

**METROPOLITAN ANDREY SHEPTYTSKY
AND THE GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH
IN EASTERN GALICIA
AND TRANSCARPATHIA**

Collective monograph

¹²⁵⁶
¹²³³
LIHA-PRES Lviv-Toruń
Liha-Pres
2019

Reviewers:

Prof. nadzw., dr hab. Stanisław Kunikowski, Rektor of Cuiavian University in Wloclawek (Republic of Poland);

Prof. dr hab. Joanna Marszałek-Kawa, Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika w Toruniu / Nicolaus Copernicus University (Republic of Poland).

Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky and the Greek Catholic Church in Eastern Galicia and Transcarpathia : collective monograph / M. M. Vehesh, M. M. Palinchak, V. V. Marchuk, Ye. B. Kish etc. – Lviv-Toruń : Liha-Pres, 2019. – 212 p.

ISBN 978-966-397-192-6

The monograph of the historians of Uzhgorod National University, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University and Ivano-Frankivsk National University of Oil and Gas highlights major milestones in the life of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky. The main attention is paid to exploring aspects of the scientific, educational and ecumenical heritage of the prominent ecclesiastical, cultural, social and political figure of Ukraine. The authors of the study also raise the problem of church and cultural relations between the Metropolitan of Halicia and the figures of Transcarpathia. In particular, A. Sheptytsky's position regarding the proclamation of the Carpathian Ukraine in March 1939 is highlighted. The monograph concludes an analysis of the current state of interconfessional relations in Transcarpathia.



Liha-Pres is an international publishing house which belongs to the category „C” according to the classification of Research School for Socio-Economic and Natural Sciences of the Environment (SENSE) [isn: 3943, 1705, 1704, 1703, 1702, 1701; prefixMetCode: 978966397]. Official website – www.sense.nl.

CONTENTS

Information about the authors	1
Introduction	2
Part 1. Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky in the light of the documents.....	4
Part 2. Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky through the eyes of contemporaries and in the historiography	21
Part 3. Life path and socio-political activity of Andrey Sheptytsky.....	39
Part 4. Educational, cultural and scientific activity of metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky	58
Part 5. Ecumenical activity of metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky.....	83
Part 6. Religion and Church in Carpathian Ukraine	113
Part 7. Peculiarities of the confessional situation in Transcarpathia: history and modernity.....	126
Part 8. Theoretical and Methodological Framework for the Study of the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union	146
Conclusions	170
References	172

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Vehesh Mykola Mykolayovych – Head of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Uzhgorod National University, Doctor of History, Professor (introduction, Part 6, conclusions).

Palinchak Mykola Mykhailovych – Dean of the Faculty of International Economic Relations, Uzhgorod National University, Doctor of Political Science, Professor (Part 7).

Marchuk Vasyl Vasyliovych – Head of the Department of Political Institutes and Processes, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Doctor of History, Professor (Part 1).

Kish Yeva Bernativna – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Head of the Department of History of Hungary and European Integration, Uzhhorod National University (Part 8).

Kontsur-Karabinovych Natalia Mykolaivna – PhD in History, Associate Professor of the Department of Social Sciences, Ivano-Frankivsk National University of Oil and Gas (Part 2).

Korolko Andriy Zinovijovych – PhD in History, Associate Professor of the Department of History of Ukraine, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University (Part 3).

Vehesh Ihor Mykolayovych – PhD in Political Science, Associate Professor of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Uzhgorod National University (Part 4).

Marchuk Natalia Vasylivna – Director of the EU Information Center, PhD in Political Science, Associate Professor of the Department of Journalism, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University (Part 5).

INTRODUCTION

Christian Church holds a special place in the context of Ukrainian national culture. It has always fulfilled and fulfills the role of the moral regulator of social relations, the integrator of all spiritual factors of national life into a single whole, it is the center of national character, it plays the role of guardian of national customs and rituals, the protector of national interests of the Ukrainian people in the most difficult times of their history. In different periods of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Ukrainian culture was greatly influenced by a whole set of ideas developed by progressive figures of both the Orthodox and Greek Catholic Churches, who contributed to the formation of a peculiar and original ideology of the Ukrainian nation, focused on the rise of its national consciousness. The role of the Greek Catholic Church in this process is difficult to overestimate. After all, the union created the preconditions for the emergence of the national intelligentsia. The formal equation with the Catholic clergy opened the possibility for Ukrainian clergy to obtain secondary and higher education at European level. Polish, Roman, and later Austrian and their own spiritual institutions prepared not only priests: they produced the ecclesiastical and secular intellectuals who started and successfully carried out the Ukrainian national revival.

Among the prominent people of the previous century, it is difficult to find a person who, even in his lifetime, would have achieved such greatness and love from his people as Metropolitan of Galicia Andrey Sheptytsky. A prominent theologian, scientist, educator, pedagogue, politician, philanthropist... But, it must be agreed that at the same time it is not easy to find a person who has been attacked as much him. There is no need to give an overview of the huge number of “historical works” in which the “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist” and the “fugitive” (as he was often called by the Soviet scholarly men) was debunked, because there are no objective books or articles among them. True works, unfortunately, were published only abroad. The proclamation of Ukraine’s independence, which Metropolitan Andrey sought so much, allowed us to look at this extraordinary and truly powerful figure with very different eyes. Andrey Sheptytsky’s diverse activities have not lost their relevance to this day. His scientific, educational and pedagogical ideas withstood the test of time. Their study and comprehensive analysis are necessary in the conditions of building an independent Ukraine.

The main purpose of this monograph is to cover, as far as possible, the ecclesiastical, scientific, educational, cultural, social and political activities

of Andrey Sheptytsky on the background of his epoch. Along with the main purpose, the authors also tried to solve a number of specific problems:

- to analyze the documentary materials, which refer to the diverse and multifaceted activities of the Metropolitan of Galicia (Pastoral epistles, memorandums, letters, collections of documents, etc.);

- to give an objective evaluation of the memoirs of eyewitnesses and scientific publications of the Ukrainian and foreign researchers about Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky;

- to trace the life path of a prominent religious, social and political figure of the late XIX – the first half of the XX century on the background of the general characteristics of the epoch in which he created;

- to cover activity of Andrey Sheptytsky in the field of education and culture, raising the spiritual level of the Ukrainians;

- to make an analysis of Metropolitan's major theological works, following the evolution of his ecumenical views, to prove that Sheptytsky's ecumenism was not only limited to theoretical concepts, but also aimed at achieving concrete results;

- to find out the motivation of Andrey Sheptytsky's attitude to various political regimes, which during his pastoral activity changed each other in the Western Ukrainian lands (Austrian, Polish, Soviet, Nazi);

- to emphasize the peculiarities of the religious situation in Transcarpathia (Subcarpathian Rus – Carpathian Ukraine) during the interwar period (1938-1939) and to highlight the position of the Metropolitan;

- to draw parallels between the epoch in which Andrey Sheptytsky lived and worked and the current state of the confessional situation in the Transcarpathian region of Ukraine.

PART 1.
METROPOLITAN ANDREY SHEPTYTSKY
IN THE LIGHT OF THE DOCUMENTS

The first attempt to systematize and publish the pastoral letters of Metropolitan was made in 1965 by Anatol M. Bazylevych. The first volume included the works of A. Sheptytsky, covering the period from August 2, 1899 to September 7, 1901. The author rightfully noted that “in Ukraine, the works, letters, documents concerning the figure of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, his life and activities, were still not widespread, which is a significant barrier to the knowledge and understanding of this outstanding personality, his inviolable authority, his influence on the spiritual, socio-political, cultural development of the Ukrainian people”¹. The collection includes “The Shepherd’s First Word”, “Our Program”, “The Christian Family”, “True Faith”, “To My Beloved Hutsuls”, “On the Edge of Two Ages”, “The Great Commandment”, “About the Church”, “About dignity of priests”, “To the Ukrainian intelligentsia”, “About repentance”, “About anniversary”, “To Rusyns settled in Canada”². In the preface to the second volume of A.M. Bazylevych, M. Hrynchyshyn rightfully emphasized some of the difficulties that arose during the publication of Sheptytsky’s works. “When in 1926, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Metropolitan rule by Kyr Andrey Sheptytsky, bishop Botsyan was writing a literary review of Metropolitan’s pastoral messages that had appeared by then, even then he could not obtain the texts of all the messages. And since then, the second quarter of the century and the World War II have passed”³.

Anatol M. Bazylevych in his fundamental work “Introduction to the Works of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky” clearly outlined the main purpose of his work. “Not to create the archives as a main goal,” writes the author, “for this it would be enough to collect the materials and arrange them properly, but the urge or right to make the works of the Metropolitan accessible to the widest circles, to the researchers on the one hand, and to the public on the other. The life of Metropolitan, admired by his contemporaries, is an example, which is not

¹ Твори Слуги Божого Митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Пастирські листи. Т. I. Репринтне видання. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий відділ «Свічадо», 1994. 282 с.

² Ibid. С. 1-266.

³ Базилевич М. Анатоль. Введення у твори митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Праці Українського Богословського Наукового Товариства. Т. XV. Торонто, 1965. С. В-5.

passing away, and that's why it shines on the present generations..."⁴. The great merit of A. Bazylevych lies not so much in the publication itself as in the attempt to group and organize the works of Metropolitan. The author acknowledges that the classification he proposes is somewhat conditional, since many of Sheptytsky's messages sometimes touch a dozen issues. It is worth agreeing with such considerations. We should add that the periodization of the works of Metropolitan proposed by the researcher has not lost its relevance today. Thus, A. Bazylevych grouped A. Sheptytsky's heritage into seven parts: «1) theological-pastoral and ascetic works; 2) constitutional letters and monastery statutes; 3) writings on the topic of Church unity (ecumenical views of A. Sheptytsky – Aut.); 4) writings about ceremonial cases; 5) historical works; 6) Metropolitan's views on art; 7) writings on social topics and other"⁵.

In chronological terms, A. Bazylevych divides the works of Metropolitan into three periods: “The first period from 1899 to 1914, that is, from the time of his accession to the episcopal throne in Stanislaviv until his removal to the depths of Russia in September 1914. The second period is a period from then until 1927, that is, until the Fifth Congress of Velehrad, in which Metropolitan participated, and to the writing of [the work – Aut.] “Eastern and Western Mentality” (1927). The third period dates from the end of the great speeches about union and conferences of Metropolitan, first of all in Western Europe, that is, from 1928 to 1944, that is, until the end of his life. In the work of Metropolitan, the most productive were the last and the first periods, except of 1903, when Metropolitan was ill and did not write”⁶. A. Bazylevych also paid attention to Sheptytsky's language and style: “As for the style of Kyr Andrey's writings, it differs in different works. Larger ascetic works... are characterized by a heavy philosophical style... As for the language, he wrote in Ukrainian language that was spoken in Galicia at the time...”⁷. By the way, the prominent Ukrainian writer and contemporary of Metropolitan, Ivan Franko drew attention to this: “Bishop, now Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, from the very beginning of his accession to the bishopric began to accustom us to a different tone, other forms, a different character that reigns in his messages. To begin with, he writes his letters in a pure Galician-Rus national language instead of the moldy pseudochurch language, spoken by his predecessors, that is, a mishmash of Church Slavonic vocabulary with modern morphology. And sometimes, for example in A Loud Message to the Hutsuls, he is not shy to speak a dialect – a

⁴ Базилевич М. Анатоль. Введення у твори митрополита Андрія Шептицького. Праці Українського Богословського Наукового Товариства. Т. XV. Торонто, 1965. С. В 22-231.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid. С. В 232.

⁷ Базилевич М. Анатоль. Введення у твори митрополита Андрія Шептицького. Праці Українського Богословського Наукового Товариства. Т. XV. Торонто, 1965. С. В 235-236.

matter, still unheard from our church dignitaries, who considered themselves to be not only masters of souls, but also masters of a language that they considered permissible to mutilate and pervert in their liking... And finally, most importantly, Metropolitan Andrey, without comparison, knows more about life, its real interests and conflicts, than his predecessors, professional theologians and “Roman doctors”... Metr. Andrey talks about things as a European, he thinks and forces to think anyone who wants to talk to him...”⁸. Sophia Sheptytska – mother of Roman, in her memoirs, and G. Miriam-Luzhnitsky also wrote about the formation of the future Metropolitan⁹.

In 1991 were published Andrey Sheptytsky’s “Letters-epistles”, dating the years of the Nazi occupation of Galicia (1939-1944). The most famous of them were the pastoral messages of Metropolitan “Do not kill”, “About education”, “Propaganda of apostasy”, “About the liberal conscience”, “In the cause of understanding”, “My answers” and more. I. Stefanyuk, the editor of these texts, in his preface drew attention to the evolution of Metropolitan in his pastoral epistles. “The content of the first pastoral epistles of Metropolitan Andrey,” the author reasoned, “was mostly a simple catechism. Metropolitan Andrey, as a good teacher of his flock, exchanged the small truths of the holy faith according to the level of his faithful. Compared to the first letters, the last letters of Metropolitan Andrey have a larger theological content... Another reason why we publish this volume of Letters-epistles is that many of the affairs that Metropolitan Andrey wrote about in the forties are still very relevant today. The time when Metropolitan Andrey wrote them is not so far from us: it is separated by one generation...”¹⁰.

The thoughts of Metropolitan in “How to Build a Native Hata” (Message to the Clergy. From the Decrees of the Archbishop Cathedral, 1942) remain relevant: “The ideal of our national life is our native nation-wide Motherland-Hata... The task of the Ukrainian people will be to create such socio-Christian circumstances that would assure the citizens of true and sustainable happiness and have sufficient internal strength to counteract the centrifugal tendencies of internal disintegration and successfully protect the borders from external enemies. Such a powerful organization, which is reassuring happiness for all citizens, can be the Motherland only when it is not artificially made up from

⁸ Франко І. Соціальна акція, соціальне питання і соціалізм: Уваги над пастирським посланням митрополита А. Шептицького «О квестії соціальной». *Будівничий української державності: Хрестоматія політологічних статей Івана Франка / Упоряд. Д. Павличко*. К.: Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2006. С. 499-500.

⁹ Шептицька Софія. Молодість і покликання о. Романа Шептицького. Львів: Видавництво «Свічадо», 2015. 292 с.; Дванадцять листів о. Андрея Шептицького до матері / Упор. Г. Меріам-Лужницький. Львів: Світ, 1994. 80 с.

¹⁰ 150 думок Митрополита Андрея Шептицького / Упор. Тереза Ференц. Львів: Свічадо, 2015. 144 с.

different, heterogeneous parts, but only when it is like a monolith, one organism, that is, a body, animated by one spirit, which develops from the inner vital force, complements the internal connections and is healthy from its nature, strong, conscious of its goals, not only with its material body, but also with its moral body...”¹¹. The Ukrainian hata must be protected if trouble arises. Isn't Ukraine in such a situation today? Interesting parallels between Sheptytsky's ideas and modern time we find in the current research of M. Marynovych: “Is every compromise with the aggressor correct? No! Sheptytsky, at different times and under different circumstances, gave very clear explanations: “Because this is not peace, when someone has to agree to something with someone else's will, and therefore people try to break that agreement and fight – to wage war, because that same agreement is not a peace for them, because it is contrary to the understanding of what they desire”¹².

In 1995, the editorial board of J. Andriishyn, O. Hayova, L. Husar, A. Kravchuk and O. Masiuk began publishing the first most complete collection of Metropolitan's works¹³. A. Kravchuk defined the main purpose of this publication this way: “To acquaint the widest range of interested readers with the ecclesiological and ecumenical heritage of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky and to encourage new studies of this complex part of the recent history of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. We hope that this collection will encourage scientific study of this important topic. Considering Metropolitan's multifaceted heritage (more than twenty volumes of material collected through postulation in the canonization case and archival funds), this collection does not claim to be complete. This is just a selection that, with its content and limitations, highlights the present state of such researches. The editorial board tried to lay the

¹¹ Шептицький А. Як будувати Рідну Хату? Львів: Свічадо, 1999. С. 3-4.

¹² Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. С. 970.

¹³ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і Матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 1. Пастирське вчення та діяльність / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1998. 572 с.; Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. 571-1096 с.; Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Юрій Аввакумов, Оксана Гайова. Т. III. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і греко-католики в Росії. Книга 1. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1917. Львів: Видавництво Українського Католицького Університету, 2004. 924 с.; Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Церква і Церковна єдність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Андрій Кравчук, Оксана Гайова. Т. I. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий Відділ «Свічадо», 1995. 524 с.

groundwork for new, still unexplored issues and to shed new light on the findings of the previous researches. If this volume encourages current and future scholars to disseminate and improve the knowledge of the primary sources of our church historiography, and if it raises the level of understanding of the Church's concept and issues of Church unity, we will consider it successful"¹⁴.

