

UDC 271.2-6(477+438)“1458/1509”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.22.253747

Andrii TSEBENKO

PhD (History), ThDr, Senior Lecturer, Department of History, Museum Studies and Cultural Heritage, Lviv Polytechnic National University, 3 Mytropolyta Andreia St., Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79000 (tsebenko@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-5774-049
ResearcherID: AAB-7148-2022

Андрій ЦЕБЕНКО

кандидат історичних наук, доктор теології (ThDr), старший викладач кафедри історії, музеєзнавства та культурної спадщини Національного університету “Львівська Політехніка”, вул. Митрополита Андрея, 3, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79000 (tsebenko@gmail.com)

Bibliographic description of the Article: Tsebenko, A. (2022). Orthodox Church in the Context of State and Church Development in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Ruthenia, Samogitia and the Kingdom of Poland (1458 – 1509). *Skhidnoieuropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 22, 24–32. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.22.253747

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN THE CONTEXT OF STATE AND CHURCH DEVELOPMENT IN THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA, RUTHENIA, SAMOGITIA AND THE KINGDOM OF POLAND (1458 – 1509)

Abstract. *The purpose of the study is to analyze the state and legal processes that influenced the organizational development of the Orthodox Church in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Ruthenia (Rus’), Samogitia (Žemaitija) and the Crown of the Kingdom of Poland and as the consequence – transformation of the society. The research methodology is based on the principles of historicism, systematic, scientific, verification, authorial objectivity, moderate narrative constructivism, as well as the use of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization) and special historical (historical and genetic, historical and typological, historical and systemic) methods. The scientific novelty of obtained results is determined by the fact that there have been comprehensively analyzed the state and church relations in the Ukrainian lands in the second half of the XVth – at the beginning of the XVIth centuries to comprehend the experience. The Conclusins. In the middle of the XVth century weakened Kyiv metropolitanate became the object of active interest of two religious centres – Rome and Moscow. Religious policy of the Lithuanian and Polish rulers of the second half of the XVth – the beginning of the XVIth century was determined by the pressure of the papal throne on the accession of the Orthodox to the Roman Church (including by means of the Union) and the personal attitude of this or that ruler. Religious intolerance on the part of the Catholic secular and ecclesiastical authorities forced the Orthodox population to seek protection among the rulers of the Grand Duchy of Moscow. Under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Kyiv there remained the dioceses, which were located on the territory of two states: the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland. The difficult situation of the Orthodox Church in the Catholic state, the appointment of dubious people to higher ecclesiastical positions by the king, put on the agenda the need for church reforms. The resolutions of Vilnius Synod were the results of the attempt of the Church, in the person of Metropolitan Joseph, to react to the transformed right of patronage and to propose a model of church and state relations. The decisions of Vilnius Synod reflected the struggle against the interference of the secular authorities in the affairs of Kyiv metropolitanate.*

Key words: *Kyiv metropolitanate, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Kingdom of Poland, the Ukrainian lands, Union, religious policy, state and church relations.*

ПРАВОСЛАВНА ЦЕРКВА В КОНТЕКСТІ ДЕРЖАВНО-ЦЕРКОВНИХ ПРОЦЕСІВ У ВЕЛИКОМУ КНЯЗІВСТВІ ЛИТОВСЬКОМУ, РУСЬКОМУ, ЖЕМАЙТІЙСЬКОМУ ТА КОРОЛІВСТВІ ПОЛЬСЬКОМУ (1458 – 1509)

