

**PUBLIC OPINION AND HISTORICAL THOUGHT ON THE
AUTOCEPHALY ACQUISITION IN UKRAINE (1917–1921):
PARALLELS XX-XXI CC.**

Ihnatusha O. M.

INTRODUCTION

In the Ukrainian Church recent history there is hardly an issue with a social response as powerful as that of autocephaly.

At the meeting with the Ecumenical Patriarch in Istanbul on April 9, 2018 and later in his address to the Ukrainian Parliament on April 17, P. Poroshenko, the fifth President of Ukraine, put forward the initiative, supported by the Ukrainian episcopate, to join forces in getting Tomos (a document of Ukrainian Church autocephaly).

That's how the last attempt to recognize the international status of the Autocephalous Church of Ukraine began.

The question of autocephaly was raised during the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council in 1918. On January 1, 1919 the Directorate of the UPR adopted the Law on Church Autocephaly in Ukraine. On May 5, 1920 the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council declared its withdrawal from the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. On October 14, 1921 on the wave of national exaltation, there emerged and started functioning the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC). It existed from 1921 to 1930 but without worldwide recognition was destroyed by the Soviet regime.

The idea of Ukrainian autocephaly was so meaningful that it became one of the main factors in proclaiming Ukrainization as the state policy, and resulted in autocephalous projects of other newly established Ukrainian churches – Synodal (1923–1941) and Cathedral-Episcopal (1925–1937). The fate of these churches was tragic as well.

Another attempt of getting autocephaly was made during the Second World War; the German occupation authorities, however, did not allow Ukrainian forces to unify.

By its social nature the pursuit of autocephaly is quite typical. All nations of the Orthodox world on a certain level of their national-state consolidation followed this path. There already are 16 autocephalous churches already that exist in the modern world.

In order to better understand both driving and braking factors of this path, we will examine the changes in social and historical thought about autocephaly among those who were the participators of the events of the

Ukrainian revolution of 1917–1921. Those years were the starting point of the long struggle which ended with acquisition of the Tomos on autocephaly only in 2019. We will describe the stages of the Ukrainian movement for autocephaly in 1917–1921 and define their common and distinctive features as well as investigate the society's response to the need for an independent Ukrainian church.

The aim of the research predetermined the article's structure; it consists of three chronological blocks: 1. The Struggle for autocephaly during the period of the Central Council of Ukraine (1917 – April 1918); 2. Autocephalous projects of the period of the Hetmanate of P. Skoropadskyi (May – December 1918); 3. The establishment of autocephaly during the time of the Directorate of the UPR.

Despite the availability of scholastic research on the history of the UAOC, (the author of this article analyzed in his PhD thesis in 1993¹), as well as other relevant historiographical articles, the mentioned problems are not fully disclosed. (We mean the research of I. Prelovska², A Coridon³ and the author of this publication⁴). Therefore, we will turn to the main idea – to show what was typical and specific in the need of Ukrainian society for autocephaly during the revolution of 1917–1921.

1. The struggle for autocephaly during the period of the Central Council of Ukraine (1917 – April 1918)

The issue of the Ukrainian Church autocephaly has been put on the agenda of Ukrainian history by the process of modernization. The formation of the modern Ukrainian nation, the appearance of the Ukrainian national movement in the political trajectory of its development were followed by certain transformations of religious consciousness. Secularization of these relations, as a manifestation of market relations, dramatic increase of the interest to the forms of national identity and appreciation of these forms among believers – all these phenomena became evident. They became aware of the inseparability between national-religious and political demands of Ukrainians. This process

¹ Ігнатуша О. М. Українська автокефальна православна церква (1917–1930 рр.): дис. ... канд. іст. наук. 07.00.02 / Харківський державний університет. Харків, 1993. 255 с.

² Преловська І. Стилий нарис історіографії УАПЦ. *Український церковно-історичний журнал*. 2001. № 1. С. 68–89.

³ Киридон А. М. Українська Автокефальна Православна Церква: проблеми історіографії. *Православ'я – наука – суспільство: проблема взаємодії*: матеріали Всеукр. наук.-практ. конф. 24–25 квітня 2003 р., м. Черкаси. Черкаси: Черкаська академія менеджменту, 2003. С. 42–44.

⁴ Ігнатуша О. М. Сучасна українська історіографія відносин православної церкви та радянської держави (1920–1930-ті рр.). *Український історичний журнал*. 2006. № 2 (467). С. 174–190.

was described by the lines of Mykola Mikhnovskyi's in "Independent Ukraine" (1900). The author called for restoration and continuation of the achievements of the Ukrainian national revolution of the 17th century, in which he saw the source of sociological-political development of Ukraine: "All those religious and cultural movements were the result of increased educational level and they disturbed our society in the 17th century, promised to become a source of not only freedom of conscience but also of political freedom⁵".

After the first newspaper publications in the Ukrainian democratic press, born by revolution of 1905, and in the brochures of the times of the Ukrainian revolutionary spring of 1917, there appeared well-argued demands of autocephaly. The authors of these publications who relied on compelling historical facts were public figures. Most of them, for example, Oleksandr Lototskyi and Volodymyr Chekhivskyi had a special education in theology and history. They both came from priests' families, graduated from the Kyiv Theological Academy at different times and actively participated in the Ukrainian political movement. More than anybody else they felt the deep religiosity of the Ukrainian people and at the same time understood the national issue significance in liberation struggle and state establishment. They were the representatives of the Ukrainian intellectuals who formulated the idea of the Ukrainian Church autocephaly and understood the necessity of its implementation.

Some of the activists, involved in a process of an independent Ukrainian Church establishment, had holy orders, which was quite natural. However, for a long time their active social and church activity did not allow them to fulfill themselves as church historians. Therefore, their studies came to light much later, after overcoming the unfavourable circumstances, created by the Soviet authorities. Such publications became possible mainly abroad, in the Ukrainian diaspora, so their intellectual inheritance returned to homeland only after Ukraine had gained independence. A lot of research of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskyi, Metropolitan Archpriest Mytrofan Yavdas, Protodiacon Vasyl Potiienko came to their reader in that way.

At that time of revolutionary events only small polemical articles of historical and journalistic character came to life, and they could hardly be attributed to the early historiography of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church. They produced necessary arguments for autocephaly. Among them it is worth to mention the brochure "On the Ukrainianization of the Church"⁶. It was published without the author's signature but it became extremely popular with

⁵ Міхновський М. І. Самостійна Україна. Київ : Діокор, 2002. С. 38.

