *that is an old Christian teaching from Holy Scripture for the simple person in the Ruthenian language in the form of questions and answers* was an adaptation of Luther's *Catechism*; cf. Vozniak, *Istoria ukrains'koi literatury*, p. 18. Henryk Merczyng, confining himself to Budny's New Testament, supplies several of the notes by Budny on which the translator based his non-adorantism, etc., *Szymon Budny jako krętek przekładu biblijnych* (Cracow, 1912). For Budny on the translation

Artemius his *Opravdanie* [On the Justification of Sinful Man before God] (Nesvezh, 1562), which was dedicated to Court Marshal Eustathius Volovich. In these and other works he found that Budny had already moved from Calvinism to a Unitarianism with a social gospel less radical than that of the man who influenced him, Dr. Peter of Goniądz (Gonesius), the Podlachian Binitarian (not yet a Ditheist).²⁰ In 1564 Budny also collaborated with Laurence Krzyszkowski (d.ca. 1573) — who was first a Czech Brother, then, successively, a Calvinist, a Lithuanian Brother (1565), and an Anabaptist leader — on the translation of Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* (Nesvezh, 1564). It is of interest that the humanist Archimandrite Artemius, who had been expelled from Orthodox Muscovy for being a Judaizer in 1554, pilloried the Calvinist Budny, who by 1582 would be disowned as minister and brother by the general synod of the Commonwealth's Unitarians held at Lusławice for being a Judaizer. The specific charges were his upholding of the validity of pedobaptism (he changed on this issue) and the legitimacy of defensive war, and his eschewing of the worship (adoration) of Christ as idolatry, since he was now convinced that Christ was solely human in his perfection.

Pseudo-Kurbskii also wrote three letters to Prince Basil Constantine Ostroz'kyi (1527–1608). His father, Constantine (ca. 1460–1530), was from 1497 great hetman of Lithuania, from 1511 castellan of Vilnius (where he erected a large palace), and had acclaim as a valiant fighter against Muscovites and Turks. The son, Basil, commonly called by his father's imperial name, became the foremost leader of the Orthodox enlightenment; his principal seat, with school and press, was at Ostroh on the Horyn' River in Volhynia. He was from 1551 palatine of Volhynia and from 1560 until his death in 1608, palatine of Kiev. Prince Ostroz'kyi's religious beliefs were complex. He was a patriot prince of the Commonwealth, as was his father; he was ecumenical, first, to the point of desiring the union of Orthodox and Catholics with certain clearly considered preconditions, and, second, to the point of extending a cordial hand, as we shall see, to Czech Brethren, Lutherans, and Calvinists, and even permitting a Unitarian church within view of his palace at Ostroh.

In the first (XII) of the three letters Pseudo-Kurbskii reproached Ostroz'kyi for having sponsored the translation of a devotional work by St. John Chrysostom from the Latin rather than the Greek, and into

²⁰ Józef Jasnowski, "Piotr z Goniądza," *Przegląd Historyczny* 31 (1935): 5–58.

Polish rather than into a modernized Slavonic. He chided him further by quoting the words of Pseudo-Dionysius in the *Celestial Hierarchies* as to the importance of keeping sacred matters "from the profane." In the second letter (XXIII), Pseudo-Kurbskii reproached him again for having sent him *On the Unity of the Church* (Vilnius, 1577) by Peter Skarga, S.J., in which *inter alia* Skarga belittled the use of any language other than Greek or Latin for theological and liturgical purposes. Skarga's Latin hauteur had so aroused Ostroz'kyi that, despite his hope for ultimate church union, he had his obscure companion Motovylo reply to Skarga's unacceptable proposals. He sent this, as a friend, to Pseudo-Kurbskii, who angrily retorted, in the third letter (XXIV), that Ostroz'kyi should not resort to employing an "Arian" in the defense of Orthodoxy. He called Motovylo "a heretic worse than Mohammed," and the Catholic bishops penetrating Byzantine-rite territory and ridiculing the Orthodox, "Antichrists."

II. THE REFORMATION MOVEMENTS FROM THE WEST IN THE COMMONWEALTH: THE REFORMED AS "JUDAIZERS"

Having dealt primarily with the few Judaizers from Russia in the Ukraine, notably in Volhynia, and having also mentioned, in passing only, the contacts between the unitarianizing Calvinist Simon Budny and Archimandrite Artemius, we turn to the main waves of the Reformation billowing in from the West.

With respect to the spread of the Reformation in the Commonwealth, we should remark that Lutheranism often went by the name of "Augsburgism" — in reference to the Confession of Augsburg presented to Charles V in 1530 — while, in contrast, the Reformed faith commonly went by the name "Evangelicalism." This is only the beginning of the distinctive nomenclature for confessions of faith that characterize general and monographic presentations of religions in the Commonwealth. Although the term "Calvinism" came to prominence in due course, the Reformed faith and praxis in the Commonwealth drew as much upon the German-speaking Swiss, notably in Zurich and Basel, as upon the French-speaking Swiss in Geneva and Lausanne; therefore, in the Commonwealth it was also called the "Helvetic Church." Originally, the church developed primarily in Little Poland and the Grand Duchy north of the Prypiat' River. Only later was it established in towns and on estates in the Ukrainian regions.

from John Łaski, who became its superintendent from 1556 until his death in 1560 — but it might be well so named. For it was this nephew and namesake of the primate (Archbishop John VIII Łaski, Gniezno, 1510–31), who, as the sometime bishop of Hungarian Veszprem, the “Zwinglian” Reformer of Oldenburg, the superintendent of the multilingual Strangers’ Church of London under Edward VI, and the pastor of Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, stamped his indelible character on the Polish Helvetic Church in but four years of intensive Reformed activity in his native Commonwealth.

Because the Reformed Church in the Commonwealth developed distinctive features, identifiable with the Reformer John Łaski, which survived in both branches of the tradition that split into the Major (Calvinist) and the Minor (Unitarian) Church in 1563, we must summarize the traits of the Łaskian Church before turning to further particulars in the Ukraine.²¹

There are some six traits of John Łaski’s Church that go far to explain why his version of the Reformed faith commended itself so swiftly and widely in the Commonwealth. Some of the traits also help explain how the schism leading to antitrinitarianism occurred in his church.

The first trait is Łaski’s vision of a pan-Protestant Commonwealth Church formed out of the Czech Brethren living mostly in Great Poland, the Lutherans within and beyond Ducal Prussia, and the Reformed in Little Poland (and, to a small extent, even then in Ruthenia) and the northern half of the Grand Duchy. Developing the idea while in London, he had the church orders printed and dedicated, in 1555, to King Sigismund II Augustus, to whom he wrote one of three major reformatory letters in response to the king’s call for a national council at the diet of Piotrków in that year. Upon entering Poland via Frankfurt, he immediately sought out the king, as well as the Calvinist grand duke Nicholas VI Radvila the Black (1515–65), in Vilnius and the Lutheran duke Albert Hohenzollern (1490–1568) in Königsberg — all with a view toward organizing a non-episcopal, national church. To this end he was instrumental in dissolving the earlier agreement of Koźminek between the Czech Brethren of Great Poland and the Reformed of Little Poland, which, he believed, was not broadly enough conceived.²² It should be

²¹ The six traits are more fully presented and documented in my “Erasmianism in Poland,” *Polish Review* 22 (1977): 3–50. The points advanced here are not numbered or summarized precisely as “traits” there.

²² The most recent and comprehensive work on Łaski as reformer in Poland is that of

remarked that, unlike some of his followers and later Protestants of other sorts, Łaski was expressly opposed to dealing constructively with the leadership, whether lay or clerical, of the Commonwealth's millions of Orthodox subjects. Unlike the soon-to-emerge Unitarians, Łaski had no sympathy with Orthodoxy and vigorously disputed its claim to be any more apostolic than Roman Catholicism or to be in any less need of reform.

The second trait of the Laskian Reformed faith and praxis is that the latter — that is, the sacraments or ordinances, polity, and discipline — were very prominent in the mind of the reformer. For him, faith, when formulated as a confession of faith, or, in the language of the day, as a symbol or creed, could be divisive in distracting the simple and enraging the learned, thus resulting only in disunity. In fact, Łaski could be equivocal in matters of doctrine, partly because of his indisposition toward involvement in theological niceties, and partly because of his practical temperament — after all, he had been educated by his primatial uncle to become his gifted namesake's successor, both as primate and as, on occasion, interrex, according to the constitution of the Commonwealth. Reformer Łaski was preeminently political, in terms of both politics and polity.

This temperamental trait leads directly to a third characteristic of the Laskian Church during Łaski's lifetime: it did not adopt any confession of faith. Nay more, Łaski programmatically eschewed all the great conciliar creeds of the patristic age and all the symbols of the Reformation Era. Finding sanction in Erasmus and Hilary of Poitiers ("the Athanasius of the West"), specifically in the dedicatory epistle of the great humanist to his *editio princeps* of Hilary, Łaski insisted to the end of his career that only Scripture and the Apostles' Creed were normative; the latter he, with Erasmus and Hilary, considered as not literally but substantively apostolic, and as dating from about the time of the First Council of Nicaea, in 325. Thus, although he upheld Nicene-Constantinopolitan Triadology and Chalcedonian Christology, Łaski was very reluctant to use anything but scriptural language to defend the notable and difficult doctrines long fought over by the learned fathers, who had, in the end, been obliged to resort to non-scriptural philosophical language to defend their post-scriptural faith. Łaski characteristically called God, presumably God the

Father, *Deus Optimus Maximus* — an appellation surely more Ciceronian than scriptural!

A consequent fourth trait of Łaski was his stress, for catechetical and several other purposes, upon the threefold office of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King — an idea that he most certainly derived from Erasmus, who had developed the *triplex munus Christi* in his *Commentarium in Psalmum Secundum* (1522) shortly before the young Łaski had come to live and study with him. Significantly, Łaski used the threefold office in connection with Psalm 2 and in his great reformatory letter to King Sigismund, which suggested that the king needed an experienced sacerdotal *Propheta* who had already served well in England in a multiethnic congeries of churches under Edward VI. (Calvin, to be sure, eventually came to appropriate the terminology of the threefold office, but only in passing and first in his edition of *The Institutes* of 1543, but never in his commentaries, not even those on Psalm 2.)

The fifth trait, surely Erasmian rather than Calvinist, was Łaski's reluctance to discuss predestination and free will, his clear tendency, unlike Calvin's, to identify the predestined elect with membership in a Protestant Church, and his lack of concern, in scrutinizing the confessions of faith of the Czech Brethren of Great Poland, toward their formulation of this key Reformation doctrine, whereas he fussed considerably over their church order. Łaski, as a kind of *szlachecki*-superintendent, had to go along nominally with the Swiss and the Saxon predestinarians; but he probably believed that a man was free not only as a freeman of the Commonwealth, but also as a true follower of Christ's precepts. (In many of his works published before his final return to Poland, Łaski identified himself as *Baro Polonus* as well as, or rather than, *Pastor in Anglia peregrinorum*, etc.)

The sixth trait of the Laskian form of Helvetic evangelicalism included a great stress on deacons, including supra-congregational synodal deacons commonly of the noble class, a great deference to elders and patrons regarded as ministerial if not actually clerical, and a tendency to equalize the magnate and the elected pastor who served as co-moderators at the local and general synods of the Helvetic Church. The Laskian practice continued in both the Major and Minor churches after the schism. Calvin, although he held a higher view of a Christian magistracy than did Luther, would never allow it to interfere in the internal life and thought of the church. In the Reformed synods of Poland the pastors were subject to the collective moral and theological discipline and scrutiny in which the patrons, some of whom were princes in the Ukraine

and the Grand Duchy, and the "ministerial" elders, also generally noblemen, had a voice.²³

Some of the foregoing traits make clear why Laskian Calvinism appealed to so many of the gentry and magnates of the Commonwealth, eventually also in regions beyond the internal boundary between the Latin-rite and Byzantine-rite. The nobility had long resented the episcopal tribunals exercising jurisdiction over the lay lords, and they welcomed a polity in which, as patrons, elders (*seniores*), and synodal deacons, they were the equals or even more of the bishops now called simply pastors and themselves now subject to joint lay-clerical discipline in synod.

Łaski, for all his diligence, never succeeded in welding together a pan-Protestant Church of the Commonwealth. Shortly after his death, there opened up the already mentioned schism, 1563-65, over the issues of baptism and Triadology, which generated still more ecclesiastical nomenclature. The conservative Łaskians became known, as already noted, as the Major Church, against the Minor Church of the Polish-Lithuanian-Ukrainian Brethren.²⁴ On the issue of Triadology, the Minor Church

²³ At the time my article "Erasmianism in Poland" was completed, I did not have the careful, supportive analysis of Łaski's polity in East Frisia, London, Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, and Poland as worked out by O. Naunin, "Die Kirchenordnungen des Johannes Łaski," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, 3rd series, 19 (1909): 23-40, 195-236, 347-75. Naunin agrees that Łaski brought the *seniores* and patrons to a very high level of authority in the Church, especially in synod, where pastors were disciplined on preaching and doctrine no less than on pastoral care and personal behavior. However, Naunin disagrees with Johannes Kruske, *Johannes a Lasco und der Sakramentsstreit* (Breslau, 1899), that in giving such prominence to the elders and patrons Łaski was influenced by the usage of Menno Simons, with whom he was once engaged in debate on another issue. Naunin holds, rather, that the lay control of the parish priest had been vigorously and widely preserved from early times in East Frisia, precisely where Łaski first labored as a reformer, and that it was from the usage in this region that he appropriated his henceforth distinctive principle of polity.

²⁴ Those whom I have distinguished, using hyphenated terms, as brethren of the three major parts of the Commonwealth, were in their own time always called Polish Brethren, even though many of their recruits were ethnic and foreign Germans, Italians, and even Frenchmen. "Polish Brethren" was applied even though the language of their discourses, publications, and synods was more commonly Latin than Polish, and even though for more than a decade near the end of their existence in the Commonwealth the center of gravity had shifted to Byzantine-rite territory. The standard work on them, in the Commonwealth and beyond, remains that of Earl Morse Wilbur, *The History of Unitarianism: Socinianism and its Antecedents* (Cambridge, 1945). In my introduction to Stanislas Lubieniecki's *History of the Polish Reformation*, to be published in the Harvard Theological Studies series, I update Wilbur and cover the development of all confessional groups in the Commonwealth from 1518 to 1601. My introduction to *The Polish Brethren, 1601-1685*, Harvard

went through a tritheist, a binitarian, and a ditheist phase before reaching, in most regions, a fully unitarian position by the end of the sixteenth century. For the sake of clarity, it should be noted that though the Polish Brethren as unitarians might have been called by their Calvinist and Catholic foes "Judaizers" in the Protestant context, the term was in fact very rarely employed (only by an occasional Catholic polemicist) because the Polish Brethren, in general, programmatically placed the New Testament above the Old Testament and adored the ascended Christ (first conceived of the Spirit of God the Father and born of the Virgin). In the process of reaching the fully unitarian position, the Minor Church divided itself temporarily into separate local synods under leaders who lent their names to distinctive lesser sects, only to merge again with the main body of the Minor Church of the Polish-Lithuanian-Ukrainian Brethren under the influence of Faustus Socinus, a permanent resident of Poland from 1579 until his death in 1604. Hence also the name Socinians for the Unitarian Brethren.

It was on the other issue which had gained prominence in the Reformed Church and led to the definitive schism, namely, baptism, that Socinus did not agree with the Brethren. By the time of his arrival believers' baptism by immersion was becoming the rule, and there were several instances of rebaptism or anabaptism at the conversion of several men who eventually became notable leaders of the movement, especially former Lutherans. Moreover, with believers' baptism and a strict adherence to the precepts of Christ came a stress on pacifism or, minimally, a revulsion from any but purely defensive war. In following what they understood to be the implications of the precepts of Christ, some of the Unitarian nobles in Little Poland, Ruthenia, and Volhynia freed their serfs so that they might be brethren with them in the present life. They also occasionally exchanged the sword of the lord or magnate for a wooden staff like that of the Hutterite communitarian Anabaptists in Moravia. A party within the Minor Church tried to achieve a fraternal union with the Hutterites, and failing this, modeled the early Raków (1569-72) as a Polish *Bruderhof*, but with lords, pastors, and artisans as equal members.

In Lithuania, which retained its distinctive administrative, military,

Theological Studies, vol. 30 (Missoula, Montana, 1978), is largely limited to the Unitarians in their constitutional and confessional setting. The term "Polish" was commonly appropriated by Ukrainians at the time. It is of interest that the almost wholly Polonized Czech Brethren in the Commonwealth retained their confessional and ethnic designation.

judicial, and monetary arrangements even after the Union of Lublin of 1569, the Unitarians, it is true, tended to remain pedobaptist, like their much more numerous Calvinist confreres. At the same time, they became more strictly unitarian than the Polish Brethren in that many ceased to adore Christ as the exalted King of the Cosmos, of the kingdoms of this world, and of the Church of the faithful followers of his precepts. On magistracy and war the Lithuanian Brethren remained or again became conservative, believing in the legitimacy of office-holding and opposing only aggressive wars. In this differentiation between the Polish Brethren in the narrower sense and the Lithuanian Brethren in the narrower sense, or Budnyites (after Simon Budny), there was nevertheless a general feeling that together they constituted a single Church of the Brethren. Because the Brest Bible, sponsored by Nicholas the Black in 1563, had proved unsatisfactory, Budny was encouraged to undertake its revision; undertaking the task, he finally dispensed with the Vulgate and western vernacular translations and translated into Polish directly from the Hebrew (Nesvezh, 1572) and the Greek (Nesvezh, 1575). The former was much admired by rabbis who noted clearly Judaizing trends in Budny's creative lexicology. His translation and general non-adorant, non-pacifist stance earned him the charge of being a Judaizer from the Polish Brethren in Little Poland, Ruthenia, Volhynia, and Podolia, as well as the appellation "Jewish atheist" from the less radical Brethren. He, however, still regarded himself as a Christian and, like the adorants and pacifists among the Brethren, held to believers' baptism and observed the Lord's Supper. Budny defended his Christian unitarian faith, article by article, from within the Brotherhood in *O przedniejszych wiary Chryścijańskiej artikulech* (Łosk, 1576), approved by the Brethren in the Grand Duchy. After some compromising on both sides within the Polish-Lithuanian-Ukrainian Minor Church, Budny was condemned as a Judaizer (already noted in Part I:B) for his "wicked opinions and acts" at a synod in Lustawice (near Cracow) in 1582, and again at a synod in Węgrów (Uhriv) in Podlachia in 1584. In all likelihood, it is against the background of Jewish proselytism and Budny's move from Calvinism to a Christian Unitarianism markedly altered by Budny's high respect for the Old Testament — similar to that of his ally among Transylvanian Unitarians, Jacob Palaeologus — that some of the "Pseudo-Kurbskii" letters to Ukrainians (see Part I:B) were written. This is probable also because the Budnyite Unitarians came to mingle sometimes indistinguishably with the more nacificistic and adorant type of Unitarians associated by 1580 with Faustus

There are further distinctions to be made in the congeries of congregations calling themselves the Minor Church in Poland proper, in the Grand Duchy as of 1569, and in the Ukraine. Socinus, a somewhat camouflaged pacifist in dealings with the Lithuanian Brethren, was known to the Polish Brethren, whose spokesman he had rapidly become, as an uncompromising opponent of baptism, which he viewed as a rite of the Primitive Church long since superseded and useful only in marking an occasional convert from Judaism or Islam. This Socinian view was incorporated in the Racovian Catechism (in Polish) of 1605, although the Brethren appear to have observed the provision in the breach. Thus the Minor Church included some Socinian — mostly Polish — anti-baptists, some Polish, Lithuanian, and Ukrainian immersionists on the confession of faith, and some hold-out Lithuanian pedobaptists.²⁵

There was one more doctrine of considerable internal importance to many, but not all, the members of the Minor Church throughout the Commonwealth. Already part of the theology of some of the Brethren, it seems to have received special impetus from Socinus. The doctrine held that the soul dies with the body and that only the righteous will be resurrected and reanimated at the Second Advent of Christ, when the punishment of the wicked will consist of Christ's humane decision not to awaken them from their eternal sleep, unless it be momentarily to behold what they could have enjoyed had they followed his precepts in life.²⁶ This view may have an Italian Marrano, Valdesian (from Juan de Valdés) or perhaps even, indirectly, a Jewish source, for the ancient Jews and medieval rabbis tended to believe in a limited resurrection of Jews and righteous Gentiles.

Such a body of beliefs and practices, not wholly harmonized either by region or generation from 1563 to the expulsion of the Brethren from the Commonwealth in 1660, cannot be called "Arianism" in any sense in which that term was used in Christian antiquity. This remains true even though today the term is widely used, especially in Polish, Lithuanian, and Ukrainian studies, to refer to the Brethren. This usage has become current largely because the designation "Arian" and the ascription of that

²⁵ Although the Lithuanian Brethren were largely autonomous and differed in some ways from the main body in Crown Poland, they, too, called themselves Polish Brethren. Only the opponents in Crown Poland called their extremists Budnyites. The main group that broke away from the Minor Church were the Ditheists, also called Farnovians, after their leader Stanislas Farnowski.

²⁶ I have dealt with Socinus's eschatology in *Polish Brethren*, doc. 3:D.

ancient heresy to the Brethren brought about their banishment from the Commonwealth in 1660.

How did such a body of beliefs and practices emerge in the Reformed congregations so quickly after the death of Łaski?

The first answer must be that a tendency towards unitarianism in the strict theological sense is perhaps endemic in the Reformed position, because salvation is preeminently located in the eternal decrees of God, only one of which was the foreseen historic atoning event on Calvary. In nearby Transylvania the Reformed Church also split, at about the same time, into a trinitarian and a unitarian body. The Unitarians there, however, remained largely pedobaptist and came to refuse to adore Christ, thus being more like the Lithuanian Budnyites than the Polish-Ukrainian Brethren.

