

METROPOLITAN ILARION

THE UKRAINIAN CHURCH

**OUTLINES OF HISTORY OF THE UKRAINIAN
ORTHODOX CHURCH**

(IN TWO VOLUMES)

Prefaced and edited by
FR. STEPHAN JARMUS

Translated by
ORYSIA FERBEY

Published by the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada
Millennium Central Committee

WINNIPEG

*

1986

*

CANADA

And everyone, who helped Muscovy take the Ukrainian Church, did so in the name of "the entire nation."⁶¹ Finally, the hetman's delegate, Ivan Lysytsya, took a request from "the entire Ukrainian nation" to the patriarch of Constantinople: to release the Ukrainian Church to Muscovy.

Under such conditions could the patriarch of Constantinople, fearing the Turks besides all this, not have agreed to "the tearful request of the entire Ukrainian nation?" Could the patriotic Ukrainian clergy have done anything against the pressure and willfulness of its secular power? The events had followed the course which Bohdan Khmelnytsky had first set into motion.

The Russification of the Ukrainian Church

The Levelling Politics of the Muscovite Church

After thirty-two years of difficult struggle (1654-1686), Muscovy succeeded in uniting the Ukrainian Church to the Muscovite by government pressure and open simony. Having done so, Muscovy immediately embarked upon its levelling politics against the Ukrainian Church, so as to make it an ordinary Muscovite metropolitanate. The entire state of the old Muscovite Church was forcibly imposed upon the Ukrainian Church; and although it defended itself, the Ukrainian Church was finally broken and formally levelled to the state of the Muscovite Church.

The state of the Muscovite clergy at the time was extremely sorrowful. The unusually narrow education of the entire clergy, including the higher ranks, gave birth to a narrow ritualistic arrogance and with it an attitude of self-righteousness and intolerance in religious matters. Muscovy considered its own way of understanding of the Holy Scriptures and Church canons as the only way, and inviolate, and its local church rituals and customs as a sacred temple. Any Orthodox individual, who did not think as the Muscovites taught, was looked upon as a heretic.

The results of this were damaging to the Muscovite nation: it encompassed the most various customs and beliefs which bordered on paganism. The nation was not deeply Christianized; the entire faith was transformed into an external ritualism. The base of Christianity, the Holy Scriptures, were little known among the Russian nation; the language of the Bible was little understood, thus the nation knew the Scriptures only superficially. It should be noted that a translation of the Holy Scriptures into the Russian language appeared as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century, whereas translations into the Ukrainian language had already appeared in the sixteenth century, that is, three centuries earlier.

Of all the Orthodox Churches only the Muscovite blindly followed the Byzantine Church in regard to state subordination. It not only followed the Byzantine Church in this respect, it

⁶¹ Cf. my work, "Ukrayins'ka Tserkva v Chas Ruyiny."

surpassed it by establishing a genuine caesaro-papism. The Muscovite Church underwent state subordination still in the fifteenth century, in 1458, when it definitively broke away from the Kievan metropolitanate. This subordination was complete, with all its damaging results: the complete ecclesiastical enbondage by the secular power and by any one of superior rank.

The first reason for such a low state of the Muscovite Church was the fact that it broke away too early from the highly cultural Ukrainian Church; it broke away at a time when it had no individual strength for an independent life. And very soon afterwards, the ignorant, but presumptuous Muscovite hierarchy brought its Church into a schism, from which it never recovered. In 1551, a Stoglav (Hundred-head) Sobor was held in Muscovy which was attended, mainly, by the clergy (the metropolitan, nine archbishops, and so on); the Ukrainian clergy, of course, was not in attendance. It was this Stoglav Sobor that established such strange rules as making the sign of the cross with two fingers, singing "alleluia" only twice, the prohibition of shaving beards, and so on. This was a novelty for many, but they were instructed to abide by these rules or be punishable by damnation.

Later, when a strong cultural influence of the Ukrainian Church on the Muscovite began, the Ukrainians fervidly rose against the rules of the Stoglav and, in 1666-1667, a new Sobor established that the Stoglav rules were absurd. But after crossing themselves with two fingers for 116 years, people were accustomed to this and the new prohibition had a terrible effect: half of Russia would not abide by the Sobor of 1667, thus a schism resulted that remains until this day.

After breaking away from the Ukrainian Church, the Muscovite Church, in its arrogance, began to violate Orthodox dogmas. Thus, the Muscovite Sobor of 1620, having forgotten the dogma about "acknowledging one baptism," made the decision to re-baptize all "Latinists," that is, all non-Russians. This heretical rule was only legalizing that which had gone on in Russia for a long time—the re-baptizing of anyone who believed differently than Muscovy wanted. For a long time, therefore, Ukrainians, who came to settle in Russia, were re-baptized. Only the Great Sobor of 1667 changed this heretical rule of the Sobor of 1620.

The state of the Ukrainian clergy was totally different and, therefore, it is no wonder that it categorically refused to submit to the Muscovite Church and that it fought with it for centuries. The Ukrainian clergy gravely feared this Church.

In 1685, after the non-canonical Sobor called by Hetman Samoylovych, elected Hedeon Chetvertynsky as the Kievan metropolitan (who immediately submitted to Muscovy), the Ukrainian clergy assembled *at* another Sobor, which protested against the non-canonical election and presented a description of the conditions in the Muscovite Church, using the Bilhorod eparchy as an example. When the Muscovites took over this eparchy, they established their own order there. Priests and laymen were punished if they were unable to pay their dues to the metropolitan. Certain dues were also payable if there was a sudden natural death or death by tragedy. Kievan books were forbidden in preference of Muscovite books. Muscovite customs were introduced in the Divine Services, the singing, baptism, and the like, and the local people were not able to adapt to these new ways.'

Such was the order that Muscovy established in Ukraine; it is not surprising, then, that the Ukrainian clergy feared Muscovy so much.

Having taken the Ukrainian Church officially in 1686, for a long time Muscovy was unable to take it in actual fact; and thus the struggle of the two churches—the Muscovite (actually the Muscovite government) and the Ukrainian—continued for a long time. Indeed, this struggle has never stopped. At first, the Muscovite tsars publicly and solemnly insured the Kievan metropolitanate, on paper and verbally, of its age-old rights. Thus, after the installation of Hedeon Chetvertensky as the Kievan metropolitan, the tsars, in 1685, issued a document granting the confirmation of the former rights and freedoms of the clergy and of the former customs of the ecclesiastical courts, with the reassurance of the non-interference of the Muscovite patriarch in these courts; that the Kievan metropolitan remain under the blessing of the patriarch of Constantinople; and that metropolitans be installed by free election, locally, as before.² In addition, this document calls the Kievan metropolitanate "the first among all others."

Having enforced its levelling politics against the Ukrainian Church, Muscovy took away everything which was the essence of this Church: Muscovy destroyed its independence and its conciliar rights and badly ruined all those national peculiarities which

¹Arkhiv *Yugo-Zapadnoy Rossii*, No. I, V, 60-61, No. XII.

²(The document is quoted in the original (tr.)). From *Arkhiv, ibid.*, 98-99; *Paine Sobranie Zakonnoy Ross. Impnii*, 1830, XI, No. 8334, 364-365.

the Ukrainian Church had acquired over the many centuries of its existence.

Muscovy was greatly determined to firmly unite the Ukrainian Church to the Muscovite; it even introduced a prayer throughout the churches to this effect: "So that the Kievan Throne unite with the God-installed Muscovite Throne, and the Little Russians join the God-protected Great Russian Tsardom."

The Destruction of the Independence of the Ukrainian Church

The Ukrainian Church depended on the Church of **Constantinople** nominally only; in actual fact, the Ukrainian Church was independent. Its independence was influenced by the following reasons: the ancient legend that the Ukrainian Church was founded by Andrew, the First-Called, that is, that it was an **Apostolic** Church; the Ukrainian Church was the oldest Church in the Slavic East; the vast expanse of its territories were evidence of this; and, finally, its distance from Constantinople made its dependence fictitious.

Muscovy, of course, could not accept the independent state of the Ukrainian Church, nor its dominant position in the East. On November 8th, 1685, when Metropolitan Hedeon Chetvertensky pledged allegiance to the Muscovite patriarch, the destruction of the independence of the Ukrainian Church began. The age-old title of the Kievan Metropolitan was "Metropolitan of Kiev and all of Rus" (about the tenth century); later it was "Metropolitan of Kiev, and Halych, and all of Russia." This title annoyed the Muscovite patriarch and the Muscovite government and, thus, they persisted in its destruction. The mitre, which was issued in **MUSCOVY** for Metropolitan Hedeon, still had the inscription: "Metropolitan of Kiev, and Halych, and all of Russia," but on January 27th, 1688, Hedeon was ordered to sign "Metropolitan of Kiev, and Halych, and Little Russia." And in 1721, Tsar Peter I ordered that the Kievan Metropolitan be addressed only as Archbishop. This was continued until 1743, when the title of Metropolitan was graciously reinstated. But in 1767 it was ordered that the title, further, should only be: "Metropolitan of Kiev and Halych".