⁶ Про українізацію церкви. 4-е вид. Лубні, 1917. 12 с.

readers and therefore, survived at least four editions in the same year of 1917. As it became known now, it was written by a priest, the future bishop, Feofil Buldovskyi. He reported on this issue at the Diocesan Congress of Poltava in May 1917. Relying to the authority of Scripture and his knowledge of church history, the author maintained the main idea: “The church can approach the ideal of christianization of life only when it relies on it’s nation⁷”. On the examples of Apostle Paul’s mission in Macedonia, Cyril and Methodius in the Balkans, he tried to convince the readers of the vital necessity of national principles in church life organization, and emphasized the great responsibility of the clergy in this process. In his opinion they should “help the Ukrainian people not as if they were alien to them but as their allys, that is – speaking their language, respecting their national character, mentality, personal life, climate, nature – they have to Ukrainize the Church⁸”. F. Buldovskyi showed deep historical traditions in the ecclesiastical life of the Ukrainians which were purposefully destroyed by the Russian state and ecclesiastical authorities in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They were mainly the traditions in ecclesiastical administration, in the ceremonial sphere, in the language of the certain religious texts and chants. In this way the author emphasized on the revival of the Ukrainian church traditions and on proclamation of the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine. He linked it, as the majority in our society, with the necessity of state establishment of Ukraine on the basis of “national territorial autonomy”. Thus the study of Scripture and historical examples had led the author to quite practical conclusions: “1. Independent and territorially autonomous Ukraine must have independent of the state, autocephalous Church⁹”.

In the same year, 1917, Pavlo Maziukevych’s brochure “Christ and Ukrainism” was published in Zvenyhorodka, the contents of which are revealed in its subtitle: “Outline of the Path to Creation of a Free Ukrainian Orthodox Church¹⁰”. P. Maziukevych is not a well-known figure in the Ukrainian movement but he managed to fulfil himself by his active citizenship, by his activity in the field of information support of the struggle for Ukrainian statehood, being an editor of the newspaper “Dzvin”¹¹. In the first lines of his publication the author stated that the issue of the Ukrainian Church began to appear on the agenda of national life of Ukraine more often. Analyzing the cause of the decadence of the Church, “clogged and neglected

⁷ Про українізацію церкви. 4-е вид. Лубні, 1917. С. 3.

⁸ Про українізацію церкви. 4-е вид. Лубні, 1917. С. 5.

⁹ Про українізацію церкви. 4-е вид. Лубні, 1917. С. 10.

¹⁰ Мазюкевич П. Христос і українство. Звенигородка, 1917. 8 с.

¹¹ Ігнатуша О. М. “Наш храм зруйновано і вівтарі розбито...”. Павло Мазюкевич: грані таланту та поклик серця. *Київська Старовина*. 2008. № 4. С. 151–168.

by foreign management”, P. Maziukevych emphasized the consequences of such management: “from exterior architectural look to and the way of prayers pronunciation, the Church in Ukraine looks more Russian than even the Russian Church itself: Russian-Orthodox character in it became so strong that there is no place there for the one with a Ukrainian-Orthodox soul. Not a single Christian feature is left there, as if Christ himself and Holy Spirit commanded the church to turn the rest of nations into the great Russians (velikorossy), or at least into southern Russians (yugorossy)¹²”.

Did the author of the cited brochure aptly mention the breeding ground of the “Russian world” in Ukraine? These destructive for Ukrainian culture and religious psychology consequences of the pro-Russian church activity in Ukraine urged (and are still urging now) those, who are not indifferent, to seek a solution from the situation. P. Maziukevych did not blame the clergy alone for all the troubles, he did not consider the proclamation of autocephaly to be a quite sufficient act. In his opinion, the only possible way to revive the Orthodox Church in Ukraine was an establishment of the smallest church units, e.g. brotherhoods.

The abovementioned ideas also arised from the front pages of the “Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council” newspaper on the eve of the opening of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council two issues of this unique edition (December 31, 1917 and January 5, 1918), prepared by its editorial board, were published under the slogan “Long Live the Free Independent Ukrainian Orthodox Church¹³”.

The first issue began with the appeal of Archpriest Vasyl Lipkyvskiy (the future Archbishop and Metropolitan of the UAOC). He greeted the “faithful sons of the Orthodox Ukrainian Church” in such way: “We return home, begin our church establishment in a great and glorious time, time of the revival of the Ukrainian national state¹⁴”. In the same issue a large article by priest S. Fylypenko was published. It contained a chronicle of events in the church in Ukraine on the eve of the Council, and described the struggle of national-democratic forces for the Council convocation.

In the second issue the text of the above mentioned P. Maziukevych’s essay was reprinted and the booklet “On Ukrainianization of the Church” was featured in the section “Bibliography”. In the same issue the publishers annotated a report of a Doctor of Church History Archbishop Oleksii Dorodnitsyn “A Historical Background of the Ukrainian Church

¹² Мазюкевич П. Христос і українство. Звенигородка, 1917. С. 4–5.

¹³ *Вісті Українського Православного Церковного Собору*. Київ. 1917. Ч. 1. 31 грудня; *Вісті Українського Православного Церковного Собору*. Київ. 1918. Ч. 2. 5 січня.

¹⁴ Ліпковський В., прот. Соборноправність православної церкви. Київ : Кирило-Мефодіївське братство, 1918. 15 с.

Subordination to the Moscow Patriarchy”. It combined the features of scientific and historical studies and theology. Both issues were imbued with the idea of the Ukrainian Church revival, the release of the powerful energy of the Ukrainian people, who were ready to establish the Ukrainian Church on the principles of autocephaly.

Such was the optimistic beginning and rapid burst of the Ukrainian church-liberation movement on the eve of the All-Ukrainian Church Council’s convocation, reflected in historical and theological promotional writing. But the coming events of political and church life put the question of autocephaly on a long pause. There began the phase of pro-Russian conservative forces mobilization, which slowed down the implementation of Ukrainian autocephaly for a century.

2. Autocephalous projects of the Hetmanate of P. Skoropadskyi (May – December 1918)

This pause was recorded in a certain issue, which contained historically grounded publication on the subject of Ukrainian autocephaly. Its author, Pavlo Mohor, a man whose name deserves recognition of our contemporaries. Unfortunately, we know little about his social background as well as his profession and education, so we can only make some assumptions about it. But his national convictions were quite obvious. He worked in the Cultural Commission under the Ministry of Confessions of the Hetmanate¹⁵. His further career after the defeat of the Ukrainian Revolution was typical for those participants in revolutionary events, who remained with the Bolsheviks. Like many of them he tried to fulfil himself in cooperative movement and scholastic activity.

On the pages of the democratic newspaper “Renaissance” P. Mohor published a substantial article entitled “Autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church”. The newspaper was published by the editorial and publishing department of the Military Ministry of the UPR.

Not only the place of the article publication is notable, but also the time of its appearance – the first days of the Hetmanate, when according to the words of the editorial board itself: “We can not even define in general the direction we will take: the direction of the consolidation of our statehood or the direction of its total loss”¹⁶.

¹⁵ Протоколы заседаний Культурной комиссии при Министерстве исповеданий по вопросам охраны древней церковной старины, памятников, возвращении части их по договору с РСФСР и др. 1918. *Центральний архів Автономної Республіки Крим*. Ф. 540. Оп. 1. Спр. 142. Арк. 1–4.

¹⁶ Переворот і українські політичні партії. *Відродження*. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).

These words demonstrate a well-considered state position of the author – a supporter of democratic forms of society, and thus – strong convictions of the social and political forces that he embodied.

In 1918, the same year the article was published by a separate brochure¹⁷. It is worth to be given special attention, as the problems of the Ukrainian church-liberation movement in the past and nowadays in the 21st century are very much alike. P. Mohor analyzed the importance of the autocephalous church for the state building, society, church, and human personality.