The second and more commonly advanced answer, especially for the rise of Unitarianism in ethnic Poland, is the influence of the large number of Italians of a rationalist bent. Although drawn to Calvin rather than Luther and often sojourning in Geneva before moving on to the Commonwealth or to Transylvania, they subjected the received doctrine of the Trinity to such intensive questioning in the philological and critical tradition of Lorenzo Valla that they wittingly or unwittingly unraveled the traditional doctrines of the Trinity and Christology. In the Commonwealth Laelius Socinus and, especially, Francesco Lismanino, Francesco Stancaro, and Dr. Giorgio Biandrata must be considered foremost figures.²⁷

While accepting this explanation for the early emergence of Unitarianism in the Commonwealth, I would wish to ascribe something of the devolution of the doctrine of the Trinity in Poland to Calvin and Łaski themselves. After becoming Protestant, the Franciscan confessor of Bona Sforza, Lismanino, urged Calvin to take an active role in guiding the Reformation in an Helvetic direction throughout the Commonwealth, which he proceeded to do. But as soon as Łaski arrived, the overcommitted Calvin let his correspondence drop.

An intra-Reformed controversy arose at Königsberg in which Stancaro charged the Lutheran deviant Andrew Osiander with subordination for

²⁷ All three and others, too, are perspicaciously dealt with by Lorenz Hein, *Italienische Protestanten und ihr Einfluss auf die Reformation in Polen . . . vor dem Sandomirer Konsensus* (Leiden, 1974). For their role in the devolution of the doctrine of the Trinity, see my "The Polish-Lithuanian Calvin," in *Essays in Honor of Ford Lewis Battles*, ed. by Brian Gerrish (Pittsburgh, Pa., forthcoming).

his interest in distinguishing the roles of Christ in the atonement and in justification. Concurrently, Stancaro held that he alone was faithful to the tradition common to Catholics, Protestants, and Orthodox alike. As a major Italian Hebraist who had also mastered the Midrash and Cabbala, Stancaro argued — correctly, in terms of Anselm of Canterbury and Peter Lombard — that Christ could not be the mediator between God and man in his divine nature, for this would make Christ's deity inferior to the Father's. Instead of supporting this traditional Catholic view of the atonement, Calvin, with his penal theory, turned out to be confusing. Also, because of his virtual interruption of correspondence and supervision of the Reformed churches in the Commonwealth in deference to Łaski, Calvin was not readily heeded by the churches when, stirred by the controversy of Stancaro, he resumed correspondence in 1560.²⁸ Moreover, because of the subordinationism that Calvin had expressed in his *Responsum* (1557) to George Blandrata and the Reformed in the Commonwealth, in which he spoke of the Person of the Mediator in both natures as having the role of a *medius gradus* (middle rank), he unwittingly contributed to the process of the devolution of Christology and then Triadology. Two additional letters to the Reformed in the Commonwealth, in which Calvin tried to dissociate himself from Stancaro, only worsened the situation.²⁹ When these letters of Calvin are considered with some of the above-mentioned distinctive traits of Łaski, notably his view of God and primarily God the Father as *Deus Optimus Maximus* and his refusal to allow his synod to have recourse to any but the Apostolic Creed, it is not surprising that the movement toward antitrinitarianism spread rapidly. Łaski, follower of both Erasmus and Calvin, emerges, then, as the unwitting father of Unitarianism in the Commonwealth.

Not long after his death one of Łaski's major intra-Protestant ecumenical concerns was consummated.³⁰ Stimulated in part by the greater

²⁸ See Nancy Conradt, "John Calvin, Theodore Beza and the Reformation in Poland" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1974), and a forthcoming article by Jill Raitt, "The Person of the Mediator: Calvin's Christology and Beza's Fidelity."

²⁹ "Responsum ad quaestiones Georgii Blandratae," *Corpus Reformatorum* (hereafter CR), vol. 37. The two additional letters are "Responsum ad Fratres Polonos quomodo Mediator sit Christus ad refutandum Stancari errorem" (1560), CR 37: 333-42, and "Ministrorum Ecclesiae Genevensis responsio ad Nobiles Polones et Franciscum Stancarum Mantuanum de controversiis Mediatoris" (1561), CR 37: 345-58.

³⁰ For intra-Protestant and Protestant-Orthodox relations in the Commonwealth with material on the Ukraine, see Kai Eduard Jordt Jørgensen, *Ökumenische Bestre-*

consolidation of the Commonwealth in the Union of Lublin (1569), through the already mentioned Agreement of Vilnius and the Consensus of Sandomierz (both of 1570), the Czech Brethren, the Lutherans outside Ducal Prussia, and the Calvinists, with seven of the followers of Stancaro submitting at Sandomierz, joined in a federal pan-Protestant union theoretically coterminous with the Grand Duchy and the rest of the Commonwealth, respectively. The three bodies agreed to keep their respective confessions as mutually compatible. The Calvinists had but recently accepted the Second Swiss Confession (1566) translated into Polish by Paul Gilowski, which he modified only in the new section on the Lord's Supper. The Unitarians were expressly excluded from the Agreement and the Consensus. The delegates who drew up the Consensus and deliberated from 9 to 14 May 1570, opened their Consensus with reference to churches of one confession or another, present by delegation, from "Russia," meaning thereby the palatinate of Ruthenia.³¹ The federating confessions agreed to hold Commonwealth-wide joint synods every five years; actually, however, the Sandomierz Confederates managed to convene only four times in the sixteenth century, at Cracow, Piotrków, Włodzisław, and Toruń.³² Their General Synod of 1586 in Włodzisław was the first to authorize the printing of the Consensus.

In the deliberations of Sandomierz the Lutherans, headed by their superintendent for Great Poland, Erasmus Gliczner, were the most rigid. The Czech Brethren, who were the least conspicuously represented, were perhaps the most creative: the colloquy took place, moreover, half-way between their home base in Bohemia-Moravia and their extensive settlements in Great Poland. As fashioners of what they may have considered

bungen unter den polnischen Protestanten bis zum Jahre 1645 (Copenhagen, 1942), and Ambroise Jobert, *De Luther à Mohila: La Pologne dans la crise de la Chrétienté, 1517-1648* (Paris, 1974).

³¹ An English version of the Consensus may be found in Edmund de Schweinitz, *The History of the Church Known as the Unity of the Brethren* (Bethlehem, Pa., 1885), pp. 354-56. The standard monograph is by Oskar Halecki, *Zgoda sandomierska 1570 r.* (Warsaw and Cracow, 1915). The most recent study is by J. Lehmann, *Konfesja sandomierska na tle innych konfesji w Polsce XVI wieku* (Warsaw, 1937). An important account of Sandomierz and of the Brethren in the Commonwealth is that of Józef Łukaszewicz, *O kościołach Braci Czeskich w dawnej Polsce* (Poznań, 1835), trans. G. W. T. Fischer, *Von den Kirchen der Böhmischen Brüder im ehemaligen Grosspolen* (Graz, 1877). It leaves out, however, 155 pages of listings of bishops, schools, churches, etc.

³² De Schweinitz, *History of the Church Known as the Unity*, p. 447, gives only three, while Jobert, *De Luther à Mohila*, p. 140, says there were four, which he dates, without reference to place, to 1573, 1578, 1583 (undoubtedly an error, correctly 1586), and 1595 (Toruń).

the "first Reformation," the Czech Brethren were aware of their strategic position between the Lutherans and the Calvinists in matters of both belief and practice. Moreover, they were fully Polonized, with a school in Leszno and another major center in Ostroróg. At the time of the colloquy, there were one hundred Lutheran and sixty-five Czech Brethren congregations in Great Poland.³³ The fact that only the palatinate of Ruthenia is mentioned as being represented would confirm the general observation that Protestantism in the Byzantine-rite lands of the Crown began mostly after 1570.

Of indirect interest to the narration of Reformation events relevant to the Ukraine is the fact that the chief magnate among the Czech Brethren was a theologian who figured prominently in a delegation to Ivan IV. With the Union of Lublin, Muscovy's threat to the Grand Duchy (which had been a major factor in the union and the Duchy's territorial concessions to the Crown) became a threat to the more fully integrated Commonwealth. Accordingly, Sigismund II had already settled upon sending a large delegation to Moscow, to discuss an armistice, trade relations, and possibly religion. On both sides lay the consideration that if religious differences could be worked out, the tsar might in fact become a contender for the elective kingship of the Commonwealth, since the present king was childless. Sigismund's delegation consisted of 718 persons and an additional 643 merchants. Among the delegates were Czech Brother Raphael Leszczyński, *starosta* of Radziejów, and Czech Brother John Rokyta, as theologian. The negotiators arrived in Moscow 3 March 1570, but, because of the absence of the tsar, who was in Novgorod, they did not deal with him directly until May. From the outset of the talks, the religious exchange was most difficult: on 10 May, Ivan called the religious delegation "vos porci," before which he would not cast Orthodox pearls. Later, however, he did ask for written statements respecting Protestantism and gave the delegates presents.³⁴

While Protestantism in the Ukraine was expanding through the ongoing settlements of Polish Brethren and the indigenous development of local organizations of Reformed and some few Unitarian congregations, a notable ecumenical episode was taking place. It is possible that

³³ Jørgensen, *Ökumenische Bestrebungen*, p. 276, fn. 1.

³⁴ Joseph Th. Müller, *Geschichte der Böhmisches Brüder*, 3 vols. (Herrnhut, 1922-31), 3: 146-49. A major source is Jan Łaski's *De Russorum, Moscoviticarum et Tartarorum religione* . . . (Spire, 1582). Also see Valerie Tumins, *Tsar Ivan IV's Reply to Jan Rokyta* (The Hague, 1971), which is a facsimile edition of the Russian and Polish versions with English translations.

the discreet Italian anabaptist unitarian philosopher of the medical faculty of Padua, Dr. Nicholas Buccella, may have been a small factor in the spread of immersionist Unitarianism among East Slavs. In the war against Muscovy under Stephen Batory (1576-86), Russian prisoners, presumably men of some rank, were lodged in Cracow with Dr. Buccella, personal physician to the king. (Some have thought his Russian charges were orphans.) He converted the lodgers to his views, and in his *Testamentum* made substantial provision for them as they dispersed eastward.³⁵

The three confessions of Sandomierz — made to counter the general harassment of Protestants and to head off the bruited and actually imminent union of Latin-rite and Byzantine-rite Christians, which Skarga had called for as early as 1577 and which was to culminate in the Union of Brest at a series of synods and colloquies there and in Cracow and Rome in 1595-96 — definitely reaffirmed their pan-Protestant unity. Already in advance of the first synod of Brest, the three Protestant confessions felt themselves to be strongly threatened by King Sigismund III Vasa (1587-1632) and his Jesuit advisors. Confident in the privileges granted all Protestants (including the Unitarians) in the *pax dissidentium* of 1573 (insisted on by all Protestant groups in return for supporting Henry of Valois), their representative lay and clerical leaders at the diet of Cracow in 1594 concurred in sending out an invitation for a general synod of the three confessions, to meet in Toruń, in St. Mary's Lutheran Church, 21-26 August 1595. Protestants from all parts of the Commonwealth, and specifically large numbers of Calvinist nobles from the palatinates of Ruthenia, Volhynia, Podolia, Bratslav, and Kiev, flocked to Toruń. They reaffirmed the Consensus and authorized a deputation to parley with the king; despite the eminence of its members, the delegation was to effect nothing. Through this experience, however, the three confessions recovered their sense of a common destiny in the face of increasing hazards.

Their feeling of desperation brought about the idea of approaching the non-Uniate Orthodox clergy with a view to extending the principle of federal Consensus to include holdouts among the Orthodox in the Commonwealth. In the meantime the initiative had already been taken by a major Orthodox prince who had sent observers to Toruń.

Prince Basil Constantine Ostroz'kyi of Ostroh in Volhynia, the palatine

³⁵ See Aldo Stella, *Dall'Anabattismo al Socinianesimo* (Padua, 1967), p. 193.

of Kiev whom we met as the correspondent of Pseudo-Kurbskii, had originally favored the Roman-Orthodox Union, but only on the condition that all the Patriarchs, as well as the Pope, concur in an ecumenical council. Indeed, it had been he who, having the right of advowson to the Orthodox see of Volodymyr, first convinced its widowed castellan, a semi-Calvinist educated at Cracow, Hypatius Potii (Pociejj), to become a monk, hence eligible for episcopal promotion and to provide Orthodox leadership toward union. As the Uniate movement seemed to be getting out of control, however, Prince Ostroz'kyi took the initiative even during the Protestant General Synod of Toruń in 1595 and then, more urgently, in 1596. He defended Orthodoxy and proposed bringing together the Protestant three of Vilnius-Sandomierz, now of Toruń, with the Orthodox in Vilnius in 1599.³⁶

In his immediate defense of Orthodoxy Prince Ostroz'kyi, who had already established an Orthodox academy at Ostroh sometime before 1581, now engaged a Protestant to write, under the pseudonym of "Christopher Philaleth," *Apocrisis or Reply to the Book of the Synod of Brest, given in vehement haste . . . in the name of the people of the ancient Greek Religion* (Vilnius: in Polish, 1597; in Ruthenian, 1598). The work has been ascribed both to the Unitarian Christopher Broński and to the Calvinist Martin Broniewski (on whom see below).³⁷

At the colloquy of Vilnius on the side of the Czech Brethren there were, among others, Lord Andrew Leszczyński, palatine of Brześć-Kujawski, and Senior (Bishop) Simon Theophilus Tarnowski (Turnowski) of Ostroróg;³⁸ on the side of the Lutherans, Erasmus Gliczner, superintendent of the Lutherans of Great Poland, and the German and the Polish

³⁶ An account of the colloquy in Vilnius is given by Józef Łukaszewicz, *Dzieje kościołów wyznania helweckiego w Litwie*, 2 vols. (Poznań, 1841-43); probably translated by the author, *Geschichte der reformirten Kirchen in Lithauen*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1848-50). The authors of this and other older accounts did not have direct knowledge of the signed and sealed document, which is presented in five plates by Domet Oljančyn, "Zur Frage der Generalkonfederation zwischen Protestanten und Orthodoxen in Wilna 1599," *Kyrios* 1 (1936): 29-46. The text was in the Royal Secret Archives in Königsberg. Tracing the history of the interpretation of the colloquy, Oljančyn holds that, despite the lack of any Orthodox signatures, the document still had validity, as subsequent joint actions clearly indicate. Jørgensen, *Ökumenische Bestrebungen*, pp. 323ff., accepts these findings.

³⁷ On these two, see Kazimierz Chodynicki, *PSB*, 2: 426ff. Tazbir, "Na ziemiach ukraińskich," p. 111, ascribes the work without question to Broński and says it was published "on the Arian press in Cracow."

³⁸ In Great Poland the Czech Brethren called their elected Bishop *senior* and the other ministers *conseniores*. Müller, *Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*, 3: 408-410.

preacher in Vilnius; on the side of the Calvinists, Grand Hetman Christopher I Nicholas Radvila (Radziwiłł), castellan of Vilnius (two of whose four wives belonged to the Ostroz'kyi family), his son George, palatine of Brest, and Superintendent Daniel Mikolajewski; on the side of the Orthodox, besides the prince, his son Alexander, palatine of Volhynia, Senator and Castellan Gregory (George) Sangushko of Bratslav, Metropolitan Luke of Bilhorod,³⁹ Hegumen Isaac and Archdeacon Gideon, both of Dubno. The two staunchly Orthodox bishops in the Commonwealth, Gideon Balaban of L'viv and Michael Kopystens'kyi of Peremyshl', although urgently invited by Prince Ostroz'kyi, did not attend for unexplained reasons.⁴¹

A preliminary meeting of representatives of the three federated confessions and the Orthodox took place before the arrival of Leszczyński and Radvila in the palace of Prince Ostroz'kyi at Vilnius. The greeting of Archimandrite Isaac to Bishop Tarnowski, which he spoke with hand extended, augured ill: "I greet you, although the Scriptures forbid us to greet heretics." Tarnowski gently expressed surprise that he and his companions could be so readily identified as heretics. Ostroz'kyi opened the proceedings with the hope that an accord could be reached: "If God the Lord would permit union between our Greek and your Evangelical Church, I would be ready tomorrow to leave this world with joy." And when after a hopeful intervention by Lutheran Gliczner, Metropolitan Luke said that union on the basis of mutual concessions was in vain, Ostroz'kyi rebuked him: "If our clergy decline union, let the devil take them." Tarnowski was the key figure in a temporary reconciliation. The Church in Bohemia, of which his in Great Poland was a branch, had earlier sought to establish contact with the Eastern Church. The retention of many medieval institutions and an orthodox ethos made the Polish Czech Brethren and their chief theologian in the colloquy of Vilnius the most important resource, on the Protestant side, in seeking a basis for a political confederation or a common front against Roman and Byzantine-rite Catholicism on the ascendancy. Basing their pact on the Polish-Lithuanian constitutional principle of a parliamentary confederation,

³⁹ Włodzimierz Dworzaczek, *Genealogia* (Warsaw, 1959), table 163.

⁴⁰ Jobert, *De Luther à Mohila*, takes the name as referring to Belgrade, but the same Latin word also stood for Ukrainian Bilhorod.

⁴¹ A Calvinist source for the colloquy, utilized by writers already cited, is that of Andrzej Węgierski, *Libri quattuor Slavoniae Reformatae* (2nd ed. Amsterdam, 1679; facsimile ed. by Janusz Tazbir, Warsaw, 1973), pp. 478-503. He does not refer to the failure of the two Orthodox bishops to appear.

grounded in this case expressly on the Confederation of Warsaw of 1573 with its *pax dissidentium de religione*, the assembled agreed, on 3 May 1599, that they should consider themselves "a body under the one single Head the Lord Jesus Christ" and that they should send representative observers to the synods of each group and mutually defend each other's religious rights locally and generally within the provisions of the constitution of the Commonwealth.⁴² It was established that 126 "general provisors" would be elected to convene, confer, and uphold the religious-political agreement: three Orthodox Senators headed by Prince Ostroz'kyi, sixteen Orthodox Deputies, twenty (non-Unitarian) Protestant Senators, and eighty-seven Protestant Deputies. The Polish text of the agreement shows that although there were enough waxed spaces for the full number of participants to sign and imprint with their seals, only eighty-six (fifty-four with seals) — all of them Protestant — actually did so. It has sometimes been argued that the Orthodox had a Ruthenian version of the document, but this would appear to have been, in fact, another document of similar purport and period brought out by the Orthodox brotherhood of Vilnius.⁴³ It would appear that Cyril Lucaris, at the time the representative of his uncle Patriarch Meletius Pigas of Alexandria, dissuaded the Orthodox from signing the document of confederation, although many of the Orthodox lords proceeded to act in accord with its intentions. They apparently agreed among themselves that nothing further could be done until Patriarchs Matthew II of Constantinople and Meletius Pigas of Alexandria replied endorsing the agreement. The colloquy adjourned 5 June 1599.

Six leading Protestant clergymen sent a letter to the patriarch of Constantinople, appealing for his support of the Vilnius accord.⁴⁴ It is possible that the joint letter to Constantinople was intercepted by Jesuits.

⁴² The full Polish text is translated into German by Oljančyn, "Zur Frage der Generalkonfederation," pp. 31 ff.

⁴³ Oljančyn, "Zur Frage der Generalkonfederation," pp. 37 ff.

⁴⁴ Wegierski, *Libri quatuor*, pp. 491-94. It is important to clarify the patriarchal situation. The Orthodox of the Commonwealth were under the patriarch of Constantinople and the metropolitan of Kiev; the latter city was an integral part of the Commonwealth and the seat of one of its palatinates. After the union, the Uniate metropolitans were Michael Rohozha, 1588/96-99, Hypatius Potii (Pociej), 1600-13, Joseph IV Ruts'kyi, 1614-37, etc. In 1620 a complete new Orthodox hierarchy was instituted, with Job Borets'kyi, 1620-33, Isaac Boryshkevych, 1633, Peter Mohyla, 1633-47, etc. In Constantinople Matthew II was patriarch for the first time in 1595. Two patriarchs ruled briefly, followed by Meletius Pigas of Alexandria as *Locum tenens*, 1597-98, and Matthew II a second time, 1598-1602. The instability of the throne in Istanbul made Patriarch Meletius Pigas of Alexandria the key figure.

The letter of Tarnowski alone to Meletius Pigas as *locum tenens* of Constantinople (1597-98) while also patriarch of Alexandria, in which he referred to the earlier contacts of the Czech Brethren with Patriarch Nicodemus of Constantinople in 1440, is dated 4 June 1599.⁴⁵ Patriarch Meletius, who probably received several accounts of the colloquy from his own clergy, sent a response to his nephew Archimandrite Cyril Lucaris, who had been his representative at the Union Synod of Brest.⁴⁶ Destined to become himself successively patriarch of Alexandria and then of Constantinople, Exarch Cyril Lucaris was unwilling — fearful of the king and the Catholics — to make known what was apparently the somewhat favorable response of his uncle, which he discussed only privately in Volhynia.⁴⁷ Bishop Tarnowski did get a brief letter from Meletius, as did Lord Martin Broniewski, who, with another noble, had first spoken in the name of Prince Constantine at the outset of the gathering in Vilnius. Both letters, dated December 1600, refer to the reply carried by Cyril Lucaris as exarch and as the Alexandrine patriarch's authorized spokesman.⁴⁸

Harvard University

(To be Continued)

⁴⁵ Węgierski, *Libri quattuor*, pp. 495ff.

⁴⁶ Cyril Lucaris was briefly head of a brotherhood college in Vilnius and personally opposed the union. He became patriarch of Alexandria from 1602 to 1620, and of Constantinople, with interruptions, from 1620 to 1638. The main modern work on him is that of G. A. Hadjiantoniou, *Protestant Patriarch: The Life of Cyril Lucaris* (London, 1961). I have dealt with his double-predestinarian *Confessio fidei* in Latin and Greek (1629, 1631) and with other aspects of this unusual figure, so prominent in Commonwealth interconfessional intrigue that he became a Calvinist in a major doctrine to oppose the Catholics, "New England Puritan Interest in the Christian East," *Andover Newton Quarterly* 15 (1975): 267-77.

⁴⁷ Węgierski, *Libri quattuor*, p. 497.

⁴⁸ Węgierski, *Libri quattuor*, pp. 497ff.

II

PROTESTANTS IN THE UKRAINE DURING THE PERIOD OF THE POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH (*continued*)*

GEORGE H. WILLIAMS

III. PROTESTANTISM IN THE UKRAINE, 1569/77-1699

Retrospect and Introduction

The preceding part of our narrative followed the Judaizing currents of several kinds flowing into the Ukraine from Novgorod and Moscow by way of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and the Reformed currents from the West flowing into Poland and Lithuania as Lutheranism. It also dealt with the Reformed movement, which split into the Calvinist Major and the proto-Unitarian Minor Church, 1563 to 1565, and with Anabaptism. All these latter-day reformed groups moved in alongside the Protestantizing Czech Brethren who had penetrated Poland and Lithuania before the Reformation era. All proselytized among the Catholics or the Orthodox of the confessionally already sharply divided Commonwealth.