The first volume, entitled "Church and Church Unity. Documents and Materials. 1899-1944" included pastoral messages, letters and other works by Metropolitan. Although they covered a long period of time, the authors, in our view, managed to group them successfully into separate sections: "From Early Unitarian Activity and Writings on the Church (1899-1913)", "Correspondence with Orthodox Correspondents (1901-1910)", "Letters from Orthodox who went to the GCC and from those who wish to join (1903-1942)", "The Church Issue in the Time of Military Disasters (1914-1919)", "The Case of the GCC in Eastern Ukraine (1918-1928)", "The Case of the GCC in Belarus, Russia and other territories outside the Lviv Archdiocese (1917-1934)", "From the works and activities of Metropolitan in the Case of Church Unity (1920-1939)", "From the External Relations of the GCC (1921-1943)", "Protection of the Persecuted Orthodox Churches (1929-1930)", "From the Works and Activities of Metropolitan in the Case of the Church and the Unity (1939-1942)", "From the Acts of the Archdiocesan Councils (1940-1943)", "Correspondence with the Orthodox in the Case of Understanding (1941-1943)". The materials end with a selected correspondence of 1941-1944¹⁵. For the first time on the pages of this volume, the editors put the main milestones in the life and activities of the Metropolitan of Halicia¹⁶. Some fragments of these messages have already been published in other collections of Metropolitan's works¹⁷.

The second volume, consisting of two books, was called "The Church and the Social Issue". A. Kravchuk, who wrote an introduction, introduced the concept of this publication to the readers. "Into this volume," he wrote, "we tried to include the documents and materials that would cover a key part of Metropolitan Sheptytsky's practical ethics in the first half of the twentieth century, precisely the attitude of the Church to the society and states. The main issue is developing in two planes, or around two groups of issues. The first group concerns the role of the Church in society; how to apply Christian principles to

¹⁴ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Церква і Церковна єдність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Андрій Кравчук, Оксана Гайова. Т. 1. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий Відділ «Свічадо», 1995. С. XVIII.

¹⁵ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Церква і Церковна єдність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Андрій Кравчук, Оксана Гайова. Т. 1. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий Відділ «Свічадо», 1995. С. 446-472.

¹⁶ Ibid. С. XXV-XXXII.

¹⁷ Шептицький А. Послання любови. Брустури: Дискурсус, 2015. С. 34.

the life of the human community?; how could the notion of “community” be extended from narrow, clan or ethno-national categories to all-human, universal, Christian categories? Here, incidentally, Metropolitan Sheptytsky contrasts the so-called pagan patriotism, which he rejects, and the Christian patriotism, which he offers to the Ukrainian people. The second group of questions concerns the institutional level of church-state relations...»¹⁸. Thus, the first part includes the official teachings and pastoral letters of Metropolitan, and the second contains epistolary materials. All the materials, contained in the volume, are divided into three sections: the basics of Christian social life, the appeal to particular communities and groups, and the application of Christian ethics to socio-political reality. A. Kravchuk also emphasizes the three features of Metropolitan’s social ethics: 1) close connection with the concept and duty of solidarity; 2) almost prophetic insight into the diagnosis of social reality; 3) its flexibility, openness, dynamism. The scientist draws attention to the need to promote more actively the life and multifaceted activities of A. Sheptytsky. “Today, perhaps,” A. Kravchuk states, “the greatest need is the honest presentation of the truth about our church history, without ideological concerns, especially for the eastern regions of Ukraine, where Metropolitan remains insignificant or perceived through the prism of outdated prejudices. The reform of the historiographic assessment of the UGCC is just beginning, and the figure of Metropolitan Andrey is, without any doubt, the central point in this case”¹⁹. This volume included documents covering the period from August 2, 1899 to November 1943.

The second book of the second volume opens the letter of the famous Ukrainian writer Andriy Tchaikovsky to Metropolitan²⁰. In the author’s deep conviction, “these letters united a Highly Blessed Rus people, who accepted your nomination, like any fact of general importance, with disbelief. I confess that I was not one of those pessimists, but they were the ones who added Polish intrigue here and everywhere. Your letters should have allayed those doubts and generated sincere sympathy for you. Such patriotic statements of the Bishop in

¹⁸ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і Матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 1. Пастирське вчення та діяльність / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1998. с. X.

¹⁹ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і Матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 1. Пастирське вчення та діяльність / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1998. С. XXI.

²⁰ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. С. 571-574.

the pastoral letters reassure and awaken confidence, and this is the basis for understanding and further work...»²¹. To this we should add, that correspondence between Metropolitan and Andriy Tchaikovsky continued for a long time. In 2002, on the initiative of Lviv historian B. Yakymovych, a unique three-volume edition “Andriy Tchaikovsky. Memoirs. Letters. Research” was published²². It contains all the letters of the writer to Andrey Sheptytsky²³. A. Sheptytsky is also mentioned in Andriy Tchaikovsky’s Autobiography: “...It was not for the first time in our history: not many years before [it – Aut.] in the polonized Earl family of Sheptytsky, the young dragoon officer Roman was appointed as the future head of the Ukrainian Uniate Church, for the purpose of spreading the union throughout Dnieper Ukraine, and further in Russia with his help”²⁴. B. Yakymovych wrote that “Memories from Ten Years Ago” is one of the most rare books among all of A. Tchaikovsky’s works, because only few copies of it have reached our time. In the book collection of Stepan Kovalyshyn there is a unique copy of a book with a gift inscription to Andrey Sheptytsky: “To the Most Holy Metropolitan Kyr Andrey in the proof of deep devotion. Author”²⁵.

As for the letters in the second book of the second volume, “Church and Social Issue”, they are all grouped in chronological order according to the issues (1899-1914. A social issue in the Austrian context; 1914-1923. New tasks during and after the World War I; 1917-1929. New tasks in Galicia; 1920-1923. Mission of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky abroad; 1923-1939. Struggling for justice in interwar Poland; 1939-1941. Protecting the Faith against Soviet atheism; 1941-1944. The Sanctity of Life. Resistance to the German occupation power)²⁶. Here is just a fragment from Metropolitan’s speech above the grave of

²¹ Ibid. С. 572.

²² Чайковський Андрій. Спогади. Листи. Дослідження: У 3 т. / Упорядкування Б. З. Якимовича за участю З. Т. Грень, О. В. Седляра; Редкол.: Б. З. Якимович (голова) та ін. Львів, 2002. Т. 1. 514 с.; Чайковський Андрій. Спогади. Листи. Дослідження: У 3 т. / Упорядкування Б. З. Якимовича за участю З. Т. Грень, О. В. Седляра; Редкол.: Б. З. Якимович (голова) та ін. Львів, 2002. Т. 2. 468 с.; Чайковський Андрій. Спогади. Листи. Дослідження: У 3 т. / Упорядкування Б. З. Якимовича за участю З. Т. Грень, О. В. Седляра; Редкол.: Б. З. Якимович (голова) та ін. Львів, 2002. Т. 3. 576 с.

²³ Чайковський Андрій. Спогади. Листи. Дослідження: У 3 т. / Упорядкування Б. З. Якимовича за участю З. Т. Грень, О. В. Седляра; Редкол.: Б. З. Якимович (голова) та ін. Львів, 2002. Т. 2. С. 24, 123-126; 133-135; 141-142; 162; 183-184; 192; 213; 215-216; 260-262; 281; 289-290; 294-298; 309.

²⁴ Чайковський Андрій. Спогади. Листи. Дослідження: У 3 т. / Упорядкування Б. З. Якимовича за участю З. Т. Грень, О. В. Седляра; Редкол.: Б. З. Якимович (голова) та ін. Львів, 2002. Т. 3. С. 54-55.

²⁵ Ibid. С. 302.

²⁶ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання.

Markian Shashkevych: “We are gathered somewhere by a great powerful idea, and Markian was like its flag. This idea, which was an impulse for our national revival, exists somewhere and it forever will be a stub of living healing water, irrigating the branches of church and folk life, and freshing the greens of hope for the future”²⁷. These words can also be confidently said about Metropolitan of Galicia.

Among the correspondents of A. Sheptytsky are Yevhen Olesnytsky, Rafail Krynytsky, Mykhailo Tyshkevych, Hryhoriy Mykytei, Tyt Voynarovsky, Andriy Biletsky, Dmitro Levytsky, Volodymyr Kubijovych and many others. In his letter to Stalin, Metropolitan wrote with pain in his heart: “Propaganda of godlessness in general, and in a special way in schools and among youths, is a great mistake of the Soviet authorities on our territory. First of all, it impresses and terrifies people, who are attached to their faith as the most important part of the folk tradition, and causes that people, especially the masses of the peasantry, do not have...”²⁸ [The letter is, probably, incomplete – Aut]. A. Sheptytsky complained to the head of the government of the UkrSSR Khrushchev about the termination of activity of the metrical archive²⁹.

In 2003, J. Pelensky published a correspondence of V. Lypynsky, from which we learn many previously unknown facts about the life and activity of Metropolitan of Galicia: “...Andrey Sheptytsky during his visit to Lypynsky on November 5, 1929 bought from him all, except for family letters, correspondence... including about ten thousand letters, which should go to the National Museum in Lviv... The sold letters remained at Lypynsky until the end of his life and could be transferred to the public not earlier than ten years after his death. Later, less than a month before his death, urgently needing money to go to the sanatorium, Lypynsky wrote a letter to Metropolitan (16. V. 1931) and, mentioning an earlier conversation, asked to send him 500 USD. In return, he offered the manuscript of his works, that he had begun, but couldn't finish due to the illness, as well as numerous notes on various socio-political topics. Metropolitan managed to send only part of the needed sum (200 USD), which

Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. С. 571-1028

²⁷ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. с. 595.

²⁸ Ibid. С. 903.

²⁹ Ibid. С. 905-906.

Lypnysky received on May 29, 1931”³⁰. In a letter to the editorial board of the magazine “Theology”, V. Lypnysky praised Metropolitan’s perennial work: “All the undertakings intended to revive the Ukrainian tradition and the Ukrainian conservatism were met with the active assistance of Count Andrey Sheptytsky and Metropolitan of Galicia of the Ukrainian Land”³¹. In 2005, Solomiya Dyakiv edited and published “Letters from Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky to Hilarion Swientsitski”³² – first and long-time director of the National Museum, organizer of the museums in Galicia. This epistolary heritage reveals a great number of topics and a wide range of issues on museum activity, as well as the role of international cultural relations and cooperation between the National Museum in Lviv and a number of European scientific and artistic institutions. The letters were published facsimile. Some of them are handwritten (most are done by the hand of Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky’s Secretary), the rest are typed. However, unfortunately there is no comprehensive information about the number of lost letters that have not reached our time. The collection of letters contains interesting and at the same time little-known facts, that have not yet attracted the attention of the researchers, which has led to the lack of their publications, except for individual letters and fragments of them. The letters are presented in chronological order, creating a general perception of them in historical sequence, and covering the period from 1912 to May 1943³³.

In 2004 Y. Avvakumov and O. Hayova edited a large volume of documents and materials entitled “Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky and Greek Catholics in Russia”, which covered the period from 1899 to 1917. The collection contains documents kept in the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Lviv, and it covers the activities of Metropolitan Andrey in Russia, especially those concerning the Greek Catholic movement among the Russians. The vast majority of documents have not been published before, or have been published incompletely or inaccurately. During this difficult work, which lasted for seven years (1997-2004), 240 documents were selected by the editors, “the vast majority of which are letters from Russian Greek Catholics to Metropolitan Andrey and his letters of reply”³⁴. By the way, out of 240 documents, only

³⁰ Листування В. Липинського / Редактори Я. Пеленський, Р. Залуцький, Х. Пеленська та ін. Т. 1. К.: Смолоскип, 2003. С. 144 («Архів»).

³¹ Ibid. С. 218.

³² Листи Митрополита Андрея Шептицького до Іларіона Свенціцького з архіву Національного музею у Львові / Упорядник Соломія Дяків. Львів: Українські технології, 2005. 108 с. + іл.

³³ Ibid. С. 7-8.

³⁴ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Юрій Аввакумов, Оксана Гайова. Т. III. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і греко-католики в Росії. Книга I. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1917. Львів: Видавництво Українського Католицького Університету, 2004. с. XIV.

55 are Sheptytsky's materials – the rest are letters and memos received by the Galician bishop from different persons. Speaking about the historical context of the documents, J. Avvakumov conditionally identified several problematic nodes that emerge from this epistolary heritage of Metropolitan: 1) Greek Catholics between the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Russian Empire; 2) the role of the Roman Apostolic See; 3) the situation of the Russian Orthodox Church and religious revival in Russia. The editors drew attention to the fact that drafts of letters for Andrey Sheptytsky were written by the Russians Ivan Deibner, Alexey Zerchaninov, Leonid Fedorov (A. Sheptytsky believed that he did not speak Russian perfectly – Aut.). “The story, told on these pages by the living witnesses of those years,” the preface says, “is full of successes and failures, victories and defeats, spiritual quests and hopes that have come true and that are not destined to be fulfilled. With all its complexity and ambiguity, this story touches the very fundamental, pressing and urgent questions of self-awareness and identity of Catholics of the Eastern tradition, to whatever country or nationality they belong. To paraphrase the famous statement of Mykhailo Hrushevsky, let's say that the documents that reader can read will help in the search for answers to the question: “Who are Greek Catholics and what do they want?”³⁵.

Collection of documents “Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky and Greek Catholics of Russia” is ended with valuable applications (extracts from Vladimir Solovyov's article “The Slavic Question” (1884); Apostolic Message of Pope Leo XIII on the Preservation and Promotion of Prosperity of the Eastern Churches (1894); Circular Message of Patriarch Joakim III and the Synod of Constantinople Church to all the Orthodox Churches (1902); Memoirs of Father Mykola Tolstoy (1914); Fragments of the discussion on Russian Catholicism on the pages of the magazine “The Word of Truth” (1913-1915) and memoirs of Mykola Trague about his stay in Galicia in 1908-1913 (1915-1916)³⁶. In a letter to Russian Orthodox Bishop Antony Khrapovytsky in 1904, Metropolitan Andrey stated ambiguously: “What is there to interpret for a long time about the superiority of one Church over another? It is clear to everyone. There is only one true Church of Christ in the world: whether it is Orthodox, as you call it, or Catholic, as we call it. It is now split in half. But it was not divided by itself, it

³⁵ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Юрій Аввакумов, Оксана Гайова. Т. III. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і греко-католики в Росії. Книга 1. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1917. Львів: Видавництво Українського Католицького Університету, 2004. с. XLIX.

³⁶ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Юрій Аввакумов, Оксана Гайова. Т. III. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і греко-католики в Росії. Книга 1. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1917. Львів: Видавництво Українського Католицького Університету, 2004. С. 745-857.

was forcibly divided by politics. Therefore, it must be reunited, it must do it certainly, it must do it necessarily, it must do it for Christ sake, for the sake of true God! All noble souls, whether among Catholics or Orthodox, feel this need³⁷. Metropolitan Andrey has never changed this firm position.

During 2007-2013 Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky's most complete four-volume edition of the "Pastoral Epistles" was published³⁸. Well-known Ukrainian archivists Oksana Hayova and Roman Terekhovsky were its editors. In his introduction to the first volume, B. Dziurakh rightly noted that "hundreds and thousands of pages can be written about Metropolitan. You can analyze one or another aspect of his teachings or give a general description of his work. Yet, nothing, even the best comments and analyzes, will change the happiness of personal immersion into the word of the Good Shepherd of the Ukrainian land, when a person has the opportunity to discover the "treasure hidden in the arable land" of church history, and to directly share in the wisdom and the strength of spirit that live in the words of Kyr Andrey"³⁹. The first volume of this fundamental edition includes the pastoral epistles of Metropolitan from 1899 to 1914. In the end of the publication there is an extraordinarily original work by Bishop J. Botsian "Pastoral Letters of Metropolitan Andrey (Literary Review)", published in 1925⁴⁰. The author, conditionally dividing Sheptytsky's pastoral heritage into two stages – the bishop's and the metropolitan's, summed up: "Regarding the form, the letters themselves repeatedly mention that they were written fast, in the midst of a great lack of time... More valuable, however, than the style and the garments of the word is the heart that lurks beneath them – its warm love, gentleness and noble tact, even in those cases where it is necessary to say a bold word..."⁴¹. The first volume included 52 documents, the last of which dates from September 6, 1914, when Russian tsarist troops were coming closer to Lviv. Metropolitan states with sadness: "Awful destruction is all around us,

³⁷ Ibid. С. 92-93.

³⁸ Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1899-1914 рр. Т. I / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2007. L+1014 с.; Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1918-1939 рр. Т. II / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2009. XII+1014 с.; Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1939-1944 рр. Т. III / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2010. XXXII+828 с.; Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання. Спільні пастирські послання. Т. IV / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2013. XIV+1194 с.

³⁹ Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1899-1914 рр. Т. I / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2007. С. XLIX.

⁴⁰ Ibid. С. 857-912.

⁴¹ Ibid. С. 912.

the whole villages are destroyed, some have disappeared from the face of the earth. Homes burned, property ruined, thousands of families destroyed. Many families have fled from scare: relatives do not know where the children went. The people in abandonment left their native home. We have lost many of ours...⁴². Ukraine was entering an extremely difficult and at the same time a heroic period of its history...