He considered the state establishment and security, moral and cultural development of the nation, adherence to canons and traditions as the main aspects in this process. They have always been and still remain the cornerstones in the construction of the Ukrainian Church.

The author comes to a conclusion of the maturity of Ukrainian autocephaly and ends his article with the call: “Let the free autocephalous Ukrainian Church live for the benefit of its own state and the glory of its people”.

Mostly, P. Mohor emphasized the great responsibility of the authorities for the autocephaly establishment. He duly considered on the powerful resources of the Orthodox Church and its influence over Ukrainian society, therefore, stated, that it would not be difficult for Moscow to carry out its political plans in Ukraine under the religious banners.

According to the author, autocephaly is useful from a practical point of view. It allows us to develop the potential of the nation, both made by the community and the individuals. P. Mohor concluded: “For the future of our country from the political as well as moral and cultural view, we need to have autocephalous Moscow-free Ukrainian Orthodox Church¹⁸”.

He debunked groundless intimidation about the catholicization of Ukraine, a unification with Rome (which is still being heard from opponents of the Ukrainian autocephaly): “Let “the jealous followers of Orthodoxy” forgive us, but their fear of the Catholic Church can be explained either by their short-sightedness or, which is worse, by their wish to intimidate the people who are not very sophisticated in religious matters and thus, prevent the Ukrainian Church from becoming independent of Moscow”. Even then (in 1918) he noted that the signs of information warfare against autocephaly supporters. P. Mohor substantiated his view with the historical facts of the 15th – 18th centuries when unprecedented Catholic pressure in Ukraine had relied on the military power. But he asserted that times had changed. He also

¹⁷ Мохор П. Автокефалія Української церкви. Київ, 1918. 12 с.

¹⁸ Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).

stated: “What if the Catholic clergy advocates propaganda of their faith, or unity with the Pope, or unity – it is not dangerous, moreover, it is even desirable, because it will not let the Orthodox Church sleep, but will urge it to work, become ardent; this is what Apostle Paul demands for Christians”¹⁹.

At the same time, he believed that Ukrainian autocephaly would become the most important factor in overcoming the threat of atheism.

The author of the publication is aware of the specificity of the Orthodox world. This is what he said about national churches: “Each of them has the task not only of salvation of an individual, but of the whole nation, of promoting its spiritual development, of enlightening its ethnic identity”²⁰. P. Mohor concluded, that from the point of view of universal Orthodoxy, there were no obstacles to the emergence of new independent churches. “The Universal Church needs them so that in this way every nation can manifest its unique spirituality”²¹. The author tried to prove that the history of the Ukrainian Church before joining Moscow was full of energy of life, which was crushed by “tsarism and spiritual centralism.

In a separate chapter, the author examines the issue of the Kyivan Metropolitanate subordination to the Moscow Patriarchate, opposition of the church hierarchy to this process, traces the chronology of events of the establishment of the Moscow’s superiority over the Ukrainian Church. To strengthen his arguments P. Mohor referred to such sources – “The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire”, “Archive of Southwestern Russia”.

The following argument is worthy of special consideration: “Moscow’s destructive influence on the Ukrainian Church does not deny the possibility of building friendly relations with other churches: the Ukrainian Church wants to be in ecclesiastical unity with the whole Christian world, but it also wants to preserve its uniqueness in religious creativity and sincerity of service for the benefit of its people”²².

P. Mohor gave the canonical and historical grounds of autocephaly and concluded: “Now Ukraine has become an independent People’s Republic and therefore, has a certain canonical right to the autocephalous church. Moreover, it has a historical right to it as well”²³.

The article ended with the conclusion: “The time has come to return to Ukraine its independent church life, its former rights and privileges”²⁴.

¹⁹ Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).

²⁰ Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).

²¹ Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).

²² Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).

²³ Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).

²⁴ Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).

The ideas of the first abstracts of the autocephaly publications sound very appropriate in the light of Russian-Ukrainian relations and the Kremlin's hybrid war against Ukraine. The messages of the article of a hundred years ago are in line with those of modern historians²⁵ and publicists²⁶. It confirms the nature of the time-delayed conflict and that the outcome logic did not follow the old scenario of Moscow but was according to the algorithm of universal Orthodoxy.

The internal and external challenges the Ukrainian Church is facing now, the threat to the integrity of the Ukrainian state which Russia poses – all these problems remained unsolved of the point of achieving autocephaly in the past (100 years ago) and the loss of Ukrainian statehood due to the lack of spiritual unity of Ukrainians.

Since May 1918 public sentiment on church issues had shifted to the right. Especially in the questions, in which the supporters of Ukrainian autocephaly did not have a strong position – mainly in the South and the East of Ukraine. There is a striking example of the Katerynoslav's Diocesan Congress, where a famous historian Dmytro Yavornytskyi, a friend of the chairman of the presidium, took part. The congress adopted a number of controversial decisions as to the Ukrainianization of the church. The dramatic course of the dispute and the speakers' arguments demonstrated immaturity of public opinion on this issue and lack of historical knowledge.

Analyzing the results of the congress let us draw attention to a fragment of the text of the plenary session: "The Holy Father ... declared ... saying that the Holy Patriarch claimed that he would not bless autocephaly now²⁷". As we see, the bishop put direct pressure on the delegates. The heated dispute of autocephaly's supporters should be viewed at an angle of this statement, which adds controversy to it.

After a two-day active debate on May 27, 1918 two draft resolutions of the autonomy and the autocephaly were put to the vote. The former gained the majority of votes. The resolution was formulated as follows: "Taking into consideration the long-lasting union of the Churches of Ukraine and Russia which enabled them to withstand all historical fallout, – the autocephaly of the Church in Ukraine has to be rejected; autonomy, as much as the Church of Ukraine needs, is accepted²⁸". The second resolution with 11 votes

²⁵ Олександр (Драбинко), митрополит. Українська Церква: шлях до автокефалії. Київ : Дух і літера, 2019. 684 с.

²⁶ Щоткіна К. Хроніки Томосу. Харків : Віват, 2019. 304 с.

²⁷ Труды Катеринославського екстреного з'їзду представників духовництва і мирян Православної Церкви 10–17 травня 1918 року. [Катеринослав, 1918]. С. 12.

²⁸ Труды Катеринославського екстреного з'їзду представників духовництва і мирян Православної Церкви 10–17 травня 1918 року. [Катеринослав, 1918]. С. 22.

(against – 62, abstained – 4) proclaimed: “In the independent Ukrainian State the Ukrainian Orthodox Church which had been independent from the Russian Church until the mid-17th century, existed in close union with the State, consisted of more than 30 million Orthodox parishers, and thus, must be independent and loyal to the foundations of Orthodox teaching²⁹”.

As we can see, the only argument against autocephaly was the stereotypical notion of a centuries-old common history of the Ukrainian and Russian churches as being the main condition for their existence and successful confrontation against alien influences.

Supporters of autocephaly stated that the status of the independent state should be in the conformity with the autocephalous structure of the church. Other points were also noteworthy: the historical fact of the Ukrainian Church independence from Moscow up to the 17th century; the number of its followers; the unity with the Orthodox world.

The texts of both resolutions stated the existence of two separate church communities – of the Ukrainian and Russian Churches. Therefore, we believe that in the autonomists’ consciousness there was a substantial precondition for the evolution of their views toward autocephaly. Later it took place, and existence of the state itself became a convincing argument for it.

