



Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal.
Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 1(87)

Вісник Житомирського державного
університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 1(87)

ISSN: 2663-7650

UDC1: 27-31

DOI 10.35433/PhilosophicalSciences.1(87).2020.52-66

CANONIC UNCERTAINTY OF UKRAINIAN ORTHODOXY IN THE FIRST THIRD OF THE XX CENTURY

A. R. Kobetyak, V. I. Brahin*

The article analyzes the concepts of autocephalous formation of national churches and the experience of their formation in the late XIX – early XX century. The article reveals the significance of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and democratic revolutions in Europe on the formation of newly independent states and their national churches, especially in the Balkans. It was established that one of the main problems of the newly formed states was the proclamation of church autocephaly. It ensures the strengthening of national unity and the consolidation of society in the spiritual plane. It is proved that the long domination of the ancient patriarchates in the Ecumenical Church ended with the proclamation of national churches. The proclaimed national Local Churches sought equality and absolute independence, both religious and political. The study found that over the past century, two diametrical concepts of understanding the structure of universal Orthodoxy have been formed. In particular, Fanar insisted and insists on his own primacy and special status in the world church, and the reason for this: the canons of the Ecumenical Councils and the age-old tradition of Christianity of the Eastern rite. Instead, the ROC declares the existence of Local Churches in the general system of Orthodoxy as a certain confederation of independent and fully autonomous entities.

It is concluded that an in-depth consideration of the process of legal regulation of the status and canonical uncertainty of Orthodox churches in European countries in the 20s and 30s of the XX century will be important to identify the specifics of religious life of Ukrainian society during the XX - early XXI centuries. The Ukrainian nation has come a long way in the struggle for the recognition of its own church: in the first half of the XX century there were repeated attempts to proclaim the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church of various formations. However, the "state", "revolutionary" and "canonical" concepts were alternately embodied only for a short period of time. In the absence of statehood, Ukraine has not been able to realize any of the historical opportunities for the proclamation of autocephaly in the period under study. The universal recognition of the Ukrainian Church was postponed for a hundred years. At the same time, pro-Ukrainian hierarchs of the post-

*Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Economic Security, Public Administration and Management

(Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University, Zhytomyr, Ukraine)

akobetyak2019@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-0457-922X

Postgraduate Student at the Department of Philosophy and Politology

(Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University, Zhytomyr, Ukraine)

vbragin018@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-0379-2221

revolutionary period purposefully and systematically used the experience of proclaiming Balkan autocephaly.

Keywords: Canon Law, Autocephalous System of Orthodox Churches, Tomos, Canonical Uncertainty, Ukrainian Church, Patriarch, Religious Experience, Situation of Uncertainty

КАНОНІЧНА НЕВИЗНАЧЕНІСТЬ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ПРАВОСЛАВ'Я ПЕРШОЇ ТРЕТИНИ ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ

А. Р. Кобетяк, В. І. Брагін*

У статті проаналізовано концепції автокефального утворення національних церков й досвід їх становлення у кінці ХІХ – початку ХХ ст. У статті розкрито значення розпаду Османської імперії і демократичних революцій у Європі на формування нових незалежних держав та їх національних церков, насамперед на Балканах. Встановлено, що однією із головних проблем новоутворених держав стало проголошення церковної автокефалії. Саме вона забезпечує зміцнення національної єдності та консолідацію суспільства у духовній площині. Доведено, що тривале домінування древніх патріархатів у Вселенській церкві скінчилось з проголошенням національних церков. Проголошені національні Помісні церкви прагнули рівності і абсолютної незалежності, як релігійної, так й політичної. У дослідженні встановлено, що на протязі минулого століття сформувались дві діаметральні концепції розуміння структури Вселенського православ'я. Зокрема Фанар наполягав і наполягає на власній першості та особливому статусі у світовій церкві, і причина цьому: канони Вселенських соборів і вікова традиція християнства східного обряду. Натомість, РПЦ заявляє про існування Помісних церков у загальній системі православ'я як певної конфедерації незалежних і повністю автономних утворень.

Зроблено висновок, що поглиблений розгляд процесу правового регулювання статусу та канонічної невизначеності православних церков у європейських країнах 20–30-х рр. ХХ ст. буде важливим для виявлення причин специфіки релігійного життя українського суспільства протягом ХХ – початку ХХІ ст. Українська нація пройшла тривалий шлях у боротьбі за визнання власної церкви: у першій половині ХХ ст. спостерігались неодноразові спроби проголошення автокефалії Української церкви різних формацій. Проте "державна", "революційна" та "канонічна" концепції були по чергово втілені лише на незначний проміжок часу. За умови відсутності державності, Україні так і не вдалося реалізувати жодну з історичних можливостей для проголошення автокефалії в досліджуваний період. Вселенське визнання Української церкви було відкладене на сотню років. При цьому проукраїнські ієрархи після революційного періоду цілеспрямовано і системно використовували досвід проголошення балканських автокефалій.

Ключові слова: канонічне право, автокефальний устрій православних церков, Томос, канонічна невизначеність, Українська церква, патріарх, релігійний досвід, ситуація невизначеності

Introduction of the issue. The end of the XIX – first half of the XX century is a period of special ecclesiastical rise and intensification of the autocephalous movement in the systematization of the Universal Orthodoxy. Many of the mutually recognized Local Churches received autocephalous status at this time. The newly proclaimed independent nation-states formed in the Balkans began an active struggle to recognize their own national churches as

independent. On the one hand, there is a surge around canonical and theological creativity in order to justify the right to their own autocephaly of young independent states. On the other hand - the imperial struggle for the maintenance of these churches in their own "canonical territory" by the Ecumenical and Moscow Patriarchates. The appeal to the ancient canons of the Ecumenical Councils, which have no justification for the nationalization of the church, its

fragmentation into new administrative formations, contributed to the escalation of conflicts.

The problem of gaining autocephalous status by the national church is not new. The historical retrospective of the researched topic testifies to its periodic aggravation, especially since the beginning of the XX century. This is due to the struggle of a number of Balkan national churches for independence and recognition. It was then that the Ukrainian Church of various jurisdictions of the 1920s and 1930s tried to implement various concepts of the proclamation of autocephaly, from the traditional state regulation of the religious question to the revolutionary "nationwide" consecration of its own hierarchy.