From time immemorial, the Kievan metropolitan was an "Exarch of the Ecumenical Throne." This title was immediately taken away from Metropolitan Hedeon, even though Hetman Samoylovych strongly requested its retention. This particular title was a necessity for the Kievan metropolitan especially because the Orthodox Church in Poland was under the jurisdiction of this metropolitanate; the loss of this title of exarch could have shaken this independence.

This is the way **Muscovy** destroyed the independence of the Ukrainian Church. This act was completely non-canonical, for it violated the 34th Apostolic rule, which instructs: "The bishops of every nation must know the first among themselves and respect him as head." It also violated the 8th rule of the Third Ecumenical Council, which instructs: "Let none of the god-loving bishops expand his rule over another eparchy, which formerly and at the beginning, did not **under** his hand or his predecessors. And whosoever expands and unites any eparchy to himself forcibly, then he should return it so that he not violate the rules of the Fathers, so that the arrogance of the secular power does not stealthily advance in the eyes of the priesthood. Thus, it is agreeable to the Holy and Universal Council that every eparchy preserves, in purity and without interference, those rules, by which it has abided from the beginning, on the basis of the custom which has been rooted from ancient times."

The historical tradition and canonical rule spoke for the independence of the Ukrainian Church as they did for the Churches of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem; these Churches did not lose their autocephaly when their respective countries fell into entirely different political conditions.

A great satisfaction for this non-canonical injustice done to the Ukrainian Church was given by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Gregorius. In a document of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of November 13th, 1924, in regard to the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in Poland, undersigned by Gregorius and twelve eastern metropolitans, it said:

In history it is recorded that the first separation from our throne of the Kievan Metropolitanate and the Orthodox metropolitanates of Lithuania and Poland, which are dependent on it, and their union to the Holy Muscovite Church occurred in absolute non-accordance with canonical rules, and, besides, did not maintain that was established in regard to the complete church autonomy of the Kievan Metropolitan, who bore the title of Exarch of the Ecumenical Throne.

The Ukrainian nation never forgot about the age-old independence of its Church, it never acknowledged the union with the

Muscovite Church as canonical and, thus, immediately after the re-birth of the Ukrainian National Republic, it proclaimed the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church by the Act of January 1st, 1919, in which it stated that the "Ukrainian Autocephalic Church, its Synod, and its ecclesiastical hierarchy are in no way dependent on the All-Russian Patriarch." This act emerged canonically from the 17th rule of the Fourth Ecumenical Council. In 1919, the Minister of Religious Affairs, Ivan Ohienko, was engaged in endeavors to acquire the blessing of the Patriarch of Constantinople in regard to the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church, but the Ukrainian Republic **soon** fell and the matter of autocephaly, which was under way, came to a halt.

The Destruction of Conciliar Rights of the Ukrainian Church

The Church in Bondage

Tsar Peter **soon** struck at the very foundations of the Ukrainian Church in that he destroyed such an important aspect of the Orthodox Church as its conciliar rights. The higher church rule in Ukraine had been the Sobors, the regional and the eparchial, which, **now**, were at an end. All ecclesiastical posts of the Ukrainian Church, from the metropolitan to the sexton, had been elective and, now, this was cancelled as well.

As is known, Peter I established broad reforms in Russia which touched the very depths of his realm. The majority of the Russian clergy opposed these reforms and interfered with them wherever possible. Various indecorous pamphlets opposing the tsar were circulated around the country; these were written by ecclesiasts, mainly monks. Thus, in 1701, Peter issued the following strange decree: "Monks may not write anything in their cells, they may not have ink and paper in their cells, rather, the refectory will be the designated place for writing and that with the permission of the director."³

Patriarch Adrian was most dissatisfied with the tsar's reforms and Peter was well aware of this fact. Peter was an autocratic

ruler, not wanting to share power with anyone. He well realized that the patriarch has a tremendous power in the Church and he was determined to acquire it for himself as at the time of the metropolitans. In 1700, therefore, when Patriarch Adrian passed away, Peter did not designate a successor to the patriarch's throne and began a struggle with the higher clergy

Peter was aware of the striking difference between the cultural and broadly enlightened Ukrainian clergy and the ignorant and spiritually antiquated Muscovite clergy. He thus, had focussed his attention on the enlightened Ukrainian, Stephan Yavorsky, installed him as the Metropolitan of Ryazansk and, after Patriarch Adrian's death, as the vicar of the patriarch. For twenty years, Peter would not designate a patriarch and gradually took the Church into his **own** hands so that even the patient Yavorsky went into quiet opposition against him.

Upon the completion of his reforms, Peter focussed his attention on the Church. He had grown fond of the rector of the Kievan Academy, Teofan Prokopovych, who had publicly greeted the tsar with a fervid speech upon his return from the Battle of Poltava, 1709. In 1718, Teofan became the Bishop of Pskov, and Peter's closest adviser and co-worker in church affairs. Peter related his wishes to Teofan in regard to the Church and commissioned him to compose a new statute for the Church. On January 25th, 1721, Prokopovych completed the famous statute, known as the "Ecclesiastical Reglamente."

Tsar Peter was determined to abolish the patriarchate in Russia and the "Ecclesiastical Reglamente" placed the entire Church in his hands completely. This statute legalized a broad interference of the secular power into church affairs and the Church was placed under the administration of the tsar's government. Peter formed a new government institution—the Ecclesiastical College—which was called the "Holy All-Russian Governing Synod." Each member of the Synod had to pledge allegiance to the tsar. In the oath it was openly stated: "I acknowledge the All-Russian Monarch as the supreme judge of this Ecclesiastical College," that is, the tsar had become the Head of the Church.

The tsar sent the "Ecclesiastical Reglamente" to the Senate and ordered that each member undersign it. In his determination to gather the signatures of all the hierarchs, he ordered that they come to **Moscow** on March 1st, 1720, to sign. Colonel Ilavidov was sent to Kazan and Vologda with the Reglamente to obtain the signatures of all the bishops and archimandrites at these distant

³По1ное Собрание Законов, IV, No. 1835. Cf. Skabichevsky, "Ocherki istorii russkoy tsenzury, 1892, 4.

points. Davidov was given the instructions that whosoever does not sign was to give a written explanation in this regard and was not allowed to leave his residence. Obviously, no one dared not to sign. Thus, the "Ecclesiastical Reglment" acquired a seemingly canonical power. On January 25th, 1721, Peter issued a manifesto about the new Ecclesiastical College and on February 14th, the Synod began its work.

But the Muscovite government liked to do things canonically, thus, on September 30th, 1721, after the Synod had already begun its work, Tsar Peter turned to Jeremiah, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and requested him to bless the new church administration with all the other patriarchs. Peter described the establishment of the Synod in such a way as to omit anything that would seem non-canonical, thus he distorted and changed many things. After two years, on September 23rd, 1723, Peter's reform was blessed by the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, for the appropriate "aid," of course, whereas the other patriarchs refused.

In 1722 an Ober-procuror or general procurator began to head the Synod. This was a secular individual, who was the "tsar's eye" in all ecclesiastical matters. The authority of the general procurator was very great and, from this time on, the tsar became the factual head of the Church. In 1797, during the reign of Paul I, this became law by the 43rd article of the fundamental laws. Soon equivalent institutions, which later came to be known as "Ecclesiastical Consistories" (1841, 1883) were established throughout the eparchies. Each had its own secretary—the general procurator's eye. In this way the tsarist government gained absolute control over the Church in Russia.

From this time the Ukrainian Church lost its conciliar rights. For 250 years (1667-1918) there were no regional Sobors in Ukraine; their function was taken over by the tsarist government and the Synod.

The frightened clergy, who had been brought to bay, did not dare protest against the authority of the Synod, for in actual fact, the Synod was directed by the tsar himself. During the reign of Elizabeth, a strong protest was dared only by the Ukrainian Metropolitan of Rostovsk, Arsen Matsiyevych, who requested Elizabeth to abolish the Synod as a non-canonical institution. When this request went unheeded, Matsiyevich requested to change the non-canonical form of the members of the Synod, so that the oath would acknowledge Christ as head of the Synod, and not die tsar.

When this request went unheeded as well, the brave metropolitan refused to take the oath and refused membership in the Synod.

Thus, from this time on, the metropolitan and bishops in Ukraine were no longer elected by a Sobor; rather, they were designated by the Holy Synod. The independence of the court of the Kievan metropolitan was abolished and the Synod now held this prerogative.