Due to military situation in the country the congress was attended by representatives of the local state administration – Colonel Kravchenko, who congratulated the congress on behalf of the Ukrainian government. The interim commissioner for church affairs I. Umanskyi made a speech warning against disloyal statements about the possible restoration of all-Russian statehood.

As the young Dnipro researcher Y. Snida points out, that due to the authorities support of the nationalistically-oriented clergy, the question of autocephaly was put on the agenda again³⁰.

Archpriest Andrii Murin delivered a report on the nature of autocephaly. A board member of the Katerinoslav Theological College Father Serhii Mizetskyi spoke on the topic: autonomy or autocephaly. He drew attention to the practical aspect of autocephaly, which raised a lot of questions. Among them were such: if there was the necessity for autocephaly; whether it would lead to a break with the Russian Church; whether “both churches (especially Ukrainian) would not be subjected to the militant Catholicism with the Uniate

²⁹ Труды Катеринославського екстреного з'їзду представників духовництва і мирян Православної Церкви 10–17 травня 1918 року. [Катеринослав, 1918]. С. 22–23.

³⁰ Snida С. О. Катеринославська єпархія російської православної церкви в 1917–1919 рр.: проблеми соборноправності та українізації церковного життя. *Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького національного університету*. Запоріжжя : ЗНУ, 2016. Вип. 46. С. 147–150.

Bishop Sheptytskyi at the head, as the rumors had already said”; could it happen that the Patriarch of Constantinople will conquer the Ukrainian Church? The nature of these questions demonstrated the audience’s diversity, the different levels of understanding the issue, the overpowering stereotypes of prolonged Russian propaganda about the “horrors” of Catholicism and the “virtues” of unity with Moscow.

In his response speech Archpriest A. Murin argued that the historical path of the Ukrainian Church was canonical and secured by the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch. Whereas the Russian church went a way of schism³¹. The same episode was mentioned by the priest S. Mizetskyi: “In 1448, the act of appointing Metropolitan Jonah without the knowledge and consent of the Patriarch of Constantinople, the council of Russian bishops also committed schism”³². His speech ended with the words: “And the smallest autocephaly is still more real than the broadest autonomy”³³.

We can state that the certain part of the audience was familiar with in the historical material and used its argument during the dispute; they spoke boldly about the “schismatic” history of the Russian Church. These ideas were spread by priests – people who received not only theological but also historical education.

It is noteworthy, that the text of S. Mizetskyi’s report in the Congress publications was written in Russian. It indicates, that in 1918 the issue of autocephaly was understood by Russian-speaking Ukrainians not less adequately, than by Ukrainian-speaking ones. The historical parallels of 2018–2019 show, that Russian-speaking supporters of autocephaly of today had worthy predecessors.

At the plenary meeting on May 29, by request of those present, D. Yavornytskyi made a report on the Ukrainianization of the church. His speech, infused with love for his native Ukraine, was regarded as informative and extremely interesting. The speaker emphasized that contemporaries should appreciate everything that expresses the original national spirit. The Ukrainianization of the church, in his understanding, had to be manifested firstly in architecture, icon painting and hymns singing. At the same time, he believed that Church Slavonic should remain as the language of worship. It was a typical point of view even among those who sought autocephaly but understood the complexity and delicacy of introducing the Ukrainian language

³¹ Труды Катеринославського екстреного з’їзду представників духовництва і мирян Православної Церкви 10–17 травня 1918 року. [Катеринослав, 1918]. С. 10–11.

³² Труды Катеринославського екстреного з’їзду представників духовництва і мирян Православної Церкви 10–17 травня 1918 року. [Катеринослав, 1918]. С. 13.

³³ Труды Катеринославського екстреного з’їзду представників духовництва і мирян Православної Церкви 10–17 травня 1918 року. [Катеринослав, 1918]. С. 15.

into worship. Most believers were unaware of the real threat of Russia's speculation on this issue. A radical change of a language without proper preparation to it could have the opposite effect and discredit the very idea of reforming the church. It is known that D. Yavornytskyi consistently promoted the study of national church history. He offered to open a special department of the church Ukrainianization at the diocesan candle factory, where the samples of church memorials would be concentrated. D. Yavornytskyi also proposed the name to a new diocesan body – “The Church Herald of Zaporozhzhia”, which was supported by the congress. It is known, that by November 1918 at least 6 issues of this edition had been published³⁴.

There was a section of Ukrainianization of the Church at the congress. D. Yavornytsky spoke at it in favor of translation of liturgical literature and explained the use of language in church practice. The section adopted a resolution of 18 clauses. In particular, it recognized the need of immediate Ukrainianization in those parishes where Ukrainians were the majority. It allowed the Ukrainian pronunciation of the Church Slavonic text at the liturgy and reading the Gospel in Ukrainian. All priests were to know both Russian and Ukrainian. The language of the sermon could be chosen depending on the attendees of the liturgy. The section voted for the publication of explanations of the tenets of faith, sacraments, ordinances and worship in the Ukrainian language, in a convenient and comprehensible form. It supported the reprint of the Psalter, translated by P. Kulish. It was decided to buy and distribute among the parishes prof. I. Ohienko's lecture “The Revival of the Ukrainian Church”. It is known, that Yavornytskyi's speech made a strong impression on the delegates of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council and caused a storm of applause and ended up with singing the Ukrainian anthem “Shche ne vmerla Ukraina”³⁵.

The issue of autocephaly kept running on the pages of the local press. The special attention to it was given by the the article “Autocephaly or Autonomy?”, published on July 12, 1918 in the newspaper “Pridneprovsky Krai”. Its author had pro-Russian sentiments and widely used the idea of a “common history”. He wrote: “The struggle for Orthodoxy against the Latin Cross and Mohammedian Crescent – that was of higher value of the Ukrainian soul and worldview in the past”³⁶.

³⁴ Обіжник Катеринославського єпархіального місіонерського комітету благочинним Катеринославської єпархії про надіслання коштів від церков. 10 листопада 1918 р. *Державний архів Запорізької області*. Ф. 19. Оп. 1. Спр. 108. Арк. 755.

³⁵ Огієнко І. Рятування України На тяжкій службі своєму народові. 2-ге вид., доп. Вінніпег: Товариство “Волинь”, 1968. С. 11.

³⁶ Нештатный. Автокефалия или автономия. *Приднєпровський Край*. 1918. 12 июля.

In the horrors of the First World War and waves of refugees to the south and east, this idea has been reinforced. On June 25, 1918 the priest of the St. Mykolai's church in Oleksandrivsk (now – Zaporizhzhia) informed that the territory of his parish (near the railway station where there was a constant flow of migrants) is inhabited by about 3,000 of Catholics, 2,000 of Protestants, 500 of Greek Catholic, 100 – of those belonging to sects and 30 – non Christians³⁷. Such facts gave rise to anti-Catholic and anti-autocephalous hysteria. Even more conservative was the mood at the next diocesan congress as reported by the newspaper “Pridneprovsky Krai”: “The sentiment of the congress was the most moderate – the turn to the right was fast and decisive”³⁸.