The second volume of pastoral messages covers the interwar period of the Ukrainian history (1918-1939). World War I ended, the Western Ukrainian People's Republic emerged, Eastern Galicia was part of Poland for twenty years, undergoing the sanctions regime, and in 1939 it was occupied by the Soviet troops, who, according to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, divided Europe. These are just the most significant events that radically changed the geopolitical situation before World War II. All this time Metropolitan remained the true spiritual leader of his people. The volume included 72 documents, that is, pastoral messages, as well as scientific works on the topic of church unity, "The Mission of Monasticism in the Unification of the Churches" (1921), "The Role of the West in the Unification of the Churches" (1923), "The Restoration of Slavic Monasticism" (1923), "The Psychology of the Union" (1925) and "The Two Mentalities" (1926). The collection is ended with the works of Metropolitan on moral and pastoral topics.

The third volume of Andrey Sheptytsky's pastoral epistles concerns the period of 1939-1944, when German Nazism replaced Bolshevik's occupation of Galicia, and later it was followed by the "second coming" of the Bolsheviks. "The card of history has turned, a new epoch has come"⁴³ – in such words Metropolitan Andrey begins his pastoral message on September 26, 1939. M. Marynovych, who wrote the preface to this volume, rightly noted: "That this danger was really terrible, everyone could be convinced immediately after the entry of the Red Army into Lviv. However, many Galicians meet the Soviet troops with curiosity and hope. After all, the Polish authorities, whose ethnic minority policies were more unforgiving and who punished mercilessly for any attempt at seclusion, came to an end. So, in this sense, release seems to have come for Ukrainians. The tragic division of the people ended, and the dreamy "golden-haired Kyiv" became close and accessible again. Not one at the time thought to himself: "Maybe all these rumors of the horrors of the Bolshevik regime were fictions? Maybe it was all hostile propaganda, and the Soviets really care for the ordinary people?" But further reality turned out to be more terrible

⁴² Ibid. C. 829.

⁴³ Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1939-1944 рр. Т. III / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2010. С. 7.

than any rumors”⁴⁴. Mass repressions, persecution of the clergy and ordinary people, the politics of silence have become an ordinary thing. And all this continued until the entry of German troops into Galicia. Metropolitan was optimistic for a new government that would allow Ukrainians to live a state life. “From the will of Almighty God, in the Trinity of the One, a new era began in the life of the State United Independent Ukraine”⁴⁵. Sheptytsky calls on Ukrainians for unity: “All those who feel themselves Ukrainians and who want to work for the good of Ukraine, let them forget about any party strife, let them work in unity and consent to restoring our economic and cultural life, destroyed so much by the Bolsheviks”⁴⁶. Very soon Metropolitan will be convinced that the Stalinist USSR and Hitler’s Nazism are “twin brothers” that are not significantly different from each other. We must agree with M. Marynovych’s claim that 1942 could be considered crucial for Metropolitan in his condemnation of Nazi ideology⁴⁷. “This system of untruth, deceit, injustice, robbery, caricatures of all ideas of civilization and order,” A. Sheptytsky writes in a letter to Pope Pius XII. “This system of excessive selfishness on an absurd level, completely crazy national chauvinism, hatred of all that is honest and good, this system is something so phenomenal that stupor is perhaps the very first feeling the one has got when he sees this monster. Where does this system lead the unfortunate German nation? Only to such a degeneration of race, which the history of mankind has never seen”⁴⁸. Metropolitan also did not expect anything comforting from the new arrival of the Bolsheviks: “Our Church will be destroyed, ruined by the Bolsheviks. But hold on...”⁴⁹.

The fourth volume of the pastoral messages of A. Sheptytsky included common pastoral messages covering the period from 1905 to 1943, as well as selected works – “Catechism”, “Memoir from Zarvanytsia”, “Spiritual Exercises”, “God’s Sowing”, “From the history and problems of our thing (art – Aut.)”, “Sciences and spiritual apprehension...”, «General principles of moral theology”, “Russian Catholic Exarchate”, “My memories of the

⁴⁴ Ibid. C. XI.

⁴⁵ Ibid. C. 114.

⁴⁶ Шептицький Андрей. Пастырські послання 1939-1944 рр. Т. III / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фондація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Аргос», 2010. С. 116.

⁴⁷ Ibid. C. XXVIII.

⁴⁸ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Церква і Церковна єдність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Андрій Кравчук, Оксана Гайова. Т. 1. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий Відділ «Свічадо», 1995. С. 985.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

subject of museum collections”, etc⁵⁰. The volume is ended with the “Sermons” (1937-1943)⁵¹.

Although he has repeatedly stated that the church should be out of politics, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky was quite active in it. With enormous authority among the people, he could not but respond to the political situation in the country, which in the first half of the twentieth century was changing all the time. This is easy to see when reviewing a number of collections of documents pertaining to the national liberation movement in Eastern Galicia (1918-1922), the interwar period in the history of the region, World War II (1939-1944), the preparation and liquidation of Catholic Church in Western Ukraine by the Soviet authorities⁵². It is documented that on June 29, 1941, the battalion, headed by R. Shukhevych, was the first to enter Lviv, ahead of the Germans for several hours. At half past seven, that morning, Metropolitan had already received a Kurin delegation led by sotnyk Shukhevych, after which he blessed nationalist soldiers lining up at his residence⁵³. I. Kindrat recalled that on June 29, 1941, he “found himself in the group of 28 defenders of Metropolitan and his residence at St. George’s Cathedral. After barricading ourselves in the church and the residence, we waited... It is plausible that the NKVD did not have the time or the courage to attack us, and so everything ended without a confrontation between us”⁵⁴.

⁵⁰ Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання. Спільні пастирські послання. Т. IV / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фондація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2013. С. 257-958.

⁵¹ Ibid. С. 959-1018.

⁵² Західно-Українська Народна Республіка. 1918-1923. Документи і матеріали. Т. 1: Листопадова 1918 р. національно-демократична революція. Проголошення ЗУНР / Укладачі: Олександр Карпенко, Катерина Мицан. Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ, 2001. 684 с.; Західно-Українська Народна Республіка. 1918-1923. Документи і матеріали. Т. 2: Державотворчі й адміністративно-організаційні процеси / Укладачі: Олександр Карпенко, Катерина Мицан. Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ, 2001. 712 с.; Культурне життя в Україні. Західні землі. Документи і матеріали. Т. 1. 1939-1953. К.: Наукова думка, 1995. 748 с.; Ліквідація УГКЦ (1939-1946). Документи радянських органів безпеки / Упор. Сергій Кокін, Наталія Сердюк, Станіслав Сердюк; за заг. ред. Володимира Сергійчука. Т. I. К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2006. 920 с.; Ліквідація УГКЦ (1939-1946). Документи радянських органів безпеки / Упор. Сергій Кокін, Наталія Сердюк, Станіслав Сердюк; за заг. ред. Володимира Сергійчука. Т. II. К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2006. 804 с.; Літопис нескореної України: Документи, матеріали, спогади. Книга 1 (Підготували Я. Лялька, П. Максимук, І. Патер та ін.). Авт. передмови Я. Лялька, Р. Бачинський. Львів: Просвіта, 1993. 800 с.+ іл.

⁵³ Роман Шухевич у документах радянських органів державної безпеки (1940-1950) / За заг. ред. В. Сергійчука. Т. 1. К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2007. С. 7.

⁵⁴ Літопис нескореної України: Документи, матеріали, спогади. Книга 1 (Підготували Я. Лялька, П. Максимук, І. Патер та ін.). Авт. передмови Я. Лялька, Р. Бачинський. Львів: Просвіта, 1993. С. 375.

Interesting facts about the activity of A. Sheptytsky during World War II can be found in the four-volume document “Ukraine in the Second World War”, prepared for printing by V. Kosyk. The pages of this publication contain the “OUN-Bandera response to the Germans’ demand to withdraw the proclamation of the statehood on June 30, 1941”, which states unequivocally: “The government [of J. Stetsko – Aut.] has the support of such authorities as Metropolitan of the Uniate Church, Count Sheptytsky”⁵⁵. The Document “Further Information on the OUN-Bandera and the Murder of Sciborsky and Senyk” provides information about the split that took place at OUN and Metropolitan’s attitude towards this⁵⁶. According to the German SD, A. Sheptytsky wrote in a letter to Colonel Andriy Melnyk: “The whole Ukrainian public requires as a necessary prerequisite your mutual agreement with Bandera and the termination of this dispute, so terrible and harmful to the Ukrainian case. It is unthinkable that after the Bolshevik rule, the OUN can bring us a fratricidal war with all the misfortunes that come with it”⁵⁷. German special services have launched an investigation to authenticate the letter.

On January 14, 1942 A. Sheptytsky, M. Velychkivsky, A. Livytsky, M. Omelyanovych-Pavlenko and A. Melnyk wrote in a letter to Hitler: “...In the Ukrainian central regions, the possibility of cultural and national development is being withdrawn from the Ukrainians, while the difficulties are created for the political press, traditional cultural and educational associations are forbidden, schools are closed, permission for the activity of scientific institutions is withdrawn and professors are unemployed, the nation’s brain remains without the possibility of scientific activity, even without the means of livelihood. Such a state of affairs provokes a great discontent in the Ukrainian public about the future of national culture... Unfortunately, today’s reality does not give Ukrainians this confidence. Therefore, there is great concern and fear for the future of the nation among the masses and in the ruling circles. The current state of affairs contradicts the historical tasks of Ukraine, which derive from its geographical position...”⁵⁸. By the way, the Soviet security agencies also closely followed

⁵⁵ Україна в Другій світовій війні у документах. Збірник німецьких архівних матеріалів. Т. 1 / Упорядкування і передмова Володимира Косика. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 1997. С. 214.

⁵⁶ Україна в Другій світовій війні у документах. Збірник німецьких архівних матеріалів. Т. 1 / Упорядкування і передмова Володимира Косика. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 1997. С. 283-285

⁵⁷ Ibid. С. 362-363.

⁵⁸ Україна в Другій світовій війні у документах. Збірник німецьких архівних матеріалів (1941-1942). Т. 2 / Упорядкування Володимира Косика. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича; Львівський державний університет ім. І. Франка;

the activities of Metropolitan during the war. There are many reports about this on the pages of the collection of documents “Roman Shukhevych in the Documents of the Soviet State Security Authorities (1940-1950)”. People’s Commissar of State Security of the USSR V. Merkulov reported that “in the formation of the SS-Halychyna Division and the Military Committee an active role was played by... the representatives of the Uniate Church, headed by Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, personally associated with Melnyk»⁵⁹. Another report referred to Metropolitan’s support for the Act of June 30, 1941⁶⁰.

A huge factual material is contained in the two-volume edition of the documents “Liquidation of the UGCC (1936-1946). Documents of the Soviet State Security Authorities”. A researcher of the State Archives of the Security Service of Ukraine N. Serdiuk, analyzing the directive of the UkrSSR KGB “On the Agential Work on the Line of the Greek Catholic Uniate Church, headed by Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky”, stated: “...the Vatican’s agents in the USSR, by underground methods, disseminate Catholicism and, as appropriate, carry out espionage work for the benefit of various foreign powers, and Metropolitan Sheptytsky is involved”⁶¹. In general, A. Sheptytsky is mentioned in the vast majority of documents⁶². In the preface to the second volume of this edition, which deals with the liquidation of the UGCC, V. Serhiychuk states: “The offered documents testify to the following: the representatives of the Soviet special services managed to warm up the personal ambitions of Kostelnyk [H. Kostelnyk – a former supporter of A. Sheptytsky, who betrayed his ideas and faithfully served the invaders – Aut.] so much, ambitions, concerning his “messianism” in converting the Uniates to Russian Orthodoxy, that he had already dreamed of creating a special Orthodox Church in Western Ukraine under his leadership. Therefore, he wanted to influence the secret scenario of the elimination of the UGCC, by requiring the representatives of the Bolshevik authorities to take firm repression against the clergy”⁶³. The OUN could not help but respond to it: “Ukrainians are Greek Catholics! Can we,

Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. Грушевського НАН України, 1998. С. 86-87.

⁵⁹ Роман Шухевич у документах радянських органів державної безпеки (1940-1950) / За заг. ред. В. Сергійчука. Т. 1. К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2007. С. 352-353.

⁶⁰ Ibid. С. 356.

⁶¹ Ліквідація УГКЦ (1939-1946). Документи радянських органів безпеки / Упор. Сергій Кокін, Наталія Сердюк, Станіслав Сердюк; за заг. ред. Володимира Сергійчука. Т. 1. К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2006. С. 16.

⁶² Ibid. 65-68, 72-75, 77-80, 82-84, 86-92, 94-96, 9, 100, 103, 105-107, 113, 114, 121, 123, 125, 133-135, 138, 139, 144 and so on.

⁶³ Ibid. С. 5.

therefore, calmly look when enemy, with the help of several broken units from the Greek Catholic clergy, who have embarked on the path of betrayal, is dragging the whole Greek Catholic Church into the abyss? Should we let some timid clergy open the door to our villages and towns for the NKVD fathers? Do we have to wait for our parents, children and relatives to be confessed to informants and the NKVD workers? No!”⁶⁴.

Therefore, in the twentieth century, one of the most prominent figures of Ukrainian history was undoubtedly Metropolitan of Galicia Andrey Sheptytsky. A prominent religious figure of that time, he played a significant role in the growth of self-awareness of the Ukrainian people. It is difficult to overestimate Metropolitan’s contribution to education, science, cultural progress of the Ukrainians. Despite the fact that his activity was spread primarily in Western Ukraine, however, it made a huge resonance with the rest of Ukrainian lands. On this basis, the attention of researchers has always been drawn to this great figure. Even during his lifetime Metropolitan’s pastoral messages, memorandums and scientific works were published. Unfortunately, the two world wars, the occupation of Galicia by the Soviet and Nazi troops, the establishment of the communist dictatorship in the land, led to the loss of many works of Metropolitan. Today a fruitful process is underway to return from forgetting the great cultural heritage of Andrey Sheptytsky. In the West, it started earlier, in Ukraine – after proclamation of independence. Nowadays Ukrainian archivists have published several multivolume publications of pastoral messages, letters, memorandums, decrees, historical and theological works. Much work has been done in the direction of the publication of the once banned and now open archives of the Soviet state security agencies. We learned more about the Great Metropolitan – a religious, cultural and political figure, who wanted to see Ukraine as a free and independent state.

⁶⁴ Ліквідація УГКЦ (1939-1946). Документи радянських органів безпеки / Упор. Сергій Кокін, Наталія Сердюк, Станіслав Сердюк; за заг. ред. Володимира Сергійчука. Т. І. К. ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2006. С. 64.

PART 2.
METROPOLITAN ANDREY SHEPTYTSKY THROUGH THE EYES
OF CONTEMPORARIES AND IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY

A large number of works about Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky came out abroad, works, in which their authors tried to trace the major milestones in his life, to show the role of Sheptytsky in raising the national and cultural level of the Ukrainians, especially those who lived in Western Ukraine, to analyze his views, versatile educational, cultural, ecumenical and political activity. Foreign historians had the opportunity to express their views freely, which could not be said about the researchers, who published their works within the Soviet Union. Considering the fact that several hundred works have been published about Sheptytsky's life and work, we will view only some of them.

The ecumenism of Andrey Sheptytsky has been studied by many historians and even by his contemporaries. However, a special attention should deserve a doctoral dissertation of His Beatitude Lubomyr Husar, defended by him in 1972 at the Pontifical Urban University. L. Husar mentioned: "Metropolitan Sheptytsky belonged to the few people, who, being upset by the discord between Christians at the beginning of the twentieth century, worked to change somehow such a tragic situation (the split in the Christian movement – Aut.), acted at random, without any guidelines or official instructions, guided by their own beliefs and wishes of union, which, of course, affected the nature of their activities... Today, after the time interval... we can highly appreciate the essential role of those pioneers, among which Metropolitan Sheptytsky was, without exaggeration, the most prominent"⁶⁵. Metropolitan's ecumenical activity was praised by Vasyl Lentsyk: "From this angle one must understand all the activities of Andrey Sheptytsky, his tireless work in the direction of the ecclesial unity of all Christians, and the Ukrainian people in particular, in one Christ Church. In this work on unification Metropolitan saw a special role and mission of the Ukrainian people... Metropolitan Andrey realized what misfortune was a Church break-up for our people, in addition a part of our Church, both in Tsarist and the Bolsheviks period Russia, was used to the detriment of the Ukrainian people. Considering the conditions of the Ukrainian people, he

⁶⁵ Гузар Любомир. Андрей Шептицький Митрополит Галицький (1901-1944) провісник екуменізму / Видання друге. Жовква: Місіонер, 2015. С. 23.

believed that Ukrainians, more than anyone else, have a mission to work for unification. Unfortunately, this very important case even now is underestimated”⁶⁶.