In the Grand Duchy the first Lutherans had gathered possibly in 1520, most certainly by 1527, in Vilnius. In Poland the first Reformed Church to have a church edifice was that under Pastor Francis Stancaro at Pińczów in 1550. The first synod of the Reformed Church in the Grand Duchy took place in Vilnius in 1557. By 1565 the schismatic Minor Reformed Church in Poland and the Grand Duchy was beginning to polarize around the issue of the legitimacy of adoring Christ as fully human, a controversy which had its counterpart in the schism in the Unitarian Reformed Church in Transylvania. In all three areas — Transylvania, Lithuania, and Poland — the adorant Unitarians freely referred to the non-adorant radicals among them as "Judaizers."

It is regrettable for the study of Protestantism in the Ukraine in the sixteenth and the seventeenth century that the published sources and monographs on religion in "the Grand Duchy" or "Lithuania" deal mostly with ethnic Lithuania or the Duchy as defined by the Union of Lublin in 1569. Protestantism in the Ukrainian lands is only faintly illuminated by such works. Hence, it is primarily other sources and monographs that must provide information about religion on this territory to 1569, and about religion among such families as the Chaplyches to 1577. (Neither the several Chaplych lords nor pastors of their congregations appear, strangely enough, at the synods of the Reformed Church, although until 1565 they would have considered themselves members of the undivided Reformed Church of the Commonwealth.)

The first region which may be considered Ukrainian in our survey was Podlachia (Ukr. *Podliashshia*, Pol. *Podlasie*) which the Grand Duchy ceded to the Polish Crown in 1569 as part of the political congeries collectively called Masovia and distinguished from both Great and Little Poland. In this period the eastern half of Podlachia was linguistically Ukrainian, although today it belongs to Soviet Belorussia. The second region was the palatinates of Ruthenia, Belz, Kholm (Chełm) and Podolia (Ukr. *Podillia*) which had for some time been under the Polish Crown. The palatinate of Ruthenia was composed of the four districts of Sianik (Sanok), Peremyshl' (Przemyśl), Lviv, and Halych. After the concessions of the Duchy to the east, a third region, comprising the palatinates of Volhynia, Bratslav, and Kiev, was added. The three regions constituted all the Ukrainian territories under Crown Poland until 1618, when the Chernihiv lands were annexed.

A. Calvinism in the Ukrainian Lands

As early as 1559, the unitarianizing Nicholas II Radvila the Black, palatine of Vilnius, proposed that in the interests of uniformity in doctrine, discipline, and ceremonies, the Reformed Church in the Duchy and Poland hold general synods for the whole Commonwealth of "the Two Peoples." The synods' location should be chosen jointly to provide maximum geographical representation in future years. Radvila's wise proposal was not accepted by the Reformed until the decisive and divisive synod held 25 to 30 December 1565, in Węgrów (Uhriv), a town in Podlachia owned by Prince John Kishka (Kyshka). At this synod pedobaptism and believers' baptism were placed on the regular agenda for the first time, and the differences between the factions that were to become the

Major and Minor Reformed churches became so evident that the schism between the Calvinists and Unitarians is usually dated from the event. There had, in fact, been quasi-general synods on "Cyrillic" territory before this catastrophic one: in Zhakiv south of Kholm in June 1563 and in Węgrów itself in December 1563. The strictly Calvinist Major Church held no general Commonwealth-wide synods on Cyrillic territory until the Union of Lublin, partly because the chief exponent of such synods, Nicholas Radvila, died on 29 May 1565, and his heirs turned Catholic. But at the general synod of Sandomierz in 1570 — which met concurrently with the synods of the Czech Brethren and the Lutherans and together with them achieved the Consensus of the three trinitarian Protestant groups of the Commonwealth — the Calvinists, meeting separately, made provision for district (i.e., palatine) superintendents, and hence for district synods, in Ruthenia and Podolia. An important school of the Major Reformed Church later existed in Panivtsi in Podolia.

The Calvinist-Unitarian schism was not the first within the Reformed Church in the Commonwealth. An earlier division was the Stancarist schism (1561-70) of the right wing. Its leader was Francis Stancaro, the Mantuan Hebraist and Reformed controversialist who founded the first church-housed Reformed congregation in the Commonwealth. Stancaro belligerently opposed Osiander, Musculus, Bullinger and, most notably, Calvin, in contending, with Peter Lombard, that Christ was mediator only in his human nature, and he charged them all with Arianism. After his excommunication from the general Reformed Church, Stancaro became pastor in Dubets'ko (Dubiecko) on the Sian (San) in the district of Sianik, where he was surrounded by several Stancarist pastors, the most well known of whom was Christopher of Lviv, a correspondent with Calvin. The Stancarist schism ended with the submission of the Stancarist pastors during the synod that espoused the Federal Union of Sandomierz in 1570. Thereafter, except for attrition toward Unitarianism and for wars during which no distinctions among western confessions were usually made, the history of Calvinism in the Ukrainian lands appears to have been uneventful. Some congregations held together until the partitions of the Commonwealth. In the ethnic Lithuanian and Belorussian parts of the Grand Duchy, especially in the region around Vilnius, Calvinism held on rather well into recent times.

B. Unitarianism in the Ukraine from 1569/77 to 1638

The spread and organization of Unitarianism in the Ukraine falls into three periods. The first (already dealt with in Part II) was characterized by the mingling of Orthodox Judaizers (of at least two kinds), Lutherans (to a small extent), and, especially, the eclectic Reformed (ranging from the Judaizing Orthodox, influenced somewhat by Luther, more by Melancthon, and most by the Helvetian divines, to proto-Unitarians of disparate tendencies and clarities). The second period encompasses the time from these fluctuating beginnings to the destruction of the Unitarian center in Rakow in 1638. The third covers the time from the emergence of Kyselyn in Volhynia as the center of Unitarianism in the whole Commonwealth until the Cossack War and the exile of all Unitarians from the Commonwealth in 1660.

In the obscure first period, many Reformed or proto-Unitarian leanings, both pastors and lords, must surely have attended local synods of the undivided Reformed Church in Latin-rite territory; however, we do not find in attendance, with one or two exceptions, the congregations or persons mentioned in Part II. For the period after the definitive schism, there are records of Unitarianizing local synods being held in Byzantine-rite territory — in Łańcut (Landshut), palatinate of Ruthenia, on 14 June 1567, in Iv'e, palatinate of Vilnius, from 20 to 26 January 1568, and in Lask, palatinate of Vilnius, in 1578. Into the second and third periods a number of recorded local and general synods of the Minor Reformed Church were held in Byzantine-rite territory, some because the Unitarians were heeding the urgent suggestion of Nicholas Radvila, subsidizer of their Bible of 1563 published in Brest (Berestia, Brześć). Thus, as we shall see, the Minor Church in the Ukrainian lands, in the Grand Duchy as truncated in 1569, and in Little Poland continued to maintain the fiction and often the substance of Commonwealth-wide general synods, whereas the more numerous Major Church tended to become more a congeries of regional synods.

For the second and third periods, in particular, it is difficult to distinguish Ukrainian from Polish personalities on the Ukrainian lands, partly because the Ukrainian nobility, like the Lithuanian, appropriated Polish and readily used Latin in conversation, correspondence, and official documents; there was, moreover, much intermarriage between aristocratic Poles and Ukrainians, particularly in Ruthenia and Volhynia. On the history of Unitarianism in the Ukraine there are local Ukrainian and

Polish archival sources, including synodal records, and brief but confused accounts.⁴⁹

There was a relatively high number of Unitarian churches founded on estates in the Ukraine before the destruction of Raków. The Tribunal of Lublin regularly brought, as assessors and litigants, nobles from all the Byzantine-rite palatinates to that partly Protestant town (Lublin did not have a Catholic cathedral until the nineteenth century). Until 1627, Lublin had both a large Calvinist and a large Unitarian congregation and

⁴⁹ The Life of Wiszowaty and the Vindication of Stanislas Lubieniecki, both of which contain material bearing on Unitarianism in the Ukraine, are printed as two of seven documents at the end of the invaluable bibliography, *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum* (hereafter *BA*), ed. by Benedict Wiszowaty, Jr. (Amsterdam, 1684; facsimile ed. by Lech Szczucki, Warsaw, 1967), with an index of proper names. Both appear as documents in my *Polish Brethren, 1601-1685* (Missoula, Montana, 1978), and will be referred to in that connection. Among the Ukrainians whom Lubieniecki mentions are Andrew Sukhodols'kyi in Pisky (Piaski), kinsmen Peter and Paul, both of Kholm, Prince Janus Zaslav'skyi, and Prince Ladislas Zbaras'kyi. *BA*, pp. 283-85.

The records of the Reformed Church from 1550 to 1570 have been edited by Maria Sipayllo, *Akta synodów różnowierczych w Polsce*, 2 vols. (Warsaw, 1966-72). A convenient summary of the disparately located and printed allusions to, or records of, the Minor Church is to be found in the well-documented and indispensable article by Stanisław Szczotka, "Synody Arian polskich od założenia Rakowa do wygnania z kraju (1569-1662)," *Reformacja w Polsce* (hereafter *RwP*), 7-8 (1935-36): 21-100. Sipayllo mentions two local Unitarianizing synods before Szczotka's first entry in Raków in 1569; she also provides the fact that the two Major Reformed district synods, of Ruthenia and of Volhynia, were set up at the general synod of Sandomierz in 1570 (*Akta synodów różnowierczych*, 2: 271), and the fact that Radvila's proposal for a pan-Commonwealth synod was adopted at Węgrów in 1565 (*Akta synodów różnowierczych*, 2: 197). That the idea was proposed earlier is based on the letter of John Utenhove to Calvin, 27 January 1559; *Opera Calvini*, vol. 17, cols. 417f. In this same letter Utenhove reported that Senator John Tarnowski had recently proposed the elimination of bishops from the Upper House of the Diet on the grounds that their primary oath was to the pope rather than to the king. More on this appears in my "The Polish-Lithuanian Calvin," *Festschrift for Ford Lewis Battles*, ed. by Brian Gerrish (Pittsburgh, 1979), ch. 11.

Zenonas Ivinskis, who had a Catholic viewpoint and a mastery of the primary sources and the secondary literature in all languages, including Lithuanian, limits himself almost wholly to ethnic Lithuania, "Die Entwicklung der Reformation in Litauen bis zum Erscheinen der Jesuiten (1569)," *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 12 (1967): 7-45, with a rich bibliography. Marcell Kosman, *Reformacja i Kontrreformacja w Wielkim Księstwie litewskim . . .* (Wrocław, etc., 1973), and in his bibliographically multilingual "Badania nad Reformacją w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim (1919-1969)," *Odrodzenia i Reformacja w Polsce* (hereafter *OiRwP*), 16 (1971): 141-64, confines himself largely to ethnic Lithuania and Belorussia. The collectively edited *Monumenta Reformationis Polonicae et Lithuanicae*, in several incomplete series and volumes (Vilnius, 1911, 1913, 1915, 1925), deals mostly with the Church of the Unity (the Czech Brethren) in the areas indicated and with other confessions only in connection with federal union (Vilnius, then Sandomierz, 1570); it has little information relevant to Protestantism in the Ukrainian parts of the Grand Duchy before 1569.

outlying fellowships, and it stood almost on a par with Raków as an intellectual center of Unitarianism. Thus, it was surely the principal point for the dissemination of Unitarianism eastward on the territory partly harrowed by the Muscovite Judaizers (Part I: B). Raków was where many sons of the founders of Unitarian churches in the Ukraine were educated, along with the sons of Catholic, Calvinist, and Unitarian nobles. George Chaplych, founder of the church in Kyselyn in Volhynia, and Stephen Nemyrych, founder of the church in Cherniakhiv in the palatinate of Kiev, sent their sons to study there. As students, Alexander Chaplych and George Nemyrych traveled in the West with Andrew Wiszowaty, grandson of Faustus Socinus, and Peter Sukhodols'kyi in 1631.⁵⁰ There were many less notable close contacts between the sons of Ukrainian aristocrats and the intellectual leaders, lay and clerical, of Unitarianism in Little Poland. What attracted the Ukrainians, parents and sons, to Unitarianism was no doubt its simplicity, its openness to the new sciences, its stress on education and printing,⁵¹ and, indeed, its cosmopolitan character — all so markedly different from the confessional and organizational confinement of Lutheranism and, to a lesser extent, of Calvinism. It is possible that the "high" Christology of the Socinians, which beheld the ascended Christ as King of the Cosmos, had some subliminal appeal to once Orthodox aristocrats who would have remembered the *Christos Pantocrator* on the ceilings of Orthodox churches, where icons of the Trinity, by contrast, were uncommon. It is possible, too, that believers' baptism by immersion had a certain appeal to those acquainted with baptismal immersion in Orthodoxy and with the magnificent Epiphany rite on frozen rivers recalling Christ's baptism in the Jordan. Also, the social gospel of Unitarianism was attractive to some families, notably the Chaplyches, who released their serfs from taxes and socage upon conversion to Unitarianism.⁵²

⁵⁰ BA, p. 231; *Polish Brethren*, doc. I, no. 81. A few hundred Ukrainians studied at foreign universities in the sixteenth century and in the first half of the seventeenth. Domet Oljančyn, "Aus dem Kultur- und Geistesleben der Ukraine," *Kyrios* 3 (1937): 264-78, and 4 (1938): 34-66.

⁵¹ Łukasz Kurdybacha stresses this motif in *Z dziejów pedagogiki arianńskiej* (Warsaw, 1958), pp. 157-59. For Protestant presses in the Grand Duchy, as geographically defined by the Union of Lublin, 1569, see Maria Topolska, "Książka na Litwie i Białorusi," *OiRwP* 21 (1976): 145-64; she dates the first Protestant press in Brest to 1553 and in Vilnius to 1574.

⁵² Wacław Urban, *Chłopi wobec reformacji w Małopolsce w drugiej połowie XVI w.* (Cracow, 1959), p. 59, citing a decree of the Tribunal of Lublin of 18 May 1644. Earl Morse Wilbur, *The History of Unitarianism: Socinianism and its Antecedents* (Cam-

In 1581 the Ukrainian nobleman Valentine Nehalevs'kyi, at the urging "of many learned and pious people who love the Word of God and do not understand Polish," translated into Ruthenian and published in Khoroshiv in Volhynia the version of the New Testament (*Novyi Zapovit*) prepared by the Unitarian pastor in Lublin, Martin Czechowicz (Cracow, 1577). The introduction, the commentary to the original, and the translation have a Unitarian thrust. A Unitarian church and school were founded at Hoshcha in Volhynia by Gabriel Hois'kyi in about 1600. The school was directed, successively, by Theophilus Mlynarz, Daniel Duroski, Solomon Paludius (1616-20), and Albert Caper.⁵³ The ministers in Hoshcha were all Poles: Christopher Morzkowski (by 1606), Andrew Lubieniecki (until 1609), Samuel Niciecki (by 1612), and Christopher Stoiński (in 1618).⁵⁴ The church itself was probably not dispersed until 1644. It was there that the future False Demetrius (*Lzhedmitrii*) was educated by Matthew Twardochleb and was rebaptized a Unitarian! There was a Unitarian church on the estates of Prince Ostroz'kyi at Ostroh and at Starokostiantyniv before 1608. The churches in Liakhivtsi and Seniutovychi were founded in 1608 by Lord Paul Christopher Seniuta. His son, Peter, became co-pastor of Liakhivtsi with John, the eldest of the three Stoiński brothers. Peter Morzkowski was catechist in the same church in 1619 and was ordained pastor there in 1625. During his ministry at Liakhivtsi, the future compiler of the learned *Politia*

bridge, 1945), makes the same claim for the Chaplych family, p. 456, fn. 2; but the references to original sources do not fit. See, however, Orest Levitskii (Levyts'kyi), "Sotsinianstvo v Pol'she i Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii," *Kievskata starina* 2 (1882): 217. At the Union of Lublin the Crown and Polish nobles extended labor service (*śocage*: *panskhychyna*) to peasants in Crown lands, who thereby became more and more like serfs, increasingly bound to the soil and to service (up to several full days a week). There had been a more highly differentiated aristocracy in the Byzantine-rite portion of the Commonwealth (three classes) than in ethnic Poland (where all members of the *szlachta*, despite great differentiation in actual power based on property, were theoretically equal). Under Polish influence there was in the Ukraine a tendency to conceive of the aristocracy as one fraternity of lords, despite the retention of traditional titles, and a tendency to reduce the two town and village classes (again three groupings) to one. In the intermingling and intermarriage of Poles and Ukrainians and in the spread of Calvinism and Unitarianism in this fluid social situation there is some indication that the Unitarians were more considerate of the lower classes than the Calvinists or the Orthodox lords before their adoption of Protestantism.

⁵³ Caper may have been the son of a German minister at Śmigiel. Cf. Robert Wallace, *Antitrinitarian Biography*, 3 vols. (London, 1850), 3: 10ff. The first minister of the Brethren at Śmigiel, John Krotokowski, had been a Judaizer in the sense, at least, that he had preached only from the Old Testament and refused to adore Christ until forced to do so by the Synod of Raków in 1580.

⁵⁴ Lubieniecki, *Historia*, p. 277.

ecclesiastica (see p. 199) seems to have conducted himself provocatively, especially between 1624 and 1638, toward the local Catholics, thus enraging the Dominicans. He took occasion at funeral services where non-Unitarian relatives and friends were present to press Unitarianism; he preached expressly against the Dominicans; he ridiculed priests carrying the Host to the sick; he encouraged his students to stone and destroy the local wayside crucifix; and he had called for the martial success of the Lutheran king Gustavus II Adolphus in the Swedish Phase of the Thirty Years' War (1630-35), in the hope he would be elected to succeed King Sigismund III Vasa (1587-1632).⁵⁵

It might be intercalated at this juncture — somewhat out of chronological sequence — that, despite confessional animosities and mutual recriminations, the only Unitarian martyr (in the technical sense of one put to death for his heretical faith by order of church or state) in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was a formerly Orthodox burgher of Biłsk (Bielsk) in Podlachia named Ivan Tyshkovych.⁵⁶ He was executed in 1611 by order of the royal court in Warsaw during the absence (1610-12) of King Sigismund, who was fighting on the eastern front against Muscovy.

The church in Cherniakhiv, with school attached, was founded in the palatinate of Kiev by Stephen Nemyrych, father of the famous George already mentioned, by the year 1610. The rectors of this school appear to have been Germanic in background: Bartholomew Woch, the Prussian John Debel, and the Silesian Paul Myślik. In 1637 a certain Ferberinus and in 1641 Ferdinand Leisentritt were appointed to the rectorship by the synod.⁵⁷

It is at this point that we should connect George Chaplych with his many relations and forebears, some Orthodox, some Unitarian.⁵⁸ Earlier (Part I: B) our account dealt with the boisterous freethinker, horseracer, litigant, and protector of "Judaizers," Kadian Chaplych, as well as his

⁵⁵ Janusz Tazbir, "Jak IMC Pan Sieniuta z Dominikanami wojował," *Mówią wieki*, 1971, no. 12, based on manuscripts in the library of the Polish Academy of Sciences at Kórnik.

⁵⁶ *BA*, pp. 203-206.

⁵⁷ The list of rectors is from Lubieniecki, *Historia*, p. 277. On Leisentritt see Stanisław Szczotka, "Synody arian polskich," *RwP* 7-8 (1935-36): 70, 83.

⁵⁸ Most of the ensuing information on the Chaplych families derives from several entries in *Polski słownik biograficzny* (hereafter *PSB*) (Cracow, 1935-), 4: 166a-172b, by Kazimierz Chodynicki, who cites monographs and sources but does not pull together the family history, as I have tried to do here. A major monograph, based on the Chaplych family archives at Shpaniv, since lost, is that of T. J. Stecki, *Z boru i stepu* (Cracow, 1888).

brother Peter. Kadian had four sons, one of whom, Theodore (d. 1611), remained Orthodox. This son became judge of Luts'k, attended the Synod of Brest, and signed a protest against the union of October 1596. He participated in the Protestant-Orthodox Colloquy of Vilnius in May 1599, and was elected one of its "provisors." John, the son of Kadian (or his brother Peter), became prefect of Luts'k (1565-69), castellan of Kiev, and deputy to the palatine tribunal of Kiev in 1597. While still Orthodox, he was chosen a provisor at the Colloquy of Vilnius in 1599, and subsequently became a Unitarian.

Theodore Chaplych, who had remained Orthodox, also had four sons, of whom two — the oldest, Martin, and the youngest, George — became Unitarians. Martin was sent to study at the academy of Nuremberg at Altdorf, where a crypto-Socinian circle of professors and students had long existed. He published his dissertation, *Positiones de principatu* (1597), there and then went on to the University of Basel, matriculating as a "Polonus," and published a new thesis, *De virtute morali* (1579). After the death of their Orthodox father, in 1612, George built a walled church and established a college in Kyselyn, while Martin founded a church and school at Beres'k (Berestko, Beresk). George and Martin attended the Synod of Raków in 1612, and signed a letter urging the Calvinist and Unitarian congregations in Lublin to federate in mutual defense. In 1616, at the dietine of Luts'k, deputy Martin, though now a Unitarian, defended the Orthodox. In 1618 and again in 1623, George Chaplych took part in the synod at Raków. In 1623 he and his brother Martin gave two hundred florins for the purchase of publishing materials to propagate the Unitarian faith. Both Chaplyches were deputies at the Convocation Diet of 1632 that led to the election of Ladislas IV Vasa (1632-48), where they protested against the restrictions placed on Unitarians. Martin Chaplych's seat was Beres'k, where he died between 1633 and 1638. His estate passed to his sons, Andrew and Alexander.⁵⁹

C. Unitarianism in the Ukraine, 1638 to 1648: The "Golden Age"

George Chaplych outlived his younger brother Martin into Unitarianism's crisis year in the Commonwealth, that is, 1638. In that year the Diet of Warsaw approved the destruction of Raków and, by strong implica-

⁵⁹ BA, p. 236; *Polish Brethren*, doc. 1, no. 90.1. It was Martin's son Alexander who traveled with Andrew Wiszowaty, George Nemyrych, and Peter Sukhodols'kyi in 1631; see above, fn. 50.

tion, made the restraint of Unitarianism a matter of policy in the Commonwealth. Thereafter some students, professors, and printers from Raków took refuge in Kyselyn. Under the patronage of George Chaplych and other Ukrainian noblemen, its school became the intellectual center of Unitarianism in the Commonwealth for nearly a decade.