Gradually, non-Ukrainians were sent to Ukraine, even though the old tradition demanded that the ecclesiastical posts be held only by Ukrainians. Gradually, non-Ukrainians began to occupy the Ukrainian monasteries. Thus, in 1743, the monks of the Kievan Mezhyhirsky Monastery complained that their superiors are assigned to them, rather than elected as before: "When an hegumen or archimandrite died, the brothers of the monastery elected one from among their own, who was suitable for that position.... But now the archimandrite is sent to us; and this archimandrite ... does everything as he wishes, he does not observe our church order or monastic institution and never calls his fellow brothers for council; rather, he organizes everything according to his own whim."⁴

The Church Brotherhoods that had become so famous in Ukraine gradually had to halt their activities, because the government prohibited them.

The Synodal organization of the Russian Church that lasted for 197 long years (1721-1918) and brought the complete bondage of the Church was absolutely non-canonical. The Holy Synod, which enbondaged and destroyed the Ukrainian Church, rose against the clear testimony of the canons through the tsar's power and simony. As the great writes Dostoyevsky so accurately said—the Russian Church has come to a "paralysis." But more than this, the Russian Church, during the time of its synodal yoke, ceased to exist as a canonical church among other Orthodox Churches.

IV

The Destruction of the National Peculiarities of the Ukrainian Church

Every Orthodox Church is basically a national church. The main unaltered base of every church is the Holy Scripture,

⁴N. I. Petrov, *AKY*, I, No. 1, 109.

Whereas the **canons**, particularly the secondary **ones**, are adapted by each church in its **own** way. Therefore, each Orthodox Church has formed many of its **own** peculiar customs in its Divine services, ceremonies, holidays, church life, and so on. As was frustrated in the "National Peculiarities of the Ukrainian Church," they were enjoyed by the Ukrainian Church, as independent church, until they were destroyed by the non-canonical Holy Synod.

The Muscovite Church looked askance at the peculiarities of the Ukrainian Church from ancient times: whatever was unlike that of the Muscovite Church was considered heretical. As is **known**, Ukrainians living in Russia were re-baptized; they were allowed burial in Russian cemeteries; they were called little Poles and, then, uniates; Ukrainian Church education was and still is called presbyterianism.

Wherever **possible Muscovy** forcibly erased all of the Ukrainian church peculiarities. The Ukrainian Church had its own liturgical books in well-corrected publications, but the Russian government, both secular and ecclesiastical, destroyed them all and in their place introduced Russian **ones** "for the sake of church identicalness." **MUSCOVY** had no concern for the fact that the Church was alienating the nation because of this. Even though they relentlessly defended their national character, the Ukrainian printing houses were transformed to Russian **ones**. Their Ukrainian character came to an end on October 5th, 1720, when Peter I ordered that nothing be printed without censorship in the Kievan and Chernihiv printing houses.

Catherine II, burning with fury against Ukraine, finished it completely. She sent Russians to occupy various posts in Ukraine and accelerated the Russianization of the Ukrainian Church. Some Ukrainians, too, in pursuing the luxuries of this world, helped to subdue the Ukrainian Church. One of these was the Kievan Metropolitan, Samuyil Myslavsky (1783-1793) who, in the ten years of his metropolitan post, greatly Russianized the Ukrainian Church.

The chief stronghold of the Ukrainian Church at the time was the Kievan Academy, a higher school of learning, mainly for theological studies, which was established in the beginning of the seventeenth century. The Holy Synod led its main attack on this stronghold through its metropolitan, Myslavsky, until it finally Russianized this Academy and, finally, all other Ukrainian schools. It is mainly through its higher schools of learning that

each church develops and nurtures its church laws; but the Ukrainians were deprived of this from the time of the Russianization of the Ukrainian Theological Academy. Foreign professors brought a foreign concept of church law.

In all the years of its existence the Ukrainian Church had its **own** pronunciation of certain letters. This age-old pronunciation was destroyed by the Synod, which forcibly demanded a Russian pronunciation: **t** to be pronounced as **s**, **и** as **e** as **as**, and so on. Myslavsky was particularly cruel in this matter. He brought the Muscovite pronunciation into churches, schools, and ecclesiasts' families, forcibly, with the threat of sending those not knowing how to read with the Russian pronunciation to a "secular command."

The Ukrainian Church boasted its sermon from the sixteenth century, when the sermon became a matter of life and defense in the fight against Catholicism and Uniatism. **MUSCOVY** had no knowledge of sermons in the living language and thus **looked upon** the Ukrainian church sermon with annoyance, reproaching the Ukrainians: "You bigots are introducing a new heresy, you are teaching people in church, we did not teach people in church before. **YOU** have the devil in you, and you are all bigots." Later, the Synod established a censorship of sermons and sermons were very carefully examined. This caused the clergy to become totally indifferent to the church sermon.

Each Orthodox Church has its **own Misyatses/ov** (Menaia of Saints), which is usually composed of two parts a) the saints of the ancient Byzantine Church, and b) its own local saints. Saints from the Menaia of another church are usually not taken into account. In 1784, the Holy Synod forced the Ukrainian Church to accept the Muscovite Menaia in which there were holidays that insulted Ukrainian national feelings. Thus, for example, in all the Synodal Menaia for June 27th, in red print, is this great holiday: "The Celebration of the defeat granted by God to the all-Russian autocrat Peter the Great over the Swedish king Charles the Twelfth, under Poltava, the year after the birth of the Lord, 1709," that is, to celebrate the Russian victory over Ukraine, the victory over Hetman Ivan Mazepa. The Russian Church celebrates the Sunday of Orthodoxy in its **own way**, totally different from the Order of the Greek Church, and yet, the Synod forced the Ukrainian Church to celebrate the Muscovite Order and to anathematize Hetman Mazepa.

The Russian Synod destroyed the peculiarities of Ukrainian ceremonies by imposing Muscovite peculiarities. Thus, for example, the Synod ordered the Ukrainian Church to delete the oath of the bride and groom in the wedding ceremony. During baptism, Muscovy demanded only immersion, when affusion was widely known in the Ukrainian Church. Muscovy imposed its own way of celebrating Divine Services, too; in the Ukrainian Church the Gospel was read while facing the congregation, the "holy doors" were almost always opened during the Divine Service, and so on.

In the Muscovite Church, particularly during the synodal times, the tri-lingual heresy emerged: the false teaching which acknowledges that only the three ancient languages—old Hebrew, Greek, and Latin—are holy Divine Service languages. To these three, Russia added a fourth—Old Church Slavonic, more accurately—the Russian Church Slavonic and, thereby, transformed the tri-lingual heresy into a quadri-lingual one. The Russian Church stubbornly adhered to this heresy, which was denounced still in the ninth century by St. Cyril, and dispelled everything from the Ukrainian Church that was in its living language, as the reading of the Gospel, Epistles, Synaxary, and the like. Even the sermon was not allowed in the living Ukrainian language, although this is clearly against Apostle Paul's teachings (see I. Cor. XIV).

Ukrainian people did not have a full understanding of the Church Slavonic language; nevertheless, being a pious people, they endeavored to understand it. This sometimes led to a completely false understanding of the Holy Scripture as is evident from artists' illustrations that commonly accompanied Biblical texts. Two examples will suffice to show the problem: "My eyes *вѣду* (are always) toward the Lord" (Psalm 24.15), is accompanied by an illustration of a monk with extracted chains in both hands; "The babe *вздремала* (fluttered) in her womb" (Luke I.41) is accompanied by an illustration of Elizabeth with an infant playing a violin in her womb. These are not parodies on these texts; this is a work of a pious artist who truly comprehended the text in this way. This is to be expected when ecclesiastical leaders work against the instruction of Apostle Paul, who taught: "If you do not utter your words in an intelligible language, then how can one understand what you are saying? You will be speaking into a vacuum! ... If I will not know the meaning of the words, then I will be a foreigner to the speaker, and the speaker a foreigner to me.... In church, I would rather say five intelligible words so

as to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a foreign language" (I. Cor. 14.9, 11, 19).

Russia imposed its attitude toward the Holy Scripture on the Ukrainian Church as well, it prohibited the Ukrainian Church from having its own translation until 1905; it is only after this time that the Holy Synod was forced to bless the Bible in the Ukrainian language. Of course, with such an attitude, which reminds one of the Catholic attitude, the Holy Synod brutally halted the deeper Christianization of the Ukrainian masses.

Besides this, the Russian Church always imposed its Russian and its Church Slavonic texts of the Holy Scripture which often were purposely interpolated and in disagreement with the original text. Thus, for example, in Apostle Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews (6.7) the Russian translation of the Holy Synod purposely gives this inaccurate reading: "The land will grow grains useful to those for whom it is also cultivated," whereas the original in translation reads: "The land brings forth plants useful to those who cultivate them." Another example from the Old Testament, the Book of Esther (I.22) the original and translations (including the Ostrih Bible of 1581) read: "So that every man be lord in his own house and speak according to the language of his people.;" This part, which is very important to the subjugated nations of Russia, the Russian Holy Synod renders thus: "So that there will be fear for them in their dwellings...."