Today, the problem of autocephalous status and the possibility of acquiring it is again in the center of discussion of the world community. The most painful issue is the "canonical ways" of proclaiming the autocephaly of the new church. Therefore, the leveling of contradictions within the Ukrainian Orthodoxy, which are observed today and initiated by some of its representatives of the UOC, is possible under the condition of systematic study and in-depth analysis of the religious experience of proclamation of national autocephaly in the XIX-XX centuries. The "canonical uncertainty" regarding the proclamation of a new autocephalous church, which became apparent after the Cretan Council in 2016, only exacerbates religious conflicts.

The urgency of the topic is related to the new situation of interreligious relations in the world, and, above all, to the dialogue of the Local Orthodox Churches. Modern ecclesiology and the latest research on the structure of the Ecumenical Church have been intensified by the provision of a Tomos for the Orthodox Church of Ukraine. But this caused misunderstanding and aggression among representatives of

some local churches, and, above all, representatives of the ROC. On the one hand, this question is relevant both for theologians and theologians, and for religious communities. On the other hand, there is a huge amount of polemical material, statements by the Primates and representatives of various Local Churches, and, accordingly, the retransmission of their views and discussions around the primacy of the primacy of the Ecumenical Throne.

The purpose of the article is to study the problem of canonical uncertainty and the national struggle of Ukrainian Orthodoxy for the status of the Local Church, primarily on the example of the experience of the first third of the twentieth century. Today, when the Ukrainian Church has already received the Tomos of Independence, it is necessary to scientifically illuminate and clarify the historical path of Ukrainian Orthodoxy in the struggle for autocephaly.

The degree of scientific development of the topic. On the one hand, there are hundreds of public statements, speeches and official letters from hierarchs and theologians from various Local Churches, but most of them are polemical. On the other hand, the public's interest in the question of the unity of the Orthodox Churches under the conditions of civilizational challenges has significantly intensified. Such a surge of interest in the problem of autocephaly is certainly associated with the proclamation of 15 in the diptych of the autocephalous church, namely the PCU.

Especially valuable are the works of researchers of Ukrainian church history and the canonical structure of the Orthodox Church I. Vlasovsky, O. Kyridon, O. Lototsy, Y. Mulyk-Lutsyk and others. The work of the famous fighter for the independence of the Ukrainian Church, Metropolitan Oleksandr (Drabinko) "Ukrainian Church: the path to autocephaly" is relevant

today, in which the author in-depth reveals the implementation of various concepts of autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church in the XX century [14]. It is necessary to mention the work of V. Butynsky on the jurisdiction of Ukrainian Orthodoxy and the possibility of canonical formation of the Local Church [3] and M. Gergelyuk on the canonical and ecclesiological foundations of the autocephalous system of churches in the Ecumenical Orthodoxy [5]. In general, the works of such philosophers, theologians and theologians as D. Gorevoy, V. Yelensky, O. Sagan, L. Filipovych, Y. Chornomorets and others are devoted to the religious analysis of the processes of obtaining autocephaly. A. Aristova's work on ways of resolving religious conflicts, as well as P. Saukh's religious experience and the phenomenology of religion, are important for this research.

Outline the unresolved issues raised in the article. Despite the significant scientific and public interest in the topic of research, today there are a number of unresolved issues regarding the canon law and the autocephalous system of Ukrainian Orthodoxy in the first third of the XX century. The main task of scientific intelligence is to study the mechanisms of autocephalous formation of the Romanian, Polish, Albanian and Bulgarian national churches and their experience of formation in the late XIX–early XX century. Instead, the Orthodox Churches of Montenegro, Macedonia and Ukraine did not achieve canonical recognition in the XX century. One of the main problems was the canonical uncertainty of the procedure for proclaiming a new autocephalous church and the lack of state independence of Ukraine. Therefore, the implementation of different concepts of autocephaly by the Ukrainian State and the Church of different formations has not achieved universal recognition. At the same time, the unrecognized churches had their own justification and a peculiar

approach to church independence. But due to the significant level of politicization of church life and many other historical conditions, they failed to obtain autocephalous status.

In addition, after the collapse of the All-Orthodox Council in Crete (2016), scientific interest in the document "Autocephaly and ways to proclaim it", which was never approved, decreased significantly. Due to the lack of such a document, the situation in the Ecumenical Church has worsened somewhat at the moment. The signing of the Tomos for the PCU divided the Local Churches into camps, and the reason was the different views of the hierarchs on the mechanisms of granting autocephaly in modern conditions.

Results and discussion. In general, the Ecumenical Church, being united in its essence, is divided into independent Local Churches according to the administrative, territorial and national principles. This concept in the everyday sense can be interpreted as a "federation" of independent local churches [3: 119]. It is similar to the concept of "catholic church", but not identical to it. The Ecumenical Church is used in the sense of the earthly, administrative and material existence of the church as a visible structure. Although modern theologians agree that there is no single acceptable definition of this term at present. Accordingly, in the article we will use it in the sense of a set of individual Local Churches. On a universal scale, the church testifies to its unity through the Eucharist and the prayerful remembrance of the Primates of each of the churches. Thus, the Local Church alone is already self-sufficient, for it possesses the fullness of the grace of the Holy Spirit, but through the Eucharist and the Councils the unity of the Ecumenical Scale is expressed from the point of view of the Eastern Christians.

Leading hierarchs, theologians and church fathers have addressed the

problem of autocephaly and the church structure in general at different times. Autocephalous issues were again in the spotlight on the eve of the convening of the Grand Council in Crete in 2016, which became one of the main reasons for its failure. The Council could approve a document that had been prepared for several decades at the Pre-Council meetings, "Autocephaly and ways to proclaim it". It would allow a number of Local Churches, such as the Montenegrin, Macedonian and Ukrainian, to obtain autocephalous status in a regulated and unequivocal manner, which would be immediately recognized by all the Local Churches of the world.