The first act of the afflicted Unitarians was to prepare a joint parliamentary protest. At least some Orthodox as well as Calvinists and Czech Brethren among the senators and deputies joined the Unitarians. Thus, the Confederation of Vilnius of 1599 was expanded, and now included the following Unitarians: George Nemrych of Cherniakhiv, deputy of Kiev; Alexander Chaplych of Halychany, deputy of Volhynia; Andrew Chaplych-Shpanovs'kyi; George Chaplych; Prince George Chetvertyns'kyi, deputy of Volhynia; Gabriel Hulevych of Voityn, deputy of Volhynia; Tobias Ivanyts'kyi of Ivanychi; and Stephen Liniewski, judge of the castle at Volodymyr.⁶⁰

The Unitarians' second step was undertaken alone, after the fateful diet, at the Synod of Kyselyn in May 1638. Deputy George Nemrych of Cherniakhiv appealed to the Calvinist grand duke Christopher II Radvila in a letter of 28 October 1638, urging him to head the common defense of the religious rights of all dissidents within the Commonwealth. Other signatories were Lords Alexander, Andrew, and George Chaplych-Shpanovs'kyi and Tobias Ivanyts'kyi, and Pastors Christopher Lubieniecki, Christopher Stoiński and Jonas Szlichtyng.⁶¹ While awaiting a response during that year, Nemrych founded churches at Shershni and Ushomyr in the palatinate of Kiev and improved his school at Cherniakhiv.

George Nemrych was a remarkable and unusual Ukrainian leader. His Orthodox grandfather, Andrew, lord of Cherniakhiv and judge of Kiev, was converted to Unitarianism by his wife, a member of the Khrep-tov family.⁶² Their son, Stephen, studied at Altdorf and Basel (as did Martin Chaplych), returned to marry the Unitarian Martha Voina-

⁶⁰ These and many more names are given in a seventeenth-century note to Lubieniecki's *Vindication*, *BA*, p. 278. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 283, fn., in reference to the times of Henry of Valois and Stephen Batory, where it says that two Ukrainians, openly not Unitarian, supported the inclusion of Unitarians in the *pax dissidentium*: Prince Basil Constantine Ostroz'kyi and Roman Hois'kyi of Hoshcha, castellan of Kiev and captain of Volodymyr.

⁶¹ The letter is published with a preface in *Polish Brethren*, doc. 21. For more on the letter and the synod of May see V. Lypyns'kyi, "Arians'kyi soimyk v Kyselyni na Volyni v maiu 1638," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* 96 (1910): 41-57.

⁶² Lubieniecki, *Historia*, p. 277.

rovs'ka, and became chamberlain of Kiev and captain of Ovruch. The oldest son of Stephen and Martha Nemyrych, George was born in Volhynia about 1612. After receiving an education like his father's, he enrolled at the newly prestigious academy at Raków before going on his academic tour of 1631–1632. After returning to his estate, he recruited, at his own expense, German mercenaries for the Polish-Muscovite war (1632–34), but was ordered by King Ladislas IV (1632–48) to fight under Crown Grand Hetman Stanislas Koniecpolski along the Moldavian border. Under Koniecpolski he also fought against Gustavus II Adolphus in Pomerania.

After his return from the wars, George married the Unitarian Elizabeth Słupecka, daughter of the castellan of Lublin. Through his mother-in-law he became related to several members of the Leszczyński family. In 1637, just before the fateful Decree of Warsaw of 1638, Nemyrych, as deputy-assessor-elect at the Crown Tribunal in Lublin, had valiantly arranged for a debate between the Polish Brethren, who had been driven out of town in 1627, and the Jesuits. In 1640, Deputy Nemyrych doggedly submitted at the Diet of Warsaw a renewed protest against the parliamentary decree against Raków, but failed to rally sufficient Calvinist support.

Before continuing the extraordinary account of Nemyrych, let us pick up the other threads of Ukrainian Unitarian history. George Chaplych, with much help from other nobles, transformed his school at Kyselyn into a new Raków during the decade after 1638. The rectors of Kyselyn, after expanding from the relocation of several members of the dissolved Raków community, were, in succession: ⁶³ Eustace Kysil' (Gizelius; rector in 1634–38), who continued to teach and write even after being synodally excommunicated for the extreme views in his writings (not specified); ⁶⁴ Peter Stegmann (Tribander; 1638–40); ⁶⁵ Theodore Simon of Lüneburg in Holstein (Philip Cosmius; 1640); and Louis Hohleisen (1640–44). Two rectors had written important works before being called to Kyselyn. Kysil'

⁶³ Lubieniecki, *Historia*, p. 277.

⁶⁴ On Kysil' see *BA*, pp. 138, 143; *PSB*, 8 (1959–60): 19.

⁶⁵ The elder Joachim Stegmann was minister in Mark Brandenburg and became rector of Raków (1626–30). He had two sons, Joachim, Jr. and Christopher; Wallace, *Antitrinitarian Biography*, 3: 60, 66ff. He also had three brothers — Christopher, Lawrence, and Peter. Lawrence was the last rector of Raków (1634–38). Stanisław Tync mistakenly, I think, calls Lawrence a brother of the antecedent rector Stegmann, "Zarys dziejów wyższej szkoły Braci Polskich w Rakowie 1602–1638," Stanisław Cynarski, ed., *Raków: ognisko arianizmu* (Cracow, 1968), p. 148. In any case, both Lawrence and Peter Stegmann of Kyselyn disguised themselves by transposing their surnames into Greek.

had published a Greek translation of *De imitatione Christi* (Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, 1626) and a Polish *Antypologia* (Cracow, 1631). The latter was dedicated to Archimandrite Peter Mohyla of Kiev and was directed against the *Apologia peregrynaczej do krajów wschodnich* (Lviv, 1628) written by the theological, philological, and literary personage and now archbishop, Meletius Smotryts'kyi of Polotsk (Polatsk).⁶⁶ Smotryts'kyi (ca. 1578–1633), son of the first rector of Prince Ostroz'kyi's college at Ostroh, had studied under the Jesuits in Vilnius without becoming Catholic, visited German university towns and absorbed the Protestant spirit, and returned to Ostroh in 1607 to teach Latin and Greek. In 1609 he removed to Vilnius, there identifying himself with the school of the Orthodox brotherhood and opposing the Union of Brest. The point of Kysil's *Antypologia* was to disclose to Mohyla and his academy the degree to which Smotryts'kyi, as the defender of Orthodoxy, was propagating "Protestant" ideas of the very kind that Unitarians also opposed (predestination, etc.). The other literary rector of Kyselyn was Cosmius, who before coming to his post had published an anti-papal, Lutheran *Retractatio* (1630). Cosmius was rector for only a year, but remained active in the college thereafter.

As early as 1640, the Catholic prelates Bishop Andrew Bembecki of Luts'k and Dean Stanislas Urbanowicz of Volodymyr contended that Lord George Chaplych, patron of Kyselyn, was in effect going against the royal decree of 1638 by reviving Raków in his town. Eventually, by litigation in the palatinate court and, later, in the Crown Tribunal of Lublin, the two prelates succeeded in having the school ordered closed by 1644, although George Chaplych defiantly kept it open until his death about four years later.

In 1643, the theological leader of Unitarianism, Andrew Wiszowaty, was assigned as colleague to John Stoiński in Shershni, then under the patronage of Stephen Voinarovs'kyi, master of the royal hunt in the palatinate of Kiev. Wiszowaty swiftly became a de facto superintendent of the Unitarian churches in all the eastern palatinates under the Crown. At the behest of Nemyrych, he even crossed the Dnieper to carry out his mission in Orel;⁶⁷ at the time, Nemyrych compared him to St. Andrew, the legendary apostle to the proto-Slavs and patron of Byzantium. In 1644 Wiszo-

⁶⁶ On Smotryts'kyi see Mykhailo Vozniak, *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury* (Lviv, 1921), p. 61 and passim; cf. also L. Ie. Makhnovets', *Ukrains'ki pys'mennyky* (Kiev, 1960), pp. 547–54.

⁶⁷ *BA*, p. 236; *Polish Brethren*, doc. 1, no. 90.

waty was transferred as pastor to the new church in Halychany under the patronage of Alexander Chaplych, to the church of Ivanychi under the patronage of Tobias Ivanyts'kyi, and to the churches of Kyselyn and Berestechko. In 1648 Wiszowaty married Alexandra, the daughter of the Polish knight Joachim Rupniewski, the deceased pastor of Beres'k. Their first son, Benedict Wiszowaty, became editor, in Amsterdam, of some of the most important writings of the Brethren, including the *Life* of his father in *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum* and Stanislas Lubieniecki's *Historia*.

John Ciachowski, the grandson of George Schomann (author of the first *Catechesis* of Raków, 1574), was himself an alumnus of Raków and became minister in Tykholm under Lord Paul Christopher Seniuta.⁶⁸ The synod in 1642 appointed him to be pastor of several churches in Volhynia, while living at the home (near Volodymyr) of Peter Sukhodols'kyi, steward of Kholm. Ciachowski also served as domestic chaplain to Lady Sukhodols'ka till 1649.

An important Pole in the Ukraine at this time was Samuel Przypkowski. Like George Nemyrych, he had traveled and studied in the West, and was theologically conservative and non-pacifist.⁶⁹ After returning from studies in Amsterdam, he entered the service of Grand Hetman Christopher II Radvila. In 1632 he had settled in Doilid (Dojlid) in Podlachia. He was a signatory of the appeal to the Calvinist grand hetman at the Synod of Kyselyn in 1638. About 1640 Przypkowski acquired estates in the palatinate of Kiev and took an active part in its dietine, which in due course elected him deputy to the Diet.

After 1638, when the center of Unitarianism in the Commonwealth shifted from Raków and Lublin to the palatinates of Ruthenia, Volhynia, Kiev, and the Land of Kholm, annual general synods were held on Byzantine-rite territory much more frequently than before. Kyselyn was then a village (half its inhabitants Jewish) of only seventy-two households,⁷⁰ thus markedly less populated than most other places chosen for the annual synods. However, it did have a walled church, and, as was already mentioned, a major demarche to make common cause with the Calvinists took place at a synod there in 1638.

At the Synod of Kyselyn in 1639, Jonas Szlichtyng was asked to pre-

⁶⁸ Szczotka, "Synody," p. 84.

⁶⁹ Ludwik Chmaj, *Samuel Przypkowski na tle prądów religijnych* (Cracow, 1927). Translations of these writings of Przypkowski appear in *Polish Brethren* together with bibliographical material.

⁷⁰ Tazbir, "Na ziemiach ukraińskich," p. 100.

pare what would have become the Ukrainian counterpart of the Racovian Catechism, namely, a *Confessio fidei*, which was to be a much more conservative statement of faith, highly scriptural and structurally based on a profusely annotated Apostles' Creed.⁷¹

At the Synod of Kyselyn in 1640, Szlichtyng was charged further with assembling a suitable collection of sermons based on Scripture, presumably to be read or adapted by less trained ministers for use in smaller churches. The same synod decided to send Martin Ruar to Gdańsk (Danzig) with the mission of persuading Philip Còsmius to become the rector of Kyselyn. Kysił himself, a learned man, was for unspecified reasons found theologically or otherwise so unsatisfactory by the more conservative in Kyselyn as to be excommunicated, although he was later reinstated. To lure Cosmius to come to Kyselyn the synod offered him four hundred florins a year. The theological mentality of the synod is shown by the fact that the assembled Unitarians even asked Cosmius to prepare for republication the *Retractatio* of 1630, in which Cosmius "set forth the causes why the author, disregarding the Roman Pontiff, has again embraced the pure doctrine of the Law and Gospel, laid down in the Augsburg Confession." Cosmius did the reworking, for which he received an emolument at a subsequent synod.⁷²

The Synod of Piaski held in 1641 on the eastern edge of the palatinate of Lublin called for the translation into Greek of *De uno Deo Patre* (Raków, 1631), the most important single work of the theologian John Krell (Crellius).⁷³ The task was assigned to Cosmius, who received a hundred florins for the translation. A copy was taken personally by John Stoiński to Kiev, presumably to the now Orthodox metropolitan Peter Mohyla (1633-47), who was also still head of the Kiev academy.

In 1642 Kysił translated into Greek the *Janua Linguarum* by the bishop of the Czech Brethren of the Commonwealth and Hungary, John Amos Komenský (Amsterdam, 1642, 1649, etc.). The synod held in Czarków (today, Czarkowy) in 1642 was the first in five years to meet clearly west of the Commonwealth's Byzantine/Latin-rite boundary; Czarków was, in fact, near Cracow. The synod authorized Wiszowaty to become minister in Piaski in the hope that his friendship with Pastor Peter Sukhodols'kyi would help bring round the still Calvinist members of the Sukhodols'kyi

⁷¹ Szczotka, "Synody," p. 81.

⁷² On the original *Retractio*, see BA, p. 143; on the invitation to become rector, see Szczotka, "Synody," p. 82.

⁷³ Szczotka, "Synody," p. 82.

family. The synod also received from Szlichtyng the Confession commissioned earlier and had it scrutinized by a learned committee of three.⁷⁴

At the Synod of Siedliska (Selyshcha) held in the Land of Kholm in 1643, Szlichtyng informed the delegates that he was beginning a work called *De statu impiorum post mortem*, in which he would modify the view of Socinus on the resurrection of the righteous only and admit to a general resurrection and judgment of the righteous and the wicked.⁷⁵ Stanislas Lubieniecki — the minister, historian, diplomat, and astronomer — presented a new *Catechismus*, which he urged the synod to translate and publish in Greek with an eye toward making it available to seminarians at Mohyla's academy in Kiev. In the literature this *Catechismus* has survived as the *Compendiolum doctrinae Ecclesiae Christianae nunc in Polonia florentis* (1630).⁷⁶ It is of interest that neither a Greek nor a Ruthenian translation of the Racovian Catechism was proposed.

In 1644, the Synod of Siedliska agreed to send delegates to the projected Colloquium Charitativum in Toruń at the call of the king and the Catholic hierarchy. Meantime the Three Confessions of Sandomierz, meeting in their first general synod of the seventeenth century, at the Calvinist Church in Orlia in Podlachia, were hesitating, because they had formed their Federation and Consensus in 1570 against the Catholics as well as, of course, the Unitarians. The Unitarians, however, were eager to send the delegates chosen at Siedliska, namely, Jonas Szlichtyng, Martin Ruar, and Christopher Lubieniecki. These delegates were not received at the postponed meeting at Toruń in 1645,⁷⁷ where they had come expecting to present Szlichtyng's Confession, authorized by the Synod of Kyselyn in 1639, as their statement of faith.

⁷⁴ Szczotka, "Synody," p. 83. The Confession was published in Latin by Szlichtyng at his house in Wroćmirowa in 1642. The rare work appears in English translation in my *Polish Brethren*, doc. 22.

⁷⁵ No such work is listed in the *BA*, but the change in Szlichtyng's view from that of his grandfather Socinus is known from the Confession and from the final revision of the Racovian Catechism (Amsterdam, 1665–80), to which he contributed identifiable notes. In accepting a general resurrection and judgment for the wicked, Szlichtyng may have been moving not only in the Arminian, but also in the Orthodox direction, making common cause with them against the Catholics in opposing Purgatory.

⁷⁶ The title comes from Friedrich Samuel Bock, *Historia Antitrinitariorum* . . . , vol. I, pt. 1 (Königsberg and Leipzig, 1774), p. 451, who dates the work to 1630 and says it has been ascribed to Christopher Ostorodt (d. 1611) or to Stanislas Lubieniecki (d. 1633), great uncle of the historian. Szczotka, "Synody," p. 84, says only that it was a *Catechismus*, without implying it was written by the Lubieniecki who urged its translation.

⁷⁷ Szczotka, "Synody," p. 81.

By the time the annual synod met in Żulina (probably near Lublin) in 1645, the Unitarians were much distressed by a book in Polish which had come out the year before addressed to all Protestants. Entitled *Brotherly Warning to "Dissidentes de Religione"* and written by a Cistercian publicist of Cracow, it called into question the Confederation of Warsaw of 1573 and its *pax dissidentium*. The synod asked Samuel Przypkowski, already well established on his new estates and in the dietine in the Kiev palatinate, to prepare a reply. The result was *Braterska Deklaracja, i.e., Fraterna Declaratio ad non fraternam commonitionem* (text in Polish, revised by Christopher Lubieniecki; Bukowiec, 1646), which Przypkowski wrote under the protection of the Lithuanian prince John Kishka.⁷⁸

The synods at Dazhva (Dązwa) in Volhynia in 1646, 1647, and 1648 were characterized by incredible optimism, as the lay and clerical representatives discharged the business of the whole Minor Church of the Commonwealth — authorizing major publications, dispatching missionaries, and establishing contacts with Holland and Transylvania. The Synod of Dazhva of 1646 is notable for having authorized Pastor Peter Morzkowski, ordained in Liakhivtsi in 1625, to prepare a substantial *Politia ecclesiastica*.⁷⁹ One must marvel at the library at the author's disposal in Kyselyn, and at the extent to which Morzkowski described church practices vividly and sanctioned them with profuse scriptural, patristic, scholastic, and classical Reformation quotations and citations. Some of the practices described may well reflect the Ukrainian as much as the original Polish background, notably the stress on six orders in the Church, the solemnity of believers' baptism by immersion, and the eucharist, marriage, and burial rites.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ BA, p. 124; Wallace, *Antitrinitarian Biography*, 3: 31 and 2: 348, gives the succession of printers, two of them surnamed Kmita, who worked under the protection of Kishka and then the Radvilla family without referring to the place of publication.

⁷⁹ Of this *Politia* there exist a polemically edited version by G. Oeder (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1754) and a manuscript brought out of Kyselyn and preserved in the Unitarian Collection of the archives in Cluj, Rumania. The manuscript was only recently discovered by Janusz Tazbir. The table of contents of the published version and three important sections of the learned and highly illuminating book constitute doc. 23 of *Polish Brethren*.

⁸⁰ In Europe generally the Reformed churches did not make much of the ceremony of marriage. In the Commonwealth the Minor Reformed had, by comparison, a rather elaborate ceremony, which incorporated some perhaps indigenous customs. It was surely beautiful as described by Morzkowski in the *Politia*. The bride and groom clasped each other's hand, symbolic of physical union, while the pastor laid his right hand over theirs, invoking the Spirit to join with the couple as one. Then the groom and the bride's mother presented golden rings, which the pastor blessed as symbols of

Some information on the institutional aspect of Unitarianism in the Ukraine is provided in a register written by Deacon Peter Lubieniecki and by John Gieźanowski for the yoked churches of Kyselyn and Beres'k from 1632. It shows that the pastor annually received between two and three hundred florins with gifts and perquisites, and that there was much eleemosynary activity.⁸¹

Two annual synods took place in a certain Rashkiv (Raszków), quite probably at a town by that name on the left bank of the Dniester River below Iampil', a relatively safe site just across the river from the Ottoman protectorate of Moldavia.⁸² In 1649, the synod again made an appointment to a church in ethnic Lithuania, assigning Gratian Kurosz (or Kurowski) to Kedainiai (Kiejdany) (1649-53).⁸³ Kurosz had presented the synod with a compendium on congregational discipline, "*De emendatione coetuum*," but its publication was not approved. George Durosz was named minister of the yoked churches of Ivanychi and Halychany. In 1650 pastoral appointments were made for Gdańsk and Łusławice, and for as far east as Kiev. The reprinting of Krell's *De uno Deo Patre* brought about the censure of Daniel Zwicker for defending Krell without submitting his arguments to the synod.

The annual synod met twice in Czarków.⁸⁴ In 1651 there was further discussion by those present of a small catechism written in either Latin or Polish. The synod also fussed over several references to translations from or into German, but, strangely, said very little about Ruthenian; at most, Greek was mentioned. In 1652 Wiszowaty presented for assessment his

rich purity and eternity in mutual fidelity. The service also included spiritual songs and a nuptial homily based on Scripture.

Burial, too, was generally very simple in the Reformed Church throughout Europe, often without the pastor present unless as mourner. The practice of the Polish Brethren may have been simplified even more, due to their belief in the death of the soul with the body pending resurrection. They often buried their deceased on estates rather than in consecrated cemeteries and often used no markers — a simplicity which offended their Catholic and Orthodox neighbors; however, their pastors were recorded to have delivered eulogies in many cases. The evidence on burial is scanty and may well have varied according to region, period, and class.

⁸¹ Janusz Tazbir, "Kisielińsko-bereski zbór Braci Polskich," *Przegląd Historyczny* 57 (1966): 126-36.

⁸² Szczotka, "Synody," pp. 90ff. The Synod of Żulina appointed one minister, a certain Ladenbach, for the same Lithuanian town at the request of its owner, Wojciech Arciszewski: *ibid.*, p. 86. There are several ethnically Polish towns by the name of Raszków, but none in a likely location; it is almost certain that the reference is to the site, south of Yampil', which is now submerged by a Soviet dam at Dubossary.

⁸³ Kosman, *Reformacja i konireformacja*, p. 241.

⁸⁴ Szczotka, "Synody," pp. 91-93.

Annotationes in universum Novum Testamentum to a synodal committee of two, while Daniel Zwicker presented his *Mysterium Trinitatis*, in both Latin and German versions, to a committee of three. Peter Morzkowski presented his revised *Politia ecclesiastica* for similar assessment. The synod requested Szlichtyng to prepare for publication "de ratione instaurandae cum Evangelicis [Calvinists] unionis," which, it seems, never came out. Interest was shown again in Kedainiai and for the first time in Taurage, both places in ethnic Lithuania where a certain Hesichów (Hesychius) was a worthy but needy pastor.⁸⁵ A number of pastoral assignments were enacted.

In 1653 the annual synod was back on mixed Latin- and Byzantine-rite terrain, in Siedliska. Its most notable act was to send another three hundred florins to John Krell, Jr., who, having spent three years studying in England, was requested to return home. At the Synod of Czarków in 1654, Morzkowski's *Politia ecclesiastica* was again approved after thorough scrutinizing by a committee of two. These annual synods represented the entire Unitarian community in the Commonwealth.