The Russian Holy Synod prohibited Ukrainians to paint icons and to construct churches in their own style and forcibly imposed the Muscovite style on them (the saints had to be drawn with long beards, the churches had to be in the Muscovite style). Similarly the Holy Synod forcibly imposed its own ecclesiastical dress on the Ukrainian clergy and its appearance "for the sake of identicalness."

Neither the Ukrainian Church, nor the Greek Church had any particular problem about the shaving of beards; the growing of beards is not a peculiar feature of Orthodoxy. The question in regard to beards was imposed upon the Ukrainian Church by the Muscovite Church. As we know, the so-called Stoglav Sobor of 1551 established the ruling: "do not shave beards and moustaches," and used quotations from the Apostolic Rules and the 11th Article of the Sixth Ecumenical Council to substantiate this. Later, it became apparent that these quotations were falsified, since the canons say absolutely nothing about the necessity of beards and it is on this falsehood that the Sobor resolved to denounce " ... the heresy of the shaving of beards...."

Further resolutions solved nothing and the long beard is considered a mark of Orthodoxy in the Russian Church until this day. It should be noted here that in old Ukraine even the monks cut their hair.⁶

The Muscovite Synod gradually took away the Ukrainian book of **canons**, which was being printed in Ukraine under the title *Nomokanon* and contained many resolutions of the Ukrainian regional Sobors. In 1839 it was replaced by the so-called *Book of Rules*, which was absolutely incomplete in comparison to the Ukrainian book and in comparison to the old *Rudker*. The Synod did this unlawfully, since this was done arbitrarily, without a Sobor.

This is the manner, then, in which the synodal non-canonical Russian Church gradually destroyed all the national peculiarities of the Ukrainian Church; the national peculiarities that prevailed within that Church from time immemorial. This destruction clearly violated the canon—the 8th rule of the Third Ecumenical Council, which instructed: "It is agreeable to the Holy and Ecumenical Council that each eparchy preserve, in purity and without encumbrance, those rules which belonged to it from the beginning, on the basis of custom, which had become rooted from long ago."

The destruction of the national Ukrainian Church is not in accordance with the Holy Scripture either. Apostle Paul teaches that the Church must be a complete body (See Romans 12.4-5, Esther 1.22-23, Cor. 12). This Body is healthy only when all its members work effectively. **How** could the Church of the Slavs in the East have been healthy when such an important and foremost member, as the Ukrainian Church, was forcibly destroyed?

The famous Sobor letter of 1848 of the eastern patriarchs teaches that "the guardian of piety is the very body of the Church," that is, the nation itself. Thus, when the multimillion Ukrainian Church was destroyed, then this "guardian of piety" was badly shattered.

V

The Persecution of the Ukrainian Clergy

In this manner, step-by-step and year-by-year, the national rights and peculiarities were forcibly taken away from the Ukrai-

⁶Golubinskij, *Istoriya Russkoy T4erkvi*, Moscow, 1881, I, No. 2, 550.

nian Church until it was levelled with the ordinary Russian metropolitanates. The patriotic Ukrainian clergy was constantly persecuted, individually, and as well as collectively.

The Russian government and the Holy Synod took, mainly, the following three directions **the** persecution of the Ukrainian clergy: 1) the lowering of the state of the clergy in order to shalce its esteem in the eyes of the nation, 2) the lowering of the material standards of the clergy, since a poor priest is more likely to be more obedient than a wealthy one, and 3) the enslavement of the clergy, since freedom was the main feature of the Ukrainian clergy. The Russian government wanted its clergy to become a submissive instrument for its secular goals.

The Russian clergy had no age-old rights and, of long ago, it fell into complete dependence of the secular power. As we have seen, the clergy did not sympathize with Tsar Peter's reforms and constituted a secret opposition to him. In answer to this, Peter I launched a planned degradation policy against the Russian clergy which, of course, was transferred onto the Ukrainian clergy as well.

As we **know**, Peter I organized a scandalous parody at his royal court on the Holy Synod: "The wild, all-roguing, all-jesting sobor," where he slanderously mocked the clergy. This "Sobor" was to "glorify Bakhus with excessive drinking." It was composed of drunkards, who performed things which are not acceptable to put down in print. This, of course, had a strong influence on the Russian intelligentsia, which was ever prone to mock the clergy.

It came to the point where the "most noble persons" laughed at the-clergy even publicly in church. Tsar Peter, himself, teased the clergy in church; when the deacon came out with the Gospel, Peter stuck his tongue out at him. To mock his clergy, Peter issued a decree ordering the clergy to shave their beards and put on short clothes. Only the sudden death of the Tsar halted this mockery.

Peter I did not trust the clergy at all and, thus, in 1721 he established police supervision over it, the institute of the so-called inquisitors. The General Procurator of the Synod was liable to the tsar, a proto-inquisitor informed the General Procurator, provincial-inquisitors were liable to the proto-inquisitor, and the provincial-inquisitors had assemblies of rank inquisitors. These inquisitors carefully watched the behavior and activities of the entire clergy, starting from the bishop. The institute of inquisitors was

not only a caustic blow to the clergy, it entailed public contempt for ecclesiasts. This universal scandal was changed in 1727, but not entirely, for the clergy was placed under secret police watch.

In general, the Synod continued their police duties over its clergy and carefully watched its conduct, particularly the political conduct. Because the inquisitors were unable to watch over all matters, the bishops were instructed to travel through their eparchies at least once a year and carefully watch over the clergy.

Tsar Peter policed even the most sacred—confessions to the priest. The "Ecclesiastical Reglament" instructed that the priest, upon hearing political matters during confession, report it immediately to the police. Thus, he wanted to turn the priest into an ordinary spy.

Non-informing was threatened by severe punishment: "the deprivation of one's post and name and the deprivation of life." It is interesting that for these spy duties of the clergy, the Reglament referred to the Holy Scripture: "If thy brother trespasses against thee, go and tell him ... if he does not listen, tell the church . . ." (Matthew 18:15-17). It is interesting that this anti-canonical order about confession entered volume XV of *Svod Zakonov (Code of Laws)*, pages 585-586.

The priests and deacons were given the duties of watching and informing the police if anyone was in the village without a passport, if any deserter, or if anyone suspect, in general, lived there.

The frightened clergy was unable to resist. This led to a terrible corruption in its ranks and to epidemic reports.

Severe punishments were pouring on the clergy from all sides. There were incidents where secret provocateurs were sent out to confession to test the priest. The Ecclesiastical Consistory also behaved in the same base manner with the clergy and also punished it severely. Generally, when the Consistory called a priest to court, he was arrested and handcuffed, and was put under severe interrogation. Bodily punishment of a priest was an ordinary thing and was not abolished until the reign of Alexander I. Even bishops were seized for the slightest suspicions, deprived of their post, their heads were shaved, or they were sentenced to death.

Naturally, these conditions flowed into Ukraine as well, since the entire church was being persecuted there. A severe persecution was begun by Peter I, while Catherine II introduced a planned and deliberate Russification policy. She, upon the in-

stalling of higher ecclesiastical posts, gave preference to Russians, whereas Ukrainians were exiled to distant eparchies. Besides this, the Ukrainian Church had vast estates, which gave no peace to the militant Empress. The Church used estates to maintain schools, hospitals, printing houses, and the like. The Empress seized the church estates in Russia still in 1763, but in Ukraine, because of the strong opposition of the clergy, she was unable to do this as easily. She finally succeeded in 1786. In place of the seized lands she established "a benevolent staff" for the Church. By this staff the free Ukrainian clergy was transformed into government officialdom, as it was done in Russia. This corrupted the clergy, tore it away from its nation, gave birth to an indifference toward the Church, and sowed the seeds of atheism. The lower clergymen were devoid of rights and frightened as the bishops began to press upon them. There were often public scandals. Thus, a contemporary of Bishop Kyrilo Florynsky described that the bishop "always, even after the Divine Service, would be taken by such anger that he would set fire to a beard of one subject clergyman, pull the hair of another, strike one across the face, push one in his stomach with his foot.... He does all this, cursing loudly through the entire church, wherever he would be, at the altar, or the centre of the church, particularly when he is being vested...." The Archangelsk archpriest **Varsonofy** "on Easter day ordered his Sobor archpriest, priests, and deacons to stand barefoot in the snow through the entire Divine Service Inebriated, he gave bodily punishment to clergymen, and ordered to lead them chained, around the church."