***Анотація. Мета дослідження** – аналіз державно-правових процесів, які вплинули на організаційний розвиток Православної Церкви у Великому князівстві Литовському, Руському, Жемайтійському та Короні королівства Польського і як наслідок – на трансформацію суспільства. **Методологія дослідження** спирається на принципи історизму, системності, науковості, верифікації, авторської об'єктивності, поміркованого наративного конструктивізму, а також на використання загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, узагальнення) та спеціально-історичних (історико-генетичний, історико-типологічний, історико-системний) методів. **Наукова новизна** одержаних результатів визначається тим, що комплексно проаналізовано державно-церковні відносини на українських землях у другій половині XV – початку XVI ст. для осмислення досвіду. **Висновки.** Ослаблена Київська митрополія в середині XV ст. стала об'єктом активних зацікавлень двох релігійних центрів – Риму і Москви. Релігійна політика литовських і польських правителів другої пол. XV – поч. XVI ст. визначалася тиском папського престолу на приєднання православних до Римської Церкви (у тому числі за посередництвом унії) та особистим ставленням того чи іншого володаря. Релігійна нетерпимість з боку католицької церковної і світської влади змушувала православне населення шукати захисту у правителів Князівства Московського. Київському митрополиту залишилися у підпорядкуванні єпархії, які були розташовані на території двох держав: Великому князівстві Литовському та Королівстві Польському. Важке становище Православної Церкви в католицькій державі, призначення королем на вищі церковні посади сумнівних людей, висували на порядок денний необхідність церковних реформ. Спробою Церкви, в особі митрополита Йосифа, соборно реагувати на трансформоване право патронату та пропонувати модель церковно-державних відносин стали ухвали Віленського собору. Вони відобразили боротьбу проти втручання світської влади у справи Київської митрополії.*

***Ключові слова:** Київська митрополія, Велике князівство Литовське, Королівство Польське, українські землі, унія, релігійна політика, державно-церковні відносини.*

The Problem Statement. The history of relations between the state and the Church makes it possible to trace the path of change: from a symphony between them to the denial of any church institution or a religious worldview in general. National and religious revival of the end of the XXth – the beginning of the XXIst centuries revealed a number of problems (national religion / Church of the Ukrainians, confrontation between the Greek Catholics and the Orthodox, split in the Ukrainian Orthodoxy, proclamation of autocephaly and its recognition, etc.) and led to the emergence of various ecclesiastical / political and religious formulas (Rusky world, Kyiv Church, etc.). The above mentioned issues highlight the need to study the experience of state and church relations in the Ukrainian lands, to study the origins and challenges of the current religious situation in Ukraine.

The chronological boundaries cover the period from 1458 to 1509. The lower limit is due to the interference of secular and Latin ecclesiastical authorities in the administration of Kyiv metropolitanate (appointment of the Union Bishop Hryhoriy Bolharin to the Orthodox Cathedral), which led to its weakening and split – completed the separation of the dioceses from its administrative territory (the formation of Moscow metropolitanate). The upper limit is connected with Vilnius Synod of 1509, which identified external and internal threats and possible consequences of the most acute problems of the Metropolitanate and outlined the vision of state and church relations, in particular the interference of the secular authority.

The Analysis of Sources and Publications. The source base of the study consists of the published documents: royal charters, metropolitan messages, chronicles, etc. Various

aspects of the issue under analysis were reflected in the works of Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Vasyl Biednov, Vasyl Kmet, Mykhailo Krumalenko, Ihor Skochyliias and the others.

The purpose of the study – analysis of state and legal processes that influenced the development of the Orthodox Church in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Grand Principality of Ruthenia (Rus'), the Grand Duchy of Samogitia (Žemaitija) and the Crown of the Kingdom of Poland and, as the consequence – transformation of the society.

The Main Material Statement. In the first half of the XVth century attempts by the Greeks to save Byzantium by means of the church union with the Roman throne weakened Kyiv metropolitanate and intensified the authority of secular and ecclesiastical authorities. Accordingly, taking into account the Union policy of Constantinople of that period of time, Isydore, a Greek, was appointed to Kyiv metropolitan cathedra from among all the candidates. This appointment was done in order to make Constantinople as representative as possible at the expected Union Synod. In the discussion and preparation of the Union the cohort of Orthodox bishops (humanists-intellectuals) set pragmatic and political goals, which coincided with the state policy of Byzantium of that period of time. In addition, the patriarch apparently hoped that “the metropolitan would bring the money that was urgent for the Greeks” (Golubinsky, 1997, p. 427).