Famous English theologian and church historian J. Pelikan, analyzing A. Sheptytsky’s work from the point of view of today, wrote: “Andrey Sheptytsky’s ideas of unification were theologically meaningful and historically fascinating. It is safe to say that he was one of those, who worked hard to make the unification of the Universal Church come true. His great merit is that now, after the Second Vatican Council, the prospects of understanding between East and West are better than ever in the previous centuries. Everything points to the fact that the most difficult antagonistic and doctrinal cases that have remained unchanged for 1,000 years, could be solved today. It was once a great vision for which Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky dedicated his entire life”⁶⁷. One of the closest associates of Metropolitan, Kyrylo Korolevych (Paul Francois Sharon) thoroughly described the activity of Sheptytsky in Russia, and it is evidenced by at least the titles of the chapters (“Private visit to Russia”, “Father Ivan Deibner”, “Father Olexii Zerchaninov”, “Pius X confirms the authority of Metropolitan”, “Parish in St. Petersburg”, “Father Leonid Fyodorov”, “Russian Greek-Catholic Synod, Petrograd in 1917”, “Russian Greek Catholic Exarch”, “Renaissance of the Russian Orthodox Church”, “persecution of the religion”, “Greek Catholic Community in Moscow”, “other Greek Catholics in Russia”, etc.). K. Korolevsky expressed Metropolitan’s intentions in Russia in his own words: “I am Metropolitan Sheptytsky, I offer you my mediation to establish contact with Rome”⁶⁸. A. Sheptytsky’s diplomatic missions were described by Josyf Slipyi in his “Memories”⁶⁹. In the Ukrainian historical science the ecumenical activity of Metropolitan was researched by V. Basarab, O. Khomenko, E. Bystrytska, J. Bilas, M. Vavzhonek, H. Hladka, L. Krupa, M. Marynovych, A. Smyrnov, O. Surmach, O. Sheremeta and others.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Ленцик Василь. Визначні постаті Української Церкви: Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і Патріарх Йосиф Сліпий. Львів: Свічадо, 2004. С. 269.

⁶⁷ *Morality and Reality. The life and times of Andrei Sheptytskyi* / Paul Robert Magocsi, editor with the assistance of Andrii Krawchuk. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies University of Alberta Edmonton 1989. P. 10-11.

⁶⁸ Королевський Кирило. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький (1865-1944) / пр. з фр. Я. Кравець / Вид. 2-ге, випр. Львів: Свічадо, 2016. С. 239.

⁶⁹ Сліпий Йосиф. Спомини / ред. Іван Дацько, Марія Горяча, вид. 3-тє, виправлене й доповнене. Львів – Рим: Видавництво УКУ, 2017. С. 114-115.; Див.: Матеріяли до історії українського патріархального руху / Упор. А. Сороковський. Львів: Свічадо, 2009. 364 с.

⁷⁰ Басараб В. Проблема єдності Церков у світлі екуменічних ідей митрополита А.Шептицького. Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції Волинської

Among the special works that analyzed the life and activities of Andrey Sheptytsky, one should mention the work of Vasyl Laba, the first edition of which appeared in 1965. Some sections of his work are titled this way: “Boyar ancestry of Sheptytsky”, “The boyish and school age of the future Metropolitan Andrey”, “An important decision of Dr. Roman Olexandr Earl Sheptytsky”, “Roman Sheptytsky as the Basilian monk”, “Andrey Sheptytsky as a Stanislaw Bishop”, “Bishop Andrey Sheptytsky as Metropolitan of Galicia”, “Metropolitan Andrey – Kniaz of the Ukrainian Church”, “He who prays for his brothers”. This list of sections of V. Laba’s work testifies to the comprehensive coverage of the life of Metropolitan. However, the author himself considered his research a modest job. In the preface to the book, V. Laba wrote: “The full biography of Metropolitan can be arranged no sooner than when the title of that biography will sound “The life of St. Andrey, Great Metropolitan of Galicia”. All that will be written about him by that time is just the little parts that future hagiographer will bring into one. I confine myself to recording in order the most important events in the life of Metropolitan, and I’m weaving a canvas for the network

православної богословської академії УПЦ КП «Державотворення і помісність Церкви: історичні процеси та сучасні реалії» (18.05.2017). Луцьк: Видавництво Волинської православної богословської академії ΕΙΚΩΝ, 2017. С. 27-34; Бистрицька Е. Українське православ’я та екуменічна діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького в роки Другої світової війни. Українське релігієзнавство. 2002. № 23. С. 45-55; Білас Я. І. Екуменізм Андрея Шептицького і проблема суверенності нації. Історія релігій в Україні. Кн. 1. Львів, 1999. С. 45–48; Вегеш М. М., Хоменко О. В. Екуменічні ідеї митрополита Андрея Шептицького та діяльність по їх реалізації. Carpathica–Карпатика: Актуальні проблеми політичного та етнокультурного розвитку Карпатського регіону в ХІХ–ХХ століттях. Ужгород: Вид-во «Два кольори», 2001. Вип.10. С.278–312; Гладка Г. Л. Берестейська унія й екуменічний процес в оцінках та діяльності А.Шептицького. Обрії. Часопис Івано-Франківського обласного інституту післядипломної освіти педагогічних працівників. Івано-Франківськ, 1996. №1(3). С.43-47; Гладка Г.Л. Екуменічна діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Добрий пастир. Часопис, присвячений церковним і богословським справам. Івано-Франківськ, 1996. Ч.1. С. 99-101; Гладка Г.Л. Проблема релігійної єдності України в унійно-екуменічній діяльності митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Наукові записки Тернопільського державного педагогічного університету ім. В. Гнатюка, Серія: Історія. Тернопіль, 1999. Вип.ІХ. С. 37-40; Крупа Л. Спроби митрополита Андрея Шептицького через ідеї екуменізму досягти фізичного та духовного об’єднання України. Наш голос. /видає Асоціація Українців Америки/, 2000. Вересень-жовтень, ч. 9-10.; Маринювич М. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і принцип «позитивної суми» / передмова Адріана Сливогоцького. Львів: Видавництво Старого Лева, 2019. 248 с.; Смирнов А. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і православ’я: від екуменізму до національної єдності. Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія «Історичні науки». 2017. Вип. 26. С. 40-44; Сурмач О. Екуменічна діяльність УГКЦ в роки німецької окупації Галичини (1941-1944 рр.). Київська Церква. Київ-Львів, 2000. №4 (10). С.72-78; Шеремета О. Екуменізм як етична ідея А. Шептицького. Філософ. думка. 2007. № 1. С. 60-69; Шеремета О. Ю. Екуменізм як етична ідея Шептицького. Філософська думка. №1. 2007. С. 60–68.

of virtues, ideals and deeds of the Great Metropolitan, and that will perpetuate him in the grateful memory of the Ukrainian people. My modest sketch of the life of Metropolitan Andrey is only a statement of my modest special gratitude for him: my Tutor, Saint and long-time Hierarch”⁷¹.

The works of S. Baran and V. Doroshenko were published even earlier⁷². Both of these essays are similar to V. Laba’s work. They analyze in general terms the main stages of life and activity of Metropolitan. Professor of University of Toronto O. Baran is the author of the number of articles on ecumenical ideas of Andrey Sheptytsky⁷³. I. Khoma researched the role of Sheptytsky in the life of Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj⁷⁴. According to N. Davis, “it is no wonder that Earl Andrey Sheptytsky, the most prominent patron of the Ukrainian national movement in Galicia and the Uniate Archbishop of Lviv since 1900, was a loving older brother of the active Polish nationalist General Stanislaw Sheptytsky”⁷⁵. Ukrainian-Polish relations at the turn of the century have been researched by I. Tsenda, L. Hentosh, D. Blazheyovsky, O. Krasivsky, I. Pylypiv and other researchers⁷⁶.

The famous foreign historian and political scientist I. Lysiak-Rudnytsky paid great attention to the personality of Andrey Sheptytsky. In the article “Ukrainians of Galicia under Austrian domination”, he wrote that Sheptytsky was “generally recognized as one of the most prominent Slavic ecclesiastical figures of our century... It is just enough to mention that he

⁷¹ Лаба Василь. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Його життя і заслуги. Люблин: Свічадо, 1990. С. 13.

⁷² Баран С. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: життя і діяльність. Мюнхен: Вернигора, 1947. 151 с.; Дорошенко В. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і обєднання Церков. *Логос*. 1955. Т. 6. С. 137-143.

⁷³ Баран О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і його екуменічні ідеї. *Український Історик*. 1-4 (120-123). Нью-Йорк – Торонто – Київ – Львів – Мюнхен, 1994.

⁷⁴ Хома І. Шляхами каторги Блаженного Йосифа Сліпого. *Альманах «Гомону України»*. Торонто, 1995. С. 49-75.

⁷⁵ Дейвіс Н. Боже ігрище: історія Польщі. К.: Основи, 2008. С. 505-506.

⁷⁶ Цепенда І. Українсько-польські відносини 40-50-х років ХХ століття: етнополітичний аналіз. К., 2009. 387 с.; Блажейовський Дмитро. Деякі сумні сторінки з історії України та дещо про її сусідів: Україну краще треба нам самим будувати (Збірка особистих спостережень автора). Львів: Видавництво «Каменярь», 2007. 640 с.; Гентош Л. Митрополит Шептицький: 1923-1939. Випробування ідеалів. Львів, 2015. 596 с.; Гентош Л. Постать митрополита Шептицького в українських та польських наукових виданнях останнього десятиріччя. *Україна модерна / За ред. В. Верстюка, Я. Грицака, Л. Зашкільняка, В. Кравченка, М. Крикуна*. К.: Критика; Львів: Інститут історичних досліджень Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка, 2003. Ч. 8. С. 179-210; Красівський О., Пилипів І. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і польська держава (1918-1923 рр.). *Українсько-польські відносини в Галичині: матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції (21-22 листопада 1996 р.)*. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 1997. С. 152-155.

founded new monastic orders, carried out liturgical reforms and promoted theological researches. Keeping away from current politics, Sheptytsky did a great service to the Ukrainian case, tactfully using his connections in Vienna, as well as being a generous patron of the arts... Intellectually agile and conscious of the needs of the time, he encouraged the clergy to participate in public life. The fact that the Greek Catholic Church was now headed by an important person, and at the same time a distinct, bright personality, gave the Ukrainian national movement certainty in its own power. However, Sheptytsky was not a narrow-minded nationalist, but a man of a supranational vision: the idea, he devoted his life to, was a union of Western and Eastern Christianity. It envisaged respect for all the features of the Eastern religious tradition compatible with the Catholic dogma⁷⁷. On many questions, the solutions of which were vitally important for the Ukrainians of Eastern Galicia, Andrey Sheptytsky took a compromise position⁷⁸. In the work "Ukrainian National Movement" I. Lysyak-Rudnitsky once again returns to the figure of Andrey Sheptytsky. According to him, "under the leadership of a prominent figure – Andrey Sheptytsky, Metropolitan of Galicia since 1900, the Greek Catholic Church became closely linked to Ukraine's struggle for independence"⁷⁹. It is necessary to agree with such considerations.

The figures of the Ukrainian People's Republic, Lonhyn Tsehelsky and Volodymyr Vynnychenko, hoped strongly for the support of Andrey Sheptytsky. I. Lysyak-Rudnitsky describes an interesting episode on the pages of his serious work "Volodymyr Vynnychenko's Social and Political Worldview": "When Tsehelsky noted that such a move (to make Metropolitan the head of the All-Ukrainian Church – Aut.) would mean a break with the Orthodoxy, Vynnychenko immediately replied: "We will abolish Orthodoxy! It brought us under the eastern king, it led us through the russification of Ukraine. Orthodoxy will always gravitate to Moscow. Your (Galician) union is good for distinguishing yourself from Poland and from Moscow. The Uniate, because of his nature, becomes a (nationally conscious) Ukrainian. We will convene a synod of bishops, archimandrites and representatives of lay people from Ukraine and we'll advise them to accept the union (of the churches) and put Sheptytsky in the forefront. Let's

⁷⁷ Лисяк-Рудницький Іван. Історичні есе. В 2-х тт. Т. 1. / Пер. з англ. М. Бадік, У. Гавришків, Я. Грицака, А. Дешиці, Г. Киван, Е. Панкєсвої. К.: Основи – Інститут державного управління та місцевого самоврядування при Кабінеті Міністрів України, 1994. С. 436-437.

⁷⁸ Ibid. С. 422.

⁷⁹ Ibid. С. 476-477.

also get acquainted with Rome to make him the patriarch of Ukraine... Do you think I'm kidding?"⁸⁰.

Researching the life and activities of Vyacheslav Lypynsky, I. Lysyak-Rudnytsky also pays attention to Metropolitan of Galicia. Rightly referring Sheptytsky to the bright representatives of the Polish-Ukrainian aristocracy, a scientist wrote: "Considering the innumerable services rendered to the Ukrainian case only by this personality, one can ask himself whether the participation of more people such as Sheptytsky would not change the outcome of the Ukrainian struggle for independence from defeat to victory"⁸¹.

In contrast to the statements of Soviet historians, I. Lysyak-Rudnytsky rightly noted that "Sheptytsky in the questions of national importance got along with existing parties and did not consider it necessary to create a separate Catholic political organization, which was Khomyshyn's goal"⁸². He was "tuned, when using a terminology of later times, more ecumenically, and wanted to preserve the roots of the Eastern, Byzantine tradition in the Greek Catholic Church"⁸³. Thus, although I. Lysyak-Rudnytsky did not write a special work on Andrey Sheptytsky, but he analyzed various aspects of his activity, gave an objective evaluation of Metropolitan of Galicia. V. Veryha, M. Kuhutiak, M. Lytvyn and other scientists, investigated national liberation struggle of Galician Ukrainians in 1918-1919 and A. Sheptytsky's participation in it⁸⁴. The contribution of Metropolitan of Galicia to the

⁸⁰ Лисяк-Рудницький Іван. Історичні есе. В 2-х тт. Т. 2. / Пер. з англ. У. Гавришків, Я. Грицака. К.: Основи – Інститут державного управління та місцевого самоврядування при Кабінеті Міністрів України, 1994. С. 102-103.

⁸¹ Ibid. С. 163.

⁸² Ibid. С. 215.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Верига В. Визвольні змагання в Україні 1914-1923 рр. У двох томах. Т. 1. Жовква: Видавництво Отців Василіан «Місіонер», 1998. 524 с.; Верига В. Визвольні змагання в Україні 1914-1923 рр. У двох томах. Т. 2. Жовква: Видавництво Отців Василіан «Місіонер», 1998. 504 с.; Верига В. Нариси з історії України (кінець XVIII – початок XX ст.). Львів: Видавництво «Світ», 1996. 448 с.; Гуцуляк М. Перший листопад 1918 року на західних землях України зі спогадами і життєписами членів Комітету Виконавців Листопадового Чину. К.: Либідь, 1993. 408 с.; Західно-Українська Народна Республіка. 1918-1923: Історія / Керівник авторського колективу й відповідальний редактор Олександр Карпінко. Івано-Франківськ: Сіверсія, 2001. 628 с.; Красилівський О. За Українську державу і Церкву. Громадська та суспільно-політична діяльність Митрополита Андрія Шептицького в 1918-1923 рр. Львів, 1995. 86 с.; Красівський О. Дипломатичні місії Андрія Шептицького. *Україна: ЗУНР: Історія і традиції*. Л., 2000. С. 291-296; Красівський О. За Українську державу і Церкву. Громадська та суспільно-політична діяльність Митрополита Андрія Шептицького в 1918-1923 рр. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 1995. 86 с.; Красівський О., Пилипів І. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і польська держава (1918-1923 рр.). *Українсько-*

Ukrainian state-making processes has been successfully researched for many years by V. Serhiychuk⁸⁵.

An attempt to write a short biography of Andrey Sheptytsky was made by Roman Holovyn. Analyzing the main moments in the life and activity of Metropolitan of Galicia, the author noted: "I. Franko was passionate about Sheptytsky's broad activities and cultural work. He and M. Pavlyk often visited Metropolitan in scientific affairs. They were amazed of the lifestyle of the Earl– Metropolitan. He lived as an ascetic: a small room, alone in the wool black cloak of a monk-student, with a black belt, with prayer beads on his belt or in his hands, the most modest dish..."⁸⁶. To the deep conviction of the author, Sheptytsky was always worried about "the future of the Ukrainian people. He did his best to prevent somehow the denationalization of our intelligentsia"⁸⁷.