Formerly, the clergy in Ukraine was formed only of the local citizens, whereas now all posts were given to Russians. In 1799, the Synod installed a Moldavian, Gabriel Banulesko, as Metropolitan of Kiev.

VI

The De-russification of the Ukrainian Church

Thus, the independence of the Ukrainian Church was taken away, its conciliar rights were abolished, all its national peculiarities were thrown out and replaced by Russian ones. Besides this,

¹O. Lototsky, *AstokefnlyA*, II, 433.

the church estates were seized and the free clergy were transformed into government officials of lower ranks. The high state of the clergy was lowered to the level of police duties.

At this the Russian government, the patriarchs, and the Holy Synod did against the clear will of the Ukrainian Church, they did this by governmental violations and open simony, they did this by violating important church canons and even the Holy Scripture itself (as I Cor. XIV). Many times the canonists have posed the question whether this Russian Church of the synodal period was a canonical church. They determined that it was not. If this is so, then the entire activities of this Church, that is, its oppression of the Ukrainian Church, was not canonical either.

From all that I have described above, it is clear what direction Ukrainian church leaders should take. On January 1st, 1919, the government of the Ukrainian National Republic proclaimed the Autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church and, thus, tore it away from the Russian Synodal Church. But what must be done further?

Among the Ukrainians, there reigns an ease and shadow outlook on the rebirth of the Ukrainian Church—introduce the Ukrainian language into Divine Services, they say, and the same for the sermons, and this will lead to the "Ukrainization" of the Church. But, as we have seen from the above, the Ukrainian Church had its own full life, internal and external, developed over the many centuries, thus, its Divine Service language is only one segment of its life. And there is no reason for us to Ukrainize, because the Ukrainization of our Church is not the problem here, but rather, the complete de-Russification of it, that is, the restoring of all that which our Church formerly had, of which it was robbed, particularly during the synodal period. And not only do we need to de-Russify the Church, we must restore that entire and complete Church that we had for almost one thousand years.

Warsaw. II.V. 194-0.

СНАРТЕК ТИИГТЕН

How Catherine II Russified the Ukrainian Church

The Destruction of Ukraine

Empress Catherine (1762-1796) embarked decisively upon the Russification of Ukraine. She placed her energies in the destruction of the age-old freedoms in Ukraine; she was determined to see that "the kozak era and the names of the hetmans disappeared. . ." She endeavored to equalize Ukraine with Russia, to level the entire Ukrainian life, to erase from the Ukrainians their "depraved opinion by which they consider themselves as a nation different from the local (Russian) nation. . ."

The Empress detested the Ukrainians because of their culture. In 1764, she instructed Duke P. A. Rumyantsev, her newly assigned administrator in Ukraine, to keep a careful watch on the Kievan Theological Academy: "the teaching of theology and the determining of ecclesiastical orders here," she wrote, "are contaminated with many insatiable principles of ambition. . . ." On August 3rd, 1775, she issued her manifesto in regard to the annihilation of the Zaporozhian Sich (Kozaks).²

On Catherine's order, the last leader of the Zaporozhian Sich, the old man Petro Kalnyshevsky, was seized and shackled for absolutely no reason; in fact he was a supporter of Russia. He was exiled to the far corners of the earth, on the White Sea, to the Solovetsky Monastery, where he was immured in a cave. THE old man spent an entire 25 years in solitude in this dungeon, where he died on December 4th, 1803 (new style).

Upon destroying the Zaporozhian Sich, Catherine took the vestiges—the old kozak insignia documents, and the lilcc, to Petrograd, from where they were later entered into the Hermitage Museum.

In that same year, on November 7th, 1775, a new manifesto was issued in regard to "Institutions for the governing of the provinces of the All-Russian Empire."³ In Ukraine, these institu-

¹S. SolovyeV, *ISTOMAYA ROSSII*, vyd. Obshchestvennaya Pol'za, No. 6, V. 26, 35-36.

²*Polnoe sobranie Zakanov ROSSISKoy ImpemII*, XX, No. 13354, 190-193. *s/ibid.*, No. 14392, 229-304.

tions abolished the old Ukrainian civic autonomy which was in accordance with the Magdeburg Law and the Lithuanian Statute. This brought the end to all Ukrainian civic freedom.

Catherine also launched her punishment on all the common people and enshackled the entire nation in serfdom. The beginning of this move came on December 10th, 1763, when the Empress prohibited the free movement of peasants from landlord to landlord.* On April 21st, 1785, she issued a decree on nobility freedoms at which time the Ukrainian kozak officialdom became incorporated into the nobility; it took on the aspect of "the noble state of the Russian nobility," while hundreds of thousands of free peasants and kozaks were given as gifts to the Empress' favorites and to this new nobility.⁵ From this time on, Ukraine fell silent in the shackles of serfdom.

The Destruction of Ukrainian Education

The Ukrainian nation has always been a freedom-loving nation, it always strove for education and no one ever stood in its way in this regard. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there were very many schools in Ukraine. Paul Alepsky, who traveled through Ukraine in 1653, wrote the following about the Ukrainians: "all of them, with no great exception, are literate, even most of their wives and daughters know how to read and the children know how to read, even the orphans."⁶

As far back as the sixteenth century the Ukrainian clergy was distinguished by its education. In the seventeenth century this education broadened remarkably, and many famous writers and scholars emerged from the clergy. In the eighteenth century, in 1784, Metropolitan Myslavsky issued a decree instructing that no one even request the ordination of a priest or deacon, who has not attended classes of higher learning at the Academy.⁷

Every Ukrainian village had its own school at the time. As the census of 1740-1748 indicates—in seven regiments of Hetmansh-

chyna there were 866 schools for 1,904 villages. The census of Rumyanets shows that in the Chernihiv regiment there were 143 schools for 142 villages. On the territory of today's regions of Chernihiv, Horodensk and Sosnytsk, in 1768, there were 134 schools and one school incorporated a population of 746. In 1875, after one hundred years, this same territory had only 52 schools, and one school incorporated a population of 6,730. In other words, in one hundred years schools decreased by one-third, whereas the population increased ten-fold.

The same occurred on the Left Bank Ukraine. In 1740 there were 866 schools there; in sixty years time, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were none. In this regard, the Chernihiv archpriest wrote the General Governor, Prince Kurlin the following: "In my travels through the province today I did not find any established schools."⁸ That is how Muscovy influenced Ukrainian culture.

Muscovy attempted to bring an end to the Kievan Academy very early, in 1666, but it did not accomplish this only because it feared the nation.⁹

In Russia, in the seventeenth century, there were very few schools and the Ukrainian clergy feared the same for Ukraine in the event that Ukraine joined Muscovy. A scholar of this problem stated that "the subordination of the Kievan metropolitanate to the Muscovite patriarch could have disastrous consequences on the development of Little Russian schools."¹⁰ And that is exactly what happened.

When Bryukhovetsky, in behalf of the clergy, asked permission to establish a school, Muscovy replied that it be best not to establish any such schools at all."

During the reign of Catherine, the Ukrainian kozak officialdom endeavored to convert the Kievan Academy into a university. In 1763, the Ukrainian hetman of the time, Kyrylo Rozumovsky, submitted his project to Catherine in regard to the renaissance of ancient rights in Ukraine. In this project he demanded that the Kievan Theological Academy be converted to a

⁵*Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov*, 1830, XVI, No. 11987, 454-457.

⁶*IBID.*, XXI, No. 15228; XXI, No. 16187, 344-358.

⁷*Puteshestvie Antiokhiyskago Patriarkha Makariya v Polovine XVII-ho veka*. Moscow, 1897, 2nd ed., 15.

⁸*Arkhiv Kyivskoyi Dukhovnoyi Konsystoriyi za 1784*, No. 2 and 95. Cf. N. Petrov, *Kievskaya Akademiya v tsarstvovanie Ekateriny II*, 73.

⁹S. Eftremov, *Istoriya ulczayins'kobo pys'nenstva*, 2nd ed., 130.

¹⁰M. Hrushevsky, *Ochezke istora ubrainskago naroda*, 2nd ed., 1906, 388.

¹¹S. Ternovsky, *Arkhiv*, No. 1, V, 112.

¹²*IBID.*, 111.

university with four faculties, including a faculty of theology; another university, of three faculties was proposed for Baturyn.¹²

In the famous "Commission on writing a new Code," Ukrainian representatives relentlessly demanded that a university be established in Ukraine. Thus, the community of Starodub, in their request to their deputy of the "Commission," wrote that those Ukrainian schools, which are in Kiev, Chernihiv, and Pereyaslav "are for the greater enlightenment of human intelligence and for the acquisition of others necessary for government service and for the use of a general education that is lacking...." The communities of Hlukhiv and Pereyaslav requested the establishment of a university in Pereyaslav while the Kievan community requested a university in Kiev."