The society held in view the important events of church life. Local press reported recognition of the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Church and restoration of the Patriarchate in Russia, election of Patriarch Tikhon (Belavin), proclamation of the All-Ukrainian Council of Autonomy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church³⁹. There appeared the information about the renewal of the Cabinet of Ministers and about the commitment to the autocephaly of the Minister of Confessions O. Lototsky⁴⁰.

The pro-Russian forces were not satisfied with the mere idea of the Ukrainian autocephaly. An anonymous opponent of autocephaly wrote: “... No wonder that people so often protest against attempts to “ukrainize” the school”⁴¹. Rejection of Ukrainian forms of education, culture, and therefore, of statehood, all these were the links in the same chain of ideological obstacles to the Ukrainian autocephaly.

However, the development of the Ukrainian statehood required, first of all, the support of the autocephalous church. When O. Lototsky, a well-known public figure, a supporter of the idea of the Ukrainian Church independence, was included to the Hetmanate's Cabinet of Ministers as a Minister of Confessions, it led to a sharpening of the relations between the government and the pro-Russian majority of the delegates of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council. O. Lototsky formulated the state authorities' desire for autocephaly. But the Hetmanate again swayed towards Moscow, so O. Lototsky's activity in the government happened to be quite short.

³⁷ Рапорт священника Миколаївської церкви м. Олександрівська благочинному 1-го округу церков Олександрівського повіту про наявність іновірців на території парафії. 25 липня 1918 р. *Державний архів Запорізької області*. Ф. 19. Оп. 1. Спр.108. Арк. 452.

³⁸ Итоги епархиального съезда. *Приднeпровский край*. 1918. 4 октября.

³⁹ Постановления Константинопольского синода. *Приднeпровский Край*. 1918. 10 октября.

⁴⁰ Новое министерство. *Приднeпровский Край*. 1918. 27 октября.

⁴¹ Нештатный. Автокефалия или автономия. *Приднeпровский Край*. 1918. 12 июля.

Supporters of autocephaly were convinced in inevitability of ecclesiastical independence of Ukraine. A lawyer and a diplomat V. P. Hirchenko wrote: “The idea of the autocephaly of our church cannot be killed. Sooner or later people will demand its implementation because the rise of national consciousness will strengthen the pursuit for autocephaly”⁴². He explained it with the psychological and political reasons. Firstly, “philosophical-rationalist religious sentiment of Ukrainians cannot be reconciled with the mystical-ceremonial religious views of “the great Russians””. Secondly, “the native church is the best foundation of the native state, as the religious-national boundaries, held in the people’s consciousness as a manifestation of the most intimate properties of the national spirit, must serve as a basis for dividing spheres of influence from the political side as well”⁴³.

Supporters of autocephaly have deployed national church establishment, referring to the historical traditions. This path was shown in the Archpriest Vasyl Lypkivskiy’s brochure, published by the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood⁴⁴.

The Brotherhood began to play the role of consolidating center. It was formed during the first session of the All-Ukrainian Council and organizationally emerged on April 30, 1918. The Brotherhood proclaimed the purpose of “revival of the Orthodox National Ukrainian Church” by awakening public opinion and popularizing the idea of the Ukrainian National Church by lecturing, excursion, and mainly publishing. In spring of 1918 it numbered 160 people⁴⁵.

The Hetmanate supported the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood financially and promotes the organization of fraternal groups under the ward of the state⁴⁶. The concept of the Hetmanate leadership in the church issue was: to build a canonical Ukrainian Orthodox Church independent of the ROC. However, the policy of P. Skoropadskiy’s Hetmanate was not always consistent. It eventually led to Orthodox Ukraine autonomy within the Moscow Patriarchate. The Third Session of the All-Ukrainian Church Council consolidated the act of granting the Ukrainian Orthodox Church autonomous status.

⁴² Гірченко В. П. Самовизначення Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 3 грудня (20 листопада).

⁴³ Гірченко В. П. Самовизначення Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 3 грудня (20 листопада).

⁴⁴ Ліпковський В., прот. Соборноправність православної церкви. К. : Кирило-Методіївське братство, 1918. 15 с.

⁴⁵ Ігнатуша О. М. Українська автокефальна православна церква (1917–1930 рр.): дис. ... канд. іст. наук. 07.00.02 / Харківський державний університет. Харків, 1993. С. 65.

⁴⁶ Ігнатуша О. М. Інституційний розкол православної церкви в Україні в умовах модернізації: дис. ... докт. іст. наук. 07.00.01 / Запорізький національний університет. Запоріжжя, 2006. С. 40.

It did not remove the question of the Ukrainian autocephaly from the agenda of the modern Ukraine state establishment process. The Ukrainian statehood was the fact of life, and the differences between it and Soviet Russia deepened. The autonomous status of our church was not approved by Russian White Guards, who made claims on Ukraine and considered “concessions” to Ukrainians to be excessive. All this intensified the autocephalous movement which eventually resulted in the radical initiative of the Directorate of the UPR, which proclaimed autocephaly by the state law of January 1, 1919.

3. Introduction of autocephaly during the time of Directorate of the UPR

The political instability of the UPR and the loss of its territory as a result of the interventions of communists and monarchists of Russia minimized the success of the Ukrainian autocephaly. It became possible for the Ukrainian Orthodoxy to establish independent from Moscow church only on the limited territories under the UPR troops control. Consequently, the number of the supporters of the autocephaly idea decreased. Its active leaders of the time – Prime Minister V. Chekhivskiy, Ministers of Confessions O. Lototsky and I. Ohienko did not have any possibility to carry out a broad work on popularization of this idea and, moreover, to resort to deep scientific, historical and theological studies that required time, sources of scholastic information, economic resources. Therefore, they were able to pay attention to its analysis only outside Ukraine, after the end of the active phase of this systemic conflict.

Among the publications of this time the work of Vasyl Bidnov should be mentioned firstly. Being in political exile, in 1921, he published a small sketch of the history of the Ukrainian people struggle for their church independence⁴⁷. V. Bidnov was a civic activist, a former member of the Central Council of Ukraine from the “Prosvita” of Katerynoslav, a member of the Ukrainian Socialist-Federalists Party, the Dean of the Theological Faculty of Kamianets-Podilskyi State University since January 1919, a member of the Ukrainian Church-Liberation Movement (member of the Council of the Ministry of Confessions, headed by Ivan Ohienko), the head of the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood. In his publication V. Bidnov analyzed and covered the most active stage of the struggle for the church independence of Ukraine – from 1917 to the end of 1920. He said “The Ukrainian people do not want to depend on Moscow in the sphere of religion... They want the Orthodox Church in Ukraine to be autocephalous”⁴⁸.

⁴⁷ Біднов В. Церковна справа на Україні. Тернів : Українська Автокефальна Церква, 1921. 52 с.

⁴⁸ Біднов В. Церковна справа на Україні. Тернів : Українська Автокефальна Церква, 1921. С. 48.

V. Bidnov drew attention to the fact that the clergy, and the higher hierarchy in particular resisted autocephaly. He claimed that the clergy separated themselves from the ordinary people. “Our highest hierarchy stood on the basis of Moscow centralism and bureaucracy, hostile to our people, and supported Moscow policy of oppression”⁴⁹.