After all, today the ROC and the Serbian HRC broke off the Eucharistic communion with the Ecumenical Throne and the Local Churches, which mention the name of the Primate of the PCU during the service. Therefore, scholars, theologians and church hierarchs turn to the experience of the national Balkan churches in their struggle for autocephaly. In addition, the Balkan model in Ukraine in the first third of the XX century in fact, "state", "revolutionary", "evolutionary" and "canonical" concepts of autocephaly were implemented in parallel for a short period of time. But the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Moscow have radically opposite views on this issue.

The "competition for glory" and the canonical prerogatives of the two most influential patriarchates significantly delays the development of a single algorithm for granting autocephalous status to the new church. Overcoming the inter-Orthodox conflict will accelerate the recognition of the PCU by all Local Churches and restore the unity of the Ecumenical Church.

The Ecumenical Patriarchate, which is traditionally considered the first among equals (*Primus inter pares*) or the first in honor among the Primates of all Local Orthodox Churches, has undisputed

authority in the Orthodox world today. This is due to the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils (3 canons of the Second; 9, 17 and 28 canons of the Fourth and 36 canons of the Fifth and Sixth) [10] and the centuries-old tradition and practice of the Church. It is this Throne that is the guardian of the canonical order in the Church as a whole (taxis).

It is around the primacy of the primacy of the Constantinople chair and unfolded the main contradictions from the beginning of the XX century. Because of this is the right of the Ecumenical Chair to grant autocephalous status to the new church. If the Ecumenical Church is built on certain principles of hierarchy and the Cathedral of Constantinople is endowed with special powers, as prescribed by the ancient canons of the Ecumenical Councils, it has the right to grant autocephalous status alone. If the structure of the Ecumenical Church is similar to a confederation of separate independent entities, then such a decision must be made collectively. Therefore, around the primacy of not only honor but also certain powers, the Constantinople chair unfolded theological discourse in the twentieth century.

As for the opponent of the Ecumenical Throne, the Moscow Throne, after its elevation to the Patriarchal Order in 1569, repeatedly expressed its claim to supremacy in the Orthodox world. This is not surprising, because behind the shoulders of the Moscow Patriarch has always been a powerful Russian Empire, but the Church of Constantinople as such, existed in considerable isolation after the conquest of the Byzantine Empire by the Turks. In fact, the "first among equals" was left without the universal flock. After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the proclamation of the autocephaly of a number of national churches, all Orthodox dialogue resumed.

In the XX century, in preparation for the convening of the Great All-Orthodox (Ecumenical) Council, several pre-conciliar meetings took place. In most of them, the hierarchs again did not find consensus on the issue of primacy in the Orthodox Church and the proclamation of a new autocephaly. In the end, this did not allow all the Primates to gather for the Great Council of Crete.

In 2013, the ROC issued a document on the primacy of the Orthodox world [16]. It speaks of the absolutization of the Primates of the Local Churches, but at the same time denies a special role as the first hierarch of the Ecumenical Patriarch. In the Journal of the Holy Synod for 2013, the hierarchs of the ROC do not agree with the concept that the Patriarch of Constantinople is the highest appellate court. Accordingly, he cannot have a privilege before other Primates of the churches. Some modern hierarchs of religion, such as S. Butynsky (Bishop Mitrofan of the PCU) explain this by the inconsistency of the concept of Greek theologians about the primacy of the leader Fanar as an image of God the Father, who is the ancestor of the Holy Trinity. This theory is more in line with the spirit of the Catholic Church with its teaching on papal privileges. It is from these positions that the modern Greek theology emerges, which Metropolitan J. Zizioulas, for example, explains as follows. Everyone who is baptized becomes the Son of God by grace. In the image of the bishop, Greek theology suggests seeing the image of the Father. All the faithful must obey their pastor, especially the bishop. For the Son sacrificially obeyed the Divine Father. It is from the Father that Christ receives the Cup of Suffering and carries it with humility and love. And every bishop, head of the metropolis and even head of a separate church, is a son in relation to the patriarch of Constantinople. From this follows the idea of the primacy of the Ecumenical Leader [3: 83]. The ancient church did

not know such an interpretation of the idea of the primacy of the Ecumenical Throne, which is probably why the primacy of primacy in modern theological design met with such opposition from many modern theologians, especially of non-Greek origin. This becomes clear from the materials of the Pre-Conciliar Meetings and the Inter-Conciliar Presence [5: 83].

The source of the primacy of honor at the level of the Ecumenical Church is the Tradition of the Church, recorded in sacred diptychs and recognized by all autocephalous Local Churches. The content of the primacy of honor at the world level is not determined by the canons of the Ecumenical or Local Councils. The canonical rules on which the sacred diptychs are based do not confer on the former (who was the bishop of Rome at the time of the Ecumenical Councils) any authority on a church-wide scale [16].

The idea of the primacy of the Ecumenical Church was closely intertwined with periodic activity, and can be said to have originated in the ancient theory of the Pentarchy, that is, the five powers of the ancient patriarchates (Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem). It is obvious that the Primates of these five churches were delegated special powers over the entire Orthodox world. But hence the idea of inequality of local church leaders. Each autocephalous church is independent, but to some extent somewhat inferior to the five Ancient Churches [2]. It is clear that the supporters of such a theory are precisely the hierarchs of these patriarchates. From the same concept follows the primacy of the Ecumenical Throne. But the new autocephalous churches, and especially the ROC, strongly disagree with this.

After the break with the Roman Church (1054), the emergence of new autocephalous Churches (X-XIV

centuries) and the Ottoman conquest in the XV century, the theory of pentarchic underwent a marked transformation. During this period, it became a doctrine of "tetrarchy" (the power of four, because Rome fell away). Moreover, in the XVII-XVIII centuries there was a situation when the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, being formally independent, were in fact subordinate to the patriarch of Constantinople. It had special privileges in terms of state power of the Ottoman Empire. The whole Orthodox world could communicate with the sultan only through the Ecumenical Hierarchy. Therefore, there were often abuses by the patriarchs of Constantinople in appointing one or another first hierarch for the enslaved by the empire Local Churches.