Thus, during the 50 – 60s of the XVth century the subject of active political negotiations between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, on the one hand, and the Grand Duchy of Moscow, on the other, was the issue of subordination or re-subordination of individual dioceses of Kyiv metropolitanate, in which the main object was the Ukrainian-Belarusian lands. The result of the negotiations was the Decree of the Grand Duke of Lithuania and King of Poland Casimir IV of January 13, 1451 on the recognition of Iona Metropolitan of Kyiv and all Rus' (Akty istoricheskiye, 1841, pp. 85–86; Hrushevs'kyi, 1993, pp. 406–408). According to the document, all dioceses of Kyiv metropolitanate within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland came under the jurisdiction of Iona, the metropolitan who was settled in Moscow.

In 1458, at the request of Isydore, the Union Metropolitan, the Pope issued a certificate to Hegumen Hryhoriy of approval to Kyiv Orthodox Cathedra. The episcopal ordination was performed by the Union Patriarch of Constantinople Hryhoriy Mamma and he conferred the title of “Metropolitan of Kyiv, Halych and All Rus'”. To prevent difficulties in appointing the Union representative to the Orthodox Cathedra, the pontiff sent an envoy to King Casimir.

Despite the efforts of secular and ecclesiastical authorities in the Grand Duchy of Moscow to prevent the Union Metropolitan Hryhoriy (1458 – 1470) to manage the Lithuanian-Ukrainian-Belarusian dioceses of the Metropolitanate (located on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland), in 1458 he came to Lithuania from Rome. Thus, from the middle of the XVth century Kyiv metropolitanate found itself between two opposite religious poles and became a springboard for the competition of interests of two world religious centers – Rome and Moscow, which had an impact on the relations of Kyiv Metropolitanate with authority officials.

The Diocese, to which Metropolitan Hryhoriy was appointed, was to include dioceses on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Moscow. The Union ideas were not accepted in Moscow, which in its turn outlined the limits of Hryhoriy's jurisdiction, and thus, the limits of the spread of the Union in Eastern Europe.

In 1460, at Beresteisky Sejm, King Casimir IV, under pressure of the Roman pontiff, officially recognized Hryhoriy as Metropolitan of Kyiv. Having strengthened his power

within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland, the Metropolitan began seeking the extension of his jurisdiction to the northern dioceses zealously. In this case he had the support of the king, who called on the Duke of Moscow to recognize Metropolitan Hryhoriy, but this call did not have any expected result.

In 1470, Metropolitan Hryhoriy (1470 – 1473), due to the strong dissatisfaction of the Ukrainian-Belarusian parish clergy and the faithful, renounced the Union and joined the Orthodox Church. Patriarch Dionysius I the Wise of Constantinople (1461 – 1467; 1488 – 1490) officially confirmed Hryhoriy's metropolitan dignity and sent letters to Lithuania, Novgorod, and Moscow demanding that Hryhoriy be recognized as the legitimate Metropolitan of Kyiv. Despite this, Moscow still did not want to recognize Metropolitan Hryhoriy (already under the jurisdiction of Constantinople) as its bishop, and demonstrated disobedience to the Mother Church and the end of the unity with Kyiv metropolitanate, under whose administrative subordination it was. In fact, this meant the formation of an administratively separate Metropolitanate of Moscow.

In January of 1473, after the death of Metropolitan Hryhoriy, King Casimir IV did not give permission for the election of Metropolitan of Kyiv for some period of time (Ul'yanovs'kyi, 2004, p. 75). The reason was, probably, the opposition of the Latin bishop of Vilnius, Jan Losovic. After the appropriate permission of the king (on condition of approval of the elected Metropolitan by the Roman pontiff), the Synod of Bishops elected Bishop Mysail of Smolensk to Kyiv Metropolitan Cathedra (Vlasovs'kyi, 1988, p. 176).