It was the synod held in 1655 at Rashkiv, where the brothers Christopher and John Krell, Jr., had served as pastors, that made the important decision to publish a psalter in both Polish and Ruthenian and to translate Szlichtyng's Confession into Ruthenian.⁸⁶ Nicholas Cichowski, S.J., whose attacks had already been fielded by several synods, said in his *Manes Slichtingiani seu Trutina Vindictiarum Confessionis Socinianae Varsoviae exustae editarum* (Cracow, 1659), that the Confession "was rampaging to the great peril of Christian souls throughout Volhynia and [the Kiev palatinate of] the Ukraine."⁸⁷ Cichowski himself did not know of any version of the work other than that burned in Warsaw by the public hangman. This synod at Rashkiv, which met during the first year of the Swedish War (1655-60), reflected the political and military strains of the time.

The uprising led by Hetman Bohdan Khmelnyts'kyi that began in

⁸⁵ Szczotka, "Synody," p. 95; Wallace, *Antitrinitarian Biography*, 3: 27.

⁸⁶ The inaccessible Jesuit work is noted by Adam Jocher, *Obraz . . . literatury i nauk w Polsce*, 2 vols. (Vilnius, 1840, 1842), 2: 535. The Confession does not appear in Fedir Maksymenko, *Kyrylychni starodruky ukrains'kykh drukaren', shcho zberihaiut'sia u Lvivs'kykh zbirkakh (1574-1800)* (Lviv, 1975). Levitskii, "Sotsinianism," p. 497, intimates that the Confession might well have appeared in Ruthenian. My sources, besides Jocher, are BA, p. 143, and Szczotka, "Synody," p. 95.

⁸⁷ Jocher, *Obraz . . . literatury i nauk*, 2: 535, excerpts page 8 of Cichowski's works, where the Jesuit made this claim even before a Ruthenian version of the Confession could have been available.

1648 — the year of the election of John Casimir Vasa (1648–68) — was a religio-ethnic and social war of Orthodox Cossacks and Ukrainian peasants against the ruling classes, many of whom were Poles or Polonized Ukrainians. Religiously it was directed against Catholics, especially the "traitorous" Uniates, Protestants (perhaps particularly the Unitarians) and Jews. The uprising was extended by the agreement of the Cossack Council at Pereiaslav in 1654 to collaborate with the Muscovite tsar in common with the Swedes against the Commonwealth. The Ukrainians considered the agreement of Pereiaslav an alliance and the acknowledgment of remote suzerainty; the Russians viewed it as a submission of the Cossacks and Ukrainians to Muscovite sovereignty.

During the joint Cossack and Muscovite inroads into the Commonwealth, reaching to Vilnius and Lublin, the Polish families settled in the Ukraine and the Polonized, i.e., Catholicized or Protestantized, Ukrainian aristocracy and gentry looked to the Swedish invaders for help. Their situation was dire, and even many Orthodox landowners suffered at the hands of the Cossacks.

Among the Unitarians, George Nemyrych was discharging a series of leadership roles. Since defending the Unitarians at the Diet of 1640, he had been in personal difficulty, despite being the second greatest landowner in the palatinate of Kiev and its vice chamberlain. Although his position was confirmed in 1641 by royal charter, Nemyrych was harassed for his religion by the palatine of Kiev, Janus Tyshekevych, and ordered to close all the Unitarian churches on his vast estates. In the meantime, he had joined the Calvinist grand duke Janus XI Radvila (1640–55) to secure the election of Sigismund, younger son of George I Rákóczy of Transylvania, in return for general religious toleration; but Ladislas's half-brother, papally dispensed former Jesuit Cardinal John Casimir Vasa, was elected instead, in 1648.

After the swift success of the Swedish king Charles X Gustavus, claimant to the Polish throne, Nemyrych surrendered to the king's representative, General Robert Douglas. Nemyrych went on to conquer Cracow, at the time the haven of many Unitarian refugees. In the Jewish suburb of Kazimierz he and Alexander Chaplych joined Stanislas Lubieniecki in a parley with Charles, seeking a new basis for religious toleration in the Commonwealth under the Lutheran conqueror.⁸⁸ His

⁸⁸ The diary of the historian Stanislas Lubieniecki has been partially published by Janusz Tazbir, "Diariusz Stanisława Lubienieckiego," *OiRwP* 5 (1960): 201–221, especially 221.

boldest move was, at length, to renounce Unitarianism. In his now lost *Skrypt*, Nemyrych called for all Protestants to join the Orthodox as truly apostolic. The *Skrypt* was refuted, in Polish and Latin, by Samuel Przypkowski's spirited *Responsio*.⁸⁹

Nemyrych proposed to the new Cossack hetman, Ivan Vyhovs'kyi, a plan for the reunification of the Ukraine with the Commonwealth as "the Grand Duchy of the Ukraine" (the address, in Polish, also referred to the *naród ruski*). With Crown Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Grand Duchy would be a component of a constitutionally reconceived Commonwealth, in which Nemyrych would be chancellor. Under the plan, only Orthodoxy and Roman-rite Catholicism would be licit religions, so the Uniates would be obliged to choose one or the other rite and jurisdiction. The plan was agreed to at Hadiach in 1658 by the Crown's plenipotentiaries. Although also called the Duchy of Ruthenia, the new entity included only the palatinates of Bratslav and Kiev and the palatinate of Chernihiv above Kiev on the left bank of the Dnieper. Nemyrych tried, unsuccessfully, to defend and enlarge his plan in a speech at the Diet in 1659.⁹⁰ Shortly afterwards, while heading a Cossack unit, he was slain by his own people, who suspected him of being too Polonized.

During this period of cruel warfare against Protestants and Catholics, including Uniates, the Unitarian synods resumed their meetings. In 1658, the same year as the parliamentary decree of banishment of Unitarians as "Arians or Anabaptists" within three years on pain of death or conversion to a licit religion,⁹¹ the annual synod convened in two discrete meetings, one at Czarków, of which nothing is known, and the other at Dazhva, which almost fatuously charged John Arciszewski with having published two of John Krell's works, *Commentarium in epistolam ad Romanos* and *Tractatus de Spiritu Sancto*, the latter having been discussed and approved at earlier synods.⁹² On 22 March 1659, the Diet shortened the period of grace to two years, requiring all Unitarians out of the Commonwealth by 10 July 1660. Now, should they conform, it could only be to Catholicism. The synod held in Czarków in 1659 dealt with the Unitarians' plight as best it could.

⁸⁹ The *Skrypt* can be reconstructed only from the refutatory *Responsio*, *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, vol. 9 (Amsterdam, 1692).

⁹⁰ An English translation is given in *Polish Brethren*, doc. 28. The Polish text is in J. Danezkowicz Ostrowski, *Swada polska i łacińska* (Lublin, 1745), pp. 140-42.

⁹¹ At first Unitarians were permitted to join any licit Church; from 1660 they would be required to convert to the Roman Catholic Church.

⁹² Szczotka, "Synody," p. 96.

Although some Unitarian lords in the Ukraine had treated their peasants well and several had freed their serfs upon conversion to Unitarianism, they were as much the object of the wrath of the Orthodox peasants and Cossacks as all other nobles. For one thing, most Unitarian landlords and their bailiffs were indistinguishable from their Orthodox, Catholic, or Protestant contemporaries, despite their faith's strong exhortations to social righteousness. However, Unitarian congregations did survive in Babin (Bobin, near Koszyce), Cherniakhiv, Dazhva, and Kyselyn even as late as 1658. And when Alexander Chaplych-Shpanov's'kyi, for instance, had to leave his last estate at Zboroshchovo in 1660, among his peasants, whom he had long before freed, "there was not weeping but wailing," reported a Calvinist lord observing the scene, himself moved to tears by the sad spectacle.⁹³

The very last synod or assembly of the Minor Church took place in 1662, perhaps under the protection of Prince Boguslas Radvila (1620-69), governor general (1657-69) of Ducal East Prussia for the Great Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick William. It would appear that this synod met in Podlachia (before 1569 a palatinate of the Grand Duchy) at Zabłudów in Byzantine-rite territory ten miles south of the famous Orthodox monastery of Suprasl. It is possible that the spirited *Vindiciae pro Unitariorum religionis libertate*, known to have been composed by Stanislas Lubieniecki, was delivered there by Samuel Przyppkowski before Orthodox, Catholic, and Calvinist lords.⁹⁴

After the Treaty of Oliwa and the implementation of the decree of banishment, both in 1660, no Lutheranism and scarcely any Calvinism remained in the Ukraine, in contrast to their continued existence in Belorussia. The Unitarians escaped to Transylvania, East Prussia (lost as fief of the Crown by the Treaty of Oliwa), Silesia, other parts of Germany, and, notably, to the Netherlands.

D. Ukrainian Unitarianism

The register of the Kyselyn and Beres'k congregations and a manuscript copy of Morzkowski's *Politia ecclesiastica* were among documents

⁹³ Tazbir, "Na ziemiach ukraińskich," p. 117.

⁹⁴ That there was such a synod somewhere in the Commonwealth is stated by Szczotka, "Synody," p. 97, with sources adduced. The *Vindiciae*, preserved in *BA*, pp. 265-96, and translated as doc. 29 of my *Polish Brethren*, is clearly the work of Lubieniecki. But it may well have been delivered by Przyppkowski, as suggested by Bock, *Socinianismus*, I: 699. Cf. Chmaj, *Przyppkowski*, pp. 71 ff.

carried to Cluj.⁹⁵ Most of what is known about Unitarians in the Commonwealth was published by exiles, especially in East Prussia and the Netherlands, among whom were Jonas Szlichtyng and Andrew Wiszowaty. The result has been a tendency to interpret the Commonwealth's Unitarianism in light of what came to be the most assimilable aspects of Socinianism there, namely, as a forerunner of Deism. However, it was not that, either in ethnic Poland or in Polonized and Ruthenian Ukraine. Unitarianism regarded itself as the Minor Reformed Evangelical Church — unitarian, immersionist, and presbyterian — in which the annual mixed synod of laymen and clergy had enormous control over preaching, teaching, writing, printing, and mutual disciplining.

Once its center in the Commonwealth shifted from Little Poland to Volhynia — more particularly, from Raków to Kyselyn — did Unitarianism acquire any Ukrainian features? I believe that Unitarianism did, indeed, absorb some faint but distinctive Ukrainian traits, due to the many works commissioned, printed, reprinted, and translated into Ruthenian or Greek, and the related actions of the synods.

The Unitarians' strong yearning for the recovery of apostolic Christianity made them feel some kinship with the Orthodox, especially in Byzantine-rite territory. For unlike the Roman Catholics in ethnic Poland, the Orthodox observed communion in both kinds for the laity, approved married priests, organized themselves in brotherhoods, upheld near autocephaly with regard to the metropolitan and patriarch, and controlled their bishops through lordly members and brotherhoods. The two religious groups had a common enemy in Roman Catholicism and its eastward extension, the Uniate Church. The several translations of Unitarian and other works, like *Imitatio Christi*, into Greek, suggest that the Unitarians really hoped to win over not only the Orthodox aristocracy, but also the few theological intellectuals rallying around the archimandrite and metropolitan, Peter Mohyla. The amount of Unitarian liturgical, devotional, canonical, and theological material translated into Ruthenian was not great, but one must keep in mind that the primary diplomatic, commercial, and literary languages of the Commonwealth were Latin and Polish: even major Orthodox apologies were written in Polish, and the language of Mohyla's academy in Kiev was Latin.

The second trait of Unitarianism in its Golden Age under Ukrainian

⁹⁵ Hungary was largely reunited after its tripartition in 1699 by the Treaty of Karlovac (Karlowitz), when the Commonwealth regained southeastern Ukrainian lands lost at Buchach (Buczacz) in 1672.

protection was theological conservatism. Three of Socinus's distinctive points were abjured, muted, or altered. Even the Catechism of Raków of 1605, though it came to be printed in four languages besides the original Polish, was never translated into Ruthenian; although not the work of Socinus, it was directly inspired by his Racovian colloquies. Yet the Catechism was in effect replaced by Szlichtyng's Confession, a scripturally annotated Apostles' Creed, which upon publication in Latin in 1642 became the official standard of Unitarianism in the Commonwealth. This Confession, over against the Racovian Catechism of 1605/08/09, espoused believers' immersion and called the Lord's Supper the solemn Eucharist (of *Politica ecclesiastica*). It modified Socinus's eschatology to accommodate a general resurrection and last judgment of the wicked as well as the righteous. The Confession also moved somewhat closer to the Arminian view of the Atonement without wholly obscuring some of Socinus's essential asseverations. Szlichtyng went beyond Socinus in exalting the ascended Christ as a veritable *Christos Pantocrator*, although still wholly human. Perhaps the Greek patristic concept of the Second Adam as *Christus victor et regnans* influenced Szlichtyng in an Orthodox environment. His Confession, authorized by the Synod of Kyselyn in 1639, was then chosen to be taken to Toruń for the abortive Colloquium Charativum (1644/45) as more representative of their scripturally Protestant and "high" Unitarianism and as more acceptable to other Protestants and perhaps to Catholics than the Racovian Catechism. This Confession is, in any case, one of the few major documents known to have been authorized for translation and publication in Ruthenian (1655). In light of the information given above (Parts I: A and I: B) it is of note that the Unitarians after 1638 centered synodally in the Ukraine were never obliged to defend themselves against charges of either "Judaizing" or "freethinking."

Another characteristic of Unitarianism in the Ukraine (also in the Grand Duchy) was the virtual abandonment of other-cheek pacifism. In the Ukrainian milieu the feeling spread that the pacifism of early Raków, akin to that of the Hutterites and the Mennonites, and of Socinus himself in casuistically camouflaged forms, should be abandoned in the parlous times and hazardous regions in which the majority of Unitarians now found themselves. The Polish lord Samuel Przytkowski and the Volhynian noble George Nemyrych had no qualms about fighting directly against Moscow or the Cossacks or, in the case of Nemyrych, indirectly against the Commonwealth. The principal Unitarian theologians, like Szlichtyng and Wiszowaty, moved cautiously toward approving defen-

sive wars. Administratively, Volhynia and the palatinates to the east had belonged to the Grand Duchy before their separation by the provisions of the Union of Lublin. It seems that the Unitarians of Volhynia and of the eastern palatinates continued to feel themselves part of the Grand Duchy. In the synods after 1638 more than before, Unitarianism was regarded as a unit, running not only east to west, from ethnic to Crown Poland, but also north to south. Many decisions reached by general synods in the Ukraine dealt with pastoral appointments, subventions, etc., for churches in the Grand Duchy. Because "Lithuanian" Unitarianism was under the abiding influence of Budny and was "realistic" on the issues of office-holding and defensive war, a pan-Commonwealth outreach was easier for Unitarian synods convening on territory that formerly belonged to the Grand Duchy.⁹⁶ Since the Czech Brethren and even the Calvinists had not been notably strong in the Ukraine, Protestantism can be said virtually to have ended in the Ukraine by 1660. Afterwards, only Roman-rite and Uniate Catholicism and Orthodoxy lived, however uneasily, side by side on Ukrainian lands. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, by contrast, Calvinist and Lutheran churches survived even the dissolution of the Commonwealth.

The charges of Judaizing among certain Ukrainian nobles that had emanated from the Pseudo-Kurbskii circle in Belorussia (Part I:B) were not repeated during the decade 1638-1648, when Volhynia was the principal center of Unitarianism in the Commonwealth. Indeed, some Volhynian families that had earlier been pilloried as Judaizing came to espouse Unitarianism, which might be what their religious enemies had originally feared. Yet neither in the Reformed nor in the Orthodox context did the later Unitarians need to defend themselves against such charges in synod or elsewhere. It is likely that the Catholics and Orthodox, who were often related by intermarriage and had a common, largely Byzantine-rite environment, made little distinction between the Calvinist

⁹⁶ Hiador Sztipszky (Stryps'kyi), "Ukránia és az unitarizmus," *Keresztény Magvető* 50 (1915): 89-99, 150-62, likewise points out that after 1638, when Unitarianism came to center synodally in palatinates once under the Grand Duchy, it tended to be more concerned with the Unitarian church to the north than when most of the synods had been held in Little Poland, 1565-1638. While Unitarianism centered in the Ukraine continued to adore Christ (against Budny), it did take over without debate Budny's positive view of magistracy and defensive war (against Socinus). It fully recovered believers' baptism by immersion (against Socinus) to the extent that the Minor Church had ever really heeded its own Catechism of Raków of 1605. The Catechism still showed the influence of Socinus (d. 1604) who had opposed baptism of any kind (except for converts from Islam and Judaism, largely hypothetical).

and the Unitarian Reformed. The Unitarian Brethren in the Ukraine, in synod with those still living in ethnic Poland, tempered the charges against the Budnyites in Belorussia, who were, in fact, Judaizers in one of the five senses given at the outset of our discussion (Introduction).

It is unlikely that in the seventeenth century Unitarians in the Ukraine were called Judaizers by the Orthodox and the Uniates as their predecessors had once been. The Orthodox may have become more tolerant because the Unitarians had become somewhat less radical on Ukrainian soil and were known to favor the Orthodox in the great Catholic versus Orthodox controversy that developed after 1596.

IV. PROTESTANTISM IN OTHER UKRAINIAN LANDS

A few words should be said about two Ukrainian regions which were never part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth but once belonged to Hungarian or Hapsburg domains: (1) Carpatho-Ukraine, which was the third Slavic constituent of Czechoslovakia from 1918 to 1945; and (2) Upper Bukovyna, which was attached to Austria-Hungary from 1775 to 1918 and then became part of Rumania until 1945.

We know very little about Protestants of any kind in these two areas during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The sources make little distinction among the various Protestant confessions. In any case, they seem to have been written by Germanic colonists who seldom communicated their views to the surrounding Slavs. We can only surmise that in the late sixteenth century a few Hutterite colonies hived off from Moravia into the Byzantine-rite portions of Hungary and Transylvania now part of the Ukraine's Transcarpathian oblast' or into the eastern palatinates of the Commonwealth. We do know that one major Moravian communitarian Anabaptist Hutterite leader, Ulrich Stadler, established a Hutterite colony ca. 1536 in Krasnets', near Volodymyr; his several letters from there are signed "Ladomir aus Podolien."⁹⁷

It has been proposed that in the Carpatho-Ukraine during the late sixteenth and the seventeenth century a majority of the local population under Calvinist and possibly Unitarian lords were for a time Protestant.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Lydia Miller, ed., *Glaubenszeugnisse oberdeutscher Taufgesinnten* (Leipzig, 1938), pp. 232, 235; Ewa Maleczyńska, "Ulrik von Stadler," *Przegląd Historyczny* 60 (1959): 473-85.

⁹⁸ Vasyľ Hadžega, "Vplyv reformatsii na podkarpatskykh rusynov," with a Hungarian summary, "A reformáció hatása a kárpataljai ruszinokra," *Zoria/Hajnal* 3 (1943): pp. 5-50. See also Aleksei L. Petrov, "Otvuk reformatsii v russkom Zakar-

This seems scarcely to comport, however, with the rivalry between Hapsburg Upper Hungary and Transylvania in this area before the reunification of Hungary in 1699, when it would have been in the interests of the Hapsburgs and the Transylvanians to compromise by making Uniates of the Ukrainian population in the contested territory. The Czech Brethren entered eastern Slovakia and some Hutterites were invited there not only to colonize, but also to preach to the Slovaks, notably the former priest Leonard Lochmaier in Szpolna (Spolná) and Oroszlánkő (Ruská Luka).⁹⁹ There seems to have been no Czech Brethren or Hutterites in Subcarpathia. No reliable information about Protestants in Bukovyna is available for this period.

The Mennonites, who had established themselves at the mouth of the Vistula by 1535 and later throughout Royal and Ducal Prussia, had their leader, Menno Simons, among them almost as long as did their co-religionists in the Netherlands. In the sixteenth and the seventeenth century the Unitarians sought fraternal relations with the Mennonites, but every overture was turned back. The Mennonites rapidly expanded upstream and founded a settlement near Warsaw, possibly during the last years of the Commonwealth. They settled in Volhynia in large numbers, mostly after the partitions. The whole of modern Ukraine was a major attraction to Mennonite settlers primarily after 1789, although the communitarian Anabaptists had at least one Bruderhof in Vyshen'ka, up the Desna River from Kiev, by 1770.

During the eighteenth century Protestant migration into the Ukraine became much more extensive. It did not, however, significantly affect the indigenous Ukrainian populations, as had the presence of the Czech Brethren, the Lutherans, and particularly the Major and Minor Re-

pat'e XVI v.," in *Materialy dlia istorii ugorskoï Rusi*, vol. 8 (Prague, 1923), which deals with the Niahiv sermons on the gospels. See text, p. 190.

⁹⁹ The Hutterites, who were later called, in Hungarian, *Habans*, the Italian Unitarians, and the Czech Brethren in Moravia and Slovakia, especially as represented by their porcelain and other crafts, are dealt with by Maria Horvath-Krisztinkovicha in "Wiedertäufer und Arianer im Karpatenraum," *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 3 (1971): 46-68. She deals with a later period and another region in "Die verschollene Keramik der Bartmennoniten in Russland (Ukraine)," *Keramos*, 1972. Her father, Bela Krisztinkovich, deals with Anabaptists and unitarian Sabbatarian (Judaizing) Anabaptists — e.g., Andrew Fischer, whom Queen Isabelle the Jagiellon's chancellor Jerome Łaski (older brother of John Łaski) tolerated at his residence in Kežmarok in Slovakia — in "Glimpses into the Early History of Anabaptism in Hungary," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 43 (1969): 127-41; but again there is no clear lead into Ukrainian Carpathia.

formed Churches in the period from the mid-sixteenth through the seventeenth century.

Harvard University

III

Francis Stancaro's Schismatic Reformed Church, Centered in Dubets'ko* in Ruthenia, 1559/61-1570

GEORGE H. WILLIAMS

INTRODUCTION

On 14 March 1560 John Łużyński, Reformed pastor in Cujavia, informed John Calvin of the death on January 8 of John Łaski, who had been superintendent of all the Reformed churches of the Commonwealth from Great Poland into Podolia, 1556-1560. During the course of his brief reforming career in his native land, John Łaski had had to cope with the onsets of two theological schisms in the Reformed church that after his death would cross over the internal Byzantine/Latin-rite boundary in the largest European state of the sixteenth century.