Thus, historically, two different approaches to the understanding of primacy and honor, and the associated privileges in the Universal Orthodoxy, have been formed. The Church of Constantinople, as the Ecumenical Patriarchate, presents the arguments of the capital's apostolic chair as the New Rome. This is really confirmed by the canons of the Ecumenical Councils and the age-old tradition of the Church. And the new autocephalous churches, and especially the ROC, emphasize the equality of all Local Churches, which form a certain system or confederation of completely independent church formations. They are located in some independent states. The ROC even issues a special document in which it denies the supremacy of Constantinople in terms of power, and gives it only a diptychial advantage, which can be reflected in services and ceremonies.

Given that the material and geopolitical confrontation between the two patriarchates (Fonar and Moscow) could not exist in an openly open form, it was transferred to the religious plane. And from the middle of the XIX century,

an active phase of the struggle of individual national churches for their own independence began. Therefore, a whole theological-political battle in the format of Fanar-Moscow-National Church unfolded around the no/proclamation of the autocephalous status of one or another Local Church. It mainly affected the Local Churches, especially those that did not gain their own recognition during this period, such as the Ukrainian one.

The national liberation movement, which began on the Balkan Peninsula in the late XIX century, led to the emergence of a number of new Local Churches (Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Romania, and Albania). This led to the collapse of the theory of tetrarchy. A completely new system of interaction of autocephalous churches was formed. The newly proclaimed autocephaly was essentially national. They positioned themselves as absolutely equal in the structure of the systematization of the Ecumenical Church. Consequently, the theory of tetrarchy fell away as outdated, because the new churches did not recognize any supremacy over themselves. On the other hand, the rise of anti-Greek sentiment among Orthodox Arabs in Antioch and Jerusalem undermined Greek hegemony from within [2]. But for the sake of justice, we note that the ancient patriarchates themselves never gave up their historical self-awareness in the rank of the first, more worthy and those who have certain prerogatives.

In this context, it is important to consider the 2011 "Istanbul Summit" (Synaxis of Primates) communiqué, which in paragraph 5 deals with maintaining the influence of Local Churches within borders "as defined by the Sacred Canons and Thomas on the Establishment of These Churches". In a literal sense, this was directed against the Romanian Patriarchate, which began

building a pilgrimage center in Nazareth, but globally it testified to the independence and non-interference in the "canonical territory" of each of the Local Churches [9]. Formally, in this communiqué the ancient patriarchates proved their non-interference in the affairs of the newly proclaimed autocephaly, although they were not mentioned in the document. But if we analyze the church history of the XIX-XX centuries, it becomes clear the significant religious and political influence of Fanar and Moscow on the autocephalous transformations in the Cormorants and in Europe.

In view of the above, it is obvious that the problem of developing a uniform concept of proclaiming a new autocephalous church, which is still absent, given the incomplete recognition of the PCU by the Local Church, and the struggle of the churches of Macedonia and Montenegro for independence, is extremely relevant.

This was shown by the situation surrounding the "Ukrainian church issue", because after granting the Orthodox Church of Ukraine autocephalous status, the local churches were divided into two hostile camps: some supported this decision, others condemned it. It is for these reasons that it is necessary to reveal in detail the essence of the conceptual approach of national churches in the justification of granting them autocephalous status in the XX century. It is necessary to consider two main concepts of autocephaly of the church: national and territorial. They are closely intertwined and complement each other.

A new page of history in the systematization of the Universal Orthodoxy began in the middle of the XIX century, when the connection between a certain territory and the church was strengthened. This was due to the decline of the Ottoman Empire,

from which the nation-states began to secede. Accordingly, the struggle for autocephaly in them was connected with the territorial and national principle. There is an idea of "political sovereignty", which is intertwined with the theory of "canonical territory" [8: 101].

The second approach, which was the basis for the proclamation of the new Local Churches, is based on the national factor. This concept is based on the 34 apostolic rules, according to which the bishops of each nation must know the first among themselves and recognize it as a chapter [10: 19]. The first to receive autocephaly based on this concept was the Hellenic Church in 1850. It should be added that in both concepts and approaches to obtaining autocephalous status, the key role was played by the state authorities. Due to pressure in the international arena, the governments of various countries, including Greece, proclaimed the first national autocephaly [5: 72].

The proclamation of autocephaly by the Serbian Church is interesting. The events of state formation and church history of Serbia are reflected in the history of Ukrainian society during the first third of the XX century. In particular, in 1830 Serbia became autonomous, and a year later the church received the same status. After the signing of the Berlin Treaty on the Political Independence of Serbia in 1878, a year later Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III signed the Tomos [18: 112].

Another historical example, which is probably the most suitable option for Ukraine in the 20s and 30s of the XX century, could be the example of the Romanian Orthodox Church. The history of the Romanian metropolitanate is reminiscent of the history of Kyiv. Dependent on Constantinople, the Romanian Church at various times gained considerable importance in the structure of the Ecumenical Church, and

had only a formal dependence. Thus, the Kyiv metropolitanate until 1689 was a de facto self-governing metropolitanate within the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The collapse of the Ottoman Empire historically coincided with the rise of anti-Greek sentiment in the country. In 1865, after the unification of Moldova and Wallachia, Romania was formed. The newly elected Prince O. Kuza immediately began state reforms, including the acute question of church independence, at least in political terms. Three years later, the ecclesiastical autocephaly of the Romanian Church was proclaimed. Recognition by the Ecumenical Patriarch had to wait until 1885 [6: 56]. A very similar scenario took place in the twentieth century in the Republic of Poland, which did not have an ancient church tradition, and based on the history of the Kyiv metropolitanate received autocephalous status due to pressure on the Fanar of the State Government.

As we can see, the examples of the proclamation of state independence, after which the state authorities supported the church in the struggle for autocephalous status, have repeatedly proved effective. In all the above concepts of obtaining autocephaly in the XIX and XX centuries, state pressure played a significant role. Probably the Ukrainian state at the beginning of the XX century should have followed this path. But in the absence of statehood as such, the Ukrainian Church began its own autocephalous movement in various ways.