The figure of Andrey Sheptytsky takes an important place on the pages of the work on the history of church, written by I. Ortynsky. According to

*польські відносини в Галичині: матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції (21-22 листопада 1996 р.). Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 1997. С. 152-155; Кугутяк М. Андрей Шептицький у національно-визвольних змаганнях українського народу. Спадщина митрополита Андрея Шептицького в національному й духовному відродженні України. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2000. С. 66-75; Кугутяк М. Галичина. Сторінки історії: нарис суспільно-політичного руху (XIX ст. – 1939). Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 1993. 202 с. ; Кугутяк М. Історія української націонал-демократії (1918-1929). Т. 1. Київ – Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2002. 536 с.; Кугутяк М. Українська націонал-демократія (1918-1939). Т. 2. Київ – Івано-Франківськ: Нова Зоря, 2004. 704 с.; Литвин М. Науменко К. 1939. Західні землі України. Львів: Ін-т українознавства НАНУ, 1999. 152 с. ; Литвин М., Науменко К. Історія ЗУНР. Львів: Інститут українознавства НАНУ; Видавнича фірма «ОЛВР», 1995. 368 с.; Расевич В. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і проблеми національно-політичної консолідації українців (1900-1918 роки). *Ковчег*. Науковий збірник із української історії / Під ред. Б. Гудзяка, І. Скочиляса, О. Турія. Львів, 2000. Ч. 11. С. 189-211; Цвенгрош Г. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: 1918-1919. Львів: Місіонер, 1991. 38 с.; Цвенгрош Г. Митрополит на сторожі держави. *Літопис Червоної калини*. 1994. Ч. 1-3 (32-33). С. 2-5; Цвенгрош Г. Національно-державотворчі погляди митрополита Андрея Шептицького й польсько-українська війна 1918-1919 рр. *Польсько-українські студії*. Матеріали наукової конференції. 29-31 травня 1992 р., м. Каменець-Подільський. К., 1993. С. 172-183; Цвенгрош Г. Рим і Україна: Апостольський престол і митрополит А. Шептицький у 1918-1919 рр. *Дзвін*. 1992. № 5-6. С. 107-113.*

⁸⁵ Сергійчук В. Греко-католицька церква в 1944-1991 рр. *Український історичний журнал*. 1996. № 4 . С.101-112; Сергійчук В. Нескорена церква. Подвижництво греко-католиків України в боротьбі за віру і державу. К.: Дніпро, 2001. 494 с.; Сергійчук В. Постає митрополита Андрея Шептицького в українському національному житті. *Державник, мислитель, богослов: матеріали міжнародної конференції, присвяченої 60-річчю від дня смерті Митрополита Андрея Шептицького*. К.: Українська видавнича спілка, 2005. С. 5-21; Сергійчук В. Українські державники: Андрей Шептицький. К., 2015. 440 с.

⁸⁶ Головин Р. Владика Андрей. *Альманах «Гомону України»*. Торонто, 1994. С. 45-46.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* С. 109.

the author, “Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky becomes the greatest personality that the Sheptytsky family gives to Ukraine. He was not only the absolute and undisputed leader of the Ukrainian Church for half a century, but also the highest authority among the Ukrainian people in such difficult times of Ukrainian history. He could be called the generous gift of God’s Providence to the suffering Ukrainian people”⁸⁸. The researcher made it clear that “his view is not only directed to Ukraine, although it remains his first goal. Due to the loyalty to the Ukrainian people, Metropolitan Sheptytsky wants to bring to the unity all the Eastern Christians. He intends to complete what Pocij’s Union began, and, in particular, what great metropolitans from the seventeenth century, Josyf Veliamyn Rutsky and Petro Mohyla, dreamed of: a Ukrainian Patriarchate in Kyiv in connection with the whole Universal Church under the surface of Pope”⁸⁹.

Some touches to the portrait of Sheptytsky as a politician were made by well-known foreign scientists Volodymyr Kosyk⁹⁰ and Paul Robert Magocsi⁹¹. The latter, in particular, noted that “Sheptytsky was a titanic figure (both in physique and for his socio-cultural influence), he came from a polonized Ukrainian family and, having found his Rus roots, sincerely joined the Ukrainian national camp... As a result, Greek Catholic eparchy in Galicia under the leadership of Sheptytsky gradually changed its position and in the early twentieth century became a bastion of the Ukrainian movement”⁹². The researcher also claimed that “in the neighboring Galicia (1938-1939 – Aut.) Ukrainians, led by influential Greek Catholic Metropolitan of Lviv Andrey Sheptytsky, looked at Subcarpathian Rus with a great hope”⁹³. Andrey Sheptytsky congratulated the Transcarpathians on granting them autonomous rights by Prague, served a prayer at St. George’s Church, and corresponded with Avhustyn Voloshyn. In his monograph, Canadian historian P. Stercho quotes Metropolitan’s greeting letter to A. Voloshyn on the occasion of his appointment as a Prime Minister of the Government of Carpathian of Ukraine: “I’m sending my sincere wishes to you and I assure you of my daily prayers for Your Excellency and for your brothers in the Carpathians, subjected to Your power. May the Almighty take your steps and fill you with the wisdom of God from heaven so that you

⁸⁸ Оргинський І. Хрещення, хрест та харизма України. Дрогобич, 1993. С. 109.

⁸⁹ Ibid. С. 109.

⁹⁰ Косик В. Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні. Париж – Нью-Йорк – Львів, 1993, 660 с.

⁹¹ Магочій Павло Роберт. Історія України. К.: Критика, 2007. 640 с.

⁹² Ibid. С. 381.

⁹³ Магочій П. Р. Формування національної свідомості: Підкарпатська Русь (1848-1948). Ужгород, 1994. С. 145.

could lead the people, entrusted to you, to a complete freedom and versatile well-being”⁹⁴. Modern Ukrainian researchers wrote more about A. Sheptytsky’s attitude to Carpathian Ukraine⁹⁵.

Important and interesting in all respects is the work “Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky”, written by Richard Tozhetsky, and published in 1988. Having raised a number of complicated problems, the author elaborated on the ambiguous attitude of various political forces towards Metropolitan: “We still have an open question as to why Metropolitan did not find proper obedience among different groups of Ukrainian society. There was a nationalist underground brought up in the spirit of struggle after World War I. The process of its reorientation developed very slowly, and it did not intend to stop this struggle, in particular, as a result of an unrealistic assessment of international conditions. It was extremely difficult to fill hearts and inflammatory minds, even when it came to influencing clergy. They came primarily from the peasantry and formed the backbone of the national movement, and often nationalism, which grew up from the social and national wrongs, inflicted to Ukrainians. Such clergymen were convinced that if the Ukrainians were armed, then the Third Reich would sooner or later listen to their demands, they believed in a common interest, in ending the predatory policy towards Ukraine. To some extent, these reasons led to the approval of the actions of those priests, who were chaplains at various military units, which cooperated with or served in the Wehrmacht (this refers to the “Nachtigal”, “Roland” or division “Galicia”)”⁹⁶. In spite of this, “the consolidation efforts of Metropolitan are well known to all Ukrainians”⁹⁷. R. Tozhetsky will research these issues for

⁹⁴ Стерчо П. Карпато-Українська держава: До історії визвольної боротьби карпатських українців у 1919-1939 роках. Торонто: Наукове Товариство ім. Т. Шевченка, 1965. С. 101.

⁹⁵ Вегеш М. Карпатська Україна. Документи і факти. Ужгород: Видавництво „Карпати”, 2004. 432 с.; Вегеш М. Велич і трагедія Карпатської України. – Ужгород: Видавництво УжНУ «Говерла», 2007. 296 с.; Вегеш М. Карпатська Україна в портретах. Ужгород: Видавництво УжНУ «Говерла», 2007. 376 с.; Вегеш М., Токар М. Карпато-Українське державотворення: До 70-річчя проголошення державної незалежності Карпатської України. Ужгород: Видавництво УжНУ «Говерла», 2009. 536 с.; Вегеш М., Токар М. Вершина духу. До 80-річчя проголошення державної незалежності Карпатської України. Ужгород: Всеукраїнське державне видавництво «Карпати», 2018. 324 с.

⁹⁶ Тожецький Р. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. *Ковчег*: Зб. праць з церковної історії. Львів, 1993. Вип.1. С. 108.

⁹⁷ Тожецький Р. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. *Ковчег*: Зб. праць з церковної історії. Львів, 1993. Вип. 1. С. 109.

many times⁹⁸. Modern Ukrainian researchers have repeatedly written about the activities of Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky during the World War II, including the protection of the Jewish population⁹⁹. Noteworthy are the detailed monographs by Y. Kyrychuk, A. Rusnachenko and B. Yarosh¹⁰⁰. To the deep conviction of V.-D. Hajke, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky was a great supporter of the Ukrainian division “Galicia”, and his close associate V. Laba “took over the spiritual care of the division and had great merit in this field. All parts of the division welcomed him gladly, and his Divine Service on great holidays would remain in a memory forever. Each regiment

⁹⁸ Тожецький Р. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і національні проблеми. *Хроніка* 2000. 2012. Вип. 3 (93). С. 255-275.; Тожецький Р. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. *Літопис Голготи України*: Т. 2. Репресована церква. Дрогобич: Відродження, 1994. С. 29-37.

⁹⁹ Боляновський А. Дивізія «Галичина»: історія. Львів, 2000. 528 с.; Боляновський А. Між християнською мораллю і нелюдським злом (реакція митрополита Андрея Шептицького на окупаційну політику націонал-соціалістичної Німеччини в Галичині у 1941-1944 рр.: від формальної лояльності до критики і протестів). *Друга світова війна та долі мирного населення у Східній Європі*. К., 2016. С. 7-70; Бошорків Богдан. Греко-Католицька Церква і Радянська держава (1939-1950) / переклад з англійської Наталії Кочан, за редакцією Олега Турія. Львів: Видавництво Українського Католицького Університету, 2005. xx + 268 с.; Генік Л. Діяльність митрополита А. Шептицького в Галичині в період Другої світової війни. *Карпати: людина, етнос, цивілізація*. 2012. Аип. 4. С. 129-136; Гунчак Т. Україна: ХХ століття. К.: Дніпро, 2005. 384 с.; Гуркіна С. Митрополит Андрей (Шептицький) у період німецької окупації Галичини: найновіша історіографія питання (1989-2000 роки). *Ковчег*. Львів, 2001. Ч. 3. С. 563-565; Клюнь Р. Діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького часів Другої світової війни в українській історіографії. *Інтелігенція і влада*. Матеріали 5-ї Всеукраїнської наукової конференції. Одеса, 2009. Ч. 3. С. 99-106; Крупа Л. Діяльність УГКЦ в час німецької окупації з 1941 по 1944 роки. *Тернопільський комерційний інститут. Наукові записки* “Матеріали досліджень викладачів інституту, проведені у 2000 та 2001 роках”. Тернопіль: ТКІ, 2002. С.129-136; Крупа Л. Діяльність УГКЦ під час німецької окупації України з 1941 по 1944 роки. *Наукові записки: Збірник наукових статей Національного педагогічного університету імені М.П. Драгоманова* / Укл. П.В.Дмитренко, О.Л.Макаренко. К: НПУ, 2000. Ч.3. С.160-171; Крупник Л. Дискредитація Митрополита Андрея Шептицького та УГКЦ як практика радянської влади. *Друга світова війна та долі мирного населення у Східній Європі*. Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції пам'яті Митрополита Андрея Шептицького. 30 листопада-1 грудня 2015 року, м. Київ / За ред. Леоніда Фінберга. К.: Дух і Літера, 2016. С. 111-122; Лисенко О.Є. До питання про становище церкви в Україні у період Другої світової війни. *Український історичний журнал*. 1995. №3. С.73-81.

¹⁰⁰ Киричук Ю. Український національний рух 40-50 років ХХ століття: ідеологія та практика. Львів: Добра справа, 2003. 464 с.; Русначенко А. М. Народ збурений: Національно-визвольний рух в Україні й національні рухи опору в Білорусії, Литві, Латвії, Естонії у 1940-50-х роках. К.: Універсальне видавництво «Пулсари», 2002. 519 с. + іл.; Ярош Б.О. Сторінки політичної історії західноукраїнських земель (30 – 50-ті рр. ХХ ст.). Луцьк: Редакційно-видавничий відділ "Вежа" ВДУ ім. Л. Українки, 1999. 184 с.; Ярош Б.О. Тоталітарний режим на західноукраїнських землях, 30 – 50-ті роки ХХ ст. (історико-політологічний аспект). Луцьк: Надстирря, 1995. 176 с.

and separate kurin of the division had their own priests, who were subordinate to the high priest Mykhailo Leventz in the division headquarters. The Divine Services for the soldiers were served every Sunday and every holiday...¹⁰¹. P. Mirchuk wrote about the relationship between A. Sheptytsky and the leaders of the OUN: Metropolitan “confided the OUN in the ZUZ (Western Ukrainian lands – Aut.) about the agreement between Germany and USSR to the occupation of Western Ukrainian lands by the Bolsheviks – in case of Poland’s defeat»¹⁰². T. Hunchak wrote about Sheptytsky’s activity as a chairman of the Ukrainian National Council, which he embraced after the death of K. Levytsky. The historian stated: “But under the German occupation even the authority of Metropolitan did not help. On March 4, 1942, a representative of the security service declared that the National Council is impossible to be active any more. The reason for this was the signing of a memorandum in defense of the rights of Ukraine by Metropolitan Sheptytsky. But it was just an occasion to finally end the Ukrainian National Council. The Germans demanded its dissolution, but Metropolitan Sheptytsky only stopped its activities”¹⁰³.

Among the works of the Ukrainian researchers, the work of a scientist from Ivano-Frankivsk, professor J.Yu. Zaborovsky deserves attention. His book “Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky. An Essay on the Life and Service to the Church and to the People (1865-1944)” was published in 1995. The author briefly described the main periods of life and activity of Andrey Sheptytsky, analyzed his views. One can not disagree with the author’s statement that “glorious personalities are like high mountains whose snow-white peaks can be seen for many kilometers, because their heights cannot be covered with the trees or the folds of the earth’s surface. Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky certainly deserved to be called glorious, because there is virtually no part of Galicia’s socio-political life in the twentieth century, where we have not met with deeds or at least significant influence of his personality. Equal to him church or secular figures can be found only in the XVIII century, for example, Viniamin Rutsky – Metropolitan of Kyiv; and even in the X-XIII centuries. Among the kniazs are Volodymyr the Great, Danylo Halytsky. It is no wonder, then, that Metropolitan Sheptytsky has been called for a long time – not very successfully from the philosophical point of view, but quite normally from the historical

¹⁰¹ Гайке Вольф-Фрідріх. Українська Дивізія «Галичина». Історія формування і бойових дій у 1943-1945 роках / за заг. ред. В. Кубійовича. Тернопіль: Мандрівець, 2018. С. 32.

¹⁰² Мірчук П. Нарис історії Організації Українських Націоналістів. Т. 1. 1920-1939. Мюнхен – Лондон – Нью-Йорк, 1968. С. 585.

¹⁰³ Гунчак Т. Україна: XX століття. К.: Дніпро, 2005. С. 220.

perspective – “Kniaz of the Church”¹⁰⁴. The famous historian of the Greek Catholic Church V. Marchuk, basing on the huge source material, researched the promotional activity of Metropolitan of Galicia more deeply¹⁰⁵.

The promotional activity of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky was highly appreciated by the historian-theologian K. Panas. In his deep conviction, Sheptytsky is one of the most striking figures in our history, whose name will be inducted into the list of the Holy Fathers-Confessors of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The researcher identifies two important matters that the Galician Metropolitan has accomplished: “Metropolitan has devoted all his life and all his genius to the competition for the Ukrainian Church, the spiritual stronghold of the Ukrainian nation, which could not be destroyed by all the forces of the world and hell. The second thing that this genius of our history dedicated his life to was the restoration of the Ukrainian Kyiv Metropolitanate within its existence during the Kyiv kniazs era and the proclamation of the Ukrainian Patriarchate. Unfortunately, adverse political developments in Europe have hindered the accomplishment of this great case”¹⁰⁶.

Describing the various activities of Sheptytsky, Mykola Bereslavsky highlighted Metropolitan’s attitude to the development of Ukrainian culture – collecting ancient monuments, helping Ukrainian artists, creating gymnasiums and more. In the deep conviction of the researcher, “Bishop Andrey was a great humanist, philanthropist, he advocated social justice, helped the poor, needy. This is evidenced by his words and deeds”¹⁰⁷. These issues are researched in the ground works of M. Bandrivsky, O. Haidukevych, N. Kontsur-Karabinovych, S. Hnot, B. Holovyn, N. Hrecheniuk, H. Huchko, O. Kekosh, M. Kryvenko, L. Krupa, H. Kurys,

¹⁰⁴ Заборовський Я. Ю. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Нарис про життя і служіння народів (1865-1944 рр.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. С. 5.

¹⁰⁵ Марчук В. В. Українська греко-католицька церква в суспільному житті України ХХ ст. Автореферат дис... доктора іст. наук. Спеціальність 07. 00. 01. Чернівці, 2004. 35 с; Марчук В. Українська Греко-Католицька Церква: історичний нарис. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2004. 464 с; Марчук В. Церква в умовах релігійного підпілля: вибір українських греко-католиків у (1941-1946 рр.). *Галичина*: науковий і культурно-просвітній краєзнавчий часопис. 2008. №14. С.248-255; Марчук В.В. Греко-католицька церква в умовах німецького та радянського тоталітаризму (1941-1946). *Галичина*: науковий і культурно-просвітній краєзнавчий часопис. 2000. № 4. С.66-72; Марчук В.В. Українська греко-католицька церква: історичний нарис. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2001. 164 с; Марчук В.В. Церква, духовність, нація. Українська греко-католицька церква в суспільному житті України ХХ ст. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2004. 464с.