The newly elected Metropolitan Mysail (1475 – 1480), at the request of the king, addressed a letter to Pope Sixtus IV (Trajdos, 2019, p. 188). The Metropolitan described the state of the Orthodox Church and complained about oppression. It is clear from the letter that Metropolitan Mysail (Pstruch) addressed the Pope not as a subject, but as a hierarch to a hierarch. He stated that the two Churches were equal and called for dialogue (Buchyns'kyi, 1909, p. 19).

The Metropolitan Mysail did not receive an answer from the Pope and terminated his relations with Rome, which were initiated by the king. The consequence of such forced correspondence with the Pope was that the patriarch of Constantinople Raphael I (1475 – 1476) did not approve Mysail in the dignity of a metropolitan, and on September 15, 1475 ordained Spyrydon to Kyiv Cathedra, without informing the king and local bishops (Vlasovs'kyi, 1988, pp. 176–177). Metropolitan Spyrydon (1475 – 1481) was not accepted in both Duchies (Lithuanian and Moscow) and imprisoned (Polnoye sobraniye Russkikh letopisey, 1853, p. 233).

For the next two decades, Kyiv metropolitans were elected at church synods with permission of secular authorities. However, the traditional right of the patriarchs of Constantinople to ordain / approve elected metropolitans was respected. Thus, Archbishop Simeon of Polotsk (1481 – 1488) was elected to Kyiv Metropolitan Cathedra. This time the king did not require a new Metropolitan to accept the Union and receive permission and confirmation of the Pope.

The Patriarch of Constantinople Maximus IV Manassis (1491 – 1497) confirmed Simeon as Metropolitan of Kyiv and All Rus' and sent him the Blessed Letter (Kartashov, 1993, p. 552.). The Patriarchal message was brought by two exarchs: Metropolitan Nifont and Bishop Feodorit, who enthroned the new Metropolitan together with the bishops of Kyiv metropolitanate in Novogradok, in 1481.

After the death of Metropolitan Simeon, Kyiv Cathedra remained vacant for several years. His successor was the Archbishop of Polotsk Iona Hlezna (1492 – 1494). He did not agree to head the Cathedra for a long time, but eventually received approval in Constantinople, which

he visited in person. After the death of Metropolitan Jonah, the Church Synod, without a prior blessing of the Patriarch of Constantinople, elected Archimandrite Macarius of the Holy Trinity Monastery of Vilnius to Kyiv Metropolitan Cathedra.

At the same time, messengers headed by the monks Dionysius and Herasym were sent to Constantinople to receive the patriarchal blessing. In the autumn of 1496 the messengers returned together with a representative of Patriarch Nifont (1497 – 1498) Joseph and a positive response. To the ban on further election of metropolitans without the patriarchal blessing, which was announced by his representative, the bishops replied that they did not renounce of “ancient customs of the Conciliar Church of Constantinople and the blessing of the patriarch, our father”, however did it because of “necessity, as did our brothers bishops under Grand Duke Vytautas” (Polnoye sobraniye Russkikh letopisey, 1980, p. 123). Confirmation from the Church of Constantinople for the Church of Kyiv was a hierarchical and institutional protection against strong pressure of the Catholic ecclesiastical and secular authorities of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland (Mončák, 1987, pp. 32–33).