As for the struggle of the Ukrainian people for the autocephalous status of the church, in the first half of the XX century there were four main attempts to gain it. Each of them had its own historical moment and possibilities, but none of them was realized due to specific circumstances. In general, it should be noted that these efforts took place during

the period of rapid transformations of socio-political life, which embarked on the path of Ukrainization after the overthrow of czarism. But the plans of the new Bolshevik government did not include the separation of Ukraine and the independence of its church in any way.

Consider these four attempts in a complex, because they all have a single national liberation and state subtext, and this resonates with the concepts of the proclamation of recognized autocephaly in the XIX and XX centuries. The first major attempt at autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church was the convening of the All-Ukrainian Church Council in 1918, headed by Metropolitan Volodymyr (Bohoyavlensky), and after his execution in February 1918 by Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovytsky). Both hierarchs were not supporters of autocephaly, but could not openly declare it. The proclamation of the Hetmanate of Skoropadsky clearly contributed to the nationalization of society. Therefore, opponents of autocephaly could not have objective arguments as to why there could be no autocephalous church in an independent state. It was a significant start for Ukrainization and complete church secession from Moscow. But already at the Council Muscovites (and this is the vast majority of the episcopate) gradually blocked the decision on autocephaly. With the election to the Kyiv chair in 1918 of the opponent of the autocephaly of Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovytsky), the forces of "Muscovites" and "Ukrainophiles" became unequal. The Council ended, by virtue of military-political and ecclesiastical battles, with nothing. The first attempt to recognize the Ukrainian Church failed. In addition, the ethno-phyletic nature of the Ukrainian Church played a negative role

in its formation, and largely caused its non-recognition [14: 292].

The second was an attempt at "state" autocephaly, which was proclaimed by the First All-Ukrainian Council of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in October 1918. We will dwell on the concept of state intervention in the proclamation of church independence in more detail in our scientific research. It should be noted that the attempt to influence the state power on church events, as will happen later, for example in Poland, did not yield the expected results, at least because Ukrainian statehood lasted too short.

The third was the "renewal" or "Kharkov" attempt, when another autocephaly was proclaimed at the All-Ukrainian Local Council in Kharkov (May 1925). Again, this concept arose due to government support. It is directly related to the renewal movement. The problem this time was a misunderstanding between Ukrainian and Russian innovators. The plans of the latter did not include the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church. The Union Churches were to exist in the form of certain federations, but in one way or another they were subject to a single governing body in Moscow. In addition, for some time the Renewal Church actively enjoyed the support of the Soviet authorities, who used the newly created church structure to weaken the "Petliurist" UAOC. In contrast to the latter, the Bolsheviks sought to create a formally independent church, but with a single All-Union governing body.

The final attempt was the proclamation of church independence by the Council of Bishops of Ukraine in Lubny (June 1925), otherwise known as the "Bulldozer". Again, this is an attempt by the Bolsheviks to create a "competitive church" for the patriarchal (Tikhonov) church and the UAOC. For this purpose, "purely canonical bishops"

were selected, as opposed to the Lypkiv region (UAOC), and a course was taken for maximum Ukrainization, in order to oppose the Tikhonov ROC. At a meeting in Kharkiv initiated by "recruited Bishop Ioanikiy (Sokolovsky)", a supreme governing body was formed, the Council of Bishops of Ukraine, headed by Bishop Pavlo (Pohorilko). Bishops loyal to the authorities renounced the "wrong" previous church leadership and proclaimed a course of complete Ukrainization. Despite the full support of the authorities, the last community of the Cathedral-Episcopal Church existed until 1941, after which it joined the ROC in Ukraine [17: 648].

Analyzing all the above concepts of autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church, we will try to identify their main features, which are undoubtedly based on a certain canonical work and experience of other Local Churches. The aspirations of the Ukrainian people, who tried to get an autocephalous church on the waves of national-state ideas and sentiments, are quite natural. Thus, theology and the interpretation of ancient canons in favor of the Ukrainian church seem natural.

According to the ideas of the famous fighter for the independence of the Ukrainian Church V. Chekhovsky, autocephaly is a national, not a general concept. It cannot be related to a specific territory, but is unique to a particular nation. Another important remark of the Prime Minister of the Ukrainian People's Republic concerns the naturalness of the proclamation of autocephalous status. In other words, autocephaly is an inalienable, basic right of every church to its own independence. This is the "free spiritual creativity" of Christianity as a whole. Without the realization of the autocephalous system here, in the earthly church, a connection with the Divine Spirit, as the first founder of the Church, is impossible. The author of the "Kyiv Canons" is convinced that the

church system must correspond to the division of the human structure into societies and nations. Accordingly, each individual nation is automatically endowed with the right to be the bearer of an autocephalous church. It is inconceivable that the church of one nation should submit to the church of another. Otherwise, the national history, culture, nationality in general is destroyed, because the church has a powerful influence on society and is a basic component of nation-building [15: 376]. V. Chekhovsky's views as one of the main ideologues and founders of the UAOC are clear. He tries to "canonically" justify the legitimacy of declaring the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church from Moscow. Accordingly, the text of the "Kyiv Canons" unequivocally affirms the right of each individual nation, and in particular the Ukrainian people, to its own national (autocephalous) church.

The turbulent events of the 1920s proved the inadequacy of a purely canonical approach to the proclamation and recognition of the Ukrainian Church. The Orthodox in Ukraine has never been able to consolidate into a single church association that could really claim its own Local Church. V. Chekhovsky and other figures of autocephaly gave the prerogative to the canonical justification of the self-proclamation of the UAOC, but some canons were not enough. And although the All-Ukrainian Council of 1918 rejected the idea of autocephaly and Ukrainization of the church and worship in general, the society of that time needed these religious transformations [14: 327].

The Synodal Church, the UAOC of the first formation, the Lypkivtsi, the Renewalists, and other smaller church formations acted in complete disharmony. Consequently, the activities of these religious organizations were quickly curbed by the Bolshevik government, and the canonical system, which was on the side of the supporters

of the Synodal Church, blocked the possibility of further world recognition of the UAOC by various formations.