Naturally, Empress Catherine, having Russification in mind, did not permit the establishment of such universities and, thus, the Ukrainian youth had to seek higher learning abroad and, finally, in Russia.

III

The Russification of the Kievan Academy The Introduction of Russian Pronunciation in the Ukrainian Church

Further, Catherine openly led the Russification campaign in broader dimensions. Her majesty's decree of September 7th, 1782, informed about the organization of a "Commission for establishing national schools in Russia."¹⁴ And the program, organized for schools in Russia, was quickly introduced into the schools in Ukraine. From this time on, Russification flowed into Ukraine very heavily.

Catherine found herself some excellent helpers in Ukraine that quickly brought all her plans to life in regard to the destruction of the ancient Ukrainian rights and in regard to Russification. These were the famous Kievan metropolitans Gabriel Kreminetsky (1770-1783) and, particularly, Samuil Myslaysky (1783-1796).

¹²*Kievskaya Stamina*, 1883, VI, 319 and further; 1897, I, 6-7.

¹⁷*Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov*, XVI, No. 12430, 187.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, XXI, No. 15507, 663-666.

Gabriel Kreminetsky, although Ukrainian in origin, spent almost his entire life in Russia and had withdrawn from his country. His plans in Ukraine are clearly evident from his conversation with Catherine on their way to Kiev; the new metropolitan said that he "having lived in St. Petersburg for a long time, was accustomed to those customs and habits; and now, when he arrives in Kiev, he does not know where to begin whether to follow the Little Russian customs, or whether the Little Russians should adapt to his St. Petersburg ways." His guests agreed that Kiev should follow his example.¹⁵ The metropolitan proceeded to bring these "St. Petersburg ways" into the Ukrainian Church when he held the Kievan metropolitanate.

Metropolitan Myslaysky went further still. In his younger years, Myslaysky was an ardent defender of the ancient rights of the Ukrainian Church and the Kievan Academy, and even participated in the protests against Catherine's politics.¹⁶ But Catherine's relentless character broke him and he saw it useless "to go against the roasting spit." And thus, upon becoming metropolitan, Myslaysky decisively launched Catherine's politics in Ukraine. It was he, who converted the Kievan Academy to a Russian one and made certain that a pure Russian pronunciation prevailed in the churches of Ukraine and in the Academy. In 1784, upon introducing the new disciplines, geography and history, in the Academy, Myslaysky ordered that these be taught "in the pure Russian language." He also introduced classes in Russian poetry and elocution and assigned a Russian from Voronizhchyna, Dmitri Sigirevich, to teach these classes "only in accordance with the rules of poetry printed in Moscow, and oratory in accordance with the rules of Mr. Lomonosov."¹⁷ On October 26th, 1784, Myslaysky issued a decree in regard to the orthography and pronunciation at the Kievan Academy.¹⁸ On June 8th, 1787, he issued another decree in this regard directed to the Kievan Theological Consistory about the learning of ecclesiasts' children at home." And on February 13th, 1786, Myslaysky

¹⁵*Russkaya Starina*, 1871, III, 402.

¹⁶*Pecrov*, *Kievskaya Akademiya*, 1906, 70.

¹⁷*Askochenskiy, Akty*, III, No. 57, 404.

¹⁸*Rukopys Tserkouno-Arkeolohichnogo Muzeju pry Kyivus'kij Dukhivnyy Akademiya*, Mus. 725, No. 35, 131. Cf. Petrov, *Akty*, V, 81-82. (The decree is in its entirety in the original (tr.)).

¹⁹*Akty*, V, 211. (Direct quotation in the original (tr.)).

issued a decree stating that the manner of teaching in the Kievan Academy be extended to all schools.²⁰

Thus, the Russian language was introduced in the Kievan Academy. It was carefully observed that students spoke a pure Great Russian at home and in church. Russian textbooks printed in **Moscow** were brought to Ukraine and Ukrainian students were sent to Russian universities. In all the churches the Divine Services were ordered to be celebrated "with the pronunciation peculiar to Russian."²¹ The schools in Ukraine underwent the same process of Russification. Catherine gave material help to theological schools, but at the same time, demanded that all schools in the Empire adhere to the legalized method of teaching.²² This is the way Empress Catherine destroyed the Ukrainian schools, the ancient Ukrainian rights, and brought Russian into the Church.

IV

The Struggle for Church Lands

But Catherine went beyond the Ukrainian Church—she penetrated the Ukrainian monasteries as well. The monasteries were very wealthy in land and had great properties since the hetmans and the kozak oMcialdom, in general, were always charitable to them. The monastery lands incorporated 14,111 manors at the time. The monasteries were the leaders of a vast cultural-educational work—they maintained schools, hospitals, and printing houses.

Monastery lands and their profits annoyed Catherine and her countless admirers, who were greedy for land. Having usurped the monastery lands of Russia in 1763, Catherine embarked upon the same gains in Ukraine. But, on October 6th, 1763, the Kievan Theological Consistory cut Catherine off so harshly that she retreated for a time, having told the metropolitan to teach the protestors "not to dare do this in the future."

The most vociferous protest against the robbery of church lands was made by the stalwart Ukrainian defender of ecclesiasti-

²⁰*ibid.*, 123. (Direct quotation in the original (tr.)).

²¹Hrushevsky, *Ocherki*, 393-394.

²²*Ibid.*, 114, decree 1785.

²³Petrov, *Kiivskaya Akademiya v tsarstvovanie Ekateriny II*, 10 and 70.

cal rights, Arseniy Matsiyevych. He was Metropolitan of Rostov and Yaroslav at the time.

Matsiyevych was a very interesting individual. He was born in Volynya, in 1697, and had studied at the Kievan Academy. In 1741 he was installed metropolitan at Rostov and was made a member of the Holy Synod. He retained his metropolitan post for 20 years. Matsiyevych was a very passionate and emotional person. He never forgot the ancient rights of the Ukrainian clergy, for which he often struggled in governmental circles and in the Synod.

There were rumors, in 1762, that the Empress had conceived of taking the church properties. These rumors became more of a certainty with time, which troubled the bold metropolitan. He decided to take a stand against the tsarist oppression. In February, 1763, in Rostov, the Metropolitan celebrated an "Order of the separation of the enemies from the church." He boldly announced an anathema against "the oppressors and offenders of the Holy Lord's Churches and Monasteries," that is, against the Empress and her Synod. Soon afterward, in March, he sent the Synod two different ardent protests in which he boldly reproached Catherine and the Holy Synod for their intentions.²⁴

The Synod informed the Empress about this "insult on her highness." The Metropolitan was seized and taken to **Moscow**. The Empress attended his investigation, where he sharply and courageously reproached Catherine for her deeds. For this he was gagged and kept in this state until the hearing, which began on April 1st, 1763. For seven days was tried "for a wrongful and disgraceful interpretation of the Holy Scripture and for disturbing the peace." On April 12th, the Metropolitan was given a sentence—he was deprived of his post and sent to the Korelsky Monastery in Archangelesk as an ordinary monk.

But Matsiyevych continued to proclaim that the Empress had taken away the church lands unlawfully and that she ascended her throne falsely. Matsiyevych was again taken to **Moscow** for interrogation and, in 1767, he again stood trial; this time as a political criminal. It was pronounced that the former metropolitan "merited torture and deprivation of life." But "by the mercy of the Empress," Matsiyevych was deprived of monastic life, given the name Andriy Brekhun (Andrew, the Liar), and, on January 8th,

²⁴These protests are published in *Chterde Mosk. obshch. istorii*, 1862, v.

1768, the old man of 70 years was sentenced to the Revel casemate for life.

Matsiyevych was given the prison's tightest casemate—ten feet high and seven feet wide. His contemporaries described that he "was confined within brick walls, with there being only a tiny window through which his food was placed." The Metropolitan of Kiev, Yevheniy Bolkhovitinov testified that "the dungeon was never opened until his death, any news from the outside was suppressed, and he was denied clothing and even food." The martyr, whom the nation considered as a saint, "through the broken glass of his window and through the iron gratings implored not to let him die from hunger and cold." ²⁵

For four years Matsiyevych suffered in this casemate. He was kept imprisoned under great secrecy, thus, many legends emerged about him. Matsiyevych died February 28th, 1772. On the windowsill of his cell, with a nail, he had carved: "Blessed am I, for Thou hast made me humble." ²⁶

The entire episode with the insubmissive metropolitan outraged the Empress against the Ukrainians so, that she breathed revenge on them her entire life. But, being burnt by the Matsiyevych event, Catherine no longer took such decisive action against Ukraine, rather she began to approach the monastery lands from a distance; not directly, but by the bribing of the higher clergy.