The activity of the bishop of Podillia Pymen Pehov, which unfolded on the territory controlled by the Directory, was destructive and anti-autocephalist. Born in Russia, bishop Pymen sabotaged the implementation of the laws of the Directory as for the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in the diocese. He hindered the introduction of the Ukrainian language into church life. Later, when the Bolsheviks came to power, he cooperated with them, harassed supporters of autocephaly, in particular, members of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood. The bishop’s activities were regarded by the Directory as anti-state ones. On this occasion, he was investigated on charges of treason⁵⁰. When the Bolsheviks finally established themselves in Ukraine, bishop Pimen headed the church organization (the Synodal Church), directed against the UAOC.

Among the direct participants and organizers of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Movement and its first historians was Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskyi (1864–1937) – the first hierarch of the UAOC. He was the author of “History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church”, the only chapter of which survived⁵¹. Later, it was published outside Ukraine. The time when the chapter was written is unknown, but it was here that the founder of the Ukrainian Church analyzed the most difficult and critical times of the autocephalous movement and the formation of the UAOC. He noted that his “pages are more of a memoir than of historical character”, as without proper sources, they were written only on the basis of his personal memories. Nevertheless, the author managed to convey the intense events from the beginning of the revolution to the First All-Ukrainian Church Council of the UAOC in 1921. He covered the historical background and ideological foundation of the Ukrainian church development, and referred to it as a history of “revival”, rather than building of a new church.

The author reconstructed the first steps of the autocephaly and gave his assessment to many events and public figures. He spoke about the progress and results of the All-Ukrainian Church Council in 1918, the establishment of the first parishes, the work of governing bodies and mainly about the All-

⁴⁹ Біднов В. Церковна справа на Україні. Тернів : Українська Автокефальна Церква, 1921. С. 6.

⁵⁰ Біднов В. Церковна справа на Україні. Тернів : Українська Автокефальна Церква, 1921. С. 42–45.

⁵¹ Липківський Василь, митр. Історія Української Православної Церкви. Розд. VII: Відродження Української Церкви. Вінніпег, Канада : Trident press LTD, 1961. 181 с.

Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council. He assessed the influence of political regimes of the Hetmanate, Directorate, Denikin and the Soviets on the autocephalous movement. He was the first to highlight the circumstances of autocephaly announcement on May 5, 1920 and the difficulties of acquiring a bishopric. Stories of the history of the autocephalous movement in Metropolitan Vasily Lypkivskiy's interpretation have significantly influenced the historiography of the UAOC.

O. Lototskyi was one of the initiators of the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church. He played a special role in the theoretical grounding of the problems of church independence in the Orthodox world. It is a well-known fact that in the autumn of 1918, O. Lototskyi spoke at the All-Ukrainian Church Council about the setting a course of the Hetmanate for autocephaly. It was O. Lototsky, who during his brief term as the Minister of Confessions of the Directorate of the UPR, presented a draft law on the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church for Government's approval. It was proclaimed on January 1, 1919.

Soon O. Lototskyi was sent to Constantinople with the mission to gain recognition of the Ukrainian Autocephaly by the Ecumenical Church. He left valuable memories about this event. Later, in the 1930s, while in Poland, O. Lototskyi outlined his fundamental theoretical research.

A special role in the affirmation of the idea of the Ukrainian autocephaly belonged to O. Lototskyi's article "Ukrainian Sources of Church Law" which was published in Warsaw in 1931. Later, to commemorate the millennium of Baptism of Ukraine, it was reprinted by the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States in 1984. We quote the thesis of his report as Minister of Confessions at the All-Ukrainian Council of 1918, taken from the book by O. Lototskyi: "The autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church is not only the necessity of our church but also of our nation-state. This is the ultimate need of our church, our state, our nation. Those who understand and accept the interests of the Ukrainian people, also accept the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church. And vice versa"⁵².

In 1935 and 1938, two volumes of O. Lototskyi's book "Autocephalia" were published as a serial edition of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw⁵³. Giving reasons to canonical principles of church autonomy in Orthodoxy, O. Lototskyi showed historical ways of its origin, development and structure. He thoroughly analyzed the ecclesiastical and state-legal foundations of autocephaly. On the example of different churches, he

⁵² Лотоцький О. Українські джерела церковного права. Саут-Баунд-Брук; Нью-Йорк. 1984. С. 133–134.

⁵³ Лотоцький О. Автокефалія. Т. I. Засади автокефалії. Варшава, 1935. 206 с.; Лотоцький О. Автокефалія. Т. II. Нарис історії автокефальних церков. Варшава, 1938. 560 с.

described the historical and canonical traditions of granting the complete ecclesiastical autonomy, he also figured out dogmas and the meaning of transformations of the church system, revealed the principles of sobornist (unity of the Christian churches), and characterized its concepts and forms of unity. He showed in details how the principles of autocephaly were embodied in the history of different national churches. It is worth to mention, that when at the end of the 20th century, a new wave of Ukrainian national revival rose and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate appeared in Ukraine in 1992, it reprinted the research of A.Lototsky⁵⁴.

The third volume of O. Lototsky's work "Autocephaly" is dedicated to the affirmation of the Ukrainian autocephaly. It was prepared for publication but never issued because it was destroyed in the hard times of World War II. Yet that part of O. Lototsky's creative heritage, that survived, showed that there had been grounds for recognizing the local status of a self-governing Ukrainian church.

One of the active supporters of the idea of the Ukrainian autocephaly during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 was Volodymyr Chekhivskyi. He was an author a number of historical, journalistic, scholastic and theological studies that appeared during the revolutionary events and later in the 1920s. This author is quite justifiably considered to be an ideologist of the UAOC. At the same time he was a well-known public and political figure – a member of the first the Ukrainian political party (the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party) in the Transdnieper region, later – the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party, a deputy of the 1st state Duma, a member of the Central Council and since April 1918 the Director of the department of Confessions in the Government of the UPR, the head of the first Government of the Directorate and the initiator of the autocephaly law of the Ukrainian Church (January 1, 1919).

In 1918 he published his work "Who Serves the Church Parish in Ukraine" and in 1919 it was republished in a modified form – "Church Parish in Ukraine"⁵⁵. These publications revealed the political link between the church and the imperial power of Russia which enslaved the Kyiv Metropolitanate. Relying on historical facts and church sources, the author claimed the right of the Ukrainian Church to autocephaly. Soon in 1922, the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council (governing body of the UAOC), as well as the

⁵⁴ Лотоцький О. Автокефалія. Т. I. Засади автокефалії. Репринтне відтворення. Київ : АТ Книга, 1999. 206 с.; Лотоцький О. Автокефалія. Т. II. Нарис історії автокефальних церков. Репринтне відтворення. Київ : АТ Книга, 1999. 560 с.

⁵⁵ Трембійський А. А. Науково-богословська спадщина Володимира Чехівського. *Наукові праці Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка*. Кам'янець-Подільський: Аксіома, 2010. С. 76.