There was another approach in the history of Ukraine to the proclamation of church independence. This is the so-called "state autocephaly". The initiator of such a proclamation was the government of the Ukrainian People's Republic during the Directory. This is the "Law on the Supreme Government of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Cathedral" approved by Chairman V. Vynnychenko in 1919. In fact, it was a state law that not only proclaimed the church's independence, but also clearly and documented its governing bodies (the Council and the Synod). This way of proclaiming the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church had certain obvious shortcomings. The first, the church, in fact, was maintained. Through special mechanisms, and more specifically in the Synod, the position of State Representative was introduced, by analogy with the Chief Prosecutor in the Synod of the ROC, who was endowed with the right to protest the decisions of the Synod; the state had to control church life. On the other hand, researchers, such as B. Andrusyshyn, point out that the introduction of such a position should have contributed to the Ukrainization of the church, due to the lack of pro-Ukrainian clergy, and the episcopate in particular [1: 43]. The second is the lack of a real episcopate to support the newly proclaimed church. The directorate acted independently, without prior agreement with the clergy and the church majority. It is noteworthy that the bishops, like all the people, learned about the adoption of the Law on Autocephaly from a radio message [1: 41]. According to the rules, two bishops and elders were needed to form the Synod. Among the clergy were many enterprising leaders who advocated the idea of autocephaly in any way. It was

difficult with the bishops, but Archbishop Agapit (Vyshnevsky) and Bishop Dionysius of Kremenets (Valedynsky), the vicar of the Volyn diocese, who would become the future first hierarch of the autocephalous church in Poland, agreed [19: 70]. Although the Minister of Cults I. Lypa made considerable efforts for the rapid formation of the Holy Synod of the UAOC, and even on January 26, 1919 its first (and last) meeting took place, this was not enough. At the beginning of February, the authorities of the Directory were evacuated from Kyiv without assisting the canonical bishops, who agreed to cooperate for the formation of a legitimate Ukrainian church [13: 49].

It is noteworthy that when forming the governing bodies, the bishops who agreed to take part in the organization of the newly proclaimed church structure were radically against the name "Synod". A. Starodub believes that this was caused by the fear of bishops before the Patriarch and Metropolitan Anthony (the leadership of the ROC) to be accused of schism. The name "Supreme Consecrated Council" was chosen, which could be regarded as an advisory rather than a governing body [19: 75–76].

On October 7, 1919, another decree was issued on the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church, which confirmed the provisions of the Law of January 1, 1919 and added that the Ukrainian Church could not be dependent on any other church government (meaning Moscow and Constantinople). It was confirmed that power in the Ukrainian Church belonged exclusively to the Synod, before the convening of the Ukrainian Church Council. The new Minister of Confessions, Professor I. Ogienko (the future Metropolitan of Canada), was instructed to resuscitate the Synod because Archbishop Agapit was not evacuated with members of the Government from Kyiv [14: 344]. De jure,

Bishop Agapit, who moved to Odessa and was a member of the ROC leadership in southeastern Russia, remained chairman of the Holy Synod. Most likely, he did not even suspect his involvement in the resumption of the Synod. On October 14, 1919, a meeting of the renewed Synod took place, but without a single bishop.

Thus, the attempt to proclaim church autocephaly in Ukraine failed. At least this was due to the short historical existence of the Government of the Directory, and the refusal of the canonical episcopate, ordained in the ROC, to participate in the activities of the highest governing bodies of the newly proclaimed autocephaly. O. Lotocki's appeal to the Patriarch of Constantinople for recognition of this church ended in failure, at least because while the former minister was in Istanbul, Ukrainian statehood ceased to exist, so autocephaly was no longer given to anyone [12: 98]. We will note that the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the diplomatic way peculiar to it evaded the blessed letter to the Ukrainian church concerning vacancy of the Patriarchal chair.

Conclusions. Thus, analyzing the autocephalous system and the existing canon law of the first third of the twentieth century, in the context of the struggle of the Balkan countries and Ukraine for church independence, the authors came to the following conclusions.

1. Due to geopolitical uncertainty and military circumstances, in the period under study, a number of newly created states received Tomos on autocephaly. Due to various circumstances of the proclamation of church independence in a particular Orthodox state, several historical precedents have been formed.

2. Basic concepts: "state" autocephaly, when the proclamation of the independence of the church took place directly through political pressure in the international arena of the government;

"Popular" concept, which involves the struggle for the nationalization of worship and the church as a whole of religious organizations themselves. In the first case, Constantinople signed the Tomos, followed by ecclesiastical recognition, such as the Polish HRC. In the second case, the struggle for autocephaly ended in self-proclamation, followed by a period of recognition, such as the Bulgarian HRC. In the end, in fact, the autocephalous church was issued a Tomos about its independence.

3. The proclamation of the autocephaly of the new national churches did not take place on the basis of specific sacred canons, but rather on a new canonical tradition which was formed directly with the decline of the theory of "pentarchy" and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. Thus it ended the long dominance of the ancient patriarchates in the Ecumenical Church. The new national churches sought equality and absolute independence, both religious and political.

4. The struggle of the Ukrainian people for church independence in the first third of the twentieth century. did not end in success. In a short period of time, four main attempts were made to proclaim and recognize the Ukrainian Church of various formations. State governments (Hetmanate, UPR, Directory) showed considerable interest in the nationalization of the church and the proclamation of its autocephalous status, which would clearly contribute to the establishment of the authority of the state in the international arena. O. Lototsky and I. Ogienko, as ministers and official representatives of state governments of various formations, met with the hierarchs of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to proclaim the church independence of the Ukrainian church. However, due to the lack of long-term statehood in Ukraine, this issue could not be brought to a logical conclusion.

5. After the conquest by the Bolsheviks and the proclamation of the Soviet Union, the nationalization of the church had to be forgotten. The Bolshevik government tried to create a church organization that would be completely under control. Thus, the state apparatus undermined the activities of the "Tikhonov region" and the UAOC. "Pro-Soviet" churches (Buldovshchina, reformers) were created as opposed to national-national. Cruel repression and exile led to a catastrophic decline in the hierarchy and its complete obedience. As for the UAOC, as a truly popular church movement, a significant reason for its decline in the period under study was the refusal of the "canonical" clergy to join the newly created church. Eventually, this led to the episcopal ordination of V. Lypkivsky in a specific "Alexandrian way" without the participation of hierarchs, which was unequivocally condemned by the Ecumenical Church.