The Empress wanted the kozak officialdom and the higher clergy to request her, as her loyal subjects, to take the lands. Thus, in 1765, she wrote her administrator in Ukraine, Duke P. Rumyantsev, to persuade a few of the local noblemen, ecclesiastic and secular, to submit a petition requesting "the situation of the clergy in the civic state." ²⁷ In a year, in 1766, the Empress approached the Synod in this regard, that is, the secularization of monastery lands. The Ober-procuror Melisino sent the following decree to the Synod: "Her Imperial Majesty has deigned to deliver the clergy from worldly cares and from that guilt in which it found itself for many years, moving about in lay welfare circles.

²⁵M. S. Popov, *Arseny Matseevich i ego delo*, 1912, 253. Sources and literature are given on pp. xi-xx.

²⁶Cf. also M.S. Popov, *Arseny Matseevich, metropolyt Rostotkij*, 1905. See also bibliographic source *Bibliograf*, 1886, No. 2-4.

²⁷Catherine's letter of July 9th, 1765, is in the Moscow Archive "Min. In. Del." Cf. S. M. Solovev: *Istoriya Rossii* (Obshchestvennaya Pol'za) bk. 6, v. 26, 122. (The letter is quoted in the original (tr.)).

The Holy Synod through its own experience early on became aware of its blessed situation under the Orthodox authority of its monarch and did not deign because of the responsibility of its calling to accept and ask Her Imperial Majesty to bestow the same maternal beneficence upon the clergy living in Little Russia.

V

The Confiscation of Church Lands

But all this plotting by Catherine was in vain; the Ukrainian clergy strongly held its own and stalwartly defended its age-old rights. The Empress began to suppress the Ukrainian clergy. She gradually took away its old freedoms in order to force it to relinquish its lands. Irritated by its stubbornness, she issued a decree on February 17th, 1765, disallowing the movement of Ukrainians from their monastic eparchies into Russian ones. ²⁹ As N. Petrov writes, this decree "clearly abolished the former monopoly of the students of the Kievan Academy in the tenure of hierarchical and teaching positions in Great Russia." ³⁰ But the decree was never brought to life.

Catherine began to designate her own loyal administrators to the Ukrainian monasteries. She chose either Russians for this, or Ukrainians who had given long service to Muscovy and who were totally indifferent to Ukrainian national interests. ³¹ These all were people who could help prepare the ground for the confiscation of the Ukrainian lands.

Deaf protests against the violation of the old elective tradition of the Ukrainian clergy continued throughout the entire eighteenth century. Thus, in 1743, the monks of the Kievan Mezhyhirsky Monastery launched a complaint to the Holy Synod that hegumens were assigned to them, unlike before: "When an hegumen or archimandrite died, the brothers of the monastery elected one from among their own, who was suitable for the position But now the deserving archimandrite is sent to us; and this archimandrite ... does everything as he wishes, he does not

²⁹*ibid.*, 301.

³⁰*Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Ross. Imperii*, XVII, No. 12332, 49.

³¹*Kievskaya Akademiya o isarstvoavanie Imp. Ekateriny II*, 12; *Akty*, I, No. I, 109. "Petrov, *Akty*, III, viii.

observe our church order or monastic institution and never calls his fellow brothers for council; rather, he organizes everything according to his own whim. ***

Catherine waited a long time for the Ukrainian monasteries to ask her to take over the monastery land. She finally gave up the wait and on April 10th, 1786, she took all the Ukrainian monastery lands forcibly." That is how Catherine "bestowed her maternal beneficence upon the clergy living in Little Russia."

And Ukraine, suffocated and dumbfounded, began a new life, quietly sighing about its recent freedom. This sad state was aptly defined by the author of "Istoriya Russov" ("The History of the Rus"): "Formerly we were what the Muscovites are now: the government, the preeminence, and the very name Rus' were taken from us for them. And now we are to them as a parable is to languages."³⁴

How MUScovy Destroyed the Freedom of the Press of the Kievan Cave Monastery

The Kievan Cave Monastery (Pechers'ka Lavra) had acquired permission early from the patriarch of Constantinople to establish its own printing house and to have the freedom of publishing any required books.

The Cave Monastery had become a great national temple in Ukraine from the earliest of times. Its fame reverberated far beyond the boundaries of Ukraine and attracted both friends and enemies; it was often ravaged and ransacked by the enemies that attacked Kiev.

It is only from the sixteenth century, from the time the kazaks had become organized to defend the ancestral faith, that the golden age of the Cave Monastery had begun, the age of tranquility and peaceful development. The Cave Monastery became the wealthiest monastery in Ukraine, it incorporated vast lands, including large cities, as Vasylykiv and Radomyshel.

The Cave Monastery led broad cultural-educational work, particularly, from the end of the sixteenth century, when it stood at the helm of the struggle of the Ukrainian nation and its faith. It attracted learned individuals to lead the cultural work, as, Z. Kopystensky, P. Berynda, T. Zemko, L. Zyzaniy, O. Mytura, and others. The Cave Monastery established a separate institute for sermon preachers, who carried the Gospel to the nation and stood in defense of the Orthodox faith. It, also, established a school, from which the famous Kievan Academy had grown.

Printing was begun very early in Ukraine—in the middle of the sixteenth century. Unrest and uncertainties of life, long hindered the Cave Monastery's endeavors to firmly establish itself as a printing house in Kiev. But once it became possible, the monastery poured all its energies into the printing industry.

Printing was started at the Cave Monastery by the famous archimandrite, Velysey Pletenetsky (1599-1624). About 1615, Pletenetsky bought an excellent printing establishment in Stryatyn, from the heirs of Fedir Balaban (d. 1606), and moved it to the Cave Monastery.

Pletenetsky launched wholeheartedly into the printing industry; he built a large paper factory in Radomyshel which supplied the paper for the printing house. During this time, the printing

³²BA, I, No. 1, 109.

³³Decree in this regard in *Po1noe Sobmcanie Zakonoo Ros.s. impemii*, XXII, No. 16375, 575 sq.

³⁴*Istoriya Russov Maloy Rossi*, Moscow, 1846, 204.

house worked most energetically and published more books than any other printing establishment. During the first eight years of its existence (from 1617-1624, until Pletenetsky's death) the Cave Monastery published eleven great books, which were most impressive and very much in demand; these were: *Chasoslovets'*, 1617; *21711'Olion* of 1048 letters, in 1619; *Knyha o vere yedynoy* (*Book About the One Faith*), 1619, *Bozhestvennaya Lyturhiya* (*The Divine Liturgy*), 1620, *Nomokanon*, 1620 and 1624, *Besedy Zolotoustobo* (*Discourses of John Chrysostom*), 1623-1624, *Psaltyr*, 1624, and others.

The first publication of the Cave Monastery printing house was the *Chasoslovets'*, which appeared in 1617. Unfortunately, all the copies of this book which are preserved to our times are missing the first page, therefore, it is impossible to know what day this book came out. In the foreword it is noted: "Written in the month of December, on the 20th day in the year A.D. 1616." This indicates that the book was begun to be compiled in 1616, probably in the beginning of that year. In 1618 a panegyric was written honoring Pletenetsky in which the entire work of this famous Ukrainian cultural leader was stated.

Exactly 300 years (1617-1917) have passed from the time that Kievan printing began to flourish in Ukraine. In the history of Ukrainian cultural life, this work of the Cave Monastery occupies the most prominent position. It published a vast number of books, which were circulated not only in Ukraine, but far beyond its borders as well: the Cave Monastery was always generous in providing spiritual food for all the Slavic nations. And even today, there is no archive, or library, in the entire Slavic world that does not carry some book of the Cave Monastery printing house.

Let us examine the bitter fate encountered by the Cave Monastery printing house in these three centuries of its existence. The first period is the period of freedom. The Cave Monastery printed freely all books that were deemed useful and no one stood in the way of this cultural industry. The Cave Monastery enjoyed this free life for seventy years, until the time when the Ukrainian Church was given to the Muscovite patriarch in 1685 (definitively in 1686).

¹This article was written in 1917 and was published in my *Ukrayins'ka kultura*, Kiev, 1918, 148-163. About Ukrainian printing, see my work: *Istoriya ukrayins'koho drukarstva*, Lviv, 1925. About the Kievan Cave Monastery printing, see pp. 233-302.

For a long time, the Ukrainian clergy refused to come under Muscovite rule,² for it knew well that **Muscovy would soon** halt all cultural work in Ukraine. And when **Muscovy** began to rule over the Ukrainian Church, with its oppression, betrayal, and bribery, then 811 matters of the enlightenment of the Ukrainian clergy came to a halt.