Church Council of the St. Mykolai Cathedral in Kharkiv, published the separate editions of a V. Chekhivskiy's brochure "For the Church, Christ's Community, Against the Kingdom of Darkness"⁵⁶. These publications appeared when the UAOC had already been proclaimed. However, it became known that the procedure took place with a deviation from the canonical norms based on the historical precedents of Presbyterian ordination in the Church of Alexandria in the 2nd century. This caused a flurry of criticism from ideological opponents. Therefore, in this study in addition to the theoretical regulations of the previous pamphlets, Chekhivskiy paid considerable attention to the moral and legal aspect and the canonical justification of the ordination of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskiy.

The publishers of one of the later reprints (it was repeatedly reprinted in emigration) wrote about the high scientific level of the publication, profound analysis and synthesis of its research, and emphasized that it shed light on the "tremendous movement of moral and religious national revival of the Ukrainian people after Revolution of 1917"⁵⁷.

V. Chekhivskiy outlined the path of Ukrainian Orthodoxy to autocephaly relying on the history of the ecumenical and national churches, the Holy Scriptures, ecclesiastical canons, opinions of prominent Christian theologians and sources of theological literature. The UAOC's proclamation in October 1921 was presented as a fact of liberation of the church "from dependency on the "kingdom of darkness". It is not a coincidence, that the modern UAOC history researcher Iryna Prelovska recalls this publication by V. Chekhivskiy, saying that it has not lost its importance to the present day: "This research can be as a valuable source for analyzing not only the examples of argumentation in favour of separation from the Russian Church, but also for the study of the theological thought development during the Church-liberation processes in Ukraine during 1917–1921"⁵⁸.

It is worth mentioning at least one of the fragments of V. Chekhivskiy's vivid journalistic argumentation: "You are weak-minded! Do you think that the apostolic succession was preserved not by the church but by the ordinations of Moscow bishops, usurpers of the church in Ukraine? Don't fool yourself! Either acknowledge that the tree is good and its fruit will be good, or

⁵⁶ Чехівський В. За церкву, Христову громаду, проти царства тьми. К. : Вид. ВПЦР, 1922. 52 с.; Чехівський В. За церкву, Христову громаду, проти царства тьми. Харків: Вид. Церковної Ради 1-ої парафії Української Православної Церкви Миколаївського Собору, 1922. 52 с.

⁵⁷ Чехівський В. За церкву, Христову громаду, проти царства тьми. Нью-Йорк : Українська Автокефальна Православна Церква, 1974. С. 47.

⁵⁸ Преловська І.М. Прем'єр-міністр уряду УНР Володимир Чехівський (1876–1937 рр.). *Гілея*. 2008. Вип. 11. С. 41.

admit that the tree is bad and its fruit will be bad because the tree is recognized by its fruit (Mat. 12:33). You see the fruit of the Moscow hierarchy activity in the Ukrainian Church: the fading of the faith of Christ, the work abuse of the faithful Ukrainian people, national oppression, fierce enmity, wars, murder”⁵⁹.

As we see the scientific and theological nature of the first studies on Ukrainian, autocephaly was organically combined with a journalistic style of interpretation of facts which testified both to the high tension of this issue in the Ukrainian society hundred years ago, and to inevitable social radicalism in its solution.

V. Chekhivskyi was also the author of a number of other scientific and theological studies published in the journal “Church and Life”, which was allowed to be published by the UAOC during 1926–1928 by the Soviet authorities. It was the central and the only printed organ of this Church. In its several issues (in 1927–1928) an incomplete version of his theological research “The Basis for the Liberation of the Church from the Dark World of this Evilous Age (Eph. 6: 10–13)” was published. There the author asserted the legitimacy of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskyi’s consecration. The original of this substantial publication is stored in the archival fund of the UAOC. A short article by V. Chekhivskyi “Achievements of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church” remained unpublished⁶⁰. Thus, V. Chekhivskyi was one of the first theorists, organizers, and historians of the Ukrainian Church, who first proclaimed its autocephaly and struggled for it. His studies reflect the peculiarity of the Ukrainian national liberation movement of the first decades of the 20th century, during which the significance of the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church for establishing Ukrainian statehood, was established. In this way, the opinions of the supporters and opponents of this idea were formed and polarized. And the strengthening or weakening of different views was strongly associated with the victories of certain political forces that gained access to state establishment.

CONCLUSIONS

Having examined the Ukrainian public and historical opinion of 1917–1921 in favour of autocephaly, we become convinced of the resonant modernity of its ideas.

⁵⁹ Чехівський В. За церкву, Христову громаду, проти царства тьми. Нью-Йорк : Українська Автокефальна Православна Церква, 1974. С. 42.

⁶⁰ Трембійський А. А. Науково-богословська спадщина Володимира Чехівського. *Наукові праці Кам’янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка*. Кам’янець-Подільський: Аксіома, 2010. С. 77.

The first attempt to assert the Ukrainian autocephaly brought up by a powerful rise of national consciousness – the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917. The foundation of the idea relied on the historical past and its use in the practice of national state establishment. However, Ukraine's long dependence on Russia and its integration into the Russian state and culture formed strong mental stereotypes that hindered the maturing of the idea of autocephaly and its implementation at the all-Ukrainian level. The issue had an urgency of national importance and security, that is why the idea, put forward by the democratic forces, was approved even by the supporters of the Ukrainian right wing of the establishers of the Hetmanate. However, among the socialist and liberal conservative forces, there was neither a unity for implementation of this idea, nor necessary resources.

The first who drew attention to the idea of autocephaly were public figures – historians, priests, and journalists. They generated ideas, moods and spread them in the the society. Later, as the 21st century will prove, there are many analogies to this issue as well.

Even then, in the years of 1917–1921, the most controversial moments were being considered – the Ukrainian-Russian relations, the question of international legitimacy of the act of proclaiming the ecclesiastical independence of Ukraine. It was an invaluable experience that had been gained on the way to the Ukrainian autocephaly.

Historical thought was an active agent in this process. Promotion of the ideas was carried out by journalistic essays and spread from the congresses and meetings.

The century between the first autocephaly of January 1, 1919 and the autocephaly approved by the Tomos of the Ecumenical Patriarchate on January 5, 2019, convincingly affirms the vitality of the idea of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church national dignity.

Thus, the issue of the independence of the church in the independent state, the struggle for which lasted for the last century, proved that intellectual property of our predecessors of 1917–1921, is still topical and consistent.

The realia of establishing the Ukrainian statehood, with its inevitable liberation from the Russian governance, the question of national identity, which became even more significant during the Russian-Ukrainian war, proved that striving for the autocephaly had been the matter of vital importance for the Ukrainians. They proved the rightness of our choice of autocephaly as a means of normalizing the problems that were driven into the deadlock by the Russian centralism centuries ago.

We state that the origin of this movement is quite objective and natural for Ukrainian nation and at the same time, it is typical for the historical path of the world Orthodoxy.

Now that the United Orthodox Church in Ukraine has become a real fact, there appeared many new problems on the way to its unity, worldwide recognition; all this is a reflection of internal and external aspects of any development process. But this is another topic of proclaiming autocephaly, though closely related to that outlined in the article. And it is on the stage of its own historiography formation as well.