The Metropolitan Macarius (1495 – 1497) strengthened the metropolitan power by his activity under the conditions of constant raids of the Tatar hordes to the Ukrainian lands, improved the financial situation of the Church, defended the rights of the Orthodox. During his metropolitan ministry, a marriage was concluded (on condition of granting the Duchess complete freedom in professing the Orthodox faith) between the new Grand Duke of Lithuania Olexandr (1492 – 1506) and Yelena, a daughter of Duke John III of Moscow. Both the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Grand Duchy of Moscow wanted to benefit from this marriage: Lithuania hoped to strengthen peace and establish good neighborly relations with Muscovy, the Grand Duke of Moscow – to influence the policy of the Lithuanian state, including the ecclesiastical policy, by means of the Duchess’s marriage. The Orthodox population of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania hoped to have a protector and patroness in the person of the Orthodox Grand Duchess, as Grand Duke Olexandr gave his father-in-law a written commitment not to force Yelena to accept the Catholic faith and to create all the conditions (to build a church, to have a priest, the orthodox servants, etc.) to perform the Orthodox rites. The marriage did not yield the results expected by the parties, as the Grand Duke of Lithuania did not keep his promises, not to irritate the Catholic clergy and nobility.

After the martyrdom of Metropolitan Macarius (May 1, 1497), as the chronicler wrote, the Grand Duke Olexandr “gave the metropolitanate of Kyiv and All Rus” to Smolensk Bishop Joseph (Polnoye sobraniye Russkikh letopisey, 1980, p. 125). Owing to Bishop Joseph, the Duke influenced his Orthodox wife, Duchess Yelena, to convert her to Catholicism (Akty, otnosyashchiesya k istorii Zapadnoy Rossii, 1846, pp. 154–155). Appointing Joseph Metropolitan (1498 – 1501), the Duke hoped to spread the Union. In 1500, the Metropolitan sent a letter to Pope Olexandr VI (1492 – 1503) declaring his readiness to submit to Rome. But the Pope did not answer the Metropolitan, but the Grand Duke Olexandr and the Latin bishop of Vilnius, Albert Wojciech, expressing his joy at their efforts to convert the Orthodox to the Roman Church, for they were evidently also the promoters of the Metropolitan’s pro-Union initiatives.

Religious policy of the Lithuanian and Polish rulers of the second half of the XVth century was determined by the pressure of the papal throne on the accession of the Orthodox to the Roman Church (including the mediation of the Union) and the personal attitude of a particular ruler. Observing a strong opposition to the Union in the Ukrainian lands, the Roman Curia tried to weaken by other ways with the help of Catholic state rulers, and eventually eliminate the

Orthodox Church. Among the ways, the restriction of its activities by state laws, deprivation of the leading force (the Orthodox nobility) by Catholicization and Polishization, discrediting in the eyes of the faithful (by the right of patronage) of unworthy clergy and the appointment of the Catholic government officials, in particular the first Kyiv voivode Martin Hashtold (Trajdos, 2019, p. 110). It should be noted that King Casimir IV, during whose reign the final division of Kyiv metropolitanate into Kyiv and Moscow took place, until the end of his long reign (1492) he did not change his tolerant attitude towards the Orthodox Church.

Some aggravation of the state and church relations was observed during the reign of Olexandr, the son of Casimir IV, who was the Grand Duke of Lithuania (1492 – 1506), and then the King of Poland (1501 – 1506). Under conditions of religious intolerance on the part of the Catholic Church and secular authorities, the Orthodox population, the clergy, dukes and boyars had been forced to place certain hopes in defending their religious rights on the rulers of the Grand Duchy of Moscow since. In 1500 a large part of the Ukrainian Orthodox dukes and boyars moved there, in particular the Bielsks, the Mosals, the Mtsensks, the Serpeis, the Starodubs, the Shemiachychs, and the others (Polnoye sobraniye Russkikh letopisey, 1859, pp. 238–239). According to the sources, “Moscow tyranny” was an obstacle for further move of the Orthodox (Rusina, 2005, p. 48).

Such circumstances forced the successors of Casimir IV to adjust their pro-Catholic religious policy. They did not issue official orders or laws restricting the rights of the Orthodox, but encouraged them to convert to the Catholic faith by private means (Bednov, 2005, p. 53). In a number of privileges and charters, King Olexandr even confirmed the rights and freedoms granted by his predecessors to the clergy, dukes, boyars and nobility regardless of religion and the unshakable right of the metropolitans and bishops of Kyiv metropolitanate, independence of their spiritual judicial prerogatives and rights to church property (Akty, otnosyashchiesya k istorii Zapadnoy Rossii... , 1846, pp. 120–122; 136–144; Krumalenko, 2004, p. 154). However, in practice the rights did not play any role, as the previous ones were not abolished.