6. At the present stage of development of Ukrainian Orthodoxy it is necessary to state its division into different jurisdictions. Some parishes are subordinated to the UOC, which is governed by the Moscow Patriarchate. The other part – the Orthodox Church of Ukraine, which in early 2019 received the Tomos from the Patriarch of Constantinople, is on the path to universal recognition. So far, little time has passed, so only 3 of the 15 Local Churches officially mention the name of the head of the PCU after the service, but most of the already recognized autocephaly have fought for their own recognition. Therefore, the future recognition of the PCU by the majority of Local Churches is only a matter of time.

LITERATURE

1. Андрусішин Б. Церква в Українській Державі 1917–1920 рр. (доба Директорії УНР). Київ: Либідь, 1997. 176 с.

2. Бурега В. Возрождение пентархии, или Кто главный в мировом православии? // Релігія в Україні. 13.09.2011 р. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: <https://www.religion.in.ua/11887-vozrozhdenie-pentarxii-ili-kto-glavnyj-v-mirovom-pravoslavii.html> (дата звернення: 05.03.2020).

3. Бутинський В. Юрисдикційний статус українського православ'я і перспективи канонічного оформлення помісної церкви: релігієзнавчі та еkleзіологічні рефлексії (1991 – 2013 рр.). Дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філософ. наук. Чернівці, 2014. 203 с.

4. Власовський І. Нарис історії Української Православної Церкви. Т. 4. Ч. II / репринтне видання. Київ, 1998. 398 с.

5. Гергелюк М. Канонічні та еkleзіологічні засади автокефального устрою церков у структурі Вселенського православ'я: історичний контекст. Дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. істор. наук. Чернівці, 2014. 199 с.

6. История Православной Церкви в XIX веке. Славянские Церкви. Москва: Московское подворье Свято-Троицкой Сергиевой Лавры, 1998. 428 с.

7. Киридон А. Митрополит Василь Липківський: "...Очевидно, моє звільнення було вже остаточно вирішено" // Лаврський альманах. Києво-Печерська лавра в контексті української історії та культури: Зб. наук. праць. Київ, 2007. Вип. 17. С. 35–40.

8. Кирило (Говорун), архімандрит. Риштування Церкви: в бік постструктуральної еkleзіології / пер. з англ. О. Паканич. Київ: ДУХ І ЛІТЕРА, 2019. 312 с.

9. Коммюнике заседания Предстоятелей древних православных патриархатов и Кипрской церкви // Священный Патриарший Храм, Фанар. 1-3 сентября 2011. [Электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа: https://www.patriarchate.org/announcements/-/asset_publisher/anakoinothen-tes-synaxeos-ton-prokathemenon-ton-presbygenon-orthodoxon-patriarcheion-kaites-ekklesias-kyprou-phanarion-panseptos-patriarchikos (дата звернення: 17.03.2020).

10. Книга правил Святых Апостолов, Святых Соборов Вселенских и Поместных и Святых Отец. Москва: изд-во святителя Льва, Папы Римского, 2010. 447 с.

11. Лотоцький О. Г. Автокефалія. Нарис історії автокефальних церков: В 2 т. Варшава, 1935. Т. 1: Засади автокефалії. 207 с.

12. Лотоцький О. В Царгороді. Варшава, 1939. Т. ХЛ. Кн. 5. 175 с.

13. Мулик-Луцик Ю. Історія Української Греко-Православної Церкви в Канаді: В 6 т. Вінніпег, Канада: Видавнича Спілка "Екклесія". Накладом Фонду Св. Володимира, 1989. Т. 4: Українська Греко-Православна Церква в Канаді в юрисдикції архієпископа Івана Теодоровича. 831 с.

14. Олександр (Драбинко). Українська Церква: шлях до автокефалії. До дискусії навколо канонічного статусу, богослужбової мови та історії Української Церкви. Київ: Фонд пам'яті Блаженнішого Митрополита Володимира, ДУХ І ЛІТЕРА, 2018. 684 с.

15. Перший Всеукраїнський Православний Церковний Собор УАПЦ 14 – 30 жовтня 1921 року: документи і матеріали / Упорядники: Г. Михайліченко, Л. Пилявець, І. Преловська. Київ; Львів: Жовква, 1999. 560 с.

16. Позиция Московского Патриархата по вопросу о первенстве во Вселенской Церкви // Журнал № 157 Священного Синода РПЦ от 25–26 декабря 2013 г. [Электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа: <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/3481089.html> (дата обращения: 15.03.2020).

17. Саган О. Вселенське православ'я: суть, історія, сучасний стан. Київ: Світ Знань, 2004. 912 с.

18. Скурат К. История Поместных Православных Церквей: В 2-х т. Москва: [б. в.], 1994. Т. 1. 336 с.

19. Стародуб А. "Київський" період життя і діяльності Преосвященного Діонісія (Валединського) (грудень 1918 – січень 1919 р.) // Лаврський альманах: Києво-Печерська лавра в контексті української історії та культури: зб. наук. праць. Вип. 28. Київ: ДП НВЦ "Пріорітети", 2014. С. 68–76.

REFERENCES

(TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Andrusishin, B. (1997). *Cerkva v Ukraïns'kij Derzhavi 1917 – 1920 rr. (doba Direktorii UNR) [Church in the Ukrainian State 1917-1920 (era of the Directory of the UNR)]*. Kyiv: Libid' (in Ukrainian).

2. Burega, V. (2011). *Vozrozhdenie pentarhii, ili Kto glavnyj v mirovom pravoslavii? [The revival of the pentarchy, or Who is the main in world Orthodoxy?]*. *Religiya v Ukraïni*. E-resource. Access mode: <https://www.religion.in.ua/11887-vozrozhdenie-pentarxii-ili-kto-glavnyj-v-mirovom-pravoslavii.html> (Last accessed: 05.03.20) (in Russian).