Of the two emerging theological schisms, the better known is that of the Minor Reformed Church of the eventually fully unitarian "Polish" Brethren, completed between 1563 and 1565. In 1638, after the destruction of Raków in Little Poland, its intellectual center became Kyselyn (Kisielin) in Volhynia.¹ The slightly earlier and also shorter-lived schism was the Stancarist Reformed Synod, 1559/61-1570. Largely Polish in leadership and constituency, this schism began its brief existence in Byzantine-rite territory, with a school and seminary centered in Dubets'ko (Dubiecko).²

It was about the second schismatic church that Łużyński wrote to Calvin in March 1560, after appealing to him to write something further

* The western parts of the Palatinate of Ruthenia are presently within the boundaries of the People's Republic of Poland. Where identifiable, I have given placenames there in Ukrainian, with the Polish equivalent in parentheses at first occurrence.

¹ See my "Protestants in the Ukraine during the Period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2, no. 1 (1978):41-72; and no. 2 (1978):184-210, especially 192-97. The present essay is devoted to what was mentioned there but briefly (*ibid.*, p. 186).

² Andrzej Węgiński, *Libri quattuor Slavoniae Reformatae* (hereafter *Slavonia Reformatae*), 2nd ed. (Amsterdam, 1679; facsimile ed. by Janusz Tazbir, Warsaw, 1973), p. 126.

against Francis Stancaro (1501–1574).³ Łużyński's letter to Calvin continued:

From among ours, although they were even as it was scarcely ours, there are two [lords] in Ruthenia (*Russia*) especially, but not these last by their names, who are supporters and promoters of Stancaro, besides some others, Papists, who were once even ours, but who, having once adored Satan, turned and now join themselves to him again that they may find something half way between ours and the church of the Pope.⁴

Łużyński was perceptive, for the Stancarist "church" was not to be formalized until a year later. We shall presently identify the promoting patrons, but now let us review some dozen years of the neglected history of a form of Protestantism that penetrated into the Ukraine and Belorussia, although it did not involve many patrons or pastors of Orthodox antecedents.

Stancaro appears to have belonged to a converted Jewish family of Mantua. In any case, he was an accomplished Hebraist.⁵ He mastered the Talmud and the Cabala, and he argued with the Talmudists and Italian Anabaptists that the Messiah, son of Joseph, and the Messiah, son of David, were identical, and that Jesus was that Messiah anticipated by Isaiah who would come at his Second Advent in glory as the Son of David, as predicted by other prophets.⁶

Although converted to the Reformed version of Protestantism, Stancaro did not accept such distinctively classical Protestant emphases as original sin, the bondage of the will unto salvation, or ineluctable election or reprobation. Yet, he is remembered primarily as the exponent of the view that Jesus Christ was Mediator in his human nature alone and not in his divine nature. Stancaro at first assumed that the principal Reformers

³ The literature on Stancaro is extensive. I cite only the most recent works, with antecedent literature: Lorenz Hein, *Italienische Protestanten und ihr Einfluss auf die Reformation in Polen [to 1570]* (Leiden, 1974), chap. 3; Theodor Wotschke, "Francesco Stancaro," *Altpreußische Monatsschrift* 47 (1910): pp. 1–78; Francesco Ruffini, *Studi sui Riformatori Italiani*, ed. by Arnalda Bertola et al. (Turin, 1955), pp. 165–361 [reprinted from several installments in *Ricerche Religiose*, vols. 8 [1932] and 9 [1933]].

⁴ Johannis Calvin, *Opera omnia* (hereafter *OC*), 59 vols. (Braunschweig, 1863–1900), 18, no. 3168, especially col. 25.

⁵ The evidence for his ethnic Jewish antecedents has not yet been published by Italian scholars.

⁶ G. H. Williams, "Two Strands in Italian Anabaptism ca. 1550," in *Social History of the Reformation: In Honor of Harold J. Grimm*, ed. by Lawrence P. Buck and Jonathan W. Zophy (Columbus, Ohio, 1972), pp. 156–207. For the ancient Jewish beginnings of the idea of the Messiah ben Joseph, not originally a suffering warrior, see Joseph Heinemann, "The Messiah of Ephraim and the Premature Exodus of Ephraim," with the literature, *Harvard Theological Review* 48 (1975): 1–15.

were on his side, but later he found that Philip Melanchthon and then Henry Bullinger and John Calvin all came around to the view that Christ by office was Mediator in both natures, and that, indeed, Christ was Mediator before the incarnation and that *qua* Mediator he was inferior to the Father, with whom he achieved redemption by suffering through his Person in two natures. Yet Stancaro knew very well that according to the "asymmetric" Christology in Greek Orthodoxy which had been slowly refined after the Council of Chalcedon in 451, the One Person or Hypostasis in Two Natures of Chalcedon had become expressly identified with the Second Hypostasis of the Trinity. Stancaro considered himself faithful to the Greek and Latin fathers — even those antedating Chalcedon, like Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine — and then notably to Peter Lombard, schoolmaster of all schoolmen, who wrote: "Christ can be called Mediator only according to his humanity, not according to his divinity."⁷ The problem of Christ the Mediator crested among classical Protestants about 1550. It was particularly acute for Lutherans in Königsberg and Frankfurt, the university cities of Ducal Prussia and the Mark of Brandenburg, respectively, and in the Reformed church of the Commonwealth.

Stancaro had come north prepared to teach Hebrew, and his first employment was as a professor of that subject in Vienna. When his adherence to the Reformation became known, he had to leave his post. Thereafter, he successively published a Hebrew grammar, acquired a doctorate in theology at Basel, and moved on to Cracow, where he was again immediately engaged as a professor of Hebrew at the Jagellonian University. Once his Evangelical views became known to the bishop, however, he was imprisoned at Lipowiec. There he composed, among other pieces, his *L. Canones* for the Reformation of the Commonwealth. Peter Negri liberated the Mantuan Hebraist, who was received by the deputy chamberlain Stanislas Lassocki and the poet Andrew Trzecieski, Jr. Stancaro then went straightaway, surely by previous agreement, to Lord Stanislas Matthew Stadnicki in Dubets'ko.⁸ Stadnicki had become a "Lutheran" under the influence of Felix Cruciger (Krzyżak, d. 1563) of Shchebreshyn (Szczepreszyn) near Kholm (Chełm), pastor of his village of Medvid' (Niedźwiedź). The lord in turn converted the priest of Dubets'ko, Albert of Ilża, forming a congregation there ca. 1546. Stadnicki

⁷ *Libri sententiarum*, II, dist. xvii, 7; J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (hereafter *PL*), XXII, cols. 797f.

⁸ Węgierski, *Slavonia Reformata*, p. 228.

became a strong supporter of the Reformed church and, eventually, one of the two major patrons of Stancaro as schismatic.

Stancaro soon left Stadnicki's home for that of Lord Nicholas Oleśnicki, owner of Pińczów. A synod was held in Pińczów in October 1550, which Gregory (Orszak) Orsatius (ca. 1520–ca. 1567) attended, and where Stancaro proposed, as the basis of reformation, the *Reformatio* of Electoral Archbishop Hermann von Wied of Cologne. It was provisionally accepted as the proposal least upsetting to tender consciences.⁹ Thereafter Oleśnicki drove the Pauline monks from their church,¹⁰ and made of it the house of worship for the first Reformed congregation in the Commonwealth (25 November 1550), organized under Stancaro. His first Commonwealth patron, Stadnicki, along with those who had helped him escape from Lipowiec, participated in the Lord's Supper, solemnized by the former priest, Jacob Sylvius.

Another protégé of Lord Stadnicki was Martin Krowicki (d. 1572), possibly of Krowicka, near Belz in Ruthenia. Krowicki had upon ordination to the Latin priesthood received two livings, one of which was in Sudova Vyshnya (Sądowa Wisznia); it was there that the dietine of the palatinate of Ruthenia took place in which he participated. In the diocesan synod of Peremyshl' (Przemyśl) of 13 December 1550, Krowicki, having been won over to the views of the Ruthenian Latin-rite priest Stanislas Orzechowski (see below), argued for communion in both kinds for the laity, for optional marriages of priests, and for the validity of Orthodox baptisms. Later, in December 1550, Krowicki became the first Latin-rite priest in the Commonwealth to be married — by a village vicar with the unwitting permission of the rector of Perevors'k (Przeworsk). Afterwards, the stern Latin-rite bishop John Dziaduski of Peremyshl' summoned Krowicki for trial. At this point Lord Stadnicki intervened to protect Krowicki, who later succeeded Stancaro as castle chaplain to Oleśnicki in Pińczów (1551–53) and went on to matriculate at Wittenberg.¹¹

⁹ Maria Sipayllo, *Akta synodów różnowierczych*, 2 vols. to date (Warsaw, 1966–), 1:2. On Orsatius, rector (*didascalus*) of the first Reformed school in the Commonwealth at Pińczów and translator of postils and part of the Old Testament into the vernacular, see Stanisław Bodniak, "Grzegorz Orszak," *Reformacja w Polsce 7–8* (1935–36): 1–20; Henryk Barycz, *Polski słownik biograficzny* (hereafter *PSB*), vols. A through O (Cracow, 1935–), 24:260–63. Orszak seems to have been of German ethnic origin.

¹⁰ The Pauline Monks, named after Paul the Hermit of Nitria, had their origin in the Kingdom of Hungary in the eleventh century and in Poland during the time of Louis the Hungarian. Their first cloister in the Commonwealth was on Jasna Góra above Częstochowa. *Podręczna encyklopedia kościelna*, 64 vols. (Warsaw, 1904–1915), 30: 395–404.

¹¹ Henryk Barycz, "Krowicki," *PSB* 15 (1970): 350–53.

A royal edict of 12 December 1550 made it necessary for Stancaro to go to the university at Königsberg. He spent the early spring of 1551 with the Lutheran Lord Andrew Górka, and arrived at the university in May with letters to Duke Albert from Górka and from Queen Isabelle of Hungary-Transylvania. We cannot pursue the controversialist through his argumentation and peregrinations in Ducal Prussia and Brandenburg. When Stancaro reentered the Commonwealth, he went first to Lord Abraham of Zbąszyń (Bentschen), who had Hussite antecedents, and then to Lord Jerome Filipowski of Krzęcice, who expended some hundred florins in having Stancaro's *L. Canones Ecclesiarum Polinicarum Reformationis* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1552) translated and published (Cracow, 1553). A cartful of the publication was drawn to the Reformed synod at Słomniki on 25 November 1554, where, according to a hostile reporter, twelve presbyters and many nobles "elected Stancaro pope, and others they made into bishops, others archdeacons." Because Stancaro had been proscribed by royal decree and because the *Canones* used such expressions as "we ordain, we decree," Stadnicki with others was successful in having the cartful of books burned "out of fear of the king." Nonetheless, the *Canones*, without ascription to Stancaro, were accepted as the new constitutional and sacramental basis of the emerging Reformed church.¹²

Stancaro left the Commonwealth in November 1554 to spend almost five years in Hungary-Transylvania. On his second visit to the region he aroused further controversy within the Lutheran church in Transylvania and found himself opposed on the issue of the Mediator by, among others, Francis Dávid. Stancaro composed a *Collatio*, comparing the doctrine of Melanchthon and his followers, such as Dávid, with that of Arius. As put forth in a parallel column, the position of Arius was drawn from Augustine's *Contra sermonem Arianorum*.¹³

Meanwhile, in the Commonwealth John Łaski had come to head the Reformed church (December 1556 to January 1560), eschewing the title of "superintendent" but acting as "the pope" of Protestantism, according

¹² On Stancaro's activity in Great Poland in towns west and north of Poznań, see Hein, *Italienische Protestanten*, p. 80. The hostile account is that of Canon Stanisław Górski of Cracow to Bishop Stanisław Hosius, 6 January 1555; *Epistolae*, 5 vols., ed. by Franz Hipler and Wincenty Zakrewski (Cracow, 1886), 2: no. 1317. This information supplements Sipaytlo, *Akta*, 1:3, 4. Only fragments of a single copy of *L. Canones* survive. The Polish version was entitled *Porządek naprawienia w kościołach naszych*.

¹³ Migne, *PL*, 42; Hein, *Italienische Protestanten*, pp. 97-99. A copy of the *Collatio* is in the Staatsarchiv in Zurich. The Transylvanian followers of Melanchthon whom Stancaro had in mind, besides Dávid, were Caspar Helt and Matthias Hebler. Dávid and Helt became Unitarians.

to a hostile observer.¹⁴ During his directorship, of the several lords destined to become prominent in the Stancarist schism, Stadnicki of Dubets'ko first reappears by name in the synodal protocols at the gathering of 9 March 1557 in Krzęcice (owned by Filipowski). It was Albert of Itza who was present with papers from Stadnicki, and who explained why, after four years as pastor there, he was leaving Dubets'ko.¹⁵ Jerome Ossoliński, owner of many properties, especially in the Palatinate of Sandomierz, first appeared at the Reformed Synod of Pińczów on 10–17 August 1557.¹⁶ Ossoliński, brother-in-law of Stadnicki and father-in-law of Drohowski (see below), was the spokesman of five lords, including Filipowski. Having long taken an anti-episcopal stance, they now also expressed dislike of ministerial controls. They demanded and were accorded the right of choosing synodal elders from among their own number. The lords also insisted on approving, separately, the *Confessio* of the Czech Brethren, which had been undergoing repeated scrutiny and revision since the arrival of Łaski, as the prospective future basis for the federation of the Czech Brethren, the Lutherans, and the Reformed in the Commonwealth. The ministers who succeeded to Ossoliński's principal seat at Goźlice were Martin Krowicki and Alexander Witrelin.

At the instigation of Rector Orsatius of the School of Pińczów, himself under epistolary pressure from Stancaro, the printer Daniel of Łęczy published the provocative *Collatio* of Stancaro (Pińczów, 1558). At the Synod of Włodzisław of 16–28 June 1559, the printer was disciplined and Stancaro's *Collatio* was burned.¹⁷ The synod asked several lords to assume the costs of printing what would appear as the Berestia (Brest) "Unitarian" Bible of 1563.

Among the lords thus singled out were Jerome Filipowski of Krzęcice and Stanislas Drohowski (Drohovs'kyi) of Iachmyr (Jaćmierz) near

¹⁴ See my "The Polish-Lithuanian Calvin during the 'Superintendency' of John Łaski, 1556–1560," *John Calvin: Essays in Honor of Ford Lewis Battles*, ed. by Brian Gerrish (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, forthcoming), chap. 8. Łaski never assumed the title of superintendent; in the protocols of the synods, however, he was always listed before the superintendent and once as *reverendus pater*. Sipayllo, *Acta*, 1:304; Halina Kowalska, *Działalność reformatorska Jana Łaskiego w Polsce, 1556–1560* (Wrocław, etc., 1969). For the hostile characterization of Łaski, see Jan Przerembski, bishop-elect of Kholm, to Hosius, Vilnius, 4 November 1557, in Hosius, *Epistolae*, no. 1872, p. 911.

¹⁵ Sipayllo, *Acta*, 1:175.

¹⁶ Sipayllo, *Acta*, 1:216–22; *PSB* 24 (1979):396–99.

¹⁷ Sipayllo, *Acta*, 1:309. Hosius refers to this: see his *Opera*, vol. 2 (Cologne, 1584), p. 655; and also Francesco Lismanino to the Zurichers, September 1559, in Theodor Wotschke, *Der Briefwechsel der Schweizer mit den Polen* (Leipzig, 1908), no. 174, p. 96.

Sianik (Sanok). We have already noted that the former took Stancaro in 1553; the latter was another supporter of Stancaro in the formal schism. Stanislas (1529–1583) was brother of Bishop John (1505–1557) Drohowski of Cujavia.¹⁸ They were sons of John Parys Drohowski and Catherine Orzechowska (baptized into the Greek Orthodox Church). After having studied in Wittenberg and Padua, Stanislas returned to the Commonwealth to become secretary to Sigismund Augustus. Through contacts in Germany Stanislas became a collector of Polish and Greek manuscripts for the Magdeburg centuriator Matthias Flacius Illyricus. In 1559 Stanislas Drohowski established a Reformed congregation at his seat, with Stanislas of Żywiec as pastor. Excommunicated by the Latin bishop of Peremyshl' in 1559, Drohowski would later become castellan in that city (1574).

THE STANCARIST FACTION IN THE SYNOD, 1559–1561

In May 1559 Stancaro entered the Commonwealth for the third and last time, going directly to Lord Oleśnicki at Pińczów. He appeared in his own defense at the Synod of Pińczów, 7/20 August 1559. The items on the agenda were: (1) the proposed condemnation of Stancaro as a Nestorian, and (2) the appeal of Ossoliński, with his pastor Alexander Witrelin, and Drohowski, with his pastor Stanislas, and other lords and pastors to allow for a debate. Stancaro had gathered works of the Fathers in the chamber of the former Pauline cloister for debate. Łaski, supported by the other clerical leaders, informed the synod that Stancaro was guilty of heresy, that Lord Oleśnicki should send him away, and that they would be committing the crime of lese-majesty if they presumed to debate dogma without royal approval. Łaski also maintained that such a discussion would jeopardize the Reformed participants in the national reform council promised by the king at the Diet of Pitorków (1555), but that they would freely dispute with Stancaro if the king granted permission.

The synod proceeded to draw up a lost *Confessio (longa)* of 19 August and the *Confessio (parva) de Mediatore generis humani* (Pińczów, 10 August 1559). The latter represents the reworking by Peter Statorius, teacher in the school at Pińczów, of the work of Caspar Helt of Transylvania and of Melancthon against Stancaro (Wittenberg, 1555). The *Confessio parva* gave prominence to the threefold office of Christ in

¹⁸ On both, see *PSB* 5 (1939–46):380–82, 388; also see the entry "Jaćmierz," in *Słownik Geograficzny* (hereafter *SG*), 15 vols. (Warsaw, 1880–1906), 3:358; Wotschke, "Francesco Stancaro," p. 141; Sipaylo, *Akra*, I, s.n.

dealing with him as the Mediator in the office of Prophet, Priest, and King. During the important deliberations, despite the stricture of Łaski, Stancaro was so loud in his raving that he could be overheard, giving Statorius the opportunity to write Calvin all about it.¹⁹

Stancaro withdrew to Dubets'ko under the protection of Lord Stadnicki, where he wrote the tract "De officiis Mediatoris." An indication of the extent of sympathy many had for the position, if not the person, of Stancaro is that the compiler of the official *Confessio*, Statorius, was charged at the gathering at Pińczów (20 November 1559) with having opposed the invocation of the Holy Spirit, whereupon he was required to draw up a statement of faith in which, among other things, he abjured the "blasphemy of Stancaro."²⁰ Yet Stancaro himself was present at the full synod two days later, where his view on the Mediator was the center of the discussion. And he could have agreed with, although he was not asked to sign, the *Responsio apologetica* of the synod, drawn up against Lord Remigian Chełmski, defending the invocation of the Holy Spirit.²¹

Łaski died in Pińczów on 6 January 1560. While awaiting the arrival of distant representatives for his burial, the leadership convened a synod there from January 13 to 16, at which the principal business on the first day was to examine carefully their *Confessio de Mediatore*. On the following day a letter was read from Lord Stadnicki, asking for a new minister: whether at Dubets'ko or at Medvid', where Sarnicki was pastor, is not clear.²² At Dubets'ko, a certain Caspar had succeeded (ca. 1558) Albert of Ilza. Most of the day was taken up with the problem of the

¹⁹ Statorius to Calvin, 20 August 1559, *OC*, vol. 17, no. 3098, col. 601, for "ad ravim." The protocol of the synod is for August 7 only: Sipayllo, *Akta*, 1:310-12, and 2:1, no. 3. However, the proceedings must have been protracted. The synod's very important surviving *Confessio*, structured in terms of the threefold office of Christ, was published by Hein, *Italianische Protestanten*, suppl. 2, with a German translation, pp. 101-104. In a letter of 1 September 1559, Francesco Lismanino told the Zurichers that Stancaro was a Nestorian because he divided Christ's flesh from the Word and placed the mediatorial reconciliation in the human nature alone. Wotschke, *Briefwechsel*, no. 174, pp. 95-97.

²⁰ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 1:313ff.

²¹ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 1:315-18. Since Stancaro preferred the invocation of the Triune God as One to any of the Persons separately, it is more probable that Chełmski and Statorius were influenced by Biandrata, who had singled out the Third Person for non-invocation. Cf. Stanisław Lubieniecki, *Historia Reformationis Polonicae* (Amsterdam, 1685; facsimile ed., Warsaw, 1971), pp. 208-211.

²² The regnant interpretation of the request is that Stanisław M. Stadnicki intended to be rid of Sarnicki at Niedźwiedź, but see fn. 23 below on Casper: Sipayllo, *Akta*, 1:256. Sarnicki complained of his rough treatment by a Lord Stadnicki at Niedźwiedź without giving the lord's Christian name, which could well have been Mikołaj. Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:2, 33, 42; and below at fn. 27.

Mediator, and a formulation by Sarnicki in opposition to Stancaro gained majority acceptance. Yet it was asserted that Stancaro had suffered injury for not having been permitted to participate in a public debate in synod on the Mediator problem. Superintendent Felix Cruciger denied this in the name of the *seniores* (clerical and lay), and proceeded to promise Stancaro the privilege of defending himself in a written statement. Out of deference to the judgments against Stancaro of the most learned divines of Germany and Switzerland, it would not be permissible, however, "to descend to debate." The majority also demanded of Orsatius that he renounce his tendency to favor Stancaro. To this Orsatius responded: "I, since I am a disciple of Stancaro, have written with Christopher Przechadzka [of Lviv] our confession, which I should like to have read by me in the face of the assembly of ministers." The Stancarist Christopher of Lviv, with the sobriquet *Peripateticus*, would appear to have had conspicuous training in Aristotelianism. Superintendent Cruciger responded that there was no need for such a reading, since the church was united on the Mediator matter, but if he should wish to be instructed further, he could submit the confession to the church's judgment. An alumnus of the Jagellonian University and an advanced Hebrew student of Stancaro, already commissioned to help translate the Bible from the original languages into Polish, Orsatius said that he nevertheless wished to present the confession of faith. This boldness did not deter the synod from urging him and the other two translators from getting on with the work of producing the Brest Bible. The problem of whether Christ mediated in both natures by office and therefore, according to the Stancarists, was inferior to the Father in his *divine nature*, or whether Christ mediated in his human nature only, was still before the synod on the last day. Besides Orsatius and Przechadzka, there were two other holdouts, namely, Martin of Lublin, pastor of Włodzisław, and Erasmus Gliczner, pastor of Chmielnik (west of Sandomierz). Martin remained favorable to Stancaro, and he eventually became minister in Dubets'ko. Gliczner mustered the strength, amidst an overwhelming majority, to say that he abominated the error of Stancaro but nevertheless had his doubts.²³

Because Pińczów was in the grip of winter, the solemn sepulture of Łaski was postponed until more personages got word of his death. Thus, there was still time for a district synod at Bychawa (near Lublin) to take place, on 14 January 1560,²⁴ at which the notables present included Lord

²³ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:1-6.