After a break of almost two years after the death of Metropolitan Joseph, Jonah II (1503 – 1507) was elected to Kyiv Metropolitan Cathedral. This caused a temporary pause in the pro-Union protections of the authorities. During the last years of his life, King Olexandr distanced himself from his Latin advisers and brought the Orthodox Duke Mykhailo Hlynsky closer.

Soon after, Sigismund I (1506 – 1544) ascended the throne of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Joseph II began his metropolitan ministry (Солтан, 1507 – 1521). Patriarch Pachomius of Constantinople (1503 – 1513) approved Joseph II election to Kyiv Metropolitan Cathedral.

The threat of removing the Galician diocese from its jurisdiction caused the change of the title. Emphasizing his spiritual authority over all Ukrainian dioceses, in September of 1509 Metropolitan Joseph II began to be titled Kyiv, Galicia and All Rus' (Kmet', 2001b, p. 140). Although this title was approved by the authorities (used in royal charters), Sigismund I recognized Lviv Latin archbishop to have the right to appoint (or rather recommend to the king) a head of the Orthodox Galician Cathedral (Kmet', 2001a, p. 11). He motivated his actions by saying that it would be easier to “convert the Orthodox schismatics to the Catholic faith” (Kartashov, 1993, p. 576).

In Kyiv metropolitanate such examples of usurpation of rights over the Orthodox community by non-Orthodox people are not uncommon. As a result of such patronage, the real control over the dioceses / monasteries of Kyiv metropolitanate fell into the dubious reputation of secular “guardians” (Skochylyas, 2010, pp. 100–106).

To overcome the influence of the authority, to settle state and church relations, to bring order to the internal church life and other challenges of the Church, Metropolitan Joseph II convened a local Synod in Vilnius, the capital of the Duchy, on December 25, 1509. In addition to the Metropolitan's participation, seven bishops took part in the Synod (Volodymyrsky and Beresteisky Metropolitan Vassian, Lutsky and Ostroh Metropolitan Cyryl, Metropolitan Anthony of Przemyśl, Metropolitan Euphemia of Polotsk and Vitebsk, Metropolitan Varsonofy of Smolensk, Turovsky and Pinsk Metropolitan Arseniy, Kholm'sky Metropolitan Filaret), seven archimandrites, six abbots, seven archpriests and representatives of the parish clergy (Mironowicz, 2014, pp. 166–177).

The Synod adopted fifteen resolutions, which were called the rules, the elaboration of which is attributed to the Metropolitan (Kartashov, 1993, pp. 570–572). Obviously, this is a reaction to the state of the Church at that time and the attempt to resist the interference of secular rulers in its life unanimously.

Resolutions pointed at some abuses in the church environment, suggested the ways to solve them. In particular, the Synod Rules 8 – 11 regulated “the submission of parish churches and monasteries by patrons, also regulated the relationship among the church hierarchy, parish clergy and patrons” (Skochylyas, 2010, p. 370). The Synod banned simony, including the practice of buying church seats during the life time of those who held them and the ordination of unworthy bishops and priests, even when appointed by the Grand Duke or other secular authorities. Delegates decided to stop the arbitrariness of local nobles in the appointment or removal of parish clergy and determined the method of selection of candidates for church positions (Mironowicz, 2017, p. 156). In particular, priests appointed in the parish by the laity were forbidden to officiate without the blessing of the diocesan bishop and were threatened to excommunicate those who dared to confiscate church lands or property. It was decided to meet regularly at Synods to discuss urgent issues of church life.