3. Butins'kij, V. (2014). *Yurisdikcijnij*

status ukrains'kogo pravoslav'ya i perspektivi kanonichnogo oformlennya pomisnoi cerkvi: religieznavchi ta ekleziologichni refleksii (1991 – 2013 rr.). [Jurisdictional status of Ukrainian Orthodoxy and prospects for the canonical design of the local church: religious and ecclesiological reflections (1991 – 2013)]. Dis. na zdobuttya nauk. stupenya kand. filosof. nauk. Chernivci (in Ukrainian).

4. Vlasovskij, I. (1998). *Naris istorii Ukrains'koï Pravoslavnoi Cerkvi [Essay on the history of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church]*. T. 4. Ch. II. Kyiv (in Ukrainian).

5. Gergelyuk, M. (2014). *Kanonichni ta ekleziologichni zasady avtokefal'nogo ustroyu cerkov u strukturi Vselens'kogo pravoslav'ya: istorichnij kontekst. [Canonical and ecclesiological principles of the autocephalous system of churches in the structure of Ecumenical Orthodoxy: historical context]*. Dis. na zdobuttya nauk. stupenya kand. istor. nauk. Chernivci (in Ukrainian).

6. *Istoriya Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v XIX veke. Slavyanskije Cerkvi [History of the Orthodox Church in the XIX century. Slavic Churches]*. (1998). Moskva: Moskovskoe podvor'e Svyato-Troickoj Sergievoj Lavry (in Ukrainian).

7. Kiridon, A. (2007). Mitropolit Vasil' Lipkivskij: "...Ochevidno, moe zvil'nennya bulo vzhe ostatochno virisheno" [Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky: "... Obviously, my dismissal has already been finally decided"]. *Lavrs'kij al'manah. Kievo-Pechers'ka lavra v konteksti ukrains'koï istorii ta kul'turi: Zb. nauk. prac'. Kyiv, 17, 35–40* (in Ukrainian).

8. Kirilo (Govorun). (2019). *Rishtovannya Cerkvi: vbik poststruktural'noi ekleziologii [Church scaffolding: towards poststructural ecclesiology]*. Kyiv: DUH I LITERA (in Ukrainian).

9. *Kommyunike zasedaniya Predstoyatelej drevnih pravoslavnyh pariarhatov i Kiprskoj cerkvi. (2011). [Communique of the meeting of the Primate of the ancient Orthodox patriarchates and the Church of Cyprus]*. E-resource. Access mode: https://www.patriarchate.org/announcements/-/asset_publisher/anakoinothen-tes-synaxeos-ton-prokathemenon-ton-presbygenon-orthodoxon-patriarcheon-kaites-ekklecias-kyprou-phanarion-panseptos-patriarchikos (Last accessed: 17.03.20) (in Ukrainian).

10. *Kniga pravil Svyatyh Apostol, Svyatyh Soborov Vselenskih i Pomestnyh i Svyatyh Otec (2010). [The Book of Rules of the Holy Apostles, Holy Councils of the Ecumenical and Local and Saints Father]*. Moskva: izd-vo svyatitelya L'va, Papy Rimskogo (in Russian).

11. Lotoc'kij, O. (1935). *Avtokefaliya. Naris istorii avtokefal'nih cerkov: V 2 t.*

[Autocephaly. Essay on the history of autocephalous churches]. Varshava, 1: Zasadi avtokefalii (in Ukrainian).

12. Lotoc'kij, O. (1939). *V Cargorodi. [In Constantinople]*. Varshava, HL, (in Ukrainian).

13. Mulik-Lucik, Yu. (1989). *Istoriya Ukrains'koï Greko-Pravoslavnoi Cerkvi v Kanadi [History of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada]*. Vinnipeg, Kanada: Vidavnychy Spilka "Ekkleziya" (in Ukrainian).

14. Oleksandr (Drabinko). (2018). *Ukrains'ka Cerkva: shlyah do avtokefalii. Do diskusii navkolo kanonichnogo statusu, bogosluzhbovoi movi ta istorii Ukrains'koï Cerkvi. [Ukrainian Church: the path to autocephaly. To the discussion around the canonical status, liturgical language and history of the Ukrainian Church]*. Kyiv: Fond pam'yati Blazhennishogo Mitropolita Volodimira, DUH I LITERA (in Ukrainian).

15. *Pershij Vseukrains'kij Pravoslavnij Cerkovnij Sobor UAPC 14 – 30 zhovtnya 1921 roku: dokumenty i materialy. [The First All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church October 14-30, 1921: documents and materials]*. (1999). Kyiv; Lviv: Zhovkva (in Ukrainian).

16. *Poziciya Moskovskogo Patriarhata po voprosu o pervenstve vo Vselenskoj Cerkvi [The position of the Moscow Patriarchate on the issue of primacy in the Ecumenical Church]*. *Zhurnal № 157 Svyashchennogo Sinoda RPC ot 25–26 dekabrya 2013 g.* E-resource. Access mode: <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/3481089.html> (Last accessed: 15.03.20) (in Ukrainian).

17. Sagan, O. (2004). *Vselens'ke pravoslav'ya: sut', istoriya, suchasnij stan. [Ecumenical Orthodoxy: essence, history, current state]*. Kyiv: Svit Znan' (in Ukrainian).

18. Skurat, K. (1994). *Istoriya Pomestnyh Pravoslavnyh Cerkvej [History of Local Orthodox Churches]: T. 1.* Moskva: [b. v.] (in Russian).

19. Starodub, A. "Kiivs'kij" period zhittya i diyal'nosti Preosvyashchennogo Dionisiya (Valedins'kogo) (gruden' 1918 – sichen' 1919 r.). ["Kyiv" period of life and activity of Reverend Dionysius (Valedynsky) (December 1918 – January 1919)]. *Lars'kij al'manah: Kievo-Pechers'ka Lavra v konteksti ukrains'koï istorii ta kul'turi : zb. nauk. prac', 28* (in Ukrainian).

Receive: March 16, 2020

Accepted: May 20, 2020