²⁴ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:7.

Nicholas Stadnicki. It was this synod's decision to send two ministers into Ruthenia (*do Rusi*) at the church's cost to help in the reformation of churches breaking away from Rome and Kiev, namely, those of Pastor Stanislas Wardęski of Bychawa and Pastor Nicholas Zhytno (Żytno) in the village of Pustotiv (Pustotew), in the Land of Kholm. On 21 May 1560, Wardęski, in his capacity as "superintendent of the Reformed churches in Ruthenia (*Russia*)," wrote to Calvin asking him to send ministers and teachers "trained in the sacred languages and in pure theology," who, by turning to Greek with an appropriate *double-entendre*, could "direct a straight path (*orthotomein*) for the Word of Truth." It is clear from the letter that Wardęski had in mind the churches and people of the Byzantine-rite, as well as the Polish gentry settled on estates among them.²⁵

By January 29 all who could be expected were gathered in Pińczów for the funeral of Łaski, which also occasioned still another, very large synod, 29 January to 2 February 1560.²⁶ On the first day Łaski was laid to rest to the accompaniment of orations in Latin by Sarnicki, Statorius, and Cruciger. On the second day, much to his discredit, Orsatius said in synod that the lips of Łaski had congealed as if in divine disapprobation of his opposition to Stancaro. The whole synod stood in suspense for the coffin to be opened to prove the falsity of the claim and interpretation.²⁷ It was agreed to pay Orsatius for his work on the translation of the Bible from Hebrew into Polish, but to dismiss him from further translation with a separation bonus of twenty marks.

At the next synod in Pińczów, 5 to 9 May 1560,²⁸ which included substantial representation from the churches of Lithuania, Podlachia, and Samogitia, George Biandrata, physician and *archpresbyterus* in high repute locally (despite Calvin's numerous attempts to expose his "tritheism," or non-philosophical concept of the Trinity based upon the acceptance of the Apostles' Creed alone and Scripture), urged the synod to demand of the owner of Pińczów, Lord Oleśnicki, that he oblige Orsatius to leave the school and town altogether. The suggestion was received favorably. Martin of Lublin was charged with Stancarism and was closely questioned.

Because of his preeminent Hebrew scholarship, Orsatius was given another chance to recant. But he reaffirmed his conviction that "Jesus

²⁵ *OC*, vol. 18, no. 3217.

²⁶ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:8-12.

²⁷ Wotschke, *Briefwechsel*, no. 184, pp. 100-102.

²⁸ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:21-26.

Christ the Son of God was Mediator in his human nature only." He was thereupon solemnly excommunicated as "a Nestorian Stancarist," and the company asked God the Father that "He bring down this miserable one that His Church might be saved from this kind of pestiferous men." It had earlier been agreed that Palatine Nicholas IV Radvila (Radziwiłł) of Vilnius be asked to defray the expenses of the publication of the Brest Bible on which Orsatius and his fellow teachers had been at work.

Before the excommunication of Orsatius, the synod decided to issue a warning to Palatine Nicholas Sieniawski of Ruthenia, captain of Halych, Bar, and Kolomyia, and his minister Thomas Chodowski of another Med-vid' (Niedźwiedź) in the region of Drohobych. They were to beware of a "fanatic" Peter Gonesius, a proto-Unitarian, lest the flocks of Christ be infested with error. The Calvinist historian Andrew Węgierski put the situation thus: "Francis Stancaro of Mantua, by his disputations concerning Christ the Mediator, provided the occasion, by which the new Arians have arisen in Poland [i.e., the Commonwealth]." ²⁹

To defend Martin of Lublin, Andrew Frycz Modrzewski, an ally of Stancaro, had written in April 1560 at Wolbórz near Piotrków his first *Liber de Mediatore*, dedicating it to the forthcoming Synod of Włodzisław. ³⁰ At the gathering of seniors in Włodzisław that met on 28 May 1560, ³¹ Martin of Lublin reappeared, on probation although still minister of the town's church. During a close examination he made a useful distinction in answering one question: "I believe that the Son of God has two natures and that he is Mediator with the Father according to the divine nature as Author, but only Executor according to the human nature." In reply to further questions he acknowledged (with Stancaro): "I believe that the Son of God is Mediator even to himself, to the Father, and the Holy Spirit, because the operations of the Trinity are indivisible." ³² Thereupon he was relieved of his office for the heresy of Nestorianism. Martin appealed to the owner of the town and church, Lord John Włodzisławski-Lanckoroński, and, in fact, remained in office.

On 3 June 1560, at Dubets'ko, Christopher Przechadzka of Lviv finished his *Okazanie* (Pińczów, 1560) in defense of the Stancarist position and dedicated it to Stadnicki. On June 9, in Geneva, Calvin finished *Responsum ad fratres Polonos ad refutandum errorem Stancari*, the first of his two major tracts against Stancaro. Presumably it was in Peremyshl'

²⁹ Węgierski, *Libri*, p. 508.

³⁰ *Opera omnia*, 5 vols., ed. by Kazimierz Kumaniecki (Warsaw, 1953-60), 4: 11-18.

³¹ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2: 21-26.

³² This is based on Augustine's *De Trinitate*, 1: 4, 7 and 5, 8.

that Orzechowski composed against "the Nestorian Stancarists" (with special reference to Stancaro's "De officiis mediatoris") and against "the Arian Pinczovians" (using Stancaro's term for Lismanino and Statorius) the imprint *De Jesu Christo Mediatore seu de Ecclesia Christiana* (1560).³³

The status of Martin of Lublin was the first order of business at the synodal assembly that met in Włodzisław on 12 June 1560.³⁴ Here Martin answered to close questioning in such a way as to substantiate Węgierski's observation that Stancarism could — or, in this case, did — lead to a kind of Unitarianism. For, responding to queries in more direct a fashion than anything Stancaro himself would have said, Martin said he could not make any distinction between the Persons, their properties, and the alleged common Essence. Accordingly, he thought that the plenitude of God — namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit — was in Christ, and that the Son did not descend from heaven, but that God had sent his only begotten son (John 4: 10) in the sense that a man, not a divine son, was born from the womb of Mary. This son of Mary emptied himself according to his humanity "for our redemption," not according to his divinity (Phil. 2: 7). Martin wanted clerical *seniores* to judge his case; but the ministers saw the matter as so clearly one of confused Sabellianism and Nestorianism that they permitted no further discussion. They declared him a heretic, and a pastoral replacement was made for his church. Martin, for his part, said he would betake himself to Stancaro in Dubets'ko.

In July 1560, Stancaro took advantage of the presence of a new papal nuncio to present himself in Cracow to Bernard Bongiovanni, and to purport agreement with Catholics in all but one (unidentified) article.³⁵ In the démarche against the majority of the Reformed, Stancaro was unsuccessful in gaining favorable Catholic attention to his church as mid-way between the Reformed and the Catholic.

It was at this time that the maverick priest, historian, and publicist, Stanislas Orzechowski (Orikhivs'kyi) (1513–1567), *gente Ruthenus, natione Polonus*, became involved in the debates about Stancaro's views. Born in Peremyshl' or nearby, on his mother's side a grandson of a

³³ The imprint has been lost. For Calvin's work, see *OC*, vol. 9, cols. 333–42. For Orzechowski's work against Stancaro's, see the annotated version of Orzechowski's Polish letter in his *Wybór pism*, p. 189, fns. 16ff.

³⁴ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:27ff.

³⁵ Letter of Sebastian Pech, bookdealer and former helper of Łaski, to Calvin, 13 September 1560; *OC*, vol. 18, no 3245. Although "the one article" was probably the propriety of clerical marriage, Stancaro's whole well-wrought system of theology and polity was "low Church" Catholicism without a pope.

Ruthenian Orthodox priest, Orzechowski had studied at Cracow, Vienna, Padua, Wittenberg, Leipzig, and Bologna. A Latin-rite priest at his father's bidding, he had defended the validity of Orthodox baptism (1544) and espoused priestly marriage (1547). In 1551, following Krowicki, he, too, was married, the ceremony performed by the former priest Martin Cruciger (brother of Felix). He defended his marriage's solemnization by a Calvinist, while still regarding himself as a Catholic. His action and defense became a *cause célèbre*, requiring the attention of the Diet. He appealed to Rome. Several times he threatened to revert to or to espouse Orthodoxy, and he wrote powerfully against usurpations in Rome (1556). After being suspended from priestly duties, he finally submitted to Rome and became a notable defender of the Commonwealth constitution of mixed polity and of Tridentine Catholicism. On 3 July 1560, with temperamental fury, Orzechowski in Peremyshl' urged Stancaro to submit to the authority of St. Peter's successor, as he had done. To this appeal Stancaro in due course replied, "The Papists are [indeed] bad, the Lutherans are worse, the Swiss and the Sabaudians [the Reformed Waldensians of Savoy] are the worst of all,"³⁶ and continued to fight the alleged Arianism of the bulk of the Commonwealth Reformed and of their Helvetian counselors. On the same day that Orzechowski wrote from Peremyshl' to Stancaro, he also wrote to Lord Nicholas Stadnicki of [Stary] Żmigród about Stancaro. It seems Nicholas and a Stanislas of Dubets'ko were sons of Catharine Tarnowska and Andrew Stadnicki, castellan of Sianik and owner of Nowy Żmigród. Together or successively the sons owned Medvid', where Stanislas Sarnicki had been pastor. In a second letter, of July 6, Orzechowski said that Nicholas went with Stancaro to Medvid' to oppose Sarnicki's charges that Stancaro erred as a Nestorian, that Sarnicki and his ilk erred as Eutychians in Christology and as Arians in Triadology, and that Lord Nicholas himself should return to the Roman fold.³⁷

Stancaro's ally, Modrzewski, after visiting Castellan Ossoliński of Sandomierz, dedicated to him a second *liber*, basically supporting Stancaro

³⁶ Letter of Pech; *OC*, vol. 18, col. 183.

On Orzechowski, see *PSB* 24 (1979):287-92; Hanna Świdorska, "Stanisław Orzechowski: The Uneasy Years, 1550-1559," *Polish Review* 8, no. 3 (1963):1-45; Józef Korzeniowski, ed., *Orichoviana: Opera inedita et epistulae Stanislae Orzechowski, 1543-1566*, vol. 1 (none other printed; Cracow, 1891). Some of these works and others edited earlier appear in whole or in part, with notes, in J. Starnawski, *Wybór pism* (Warsaw, 1972).

³⁷ Korzeniowski, ed., *Orichoviana*, nos. 76-79, pp. 497-510. The letter to Mikołaj Stadnicki in old Polish is reprinted with notes in *Wybór pism*, pp. 187-98.

and enlightening Ossoliński on the issue.³⁸ He pointed out that the ancient concept of the *communicatio idiomatum*, which had been exclusively christological in application to the exchange of properties of the two natures in Christ, had become enmeshed in the eucharistic controversies among Lutherans explaining the ubiquity of Christ; that in the course of the debate over the Mediator, it had come into its own again, in a christological sense; but that difficulties in mutual understanding had ensued, since the Lutherans and the Reformed differed so widely on the eucharist. Modrzewski urged Lord Ossoliński to bring peace to the Commonwealth and the true church by helping to minimize all differences in the face of the Papists. Like Stancaro and Orzechowski, Modrzewski was almost Erasmian (and patristically Greek) on free will unto salvation. He would later be closely associated with the Unitarian Minor Reformed Church.

In the meantime, on 9 June 1560, Calvin had completed — partly, no doubt, to please John Łużyński — his *Responsum ad Fratres Polonos, quomodo Mediator sit Christus ad refutandum Stancari errorem*. There Calvin stated:

[W]e [in Switzerland] maintain . . . that the name of Mediator suits Christ, not only by the fact that he put on flesh, or that he took the office of reconciling the human race to God, but *from the beginning of creation* he already was Mediator, for he was always head of the church [of the elect] and had primacy over the angels, and was the firstborn of every creature (Eph. 1:22; Col. 1:15, 3:10).³⁹

On 1 August 1560, Calvin dedicated the second edition of his *Commentary on Acts* to Palatine Radvila, writing a letter which opposed Stancaro and Biandrata with angry perceptiveness:

Since we will never lack plagues of this kind [of theological vagaries], and since Satan will never cease bringing forward into the front line of battle those champions who are devoted to him to throw the foremost ranks of the Gospel into disorder, we must persevere and stand ready for battle.⁴⁰

The dedication ranked the medical *archepresbyterus* Biandrata, beloved by most Reformed Poles, on a level lower than that of their avowed enemy, Stancaro, but placed both among the minions of Satan. The Reformed in the Commonwealth were disconcerted. The *Responsum* would surely be no help to persons like Lismanino and Biandrata, who were trying to escape the ancient and ominous charge of "Arianism" — a charge which Stancaro would now raise against Calvin himself and the

³⁸ Entitled *De Mediatore*, it was dated 12 September 1560. *Opera*, 4:19–30.

³⁹ *OC*, vol. 9, col. 33–42.

⁴⁰ *OC*, vol. 18, no. 3232.

rest, for he could no longer say that their writings were being locally fabricated or tendentiously edited.

A very large general synod took place in Książ from 13 to 19 September 1560.⁴¹ Among its clerical participants were Francis Lismanino, in charge, Alexander Witrelin of Goźlice, Stanislas Chrzastowski, pastor in Iazlovets' (Jazłowiec) and eventually superintendent for Podolia; Stanislas Wardęski, pastor in Bychawa and superintendent of Ruthenia, and the poet and trilinguist, Andrew Trzecieski, who replaced Orsatius on the Bible translation committee. Among the noble patrons were Lord Kotnicki of Podolia, who came the furthest distance from the east, and, though not present, Lord George Jazłowiecki (1510-1575), the patron of the above-mentioned Chrzastowski.⁴² Jazłowiecki founded a Reformed congregation in Iazlovets' on the Ol'khovets' (Olchowiec) River in Podolia in 1548, converting the priest of St. Mary Magdalene's into his Reformed pastor. In 1556 he had converted the Dominican cloister in Chervonohorod (Czerwonogród) on the Dniester River, also in Podolia, into a Reformed church. Later he would become palatine of Ruthenia and Grand Hetman of the Crown. Cruciger was elected general superintendent, with Lismanino and Biandrata as coadjutors. The general synod was divided more carefully into districts. Stanislas Chrzastowski, superintendent of Ruthenia, called for the appointment of a superintendent for Podolia, and took the occasion to condemn as abomination "the doctrine of Stancaro and Gonesius," although he would end up a repentant Stancarist. Several others also spoke out against Stancaro.

The Synod of Książ received the *Responsum* of Calvin against Stancaro.⁴³ The problem of Stancarism had been at the fore, indeed, from the opening session which restated the "common belief in Christ the Mediator." Yet, during this very synod it developed that some still truly believed that the writing of the Swiss divines against Stancaro were local falsifications. Although Lord Ossoliński had professed to agree with his pastor Witrelin against Stancarism, he later made the proposal, which carried, that there be an interim of four months during which there would be no discussion of the Mediator or of Stancaro. Meantime, it was to be ascertained without doubt what the Swiss divines really held about the man and his doctrine, and to this end the confession of the Commonwealth's church, *De Mediatore*, was to be sent abroad along with the writings of

⁴¹ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:32-68.

⁴² *PBS* 11 (1964): 121-23; *SG* 3:538ff.

⁴³ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:38.

Stancaro. On the synod's opening day, September 13, Sebastian Pech, who had delivered Calvin's *Commentary* and letter against Biandrata and Stancaro in Vilnius on August 29, reported to Calvin on the influence of Biandrata in the church of the Commonwealth, and said that questions about the invocation of the Holy Spirit and about Christology were being raised everywhere.⁴⁴

On 4 December 1560 Stancaro wrote to Wolfgang Musculus, Peter Martyr, Calvin, and Bullinger, informing them of the dangerous spread of "the Arian and the Eutychian heresy" in the Commonwealth. He said that Christopher of Lviv would explain his master's position in full; nevertheless, he went on to argue it himself, while still hoping that the Swiss divines, once alerted, would agree with him. Stancaro also said that the Pinczovian heresies had spread into Ruthenia.⁴⁵ On December 11 Lord Stadnicki wrote from Dubets'ko to Calvin alone, commending his protégé.⁴⁶ He said that only Stancaro could protect the Reformed church in the Commonwealth from moving toward three Gods, three wills, and three operations while rejecting the creed of Nicaea and calling that of Athanasius *Sathanasium*.⁴⁷

THE STANCARIST FACTION CREATES ITS SEPARATE SYNOD AND SCHOOL AT DUBETS'KO, 1561-1570

At the Synod of Pińczów of 25 to 30 January 1561,⁴⁸ the official acts of the Reformed church of the Commonwealth first mentioned the school in Dubets'ko. The school, which at one point employed five teachers of fine arts and theology, was headed by the Hebraist Orsatius and had three hundred students, "almost all drawn from the equestrian order and . . . [it] would continue to the death of Stadnicki" (1563).⁴⁹ It is likely that the school continued to function until 1570,⁵⁰ as a rival to the school of

⁴⁴ OC, vol. 18, no. 3245.

⁴⁵ OC, vol. 18, no. 3288.

⁴⁶ OC, vol. 18, no. 3290.

⁴⁷ The charge was denied by Sarnicki at the synod held in Włodzisław, 21 to 25 September 1561: Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:123.

⁴⁸ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:72-91.

⁴⁹ Węgiński, *Slavonia Reformata*, p. 126.

⁵⁰ Węgiński is not always accurate. The departure of Stancaro would not have so quickly dissolved an institution of such size. Stanisław M. Stadnicki had at least two sons: Andrzej and Stanisław, the "Devil of Lantsut" (Łancut), ca. 1551-1610. Andrzej became a Catholic. In 1588 he altered services in the parish church which then stood beneath the castle, whose patrons were Mikołaj, Stanisław, and Marcin, presumably sons of Andrzej of Nowy Żmigrod. See fn. 37 above, and SG, vol. 2, col. 188A.

Pińczów. Martin of Lublin was probably one of the teachers at Dubets'ko, and was certainly minister of the local church. Stancaro, for as long as he was associated with the school, was probably general overseer as well as teacher of Hebrew and theology.

The synod agreed that since Stancaro had not met its previous conditions — that is, had not kept silent on the mediator principle until position papers were sent to the Swiss, but had, instead, sent his personal emissary, Christopher of Lviv — they were now free to act definitely. The participants summarized their own view on the Mediator in light of their earlier *Confessio de Mediatore* and of the responses from Geneva, Basel, and Strassburg:

Christ according to each nature divine and human is from eternity the High Pontifex and Mediator between God and men . . . and that he is therefore called Priest unto eternity, because he is not simply appointed from among men (*assumptus ex hominibus*) [like the High Priest of the Temple; cf. Heb. 5: 1] but *by a decree of the Father* assumed (*assumpsit*) man for the expiation of sins.

When someone asked why Stancaro should be condemned once again, the answer was that it was for the good of "our churches, in order that he not turmoil them further nor teach them to pray to a Jewish Messiah and that his Mediator is like that whom the Jews, charmed by the Devil, await." The synod went on to condemn Orsatius and Martin of Lublin as heretical "pseudopastors" and warned lords and ministers that they should refrain from sending their youths to the school at Dubets'ko lest they be infected with the Stancarist doctrine.

Clearly, Stancarism did remain a considerable threat to the main body of the Reformed church, which still embraced pastors and lords who would follow Biandrata and Lismanino into the Minor Reformed synodal schism or church (1565–1660). At this synod Sarnicki and Sylvius initiated an action against foreign pastors for lording it over native pastors; the action also favored a confession of faith from every new immigrant.⁵¹

In Geneva, Stancaro's emissary, Christopher of Lviv, wrote to Calvin, 25 February 1561, enclosing his own *Okazanie*, dedicated to Stancaro.⁵² The letter was replete with patristic and conciliar citations supporting Stancaro's view on the Mediator and stressing particularly the Ecumenical Councils V and VI. On 26 February 1561 Calvin wrote to Stadnicki against both Biandrata and Stancaro.⁵³ In March he and the ministers of

⁵¹ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:73; Alodia Kawecka-Gryczowa, "Jakub Sylwiusz a rozłam w zborze małopolskim," *Reformacja w Polsce* 9–10 (1937–39): 28–63.

⁵² OC, vol. 18, no. 3345. The only copy of the *Okazanie* is in the Czartoryski Library, Cracow.

⁵³ OC, vol. 18, no. 3347.

Geneva published their definitive *Responsio ad nobiles Polonos et Franciscum Stancarum*, which was intended to eliminate some of the ambiguities of the earlier *Responsum*. The tone of the second *Responsio* was magisterially confident and apologetic. It acknowledged that many Fathers, including Augustine, spoke of Christ as Mediator in his human nature — a circumspection due to the protracted struggle with Arian subordination of the Logos/Son to the Father — but emphasized that they also spoke otherwise. Although the terms, *Logos*, *Son*, *Christ* appeared, the usage was almost interchangeable, without any suggestion of the ancient philosophical connotation of *Logos*. Christ was considered Mediator before the incarnation with functions other than the sacrifice on Calvary. The Genevese did concede to the Stancarists that Christ mediated with God in Three Persons, but maintained that it is better to hold with Scripture that in the divine economy the Son mediated with the Father and with Augustine that “humanity apart from divinity is not mediatrix, and the divinity apart from the humanity is not mediatrix.” This concession, subordinating Christ as Mediator to God the Father, allowed many left-wing Pinczovians to feel that they could be faithfully Calvinian and yet escape the local Stancarist charge of being arch-heretically Arian by becoming even more scriptural, retaining only the Apostles’ Creed.⁵⁴

At about this time Calvin responded to Stancaro directly in an undated letter, upbraiding him for comparing the recently deceased Melanchthon (1560) with Arius, for he had a letter from Melanchthon, privately congratulating him on “the repression” of the blasphemies of “Arian” Michael Servetus.⁵⁵

In June 1561, at Dubets’ko, Stancaro prepared his “De Trinitate et incarnatione” against Calvin and an “Admonitio” for the readers of the books of Calvin with reference, in part, to the above noted *Responsum* and the *Responsio*. In the foreword to “De Trinitate” he declared that Calvin had driven him, a paralytic, and his family from the Kingdom of Poland into Ruthenia and had called him many things, including a “Nestorian, murderer, and circumcised Jew.” On the two basic theological issues he denied any communication or exchange of the divine and human properties in Christ and, appealing to Augustine’s *Ennarationes in Psalmos* (29), he again asserted that Christ redeemed by suffering only in his human nature and that the Triune God was the author of salvation through Christ. In August, Lord Nicholas Zborowski arranged a collo-

⁵⁴ *OC*, vol. 9, cols. 349–58.