The Conclusion. Thus, the interference of the Catholic secular and ecclesiastical authorities, the pragmatic and political goals of Byzantium and geopolitical realities facilitated the loss of Kyiv metropolitanate's custody of some of its northern dioceses, contributed to the formation of a separate ecclesiastical administrative unit – Moscow Metropolitanate. In the middle of the XVth century weakened Kyiv Metropolitanate of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (as well as the Patriarchate as a whole) became the object of active interest of two religious centres – Rome and Moscow.

Religious policy of the Lithuanian and Polish rulers of the second half of the XVth – the beginning of the XVIth century was determined by the pressure of the papal throne on the accession of the Orthodox to the Roman Church (including by mediation of the Union) and a personal attitude of a certain ruler. Religious intolerance on the part of the Catholic Church and secular authorities forced the Orthodox population, clergy, dukes and boyars to have certain hopes in the rulers of the Grand Duchy of Moscow in defending their Orthodox religious rights. The Metropolitan of Kyiv had under his authority the dioceses, which were located on the territory of two states: the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland.

The difficult situation of the Orthodox Church in the Catholic state, the appointment of unworthy people to higher ecclesiastical positions by the king and as a result – various distortions of a religious and moral life, in particular among the clergy, put forward the need for church reforms on the agenda. The resolutions of Vilnius Synod were the attempts of the Church, in the person of Metropolitan Joseph, to react to the transformed right of patronage

and propose a model of church and state relations. The resolutions reflected the struggle against the interference of the secular authorities in the affairs of Kyiv Metropolitanate.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the reviewers.

Funding. The author did not receive any financial assistance for research, preparation and publication of the article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akty istoricheskiye. (1841). *Akty istoricheskiye, sobrannyye i izdannyye Arkheograficheskoy komissiyey, 1334 – 1598*. [Historical Acts collected and published by the Archaeographic Commission, 1334 – 1598]. (in 5 vol., Vol. 1). Sankt-Peterburg, 608 p. [in Russian]

Akty, otnosyashchiesya k istorii Zapadnoy Rossii. (1846). *Akty, otnosyashchiesya k istorii Zapadnoy Rossii, sobrannyye i izdannyye Arkheograficheskoy komissiyey. 1340 – 1506* [Acts relating to the history of Western Russia, collected and published by the Archaeographic Commission. 1340 – 1506]. (in 15 vol., Vol. 1). Sankt-Peterburg, 432 p. [in Russian]

Bednov, V. (2005). *Pravoslavnaya Tserkov' v Pol'she i Litve (no Volumina Legum)* [Orthodox Church in Poland and Lithuania (on Volumina Legum)]. Kyiv: Mitropoliya UPTS, 431 p. [in Russian]

Buchyns'kyy, B. (1909). Studiyi z istoriyi tserkovnoyi uniyi. Mysayiliv lyst. [Studies in the History of Church Union. Mysail's Letter]. *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. T. H. Shevchenka, (90)*, 5–24. [in Ukrainian]

Golubinskiy, E. (1997). *Istoriya Russkoy Tserkvi* [History of the Russian Church]. (in 4 vol., vol. II, ch. 2). Moskva, 616 p. [in Russian]

Hrushevs'kyy, M. (1994). *Istoriya Ukrayiny-Rusy* [History of Ukraine-Rus']. (in 11 vol., Vol. 5). Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 687 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kartashov, A. (1993). *Ocherki po istorii Russkoy Tserkvi* [Essays on the History of the Russian Church]. (v 2-kh t., T. 2). Moskva, 686 p. [in Russian]

Kmet', V. (2001a). *L'vivs'ka yeparkhiya u XVI-na pochatku XVII stolittya* [Lviv Diocese in the XVIth – the beginning of the XVIIth Century]. (*Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis*). L'viv, 21 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kmet', V. (2001b). Yurysdyktsiynny status ta orhanizatsiyna struktura Halyts'koyi (L'vivs'koyi) yeparkhiyi (XII – seredyna XVI stolittya) [Jurisdictional Status and Organizational Structure of the Galician (Lviv) Diocese (the XIIth – the middle of the XVIth century)]. *Kovchek: naukovyi zbirnyk iz tserkovnoyi istoriyi, (3)*, 131–155. [in Ukrainian]