¹⁰⁶ Панас К. Історія Української Церкви. Львів, 1992. С. 132.

¹⁰⁷ Береславський М. З історії Української Греко-Католицької Церкви. Книга 2. Львів, 1992. С. 31.

P. Lazechko, L. Lazechko, H. Lytvyn, O. Ohirko, O. Pasitska, L. Roshchyna, N. Rusko¹⁰⁸.

¹⁰⁸ Бандрівський М. С. Пам'яткоохоронна діяльність Андрея Шептицького. *Записки Львів. наук. б-ки ім. В. Стефаника*. Ль., 2006. Вип.7/8. С. 459-467; Гайдукевич О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький – природоохоронний діяч Галичини. *Схід*. № 1 (141). Січень-лютий 2016. С. 35-39; Гайдукевич О., Концур-Карабінович Н. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький та охорона природи Галичини. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича*. Серія Історія. 2016. № 2. С. 20-26; Гайковський М. Велике протистояння: опір Греко-Католицької Церкви більшовицькому Гнот С. Греко-католицька церква і мистецтво Західної України 20– 30-рр. XX ст. *Науковий вісник Волинського державного університету імені Лесі Українки*. Серія – історичні науки. Луцьк: Вид.-во ВДУ, 2001. С. 44-48; Гнот С. Греко-католицька церква і організація суспільної опіки Галичини (1921-1939). *Актуальні проблеми державного управління*. Збірник наукових праць / Львівський філіал Української Академії державного управління при Президентові України. Львів: Вид.-во ЛФ УАДУ, 2001. Вип. 6. С. 299-309; Гнот С. Греко-католицька церква і проблема збереження пам'яток національної культури Галичини у міжвоєнний період. *Історичні пам'ятки Галичини*. Матеріали наукової красзнавчої конференції 21 листопада 2002 р. Львів: Видавничий центр ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2003. С. 126-135; Гнот С. До питання про діяльність Греко-католицької церкви у створенні захистів та захоронок у Галичині в міжвоєнний період. *Історія релігій в Україні*. Праці XI-ї Міжнародної наукової конференції (Львів, 16-19 травня 2001 року). Львів: “Логос”, 2001. Кн. 1. С. 179-183; Гнот С. Добродійна діяльність Греко-католицької церкви у 20– 30-х рр. XX ст. (за матеріалами української галицької преси). *Наукові зошити історичного факультету Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка*. Збірник наукових праць. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2003. Вип. 5-6. С. 211-219; Гнот С. І. Добродійна діяльність греко-католицької церкви у 1921-1939 рр. (за матеріалами Галицької митрополії). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Львів, 2003. 22 с.; Гнот С. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і розвиток національної культури Галичини в міжвоєнний період. *Історія релігій в Україні*. Праці XII-ї Міжнародної наукової конференції (Львів, 20-24 травня 2002 року). Львів: “Логос”, 2002. Кн. 1. С. 113-117; Гнот С. Проблема захисту дітей в діяльності Греко-католицької церкви міжвоєнного періоду. *Вісник Львівської комерційної академії*. Серія – гуманітарні науки. Львів: Вид.-во ЛКА, 2002. Вип. 4. С. 54-66; Гнот С. Роль Греко-католицької церкви у суспільно-політичному житті Західної України 20-30-х років XX ст. *Українське державотворення: уроки, проблеми, перспективи*. Матеріали науково-практичної конференції 22 листопада 2001 року. Львів: ЛФ УАДУ, 2001. Ч. 1. С. 107-109; Гнот С. Співпраця Греко-католицької церкви Львівської архієпархії з українським шкільництвом у період між двома світовими війнами. *Мандрівець* / Видання Національного університету “Києво-Могилянська академія”. Тернопіль, 2002. №3 (38). С. 13-19; Головин Б. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький – благодійник «Просвіти». Збірник праць. Тернопіль, 2006. Т. 2. С. 98-100; Греченюк Н. Культурно-освітня діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Україна – Європа – Світ*. Міжнародний збірник наукових праць. Серія: Історія, міжнародні відносини. 2013. Вип. 12. С. 272-275; Гучко Г. Андрей Шептицький як меценат української культури. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 87-94; Кекош О. М. Виховання молоді крізь призму педагогічних поглядів митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Педагогічні науки*. 2013. Вип. 112. С. 53-59; Кекош О. М. Просвітницька діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького в контексті духовного становлення сучасної молоді. *Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка*.

Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky closely followed the processes that took place in Transcarpathia. Uzhgorod historians dedicated their works to this issue¹⁰⁹. An essay and memoirs about Andrey Sheptytsky were published by the famous Ukrainian scientist from Ivano-Frankivsk, professor Volodymyr Hrabovetsky¹¹⁰. Although N. Kontsur-Karabinovych investigated the liquidation of the Greek Catholic Church in Western Ukraine (Lviv Council in 1946), her publications contain extensive factual material about

Серія Педагогіка. Тернопіль: ТНПУ, 2013. № 1. С. 25-30; Кривенко М. О. Книгозбірня «Студіону» у Львові (1909-1940): Історія, сучасний стан фонду. Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 27.00.03 – Книгознавство, бібліотекознавство, бібліографознавство. К., 2010. 23 с.; Крупа Л. Створення та діяльність закладів для сиріт під патронатом митрополита Андрія Шептицького. *Наукові записки Тернопільського державного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка*. Серія: Історія / За заг. ред. проф. М.М. Алексієвця. Тернопіль: Літопис. 2003. Вип.1. С.73-76; Курис Г. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: «Добре робите, що дбаєте про освіту і знання»: (Життєвий і творчий шлях А. Шептицького). *Освітняниця*. 1996. № 4. С. 27; Лазечко П., Лазечко Л. Меценати української культури: (Митрополит Андрей Шептицький). *Дзвін*. 2003. № 11-12. С. 133-137; Литвин Г. Роль митрополита Андрія Шептицького у розвитку мистецтва Галичини. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богосліва. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 324-329; Огірко О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький – славетний український педагог, опікун і меценат освіти. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богосліва. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 61-70; Пасіцька О. Андрей Шептицький у контексті суспільно-економічного розвитку Галичини 20-30-х років ХХ ст. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богосліва. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 71-77; Пасіцька О. І. Вплив митрополита Андрія Шептицького на господарське життя галицьких українців (кінець ХІХ – перша третина ХХ ст.). *Гілея*. 2014. Вип. 105 (2). С. 31-35; Рощина Л. О. Меценатська діяльність митрополита Андрія Шептицького. *Наука. Релігія. Суспільство*. 2008. № 1. С. 178-180; Руско Н. Роль митрополита Андрія Шептицького у збереженні сакральної спадщини галичан. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богосліва. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 330-337.

¹⁰⁹ Майороші М. А. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і Закарпаття. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету*. Серія Історія. Вип. 2012. С. 18-27; Вереш М. Могутня постать української історії: [Про Митрополита Андрія Шептицького]. *Календар «Просвіти» на 1995 рік / Закарп. крайове т-во «Просвіта»; [Упорядн.: П.Федака, Й.Баглай]*. Ужгород: МПП «Гражда», 1995. С.142-144; Басараб В., Вереш М. Дві постаті з історії української церкви: Андрей Шептицький і Августин Волошин. Ужгород: Видавництво УжНУ «Говерла», 2011. 210 с; Басараб В., Вереш М. Життя і помисли митрополита Андрія Шептицького. Ужгород, 2003. 112 с.

¹¹⁰ Грабовецький В. Ілюстрована історія Прикарпаття. Тисячолітній літопис Гуцульщини. Т. 3. Видання друге, доповнене. Івано-Франківськ: Видавництво «Нова Зоря», 2004. 464 с.

Грабовецький В. Історія Івано-Франківська (Станіславова). З найдавніших часів до початку ХХ століття. Частина 1. Івано-Франківськ: Нова Зоря, 1999. 304 с.

A. Sheptytsky's recent life and activities¹¹¹. The multifaceted sociopolitical activity of Metropolitan of Galicia through the prism of jurisprudence was investigated by N. Prokop¹¹².

¹¹¹ Концур Н. Ліквідація греко-католицької церкви на Станіславщині. *Красзнавець Прикарпаття*. Івано-Франківськ, 2007. №10. С. 59-61; Концур Н. Львівський собор 1946 року і проблеми виживання греко-католиків. *Наукові записки*. Серія: Історія. Вип. 3. Тернопіль, 2008. С.268-271; Концур Н. Львівський собор 1946 року та його місце в історії УГКЦ. *Наукові записки*. Серія: Історія. Вип. 2. Тернопіль, 2006. С.55-59; Концур Н. Наслідки Львівського Собору і їх вплив на систему міжнародних і міжцерковних відносин УГКЦ. *Етнос. Культура. Духовність*. Чернівці, 2006. Ч.2. С.93-100; Концур Н. Патріарх Йосиф Сліпий: штрихи до портрета релігійного діяча. *Галичина*: науковий і культурно-просвітній краєзнавчий часопис. Івано-Франківськ, 2008. №14. С.397-400; Концур Н. Підготовка до ліквідації Української греко-католицької церкви в Галичині. *Література і культура Полісся*. Вип.27.: Регіональна історія та культура в українському та східноєвропейському контексті. Ніжин, 2004. С.163-167; Концур Н. Становище Української греко-католицької церкви після відновлення радянської влади в західній Україні. *Мандрівець*: Всеукраїнський науковий журнал. Тернопіль, 2006. № 6. С. 14-17; Концур-Карабінович Н. Антиунійна політика комуністичного режиму щодо греко-католицької церкви у 1940-х рр. *Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка*. Серія Історія. 2015. Вип. 2. Ч. 2. С. 38-42; Концур-Карабінович Н. Греко-католицька церква. Початки підпілля. Івано-Франківськ: Нова зоря, 2011. 220 с.; Концур-Карабінович Н. Постаць митрополита Андрея Шептицького в антиунійній політиці радянської влади. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослівя. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 243-249; Концур-Карабінович Н. Репресивні заходи радянської влади стосовно греко-католицької церкви після смерті Митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича*. Серія Історія. 2016. № 1. С. 56-61.

¹¹² Прокоп Н. М. Державно-правові погляди митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Автореферат дис. ... канд. юрид. наук. Спеціальність 12.00.01 – Теорія та історія держави і права; історія політичних і правових вчень; 081 – Право. Харків, 2017; Прокоп Н. М. Дослідження проукраїнської державницької діяльності митрополита А. Шептицького кінця XIX – початку XX ст. *Право, суспільство, держава: форми взаємодії*. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 15-16 січня 2016 р. Київ, 2016. С. 14-16; Прокоп Н. М. Духовність як засада української державності в доктрині А. Шептицького. *Право як ефективний суспільний регулятор*. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 19-20 лютого 2016 р. Львів, 2016. С. 12-14; Прокоп Н. М. Концепт державності у політико-правових поглядах Андрея Шептицького. *Правоохоронна функція держави: теоретико-методологічні та історико-правові проблеми*. Матеріали Міжнародної наукової конференції. 13 листопада 2015 р. Харків, 2015. С. 239-241; Прокоп Н. М. Правове бачення митрополитом А. Шептицьким українських християнських церков у розбудові національної держави. *Сучасні тенденції розвитку науки*. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції (15-16 березня 2017 р., м. Київ). Київ, 2017. С. 81-83; Прокоп Н. М. Роль А. Шептицького в утвердженні загального виборчого права та національних інтересів українців в Австро-Угорщині. *Держава і право: проблеми становлення і стратегія розвитку*. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 25-26 грудня 2015 р. Ужгород, 2015. С. 22-25; Прокоп Н. М. Характеристика діяльності політичних партій А. Шептицьким в українському

Special attention undoubtedly deserves a monograph “The State-making Concept and National-Patriotic Ideas of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky”, written by Volodymyr Basarab¹¹³. The author is well known in the scientific circles for his publications on the state-making activity of Metropolitan¹¹⁴.

державотворенні другої половини XIX ст. *Рівень ефективності та необхідність впливу юридичної науки на нормотворчу діяльність та юридичну практику*. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 5-6 лютого 2016 р. Харків, 2016. С. 9-11; Прокоп Н. Методологічні засади дослідження проукраїнської державницької діяльності А. Шептицького. *Право і суспільство*. 2015. № 6. Ч. 3. С. 35-40; Прокоп Н. Митрополит А. Шептицький в українському державотворенні 20-30-х років XX століття. *Актуальні проблеми держави і права*. 2016. №76. С. 159-163; Прокоп Н. Обрис проукраїнської державницької діяльності А. Шептицького. *Право і безпека*. 2015. № 3 (58). С. 35-41; Прокоп Н. Парламентаризм і виборче право в теоретичній спадщині митрополита А. Шептицького. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету*. Серія Юриспруденція. Випуск 17. Т. 1. 2015. С. 60-63; Прокоп Н. Роль А. Шептицького в історії українського державотворення кінця XIX – першої половини XX ст. *Бюлетень Міністерства юстиції України*. 2016. № 1. С. 28-33.

¹¹³ Басараб В. Державотворча концепція та національно-патріотичні ідеї митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Ужгород: Гражда, 2019. 232 с.

¹¹⁴ Басараб В. Державницькі ідеї Андрея Шептицького в період Другої світової війни: концепція незалежності України та засудження політики Гітлера. *IX Міжнародний конгрес україністів*. Історія. Збірник наукових статей. НАН України, ІМФЕ ім. Рильського. Київ, 2018. С. 145– 157; Басараб В. Державотворчі та патріотичні ідеї А. Шептицького в історичному контексті. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету*. Серія: Історія. Вип. 2(39). Ужгород: «Говерла», 2018. С. 11-20; Басараб В. Моделі державотворення у працях А. Шептицького. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету*. Серія: Історія. Вип. 1(38). Ужгород: «Говерла», 2018. С. 11-18; Басараб В. Національно-патріотичні ідеї А. Шептицького [на основі праці «Пересторога перед комунізмом»]. *Держава у теорії і практиці українського націоналізму*. Матеріали VI Всеукраїнської конференції з міжнародного участю. Івано-Франківськ, 26-27 червня 2015 р. / Наук. ред. О. М. Сич. Івано-Франківськ: Місто НВ, 2015. С. 16-27; Басараб В. Осмислення А. Шептицьким сценарію більшовицького перевороту в Іспанії (на основі передмови А.Шептицького до «Пасторського послання єспанських єпископів»). *Матеріали II Міжнародної науково-практичної е-конференції «Мультидисциплінарні академічні дослідження і глобальні інновації: гуманітарні та соціальні науки»* (MARGINSS 2016), 28-29 липня 2016 року, м. Київ). Київ, КНЛУ, 2016. С. 22-24; Басараб В. Перспективи та реалії становлення незалежної України кризь призму політичних ідей А.Шептицького. *Економічні, політичні та культурологічні аспекти європейської інтеграції України в умовах нових глобалізаційних викликів: матеріали доповіді Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції (м. Ужгород, 16-17 квітня 2018 року)*. Ужгород: «Гельветика», 2018. С. 355-359; Басараб В. Проблема єдності Церков у світлі екуменічних ідей митрополита А.Шептицького. *Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції Волинської православної богословської академії УПЦ КП «Державотворення і полісність Церкви: історичні процеси та сучасні реалії»* (18.05.2017). Луцьк: Видавництво Волинської православної богословської академії ЕΙΚΩΝ, 2017. С. 27-34; Басараб В. Революційні процеси 1917-1921 рр. в Україні кризь призму послань митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Література та культура Полісся*. Вип. 87. Серія «Історичні науки». № 7. Ніжин: НДУ ім. Гоголя, 2017. С. 130-140; Басараб В. Роль Греко-католицької церкви в процесі становлення української державності (на матеріалі послань та листів Андрея Шептицького). *Карпатська Україна – незалежна держава*. Матеріали

The monograph analyzes in detail 62 documents, showing a clear civic-patriotic position and, according to the author, the “political competence” of Andrey Sheptytsky, who throughout his life was a rational diplomat, and who realistically treated the historical circumstances and foreign policy of the states, that influenced the life of the Ukrainian nation. The analyzed pastoral messages, letters, memorandums and other documents helped the scientist to trace the evolution of the state-building ideas of Metropolitan of Galicia, to see him not only as a prominent church figure, but also as a diplomat, who is capable of making important, complex, and sometimes compromising decisions for the good of his people. V. Basarab argued with good reason that many arguments of the Metropolitan of Galicia echo the reality of modern Ukraine, concern the problems of state formation, unity of the Ukrainian people at the spiritual, social and political level. In his numerous speeches Andrey Sheptytsky emphasized the need to build a new Ukraine, based on the Christian morality and patriotism. Throughout his life he sought to establish Ukraine as an independent state among other European countries.

Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky’s life path and rich creative heritage have also been reflected on the pages of collective monographs and in various encyclopedic publications¹¹⁵. M. Marynovych’s monograph contains a thorough analysis of the preaching heritage of Metropolitan Andrey

міжнародної конференції, присвяченої 80-річчю проголошення незалежності Карпатської України. Ужгород, видавництво ПП «Аутдор-Шарк», 2019. С. 129-140.

¹¹⁵ Нариси з історії дипломатії України / О. І. Галенко, Є. Є. Камінський, М. В. Кірсенко та ін., під ред. В. А. Смоля. К.: Видавничий дім «Альтернативи», 2001. 736 с.; Політична історія України. XX ст.: У 6 т. / Редкол. І. Ф. Курас (голова) та ін. Т. 4: Україна у Другій світовій війні. 1939-1945. Керівник тому В. І. Кучер. К.: Генеза, 2003. 584 с.; Політична історія України. XX ст.: У 6 т. / Редкол. І. Ф. Курас (голова) та ін. Т. 5: Українці за межами УРСР (1918-1940). Керівник тому В. П. Трошинський. К.: Генеза, 2003. 720 с.; Політична історія України. XX ст.: У 6 т. / Редкол.: І. Ф. Курас (голова) та ін. Т. 1: На зламі століть (кінець XIX ст. – 1917 р.) / Ю. А. Левенець (кер.), Л. П. Нагорна, М. С. Кармазіна. К.: Генеза, 2002. 424 с.; Політичний терор і тероризм в Україні. XIX-XX ст. Історичні нариси / [Д.В.Архерейський, О.Г.Бажан, Т.В.Бикова та ін. Відп. ред. В.А.Смолій]. К.: Наукова думка, 2002. 952 с.; Україна крізь віки: Т. 10. Рубльов О. С., Реєнт О. П. Українські визвольні змагання 1917-1921 рр. К.: Видавничий Дім «Альтернативи», 1999. 320 с.; Україна крізь віки: Т. 11. Кульчицький С. В. Україна між двома війнами (1921-1939 рр.). К.: Видавничий Дім «Альтернативи», 1999. 336 с.; Україна крізь віки: Т. 12. Коваль М. В. Україна в другій світовій і Великій Вітчизняній війні (1939-1945 рр.). К.: Видавничий Дім «Альтернативи», 1999. 336 с.; Україна: політична історія. XX – початок XXI ст. / Редрада: В. М. Литвин (голова) та ін. Редкол.: В. А. Смолій, Ю. А. Левенець (співголови) та ін. К.: Парламентське вид-во, 2007. 1028 с.; Шуст Р. Шептицький Андрей. С. 1085-1087. *Довідник з історії України (А – Я)*. Посібн. для середн. загальноос. навч. закл. / За заг. ред. І. Підкови, Р. Шуста. 2-ге вид., доопр. і доповн. К.: Генеза, 2001. 1136 с.

Sheptytsky in terms of its accordance (or inconsistency) with the methodological principle, nowadays called “positive sum”. Metropolitan derives the genesis of this way of thinking from theology, and the author finds examples of its use in the messages of Kyr Andrey in the field of economic relations, national relations, state building, interfaith and interreligious relations¹¹⁶. Positive is also the fact that Ukrainian scientists have defended a number of dissertations in the recent years¹¹⁷.

Thus, the writings of foreign and national historians give high praise to the ascetic activity of Metropolitan of Galicia Andrey Sheptytsky. Historians have emphasized his great contribution to the development of the Greek Catholic Church and culture in Galicia, raising the level of national consciousness of the entire Ukrainian people.

¹¹⁶ Маринович М. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і принцип «позитивної суми». Львів: Видавництво Старого Лева, 2019. 248 с.

¹¹⁷ Безпалько У. І. Інституалізація католицької церкви Східного обряду в Росії (1901-1917 рр.). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.02 – Всесвітня історія. Тернопіль, 2018. 20 с.; Білас Я. І. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і проблеми національно-визвольного руху українців. Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 09.00.11 – Релігієзнавство. К., 2003. 20 с.; Бліхар В. С. Соціально-філософські погляди Андрея Шептицького. Автореферат дис. ... канд. філософ. наук. Спеціальність 09.00.05 – Історія філософії. Львів, 2006; Гладка Г. Л. Суспільно-політична діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького (1899-1939 рр.). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Чернівці, 2000. 20 с.; Гнідик І. І. Початки та розбудова греко-католицької церкви у США (кінець XIX – початок XX ст.). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.02 – Всесвітня історія; Гнот С. І. Добродійна діяльність греко-католицької церкви у 1921-1939 рр. (за матеріалами Галицької митрополії). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Львів, 2003. 22 с.; Кривенко М. О. Книгозбірня «Студіону» у Львові (1909-1940): Історія, сучасний стан фонду. Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 27.00.03 – Книгознавство, бібліотекознавство, бібліографознавство. К., 2010. 23 с.; Крупа Л. Л. Вплив митрополита Андрея Шептицького на суспільне і культурно-просвітницьке життя в Галичині кінця XIX – першої половини XX століття. Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Чернівці, 2003. 21 с.; Прокоп Н. М. Державно-правові погляди митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Автореферат дис. ... канд. юрид. наук. Спеціальність 12.00.01 – Теорія та історія держави і права; історія політичних і правових вчень; 081 – Право. Харків, 2017; Скіра Ю. Р. Участь монахів Студійського уставу у порятунку євреїв на території Львівської архієпархії греко-католицької церкви у 1942-1944 рр. Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Львів, 2018. 20 с.; Сурмач О. І. Греко-католицька церква в період німецького окупаційного режиму в Україні (1941-1944 рр.). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Львів, 2001. 23 с.; Шеремета О. Ю. Етичні ідеї Андрея Шептицького у релігійно-філософському контексті кінця XIX – першої половини XX ст. Автореферат дис. ... канд. філософ. наук. Спеціальність 09.00.05 – Історія філософії. К., 2010. 20 с.

PART 3.
LIFE PATH AND SOCIO-POLITICAL ACTIVITY
OF ANDREY SHEPTYTSKY

According to one of the researchers of the life and activity of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, Vasyl Laba, the Sheptytsky family was one of the oldest in Ukraine and originated (as evidenced by ancient letters) from the XIII century.¹¹⁸ A somewhat different point of view belongs to the contemporary historian J. Zaborovsky, who believes that the Sheptytsky family of the counts derived themselves from the Galician boyars of the fourteenth century and had a great church tradition. The scientist proved that only from the eighteenth century the family gave to the Ukrainian Church several abbots, bishops and two metropolitans: Lviv bishop Varlaam (1710-1715), Athanasius – bishop of Lviv and Metropolitan of Kyiv (1715-1746), Athanasius – bishop of Przemysl (1762-1779), Lev – bishop of Lviv and Metropolitan Of Kyiv (1778-1779). In the middle of the XIX century this family encountered a fate, typical for the Ukrainian nobility: the transition to Roman Catholic rite and as a result – Polonization¹¹⁹.

On July 29, 1865 in the family of Earl Jan (Ivan) Sheptytsky and Sophia, a son was born to whom his parents gave at christening the triple name Roman Maria Olexandr. The Sheptytsky family lived in the village of Prylbych, near Yavoriv. Parents were not only highly educated, but also highly respected people of their time. His father, Ivan Sheptytsky (1836-1912) was a Member of the Austrian Parliament and his mother – Sofia (1837-1904) – was a daughter of the famous Polish writer Fredr. The future Metropolitan owed much of his erudition to them. He was fluent in many foreign languages, including Latin, Hebrew, Greek. During one of his many trips abroad, in France he served a church service in French. By the way, Sofia Sheptytska was also fluent in English, German and French.

According to the researchers of his life and activity, Roman Maria Olexandr was marked with great piety from the very beginning, which was also a result of family upbringing. Since 1875 he began to take private lessons at home first, passing half-time exams at a Polish gymnasium in

¹¹⁸ Лаба Василь. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Його життя і заслуги. Люблин: Свічадо, 1990. С. 13.

¹¹⁹ Заборовський Я. Ю. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Нарис про життя і служіння народів (1865-1944 рр.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. С. 6.

Lviv. In the fall of 1879 he continued his education in Krakow at St. Anna Grammar School, where he was accepted to the fifth grade right away¹²⁰. On June 11, 1883, Sheptytsky received a certificate of maturity, which testified to his excellent knowledge of school subjects. He served in the Austrian army for one year, but on June 22, 1884 he left it. There are different versions about the leaving of military service by Sheptytsky. In our opinion, it is necessary to agree with the opinion of J. Zaborovsky that the reason for this step was a disease of scarlet fever, which passed to the joints of the hands and feet¹²¹. The disease will progress, which will eventually lead to paralysis.

While still in military service, Sheptytsky studied at the Faculty of Law at the University of Krakow. After his resignation, he continued his studies first at Krakow and then at Breslav (Wroclaw) Universities (1883-1887). After graduating from them, on May 10, 1887, the future Metropolitan receives a Doctorate in Law. Thus, at first Roman Sheptytsky is only a secular person.

How did Sheptytsky decide to devote himself entirely to religion? This choice may have been influenced by a trip in 1886 to the Vatican, where he had a conversation with the Pope¹²². The mother of the future Metropolitan “immediately recorded the details of this memorable audience. When she told Cardinal Ledokhovsky and Macella about it, they immediately said: “This is truly a Providence”. Leo XIII also did not forget about this visit and, as we shall see later, reminded about it eleven years later”¹²³. Famous Russian philosopher Vladimir Solovyov and Ukrainian historian Volodymyr Antonovych made an important impact on this choice¹²⁴. It is only known that in the same year Sheptytsky finally decided to enter the Basilian order. In the monastery he adopted the name Andrey. “Twelve letters from Andrey Sheptytsky” by Hryhir Meriam-Luzhnytsky, give the next explanation of the reason for this choice of the future Metropolitan: “Thanks to my uncles and You, Dear Mother, I understood what I am and what I should be: as a monk I ask for help from Uncle Varlaam, as archiereus I ask for help from Uncle Atanasius, and before the audience at the Caesarea or in the Apostolic Capital in Rome, I ask for help from Uncle Leo. When the moments of

¹²⁰ Заборовський Я. Ю. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Нарис про життя і служіння народові (1865-1944 рр.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. С. 8.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Королевський К. Названа праця. С. 57.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Заборовський С. Ю. В. Соловйов і А. Шептицький. *Добрий настр.* 1990. С. 12-16.

powerlessness come and I become a child, then I turn to You, Mom, and immediately I feel bigger and stronger...”¹²⁵.

Already in 1896, Sheptytsky was appointed as an abbot at St. Onuphrius monastery in Lviv. And since this year Andrey did not limit himself only by monastic activity, but he goes “to the people”, which later in time has brought him great fame and authority. On June 17, 1899 Sheptytsky was appointed as the Bishop of Stanislaw, and he was only 34 years old at that time. From the Pastoral Epistle to the Clergy, dated August 1, 1899, it is clear that Sheptytsky did not have a great desire to take up this important position: “...As soon as the news came to me that I should become a Bishop of Stanislaw, I defended myself against this government for a long time and did everything that I could to get rid of it”¹²⁶. However, he also remained in this position for not a long time, because since October 21, 1900 Pope Leo XII named Andrey Sheptytsky Archbishop of Lviv and Metropolitan of Galicia.

Throughout his life Metropolitan Andrey repeated to his people that he required them to do three things: 1) to know their faith well, 2) to find out the faith of the Orthodox brothers, 3) to pray for unification. He also expected them to treat the Orthodox fairly and cordially. But he demanded the same attitude to the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church from the Orthodox Ukrainians¹²⁷. In support of these words, A. Baran quotes A. Sheptytsky's message “To the Clergy”: “Hierarchs in Ukrainian lands have been placed today in the same position as they were at the end of the sixteenth century (ie the Brest Union). If they want to solve the problems that the situation afflicts them with, for the sake of God and for the good of the Ukrainian people, they must so wisely investigate the condition of our Church as to comprehensively consider the consequences of the solution of hierarchs of the sixteenth century”¹²⁸.

Metropolitan Andrey has done a great deal during his period of activity. First of all, he had to take care of upbringing the intelligent and educated priests. For this purpose, he sends talented young men to study in different countries of the world. In total, Andrey Sheptytsky gave way to the lives of about 200 religious figures. When Canadian Ukrainians asked him to

¹²⁵ Дванадцять листів о. Андрея Шептицького до матері. С. 18.

¹²⁶ Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1899-1914 рр. Т. I / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2007. С. 19.

¹²⁷ Баран О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і його екуменічні ідеї. *Український Історик*. 1-4 (120-123). Нью-Йорк – Торонто – Київ – Львів – Мюнхен, 1994. С. 187.

¹²⁸ Баран О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і його екуменічні ідеї. *Український Історик*. 1-4 (120-123). Нью-Йорк – Торонто – Київ – Львів – Мюнхен, 1994. С. 187.

improve the liturgy, Metropolitan Andrey in 1902 sent to Canada three permanent Ukrainian priests from the Order of the Basilians, whom he placed near Edmonton. To make sure that such an act led to some qualitative changes, he made a trip to Canada in 1910, during which he visited a large part of territory from Montreal to Vancouver.

In his sermons, Metropolitan Andrey paid great attention to the education of the Ukrainian people in the tradition of Christian morality. Often he presented his ideas in written appeals to the people. There were more than a hundred of such appeals. He was the author of several dozen popular books. Everything Metropolitan did as a contributor, philanthropist and initiator of charitable actions is difficult even to list. He gave almost all his income to people's purposes. According to contemporary Ukrainian researchers Z. Sukhanova and N. Sulyma-Matlashenko, "there are many people living in Lviv today, who have used material assistance of Metropolitan at difficult times of their life"¹²⁹.

With the arrival of the Imperial army in Lviv on September 6, 1914, Metropolitan was arrested and taken deep into Russia. An important role in his arrest was played by the fact that at the same time as the arrival of Russian troops, Sheptytsky made a call to the people to remain in their faith. Some historians mention that Sheptytsky's arrest has been linked to the fact that he actively worked for German secret services, although there is no cogent evidence¹³⁰.

February Revolution of 1917 found him in Yaroslavl. One of the first orders by the head of the Provisional Government O. Kerensky (then the minister), was the order to release Sheptytsky. Although, it was not so easy to do that. In March 1917 Kerensky informed Sheptytsky that he could choose his own place of residence in Russia. Metropolitan decided to go to Petrograd. There, with the help of his acquaintances, he managed to obtain a request for the return of the personal archive, which had been confiscated earlier. The Provisional Government, at the insistence of Sheptytsky, allowed the legalization of the activities of the Greek Catholic Church in Russia, and appointed Exarch Leonid Fedorov as Metropolitan. But due to the difficult military situation, it was not easy to get to Galicia. Sheptytsky had to travel through neutral countries, "that's why Metropolitan's further road to his homeland ran through Stockholm. When crossing the Russian border in Finland, everything was taken away from him and from his companions, including even travel food. After Stockholm – Hamburg..., then

¹²⁹ Суханова З., Сулима-Матлашенко Н. Андрей Шептицький: реалії хресного шляху. *Сторінки історії України ХХ століття*. К.: Освіта, 1992. С. 325.

¹³⁰ Тополь М. Л. Виза на убийство. *Военно-исторический журнал*. 1990. № 11. С. 48-62.

– Switzerland, Austria with the intention to get to Rome to meet Pope Benedict XV, but the trip to Rome did not take place at that time, because, while being a citizen of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Metropolitan did not have access to Italy, who fought at side of the Entente, so on September 10, 1917, after three years of absence, A. Sheptytsky arrives to Lviv¹³¹. One can only imagine how the inhabitants of Lviv met their Moses. There have been church services in his honour in many countries around the world.

On November 1, 1918 Metropolitan Andrey met a group of Sich Riflemen officers and blessed the formation of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic. However, on November 3, the situation changed and Sheptytsky was placed under house arrest. This was perhaps the greatest torment for him, a man, who accustomed to communicating with the people on a daily basis.

Following Galicia's accession to Poland as a result of the Saint-Germain Peace Treaty, Metropolitan Andrey continued to travel to different countries of the world. The purpose of these trips was to achieve unity among the Ukrainians, whose destiny was scattered all over the world. At that time, Galicia was under heavy social, national and cultural oppression, when the Polish government suppressed everything that was Ukrainian. Historical documents testify to this fact convincingly. Well-known Polish writer and publicist Zbigniew Zalowski wrote that in the former Eastern Galicia cultural and economic organizations were eliminated step by step, schools were closed. And in Volyn – where 80% of the population in the village were Ukrainian peasants – there were only 8 Ukrainian primary schools out of 2000¹³². However, as noted by Z. Zalowski, "...despite this, the polonization of the "local elements" was not successful. Under the influence of pressure, the process of national consciousness, especially in the countryside, was spreading. The army "tamed" troubled Ukrainian villages in the Ternopil voivodeship, shot peasant demonstrations in Volyn. In prisons, in the Bereha Kartuzska, the police mocked the arrested Ukrainians, and in response, the bullets of terrorists killed the Minister of Sanitation Government, the school curator, and innocent ordinary people. Tensions and animosity grew. The contempt of the ruling generates the hatred of the oppressed"¹³³. The assimilationist policy of Poland in the Western Ukrainian lands first of all affected the state of public education. Under pressure from the Polish national democrats, the Sejm passed a law in 1924 about the transition of Ukrainian public schools into two languages. According to this law, history

¹³¹ Заборовський Я. Ю. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Нарис про життя і служіння народів (1865-1944 рр.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. С. 29.