⁵⁵ *OC*, vol. 19, no. 3684. Here Calvin refers to Stancaro’s *Collatio*.

quium at his seat in Stobnica in an effort to end the Stancarist schism. Lord Ossoliński was present with his pastor, Witrelin. There Stancaro presented his "Examinatio Pinczovianorum," a critique of the Pinczovian *Confessio de Mediatore* of 1559, in which he pointed out that among the Pinczovians there were three "parties" (*sectae*) on the problem of the Mediator: (1) a small group, represented by an elder visiting Dubets'ko from Lublin, which agreed with the Stancarists; (2) Cruciger and others, who held that the Son of God is equal to the Father according to his divinity and who therefore accepted the three ancient Creeds (but followed the Helvetians as to the involvement of both natures in the mediation of Christ); (3) Sarnicki, Biandrata, Lismanino, and George Negri, who made Christ "less than the Father and rejected the creeds of Nicaea and Athanasius and call that of Athanasius: *Sathanasium*."⁵⁶

In the Synod of Włodzisław of 21 to 25 September 1561 there was much discussion of the Stancarists and their protector Stadnicki. It was decided that, after due warning, the Stancarists should be excommunicated by two plenipotentiaries of the synod to be sent to Dubets'ko. However, there was considerable defense of Stadnicki as not being heretical because he held to the three ancient Creeds (as if Stancaro did not).⁵⁷

In the meantime the uxorious Latin-rite Ruthenian, Orzechowski, using arguments similar to those of Modrzewski and now defending the papacy, had become the fiercest opponent of Stancaro. Already in 1560 he had composed and published his *Chimaera: de Stancari funesta in Regno Poloniae secta* (Cracow, 1562). Having also published *Confessio catholicae fidei* (Cracow, 1561; published in Polish the following year), Orzechowski regarded himself as the handsome Bellerphontes who was summoned by Providence to slay the triple-bodied monster Stancaro, "lion before, serpent behind, she-goat in the middle." It was in this book, in which he appealed to the king for coercion, that Orzechowski adumbrated his theory of the perfection of the constitution of the multiethnic Commonwealth and in so doing became the forerunner of Polish Mesianism. To the Ruthenian publicist, Stancaro was an alien intruder. Already on 15 June 1561 Orzechowski had also written to Andrew Przecławski, scholasticus of Cracow, specifying why both the Pinczovians and the Stancarists were wrong. Lismanino and Statorius, with their Swiss and Saxon advisors, improperly held that the redeemer Son

⁵⁶ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2: 113. The pre-publication tracts of Stancaro are mentioned with some citation from the published text by Wotschke, *Briefwechsel*, p. 126, fn. 3; p. 156, fn. 2; p. 129, fn. 1; see also Hein, *Italienische Protestanten*, p. 95.

⁵⁷ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2: 115-23, especially 118, 120ff.

could be called Christ before the incarnation. He cited the words of the angels to be shepherds, Luke 2: 11: "quia natus est vobis hodie salvator, qui est Christus Dominus in civitate David." And he went on to correct the Pinczovians: "Therefore not before he was born in the city of David was Christ both Savior and Mediator, who before he was incarnate did not exist as Mediator of God and men." According to Orzechowski, the Stancarists did not understand that once the Word, and not the Triune God, was incarnate, the resultant Jesus (Christ) of Bethlehem and Nazareth became the Mediator in the interworking of the divine and human nature. In John 14:6 Christ says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life," which meant that in his human nature Christ was the way and in his divine nature the truth leading to life eternal. Orzechowski quoted approvingly, unidentified, the passage in Augustine used by Calvin in the *Responsio*: "humanity apart from divinity is not mediatrix. . . ." Thus although he did not make use of the Protestant terminology of Christ's person and three offices common to Calvin, Lismanino, and Stancaro, nor even of the patristic term *communicatio idiomatum*, Orzechowski did argue against Stancaro that once the Logos was made flesh, Jesus was the Mediator in both his divinity and humanity.⁵⁸

The manuscript of "Chimaera," the letter just characterized, and the *Confessio fidei* all belonged to the years 1560 and 1561. Then on 26 July 1562, referring to these three works as being in print, Orzechowski, while at the seat of the land judge of Peremyshl', Valentine Orzechowski, composed a letter in Latin to Palatine Nicholas IV of Vilnius, the final sponsor of the Berestia Bible. This he did in the presence of a large group of lords equally angry, including Palatine Spytek Jordan of Cracow and Palatine John Starzechowski of Podolia. Known in the literature as *Epistola ad Radvilam* (Cracow, 1562),⁵⁹ the letter ended with twenty-four articles of "admonition" in Polish, of which the most striking is the claim, presumably inserted by the co-signatories, that "the Chimaera of Stanislas Orzechowski has been sent of God to Poland for the Polish king as a prophecy" and that the statute of King Ladislas Jagiello against heresy should be made applicable alike to "Stancaro, Lismanino, Statorius, Blandrata, Krowicki, Gregory [Paul], Sarnicki, Cruciger [called after his birthplace], [Christopher] Przechadski; Arians and Nestorians." Notably, the list begins and ends with a Stancarist, while orthodox and incipient anti-Calvinist Pinczovians are mingled in between. The Ad-

⁵⁸ To Przecławski, in Korzeniowski, ed., *Orichioviana*, no. 85, pp. 523-27.

⁵⁹ Korzeniowski, ed., *Orichioviana*, no. 87, pp. 530-39.

monitors follow Orzechowski in designating both types of Pinczovians by Stancaro's term "Arians," while the Stancarists, in turn, received from Orzechowski the same appellation which the Pinczovians used.

In the same year that the *Epistola ad Radvilam* was published, Stancaro gathered together several manuscripts dating from 1559 to 1561 and published them as *De Trinitate et Incarnatione atque Mediatore* (Cracow, 1562), directed against the Helvetians and the Pinczovians.

Thus altogether four groups of the Reformed and two detached publicists were denouncing each other as Arians, to their mutual confusion. The four groups were the Swiss divines, the Pinczovians of the Creed of Nicaea, the Pinczovians of the Apostles' Creed only, and the Stancarists. The two publicists, allies on the issue of the Mediator, were Modrzewski, who would end up with the radical Pinczovians (Unitarians), and Orzechowski, the married Latin priest of Byzantine-rite origins and sympathies. None of the groups was even close to the ancient Arius on the issue of Christ the Mediator. It is little wonder that they were confused and mutually embittered, for they were trying to solve the problem of Chalcedon (Christology) with the terminology and heresiology of Nicaea (Triadology). In terminology Stancaro was closer than Calvin to the received view (Catholic and Orthodox) on the Mediator. But Stancaro's charge of Arianism against Calvin and the Pinczovians would irreparably divide the Reformed church of the Commonwealth, even after he and his followers, themselves a decade in schism, rejoined the Major Reformed in communion with Geneva.

A further indication of the effect of the Stancarist charge of Arianism against the Reformed in Little Poland, Ruthenia, and Podolia was a joint letter by Pastor Stanislas Paklepka of Lublin, who signed himself as superintendent; Martin Krowicki, signed as superintendent of Podolia; and Nicholas Zhytno, signed as superintendent "of the churches of Kholm in Ruthenia." The letter was sent in November 1562 to the divines in Zurich.⁶⁰ In it the superintendents refer to: (1) the recently published *De Trinitate et Mediatore* of Stancaro, supported by "not few nor vulgar fautores"; (2) Stancaro's charge of Arianism, which was dividing the Pinczovians into two groups; (3) their own acceptance of the Apostles' Creed as scripturally revealed truth and of the Nicene Creed as properly condemning Arius, but their rejection of the Athanasian as papist and thus of wholly philosophical, hence human, invention; (4) their dislike of the term "Trinity" as not scriptural and misused by Stancaro; (5) their

⁶⁰ Wotschke, *Briefwechsel*, no. 263, pp. 155-63.

belief in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit in simple trust, without any probing into the mystery veiled forever from them and others; (6) their belief "that the Word was made flesh or the Son of God man, not divided but whole, as our Mediator to God the Father, not to God the Trinity according to the humanity, as Stancaro dreams"; and (7) their desire to be confirmed in this confession of faith by the recipients of their long letter.

On 14 December 1562, Sarnicki, writing to John Rokyta of the Czech Brethren, listed ten propositions of the Biandratist faction emerging among the Pinczovians (represented by the foregoing letter from Lublin). Among them were that to believe in "one God in Trinity and a Trinity in unity" was "to have four gods"; that to invoke God without reference to Persons "was to have a Turkish God, a conflated God" and be Stancarist and Jewish; that God the Father is the one God of Israel and the Creator; that the Spirit proceeds from him through the Son, "as the Greeks and Ruthenians teach"; that the Father sent the Son and, as the greater, is alone reconciled by the Son.⁶¹

The noble *fautores* of Stancaro, including John Tarnowski, Stanislas Drohowski, castellan of Peremyshl', Peter Zborowski, and Lord Ossoliński, had in the summer of 1563 arranged for further conciliatory colloquia between Stancaro and selected ministers; in Rзокów (Żoków, owned by Lord John Tarnowski), with Pastor Jacob Sylvius of Oleśnica; in Oleśnica, the same; in Rзокów again, with Pastor Witrelin of Goźlice. Because Witrelin was stubbornly set against Stancaro, the owner of his town and church, Ossoliński, dismissed him.⁶²

By this time Stancaro had permanently left Dubets'ko, because of the death of Stadnicki early in 1563 and the threats from the angered lords assembled around Orzechowski. He resettled in Stobnica under the protection of Palatine Martin Zborowski of Cracow, father of Stadnicki's widow, Barbara Zborowska Stadnicka. Her brother, Lord Peter Zborowski (d. 1581), deputy chancellor of the treasury for Sandomierz, continued to work to heal the Stancarist schism. In Cracow, in the palace of Palatine John Firlej of Lublin, there was a harsh colloquy, 2 October 1567, between a haughty Superintendent Sarnicki and a somewhat conciliatory Stancaro, although the latter called the former and his party "trideists." The *Okazanie* of Christopher Przechadzka, who was present, entered into the discussion. Another person present was John Thénaud of

⁶¹ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:324ff.

⁶² Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:153, fn. 2, and 257; Wotschke, "Stancaro," p. 582.

the school of Pińczów. Peter Zborowski, in his new capacity of palatine of Sandomierz, succeeded in having Stancaro ennobled by the king in 1568. Stancaro published his records of the colloquia in Rzoków and Cracow under the title *Libri duo* (Cracow, 1568).⁶³ The Zurich divine and historian Josiah Simler (d. 1576) tried to appeal to a major patron of Stancarism in Ruthenia and Podolia: he dedicated his *De aeterno Dei Filio* (Zurich, 1568) to Palatine George Jazłowiecki, who had turned his parish priest of Iazlovets' into a Reformed pastor and seen him, Chrzastowski, elevated to the superintendency of the Reformed churches of Podolia.

On 24 March 1570 at Stobnica, under the protection of Lord Peter Zborowski, Stancaro published his *Summa Confessionis fidei* in thirty-eight articles.⁶⁴ Both pathos and arrogance color the preface, in which Stancaro refers to several ancient popes and fathers, as well as to the three Lutheran and three Roman divines at the Conference of Regensburg of 1541 (as Stancaro himself was) who had been obliged to set forth their faith before Charles V. Such a crucial moment had now come for him and his "disciples." The articles are, indeed, admirably arranged. The whole gives the impression that Stancaro's ideal Universal church was a congeries of Edwardian (low Anglican) national churches with bishops and priests, Christ as its only Head. The idea of predestination was so muted as to allow for the exercise of free will. On the central issue of the debate with the right-wing Pinczovians, since 1565 reorganized without the proto-Unitarians into the Major Reformed Church, Stancaro was very clear. In article 4, he quoted I Tim. 2: 5: "For there is one God, and there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." He understood God not as the Father alone, but as the Triune Deity. He understood the Mediator as the Word made flesh, as the eternal Son of God become man. Adducing only Augustine among the Fathers this time, he insisted that the humanity of Christ mediates with God, although the initiative for redemption comes from God, "for wherever one Person of the Godhead operates, the Three Persons act." Stancaro concluded that in making Christ the Mediator in both natures, the right-wing Pinczovians divided the Son/Logos from the Father and *ipso facto* became "tritheists," precisely Calvin's appellation for the left-wing Pinczovians who ended up in the Minor Church with only the Apostles' Creed.

⁶³ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2: 359-63, representing the section of *Libri duo* on the colloquium in Cracow.

⁶⁴ A copy is in the Universitätsbibliothek of Zurich; its preface and article headings, along with further discussion of some articles, are given by Ruffini, *Studi*, pp. 313-25. Hein discusses the booklet (45 pages) and supplies the full text of the fourth article on the Mediator: *Italienische Protestanten*, pp. 90-97, and suppl. 1.

Already by the autumn of 1567 many of the Stancarist congregations had come to desire reunion with the Major Reformed Church.⁶⁵ At the general synod of Sandomierz, held 9 to 14 April 1570,⁶⁶ the Reformed, the Lutheran, and the Czech Brethren agreed to keep their own confessions, but to construe them as roughly equivalent in a consensus which realized in principle a major goal of Łaski.⁶⁷ The three denominations agreed to meet together frequently, to receive observers from other denominations in their several synods, general and local, and to present a common political front. The Major Reformed Church, which had by now broken fully with the Minor church, had previously adopted the Second Helvetic Confession of Bullinger, altered to include material on the eucharist drawn from the Confession of the Czech Brethren. On the central issue that had by now caused the two schisms — Stancarist (1559/61) and proto-Unitarian (1563/65) — the Major Reformed Synod of 1570 declared: "We believe that the Mediator of God and men was the man Jesus Christ, such that we constantly asseverate and do not deny that the whole force and efficacy of the effected mediation proceeded from the divinity of the same Son incarnate, not of the Father incarnate, not of the Holy Spirit incarnate."⁶⁸

At the synod seven Stancarist ministers submitted and variously formulated their understanding of the consensus. The group must have had more members to have posed the threat it did at successive synods. Their identification provides some clue as to the geographical range of the Stancarist Synod at its height. The representation of pastors and lords from Byzantine-rite territories suggests that this church, "halfway between ours and that of the pope," was predominantly Polish and Latin in origin and participation. However, it had spread far to the east in the Commonwealth. Because of the strong emphasis of Stancaro, himself of Jewish origin, on the Old Testament, the study of Hebrew, and a "Jewish Messiah" mediating to an undifferentiated Triune God as one, Stancarism could have confirmed the suspicions of surrounding Orthodox, Catholic, and faithful (Sarnickian) Calvinist lords and clerics that it was a continuation of the Judaizing trend in Ukrainian religious history.⁶⁹

There is almost no way to identify the larger number of Stancarists who

⁶⁵ Wotschke, "Stancaro," p. 584; Heim, *Italienische Protestanten*, p. 115.

⁶⁶ Sipaylo, *Akta*, 2:251-304.

⁶⁷ Kai E. J. Jørgensen, *Ökumenische Bestrebungen unter den Polnischen Protestanten bis zum Jahre 1545* (Copenhagen, 1942), chap. 8.

⁶⁸ Sipaylo, *Akta*, 2:269.

⁶⁹ See my "Protestants in the Ukraine," pts. 1 and 2.

had already returned to the fold of the Major Reformed Church.⁷⁰ On April 13, Pastor Christopher Brzecholski of Dubets'ko renounced Stancarism in the name of his fellow ministers. To the synod's satisfaction, he affirmed, in a formulation that safeguarded something of what they had gone into schism over, that "Jesus Christ was [Mediator] in such a way that the whole force of the Mediation enacted was in the human nature, and the efficacy was from the divinity of the same Son incarnate."

A second person involved in the asservation and submission was a Pastor Blasius of Gorlice in the piedmont of Little Poland. Another was Pastor Stanislas Chrzastowski⁷¹ of Iazlovets' (owned by Palatine George Jazłowiecki of Podolia),⁷² who was also identified as "minister of the palatine of Ruthenia (*Russiae*)," which would clearly make a Stancarist of the palatine patron himself. It seems plausible that it was Palatine Jazłowiecki — not, indeed, *a* Ruthenian but *of* Ruthenia and Podolia — whom Łużyński had in mind along with Lord Stadnicki when he wrote Calvin of two lords who were supporting Stancaro in the formation of a church between the Calvinist and the Roman. A fourth pastor to disavow Stancarism was Michael Bieńkowski, the minister of Lord Stanislas Rzemieński of Książnice in Little Poland, whose patron must also have been a Stancarist. The next, Caspar Waznovienis, is identified as "a minister of Palatine [Nicholas Mielecki, d. 1585] of Podolia, grand Hetman of the Crown," who had married Elizabeth Radvila, daughter of Nicholas IV the Black of Vilnius. A Ruthenian pastor of Lord Mielecki, Ivan Stets'ko (Stecko), was in attendance at synod more than once,⁷³ but he does not figure as one of the last Stancarist holdouts. Palatine Mielecki was owner of Zaslav'i (Zeslaw) near Minsk and a Pastor Blasius Kaczanowski (Kachanouski) of Zaslavl' was present at the extreme Unitarian synod of Ių'e (Iwie) in Belorussia (20 to 26 January 1568) which Simon Budny attended. The radical ideas discussed there included whether Jesus was the son of both Mary and Joseph.⁷⁴ The next disavower was Pastor

⁷⁰ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:268, 271.

⁷¹ *PSB*, vol. 3, gives only later Calvinists of this name, but in Sipayllo Chrzastowski is also identified as "minister of the palatine of Ruthenia (*Russiae*)."⁷² This would clearly make the palatine patron himself, Lord George Jazłowiecki "of Ruthenia," a Stancarist.

⁷² He was deputy from Podolia in the Diet of Piotrków of 1562/63, and by 1564 he had become castellan of Kam"ianets'-Podil's'kyi. He was to become a plausible "Piaśt" candidate at the Election Diet of 1573. *PSB* 11:121-23.

⁷³ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:201, 209. On Mikołaj Mielecki, later a plausible "Piaśt" candidate at the Election Diet of 1573, see *PSB* 20 (1975): 759-64.

⁷⁴ Sipayllo, *Akta*, 2:218.

Albert of Rzeszów (Riashiv) on the Wisłok River in the piedmont of Little Poland, minister in Pidhaitsi (Podhajce) near Los'k, which had a printing press owned by Prince John Kyshka (Kiszka). His ministry was given to Ivan Chaplych Shpanovs'kyi (d. 1604) of Shpaniv (just above Hoshcha), son of Peter, the castellan of Kiev, after Shpanovs'kyi pledged allegiance to Sigismund Augustus following the Union of Lublin in 1569 (but he may have held it before this).⁷⁵ Later, there would be several Arians in branches of this family, particularly in Volhynia.⁷⁶

Stancaro himself gave up a few years before his death. After his death on 12 November 1574, in an act of reconciliation, he was buried close to his former foe, Laski, in Pińczów. Stancaro's son and namesake was among the dignitaries present to pay reconciliatory respect to the man who had founded the first Reformed congregation of the Commonwealth at that very place twenty-four years earlier.⁷⁷



So much for Stancaro and the seven self-acknowledged Stancarists at the Synod of Sandomierz in 1570. As for "the Papists who were once even ours" about whom Łużyński wrote to Calvin in 1560, the reference might well have been to Lord John Tarnowski (d. 1571/4), who tolerated Protestant pastors on some of his estates and who defended Orzechowski. The Stancarist schism had two major Polish patrons in Ruthenia, Stanislas Matthew Stadnicki and George Jazłowiecki. However, it also had many other adherents, including Jerome Ossoliński, Nicholas Stadnicki, and Stanislas Drohowski, the last an Orthodox Ruthenian by birth. The Stancarist church, true to the Fathers, Peter Lombard, and the post-Chalcedonian Second and Third Councils of Constantinople, held that Christ was Mediator in his human nature only. Andrew Frycz Modrzewski, who was close to the left-wing Pinczovians, and Stanislas Orzechowski, who moved freely in Orthodox, Reformed, and Catholic lordly circles, both agreed with Stancaro, against the Helvetian and Saxon advisors of the Pinczovians, that Christ could not have been Mediator before the incarnation of the eternal Son of God. However, these two most able native publicists, and perhaps also theologians, differed from Stancaro and from each other about the role and modality of Christ as Mediator and about the Trinity.

⁷⁵ PSB 4: 170A.

⁷⁶ See my "Protestants in the Ukraine," especially pp. 191–204.

⁷⁷ Węgierski, *Slavonia Reformata*, p. 414.

The Stancarist appellation for both the right-wing and left-wing Pinczovians, "Arian," popularized by Orzechowski, survived as the common designation used not only by Polish and Ukrainian peasants, but also by the educated to refer to Stancarist, Sarnickian, and Socinian congregations and their edifices.

The Saxon and Helvetian theologians were actually more innovative than they realized or acknowledged, changing patristic and conciliar formulations without due attention to the enormously sophisticated and not wholly scriptural Christology and Triadology of antiquity. Stancaro was, at least at the beginning, closer to Catholic and Eastern Orthodoxy than were those whom he so vituperatively attacked in the Commonwealth and in their scholarly theocracies in Saxony and Switzerland. By pillorying them as "Arian," the Stancarists caused the left-wing Pinczovians, under the guidance of Francis Lismanino and George Biandrata, to become scriptural and to be satisfied with belief in the Three Persons of the Apostles' Creed. These forerunners of the Unitarians and the later Socinians never passed through an "Arian" phase, in the ancient sense of that word. But thanks to Stancaro and Orzechowski and the eventual royal decree against them (1658), they bear that name among scholars even today.

Harvard University