Krumalenko, M. (2004). Zalezhnist' pravovoho stanovyshcha naseleння na ukraїnyn's'kykh zemlyakh Velykoho knyazivstva Lytovy's'koho u XIV – XVI st. vid relihiynoyi polityky derzhavy. [Dependence of the Legal Status of the Population in the Ukrainian Lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the XIVth – the XVIth centuries on the Religious Policy of the State]. *Aktual'ni problemy derzhavy i prava, 22*, 152–156. [in Ukrainian]

Mironowicz, A. (2014). Sobory wileńskie 1509 i 1514 roku. [Vilnius Synods in 1509 and 1514], pod red. Marzanny Kuczyńskiej i Urszuli Pawluczuk, Synody Cerkwi prawosławnej w I Rzeczypospolitej, *Latopisy Akademii Supraskiej, 5*, 71–82. [in Polish]

Mironowicz, A. (2017). Związki kulturowe monasteru supraskiego z kulturą serbską w XVI wieku. [Cultural Ties of the Supraśl Monastery with Serbian Culture in the 16th Century]. *Elpis, 19(19)*, 149–168. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.15290/elpis.2017.19.19>. [in Polish]

Mončak, I. (1987). *Florentine Ecumenism in the Kyivan Church*. Rome, 376 p. [in English]

Polnoye sobraniye Russkikh letopisey. (1853). *Polnoye sobraniye Russkikh letopisey* [Complete Collection of Rus' Chronicles]. (in 43 vol., Vol. 6). Sankt-Peterburg, 358 p. [in Russian]

Polnoye sobraniye Russkikh letopisey. (1859). *Polnoye sobraniye Russkikh letopisey* [Complete Collection of Rus' Chronicles]. (in 43 vol., Vol. 8). Sankt-Peterburg, 301 p. [in Russian]

Polnoye sobraniye Russkikh letopisey. (1880). *Polnoye sobraniye Russkikh letopisey*. [Complete Collection of Rus' Chronicles]. (in 43 vol., Vol. 35). Moskva, 306 p. [in Russian]

Rusina, E. (2005). La similitude du dissemblable. La Russie et la grande-principauté de Lituanie XVe-milieu du XVIe siècle [The Similarity of the Dissimilar. Rus' and the Grand Principality of Lithuania the 14th-mid-16th Century]. *Cahiers du monde russe*, 46/1–2, 39–50. [in French]

Skochylas, I. (2010). *Halyts'ka (L'vivs'ka) yeparkhiya XII–XVIII stolit': orhanizatsiyna struktura ta pravovyy status* [Galician (Lviv) Diocese of the XIIth – the XVIIIth centuries: Organizational Structure and Legal Status]. L'viv: Vyd-vo UKU, 832 p. [in Ukrainian]

Trajdos, T. (2019). Dwa przyczynki do historii diecezji kijowskiej w XV w. [Two Contributions to the History of Kyiv Diocese in the 15th Century]. *Echa Przeszlosci*, 22/1, 107–128. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.31648/ep.4831>. [in Polish]

Ul'yanovs'kyy, V. (2004). *Mytropolyt kyyiv's'kyy Spyyrydon: Obraz kriz' epokhu, epokha kriz' obraz*. [Metropolitan Spyrydon of Kyiv: Image through Epoch, Epoch through Image]. Kyiv: Lybid, 374 p. [in Ukrainian]

Vlasovs'kyy, I. (1988). *Narys istoriyi Ukrayins'koyi Pravoslavnoyi Tserkvy*. [Essay on the History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church]. (in 4 vol., Vol. 1). Kyiv: [b.v.], 294 p. [in Ukrainian]

The article was received April 12, 2021.

Article recommended for publishing 23/02/2022.