SUMMARY

The article analyzes the public and historical opinion of the supporters of the Ukrainian Church autocephaly, expressed by them during the Ukrainian National Revolution of 1917–1921. The foundation for our study comprised historical and journalistic writings of direct participants of the events, published and archive materials of the Orthodox Ukrainian Church of the time of revolution. In the article the circle of followers of this idea is outlined. The spectrum of thoughts and arguments in favour of the autocephaly under many political regimes that replaced each other during the Ukrainian Revolution, is described. It was showed how the process of national consciousness growth influenced our striving for church autocephaly. The attention is drawn to specificity of the Ukrainian path – the bitterness of Russian-Ukrainian issue, its connection with the imperial political course of Russia and its church. Historical thought is proved to be an active agent in the process of asserting autocephaly. It is stated that hystorical thought had always been an active agent in the process of obtaining autocephaly for the Ukrainian Church. The period analyzed is said to have invaluable experience on our path to the Tomos from the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The outcome of this process was the acquisition of the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine on January 5, 2019. It is suggested that the Ukrainian autocephaly has the potential to normalize the problems that has been driven into a deadlock of the Russian centralism.

REFERENCES

1. Біднов В. Церковна справа на Україні. Тернів : Українська Автокефальна Церква, 1921. 52 с.
2. *Вісті Українського Православного Церковного Собору*. Київ. 1917. Ч. 1. 31 грудня.
3. *Вісті Українського Православного Церковного Собору*. Київ. 1918. Ч. 2. 5 січня.
4. Гірченко В. П. Самовизначення Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 3 грудня (20 листопада).
5. Итоги епархиального съезда. *Приднепровский край*. 1918. 4 октября.

6. Ігнатуша О. М. “Наш храм зруйновано і вівтарі розбито...”. Павло Мазюкевич: грані таланту та поклик серця. *Київська Старовина*. 2008. № 4. С. 151–168.

7. Ігнатуша О. М. Інституційний розкол православної церкви в Україні в умовах модернізації : дис. ... докт. іст. наук. 07.00.01 / Запорізький національний університет. Запоріжжя, 2006.

8. Ігнатуша О. М. Сучасна українська історіографія відносин православної церкви та радянської держави (1920–1930-ті рр.). *Український історичний журнал*. 2006. № 2 (467). С. 174–190.

9. Ігнатуша О. М. Українська автокефальна православна церква (1917–1930 рр.) : дис. ... канд. іст. наук. 07.00.02 / Харківський державний університет. Харків, 1993. 255 с.

10. Киридон А. М. Українська Автокефальна Православна Церква: проблеми історіографії. *Православ'я – наука – суспільство: проблема взаємодії*: матеріали Всеукр. наук.-практ. конф. 24–25 квітня 2003 р., м. Черкаси. Черкаси: Черкаська академія менеджменту, 2003. С. 42–44.

11. Липківський Василь, митр. Історія Української Православної Церкви. Розд. VII: Відродження Української Церкви. Вінніпег, Канада : Trident press LTD, 1961. 181 с.

12. Ліпковський В., прот. Соборноправність православної церкви. Київ : Кирило-Мефодіївське братство, 1918. 15 с.

13. Лотоцький О. Українські джерела церковного права. Саут-Баунд-Брук; Нью-Йорк, 1984. 306 с.

14. Лотоцький О. Автокефалія. Т. I. Засади автокефалії. Варшава, 1935. 206 с.

15. Лотоцький О. Автокефалія. Т. I. Засади автокефалії. Репринтне відтворення. Київ : АТ Книга, 1999. 206 с.

16. Лотоцький О. Автокефалія. Т. II. Нарис історії автокефальних церков. Варшава, 1938. 560 с.

17. Лотоцький О. Автокефалія. Т. II. Нарис історії автокефальних церков. Репринтне відтворення. Київ : АТ Книга, 1999. 560 с.

18. Мазюкевич П. Христос і українство. Звенигородка : Друк. Ш. Фридмана, 1917. 8 с.

19. Міхновський М. I. Самостійна Україна. Київ : Діокор, 2002. 80 с.

20. Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. *Відродження*. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).

21. Мохор П. Автокефалія Української церкви. Київ, 1918. 12 с.

22. Нештатный. Автокефалія или автономія. *Приднепровский Край*. 1918. 12 июля.

23. Новое министерство. *Приднепровский Край*. 1918. 27 октября.

24. Обіжник Катеринославського єпархіального місіонерського комітету благочинним Катеринославської єпархії про надіслання коштів від церков. 10 листопада 1918 р. *Державний архів Запорізької області*. Ф. 19. Оп. 1. Спр. 108. Арк. 755.

25. Огієнко І. Рятуння України. На тяжкій службі своєму народові. 2-ге вид., доп. Вінніпег : Товариство “Волинь”, 1968. 96 с.

26. Олександр (Драбинко), митр. Українська Церква: шлях до автокефалії. Київ : Дух і літера, 2019. 684 с.

27. Переворот і українські політичні партії. *Відродження*. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).

28. Постановлення Константинопольського синода. *Придніпровський Край*. 1918. 10 октябрю.

29. Преловська І. Стислий нарис історіографії УАПЦ. *Український церковно-історичний журнал*. 2001. № 1. С. 68–89.

30. Преловська І. М. Прем'єр-міністр уряду УНР Володимир Чехівський (1876–1937 рр.). *Гілея*. 2008. Вип. 11. С. 35–47.

31. Протоколи засідань Культурної комісії при Министерстві исповеданій по вопросам охрانی древней церковной старины, памятников, возвращенні части их по договору с РСФСР и др. 1918. *Центральний архів Автономної Республіки Крим*. Ф. 540. Оп. 1. Спр. 142. Арк. 1–8.

32. Про українізацію церкви. 4-е вид. Лубні : Друк. Б. Левітанського, 1917. 12 с.

33. Рапорт священника Миколаївської церкви м. Олександрівська благочинному 1-го округу церков Олександрівського повіту про наявність іновірців на території парафії. 25 липня 1918 р. *Державний архів Запорізької області*. Ф. 19. Оп. 1. Спр. 108. Арк. 452.

34. Сніда Є. О. Катеринославська єпархія російської православної церкви в 1917–1919 рр.: проблеми соборноправності та українізації церковного життя. *Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького національного університету*. Запоріжжя : ЗНУ, 2016. Вип. 46. С. 147–150.

35. Трембіцький А. А. Науково-богословська спадщина Володимира Чехівського. *Наукові праці Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка*. Кам'янець-Подільський : Аксіома, 2010. С. 78–86.

36. Труды Катеринославського екстреного з'їзду представників духівництва і мирян Православної Церкви 10–17 травня 1918 року. [Катеринослав, 1918]. 47 с.

37. Чехівський В. За церкву, Христову громаду, проти царства тьми. Київ : Вид. ВПЦР, 1922. 52 с.

38. Чехівський В. За церкву, Христову громаду, проти царства тьми. Нью-Йорк : Українська Автокефальна Православна Церква, 1974. 51 с.

39. Чехівський В. За церкву, Христову громаду, проти царства тьми. Харків : Вид. Церковної Ради 1-ої парафії Української Православної Церкви Миколаївського Собору, 1922. 52 с.

40. Щоткіна К. Хроніки Томосу. Харків : Віват, 2019. 304 с.

Information about the author:

Ihnatusha O. M.,

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor,

Zaporizhzhia National University

66, Zhukovskoho str., Zaporizhzhia, 69600, Ukraine