The second period of the Cave Monastery printing house is the period of struggle for the age-old rights of the monastery—the freedom of the press (from 1685 until the end of the eighteenth century). As **soon** as the Ukrainian Church came under the Muscovite patriarch, the archimandrite of the Cave Monastery, Varlaam Vasynsky, requested Patriarch Joachim to endorse the monastery's freedom of the press.³ But such an endorsement was never given and this led to many misunderstandings. There were misunderstandings despite the fact that the tsar's decree of 1685, in regard to the affairs of the Ukrainian Church, stated that the "printing of books will remain unhindered."⁴

The printing of books in **Muscovy** was under the strict supervision of both the secular government and the patriarch; no metropolitan was allowed to print anything.⁵ **Muscovy** decided to bring the same order into Ukraine. The Ukrainian language and Ukrainian books were always a thorn in the side of **Muscovy** and the **Muscovite** government began its struggle against the Ukrainian language early.

This struggle began immediately after the union of the Ukrainian Church to the **Muscovite**, in the times of Patriarch Joachim, who fiercely despised the Ukrainians. He was the first to prohibit Ukrainian books. In 1677 he ordered to tear out the pages of Ukrainian books, because they "are not similar to Muscovite books."⁶ This is the way the censorship of Ukrainian books was started, still in the seventeenth century.

The Cave Monastery was strictly told to ask for the patriarch's permission to print books. Because this violated the age-old rights of the monastery, the printing house paid no attention to this prohibition. Thus, it published the first volume of *Chet'i Minei* of Dymytriy Rostovsky, in 1689.⁷

²See about this above.

³Cf. Evgeniy, *Opisanie Kievo-Pecherskoy Lavry*, addendum no. 15, 58.

⁴*Arkhiv Yugo-Zapadnoy Rossii*, No. I, V, 99.

⁵Filaret, *Istoriya Russkoy Tserkvi*, IV, 12.

⁶Mansvetov, *Kak u nas pravilis' tserkovnyya* Moscow, 1883, 20, 14 and 17.

⁷Professor I. Shlyapkin, *Su. D. Rostovskiy*, 190.

Patriarch Joachīm raised an uproar in regard to this insubmissiveness. In 1689 he reproached the archimandrite of the Cave Monastery for not having had the book first examined and corrected by the Sobor in Muscovy and instructed that any newly published book held by the monastery must be sent to Muscovy for examination: "But from now on, whatever newly written books you chance to publish, little or big, I, the Most Holy Patriarch, must be notified and they must first be sent to me and we, having examined them, will give our blessing as is appropriate; but without notifying us, nor first sending them to us, you should in no way dare to publish such newly written books, so as not to be subject, like a transgressor, to the church's punishment of prohibition.'

At this particular time there was a dire need for Psalters. The Cave Monastery was just in the process of putting these into print when this decree came from the patriarch. Yasynsky wrote to the patriarch that if they printed books in Russian, then the people would not be able to read them, nor would they buy them.¹⁰

Joachīm thus turned to the patriarch of Constantinople so that he would instruct the Ukrainians that they submit to and obey the Muscovite patriarch: that they "neither print any books, nor write anything without the examination of our Sobor."¹¹

Notwithstanding, the patriarch of Constantinople would not agree to this and the monastery continued its publications. In 1692, it published the Liturgy without informing the Muscovite patriarch; in the foreword there was no mention of the tsars and patriarchs, but only the archimandrite of the monastery, Meletiy Voyakhevych. This infuriated the new patriarch, Adrian. He reproached Voyakhevych in his letter of November 18th, 1692, and told the archimandrite to seek forgiveness in Muscovy.¹² In a month, on December 17th, 1692, the archimandrite replied, asking forgiveness for his "crime," stating that he had no idea that there was any decree issued by the Muscovite patriarch, and that if the former archimandrite had received such a document, it could not be found anywhere among the many letters. The archimandrite continued to explain that this would encroach on the

¹⁰Arkhiu, No. I. V, 281.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 284.

¹²*Ibid.*, 287.

¹³*Ibid.*, 199.

¹⁴*IBID.*, 359-360.

livelihood of the monastery, which depended solely on publications. He ended by entreating the patriarch to allow them to print their books, without prohibition, in their old custom.¹³

The patriarch finally showed some mercy toward the printing house. In February, 1693, he sent a letter permitting the printing of ordinary books, those regarding church orders, in the typography of the Cave Monastery. But bigger books most definitely had to be sent to Muscovy for correction. Further, he prohibited Ukrainian books from entering Muscovy, whereas books in Russian were allowed entry.¹⁴ In this way, the patriarch hoped to discourage the printing of books in Ukrainian, since many books printed by the Cave Monastery were sold in Muscovy.

This marks the end of the first period of the struggle of the Cave Monastery printing house for its age-old rights. Muscovy had not gained the victory and the monastery published freely, as it had done before. Patriarch Adrian was, then, replaced in Muscovy by a Ukrainian—Stefan Yavorsky. The Ukrainian patriarch dropped the subject and the Cave Monastery continued to enjoy its freedom until 1720, the beginning of the second period of this struggle. In this period the monastery gradually lost its rights.

Peter I took the censorship of books much further than it had been before. Vexed by the many derogatory pamphlets circulated about him, Peter, in 1701, issued the following decree for all of Russia: "Monks may not write anything in their cells, they may not have any ink or paper in their cells, rather, the refectory will be the designated place for writing and that with the permission of the director."¹⁵ On October 5th, 1720, Peter ordered that the Cave Monastery and the Chernihiv printing houses may not print any publications except in the Russian language.¹⁶ This was followed by a whole series of censorship instructions. The Kievan Cave Monastery was firmly told to send its manuscripts to the Muscovite typographic office for examination and "the Muscovite typographic workers will be paid a wage for their work from the profits of the Kievan Cave Monastery."¹⁷

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 362-263.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 372.

¹⁷*Polm, Sobralie Za'opna*, IV, No. 1835. Cf. Skabichevsky, "Ocherki istorii russkoy tsenzury," 1892, 4.

¹⁸N. Petrov, *rlkty i dokumnty, obo yashChiesya k istorii Kielskoy Akademii*, 1904, V, 164.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 166. Ukaz of the Holy Synod, 1786, and earlier.

The Cave Monastery published *Triod' without* Muscovy's permission and, in 1724, it was fined 1,000 karbovanets for publishing this book "not entirely like Great Russian." The Chernihiv printing house was, similarly, fined and then it was completely confiscated by Muscovy for refusing to send books there for censorship." These were the first penalties placed on the printed Ukrainian word.

In 1726, the Kievan Metropolitan Iosaf Krukovsky composed prayer of praise to St. Barbara. Permission was granted for the Cave Monastery's printing of this acathistus, but only if it was translated "into Great Russian."

In 1769 the Cave Monastery endeavored to obtain permission to publish Ukrainian primers, because the populace did not understand the Russian ones and would not buy them. Notwithstanding, the Synod would not grant that permission and, furthermore, ordered to take back the primers, which were already in the hands of the people." It was even ordered to take away the old Ukrainian books, which were found in the churches and to replace them with Russian ones.²⁰

On September 21st, 1755, the Synod ordered the Cave Monastery to re-print two of its major publications in the Russian language: the *Chet'i Minei* of Rostovsky and the *Pateryk (Patericon)* of the Kievan Cave Monastery.²¹

On November 9th, 1766, the monastery was informed that "henceforth, in the Cave the same books will be printed and used for sale as are printed in the Muscovite printing house with the approbation of the Holy Synod."²²

On May 7th, 1775, the Synod instructed the Kievan Metropolitan, Havriyil Krerninetsky "that books unlike the books of the Muscovite typography would not be circulated."²³ Another order was given, in 1786, to the Kievan Metropolitan, Samuyil Myslavsky, that books published by the Cave Monastery bore no difference to Russian ones in "the composition of languages."²⁴

²⁰I. Ohiyenko, *Istoriya ukraïns'koho drukarstva*, Lviv, 1925, 333-334.

²¹*150b atzenezhe stesruny mtdoruskago pechatnago slovct*, Kiev, 1914, 8. Cf. also M. Hrushevsky, *Ocherk*, 2nd ed., 393.

²²Hrushevsky, *Ocherk*, 393.

²³Petrov, *Ako*, II, 163.

²⁴*Ibid.*, V, 165.

²⁵*Ibid.*, IV, 196-197,

²⁶*Ibid.*, V, 106.

Such is the history of Kievan printing and the prohibitions on the printed Ukrainian word—decrees were pouring forth almost every year—so that it is impossible to count them, thus, I have dealt with only some of the clearer ones. It is not surprising, then, that there were not many Ukrainian published works during the eighteenth century. Rather, there were numerous handwritten works, which appeared in print incidentally only in the nineteenth century.

The struggle for the freedom of the press that the Kievan Cave Monastery so relentlessly led for such a long period of time was won, finally, by Muscovy: the age-old rights of the Cave were violated until the monastery stopped protesting and began to publish books which were the same as the Muscovite. The third period of the Cave printing had begun, new period which followed the flag of "Russification."

Kiev, 1917.