¹³² Залуский З. Пути и достоверности. М., 1990. С. 269.

¹³³ Ibid.

and geography in bilingual schools should be taught in Polish, and the study of Polish became compulsory. According to S. Kulchytsky's estimation, in 1921-1922 the number of Ukrainian and Polish public schools was almost equal in Eastern Galicia, about 2000 each. In 1937-1938 the number of Ukrainian schools decreased to 360; and instead – 2000 bilingual schools appeared. The number of Polish schools almost did not change. That is, bilingual schools were mostly organized on the basis of the Ukrainian ones¹³⁴. The Polish authorities were outraged by Metropolitan's appeal to his people "Under the One Flag": "Hard times and coming black clouds make us unite more than ever before and, in truth, in our own strong unity, defend what we all know best... We will seek and defend social justice, the development of social protection of the peasantry, of the workforce, of all workers in general, and above all socially wronged"¹³⁵. The Chairman of the Ukrainian People's Labor Party V. Okhrymovych protested against the capture of A. Sheptytsky by the Polish authorities¹³⁶.

Ukrainian deputies to the Polish Sejm S. Baran, S. Bilak, D. Velikanovych, S. Vytwytsky and others repeatedly protested against the closure of the Ukrainian schools and against the prohibition of the official correspondence in the Ukrainian language, but their deputies' requests remained unresolved. The replies of the Sejm's Bureau Director A. Rutkowski were extremely vague and too general¹³⁷. The Polish authorities systematically engaged in checking the loyalty of the Ukrainian population. Thus, on November 6, 1923 a school inspector, while inspecting a private school named after Shashkevych in Stanislaviv, concluded that Adolfina Makohon is unreliable in this institution. In his opinion, she was "the organizer of the groups of the Ukrainian pedagogical societies in Stanislaviv" and "was prone to antipanism"¹³⁸.

On January 20, 1920 the Poles abolished the autonomous rights and self-government of Galicia, thereby breaking their obligations to the Entente states to grant a Ukrainian national autonomy to the land. In fact, the Ukrainian school was under the authority of the Polish Ministry of Education. Ukrainian departments were closed at Lviv University, to which

¹³⁴ Україна крізь віки: Т. 11. Кульчицький С. В. Україна між двома війнами (1921-1939 рр.). К.: Видавничий Дім «Альтернативи», 1999. С. 319.

¹³⁵ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. С. 803.

¹³⁶ Ibid. С. 752.

¹³⁷ Державний архів Івано-Франківської області (далі – ДАІФО). Ф. 2. Оп. 14. Спр. 2. Арк. 5.

¹³⁸ Ibid. Арк. 15, 16.

Ukrainians responded by creating Lviv (secret) Ukrainian University (1921-1925), which had more than 50 departments and about 1500 students¹³⁹.

The policy of denationalization led to resistance of the Ukrainians of Galicia. So, the district commander of Kolomyia complained to the local starosta that Petro Pavliuk, Mykola Zaikovsky, Mykhailo Ovzaruk, Mykola Huzol, Mykola Budziak (54 people in total) were conducting anti-Polish agitation in the school¹⁴⁰. The Ukrainian pedagogical societies of Galicia were in a deplorable financial situation. One of the documents states that in order for the Kolomyia Society to operate fully, it is necessary to collect monthly taxes of 700 zloty's¹⁴¹.

Authorities persecuted priests, who gave marriage certificates in Ukrainian. Thus, on November 22, 1924 the Stryi starosta Stefan Novak wrote to the Stanislaw Voivodeship that priest I. Karatnytsky "gave metrics in the Ukrainian language". Parson Anatol Barylevych also committed similar "crimes", when he wrote such testimonies to P. Kostiv and M. Bryndzey, he was forced to rewrite them within 14 days¹⁴².

In the 1930s, the situation of Galicia's Ukrainians deteriorated further. Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky was one of the first to rise to the defense of his people. He addressed his pastoral letter to the entire civilized world. The letter was published in the Transcarpathian newspaper "New Freedom" and became, to some extent, a constant topic for discussion. It said: "Around one hundred churches have been dismantled and destroyed. Some were burned by the hand of unknown criminals. Worship is prohibited in closed churches and chapels, both inside and outside them. There are precious ancient monuments of church architecture among the destroyed churches. The tools of religious worship are often destroyed. People were forced, sometimes by violence, to accept the Catholic faith in the Latin rite... Innocent people were repeatedly beaten and removed from their homes. It is not even free to teach catechism there and preach in the mother tongue of the people»¹⁴³.

Speaking of the interwar period, it is necessary to agree with the assertion of modern historians that "in these circumstances, the UGCC, led by Metropolitan, was perhaps the only cementing force of the society, and its course on independence was, at least culturally and religiously, not only successful but also appropriate. It is a pity that the efforts of Metropolitan

¹³⁹ Жуковський А., Субтельний О. Нарис історії України. Львів, 1991. С. 107.

¹⁴⁰ ДАІФО. Ф. 8. Оп. 1. Спр. 123. Арк. 12.

¹⁴¹ Ibid. Арк. 15.

¹⁴² Ibid. Ф. 2. Оп. 1. Спр. 34. Арк. 1, 4, 13.

¹⁴³ Басараб В. І., Вегеш М. М. Життя і помисли митрополита Андрія Шептицького. Ужгород, 2003. С. 18.

and the Church have not always been properly understood throughout society»¹⁴⁴.

Often there were contradictions between Sheptytsky's line and the methods of combating the Poles by the OUN. Metropolitan, indeed, has for a long time maintained close relations with organizations such as UNDO, OUN and other. And this fact was constantly used by the Soviet historians to attack Metropolitan. However, most of them forgot or did not want to notice, that it was Sheptytsky, who condemned the terrorist act of OUN members against Polish Minister Bronislaw Pieracki. Metropolitan understood that this would provoke new repression against the Ukrainian population of Galicia.

In September 1939 Soviet troops appeared in Lviv to occupy Western Ukraine under the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. Doctor of Medical Dentistry in Rochester, a Ukrainian by birth, Ivan Kindrat recalled: "In this situation the danger, at least the deportation, threatened to Dr. Panchyshyn, a deputy of the parliament and to our spiritual leader, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky. So the OUN's rulers created and armed with rifles and grenades a student kurin (about 40 people) to defend them. I was in the group of 28 defenders of Metropolitan and his residence at St. George Cathedral. After barricading ourselves in the church and the residence, we waited... It is plausible that the NKVD did not have the time or the courage to attack us and so everything ended without a confrontation between us"¹⁴⁵.

On September 17, 1939 Metropolitan of Galicia and Archbishop of Lviv Andrey Sheptytsky illegally convenes a church exarchs to hold a union action on the territory of USSR, informing the Vatican of his intentions postfactum. M. Charnetsky was appointed as a bishop in the lands of Volyn, Polissia, Chelm Land and Pidliashia. Metropolitan's brother Kasymyr Sheptytsky had to act in Russia and Siberia. Father Josyf Slipyi, the future successor of Bishop Andrey, received instructions for his missionary activity on the territory of the Dnieper Ukraine, and A. Nemantsevych had to go to Belarus. The occupation policy of the Third Reich in the East did not make it possible to carry out a united action in a legitimate way. During these processes A. Nemantsevych was arrested and subsequently shot. The same fate befell Metropolitan's brother.

The Bolsheviks behaved very audibly on the western Ukrainian lands. On October 25, 1939 in a note from the representatives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine to the secretary of the

¹⁴⁴ Заборовський Я. Ю. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Нарис про життя і служіння народові (1865-1944 рр.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. С. 92.

¹⁴⁵ Культурне життя в Україні. Західні землі. Документи і матеріали. Т. 1. 1939-1953. К.: Наукова думка, 1995. С. 61.

Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine M.O. Burmystenko, it was stated there that it was necessary to “immediately collect the tangibles from the private collections of Earl Dzieduszycki, Goluhowski, Borkowski and Sheptytsky (owners ran away, collections without care)”¹⁴⁶ into the Museum of Art Industry in Lviv and nationalize them. In a letter to Cardinal Eugene Tisserrant, Andrey Sheptytsky described the times of the first Soviet occupation as follows: “...It is a system completely devoid of anything that is or could be merciful, or even benevolent, even to the poorest. Everything that comes from the authorities seems to be aimed at diminishing, ruining, destroying and causing pain; with all that, it brings incredible clutter. Numerous new posts, bureaus, committees, representatives of all authorities in Moscow and Kyiv – and all those governments, that do not have a clear line, imagine that they are called to do everything and that they can do everything. All orders are threatened with death, every department of all these governments demands and always threatens death; it seems that all these workers can afford to kill anyone without the risk of being punished”¹⁴⁷.

Andrey Sheptytsky repeatedly appealed to the Soviet officials with letters, asking for help and for loyalty to the Constitution, that was in force in the USSR: “Although freedom of conscience is guaranteed by the Constitution, it is so interpreted in schools in Western Ukraine that the school binds the freedom of children, who want to pray before science, and who are being punished for prayer. And this should, in the eyes of parents and the whole community of Western Ukraine, diminish the authority of the Constitution, and it could prove in school, in some units, samples of deviation from the directional line, defined by the Constitution”¹⁴⁸. He even ventured to write a letter to J. Stalin: “Big mistakes made by the Soviet authorities in Western Ukraine, and the consequent state of the people entrusted to my pastoral care, compel me to appeal to your highest authority with such representation and supplication...The propaganda of godlessness in general, and especially in schools and among youths, is a great mistake of the Soviet authorities in our territory. First of all, it strikes and terrifies

¹⁴⁶ Культурне життя в Україні. Західні землі. Документи і матеріали. Т. 1. 1939-1953. К.: Наукова думка, 1995. С. 99.

¹⁴⁷ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. П. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. С. 892.

¹⁴⁸ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. П. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. С. 901.

people, who are attached to their faith as the most important part of the folk tradition, and it causes that people, and in a special way – the broad masses of the peasantry, do not have... (letter not completed – Aut.)”¹⁴⁹. He also wrote a letter to the head of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine N.S. Khrushchev about excessive taxation of the clergy and peasants¹⁵⁰. In another letter to N.S. Khrushchev, A. Sheptytsky requested permission for priests to serve patients in hospitals¹⁵¹.

With the coming of the Red Army, persecution of the church and believers began, although the occupying power feared to oppose the UGCC openly. Atheistic propaganda began with the destruction of prayer houses and synagogues. So, in the city of Kovel of the Volyn region, according to the decision of mayor of the City Council, Pshenychny, two synagogues and one church were closed. The synagogue’s property was transferred to the club of “Kharchoprom”. In the city of Volodymyr-Volynsky the service in the synagogue was banned and a sewing workshop was organized. In the city of Dubno of the Rivne region, three synagogues and a church were banned, and their buildings were used for commercial institutions. Neglecting the thought of believers, there were confiscated prayer houses in the village of Lokachi of Volyn region, in the village of Vovnyche in Demydov district, Rivne region¹⁵².

According to the calculations of I. Andrukhiv, from September 1939 to July 1941, almost 400,000 people were detained and deported from the territory of Drohobych, Lviv, Stanislaw and Ternopil oblasts, of whom nearly 50,000 were executed before and during the first days of the war. Thus, almost every ninth inhabitant of the region has been repressed by the Soviet authorities. According to approximate calculations of some historians of the Russian Orthodox Church, 53 Orthodox priests were arrested in the former Polish territory, 10 of whom were later released, the fate of 37 is unknown, and six died or were shot¹⁵³. A. Rusnachenko stated: “The control over the potentially hostile society was carried out by the Soviet authorities through three consecutive deportations of the population, first of all Polish. All members of the former civilian and military authorities, civil servants, political and public figures and their families were a subject of deportation.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. С. 903.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. С. 910-911.

¹⁵¹ Ibid. С. 912.

¹⁵² Ярош Б.О. Сторінки політичної історії західноукраїнських земель (30 – 50-ті рр. ХХ ст.). Луцьк: Редакційно-видавничий відділ "Вежа" ВДУ ім. Л. Українки, 1999. С. 134.

¹⁵³ Андрухів І. Політика радянської влади у сфері релігії та конфесійне життя на Прикарпатті в 40-80-х роках ХХ століття: Історико-правовий аналіз. Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ, 2006. С. 84-85.

In general, almost every tenth inhabitant of the Western Ukraine has been the victim of repression, deportation, imprisonments and executions. The Soviet government in 1939-1941 repressed 3-4 times more people than the Nazi's on the twice smaller territory”¹⁵⁴.

The attitude of the Soviet power to monasteries and monks was thoroughly investigated by M. Vuyanko: “With the coming of the Soviet power in Western Ukraine in 1939, new leadership tried to interfere with the normal life of the monastery (Stanislawiv Monastery of Basilian Sisters – Aut.). Sad processes of interrogations, arrests and investigations began. Bolshevik officers made sure that the Sisters simply found themselves on the street, without any means of existence. Using long-standing personal relationships, Sisters have been searching privately for work, at risk of being exposed at any time. The Sisters went to live with acquaintances, relatives, and more often with strangers...”¹⁵⁵. A parson from the village Voinyliv wrote in a letter to Metropolitan about the consequences for the parish of the resolution of the National Assembly of Western Ukraine on the nationalization of church and monastery lands: “After the arrival of the Red Army I experienced everything that other people did, succumbing to everything that could not be avoided! The land property was taken away – leaving no stumps, but before that I had to witness the catastrophe of fire, that destroyed all the farm buildings on August 2, 1939 – it also burnt down all the gathering from the field, which had been taken by that time. As a result, the rest, along with the land, was taken away by the state, my possessor did not give me a year's rent, and left quite poor himself”¹⁵⁶.

In December 1939 Metropolitan Andrey consecrates Josyf Slipyi as a Bishop and appoints him as his successor. In Metropolitan's will of July 26, 1940, it was stated: “Yosyf Slipyi has been well known to the whole clergy of the Lviv Eparchy for years, because after 15 years as the rector of the Lviv Theological Seminary he has done great services for the whole Eparchy, and above all for the clergy and for all of you All. Fathers who, under his leadership, were brought up in the years from... The work, on which he had worked, sacrificing all those years, on God's leave lies in ruin, the bomb during the war destroyed completely the Church of St. Spirit,

¹⁵⁴ Русначенко А. М. Народ збурений: Національно-визвольний рух в Україні й національні рухи опору в Білорусії, Литві, Латвії, Естонії у 1940-50-х роках. К.: Універсальне видавництво «Пульсари», 2002. С. 208.

¹⁵⁵ Вуянко М. Монастирі Івано-Франківська (Станиславова): перша половина ХХ ст. Івано-Франківськ: Нова Зоря, 1998. С. 47.

¹⁵⁶ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. С. 917.

valuable library of the Theological Society, which was kept with it, was also destroyed, the preeminent and precious seminary museum and the libraries of the Seminary and the Theological Academy were confiscated and transferred; museum – to the National museum, Library – to the university library. That total annihilation of his work was a heavy cross for Josyf, which he took with the help of Almighty and raised his soul...¹⁵⁷.

Josyf Slipyi became a reliable successor of Andrey Sheptytsky. An ardent supporter of catholicity, he has repeatedly stated: "...Ukrainian people, be yourself again. Get rid of your age-old ailment of strife and quarrels, of service to strangers, of seduction and humiliation, because to our shame they still are present in our national ecclesiastical leadership circles. Get rid of your age shortcomings, stand on your own feet in Ukraine and in the settlements!

...People, raise your head, straighten your hands!..."¹⁵⁸.

By the proclamation of July 1, 1941 Metropolitan of Galicia congratulates the Wehrmacht, hoping that the German army would defeat Bolshevism: "By the will of the Almighty and Merciful God, in the Trinity of the One, a new era began in the life of the Cathedral Independent Ukraine. The People's Assembly, held yesterday, approved and proclaimed that historic event. In informing You, the Ukrainian People, of such listening to our prayers, I call You to show gratitude for the Almighty, faithfulness to His Church and obedience to the Authority... The Ukrainian people must show in that historical wave that they have a sufficient sense of authority, solidarity and vitality in order to earn a position among the peoples of Europe, in which he could develop his all God-given power. Prove through solidarity and conscientious fulfillment of responsibilities that you are ripe for the State Life"¹⁵⁹. Sheptytsky put great hope in the wisdom of the new power: "We congratulate the victorious German Army as a liberator from the enemy. We give our obedience to the established Government. We recognize (we acknowledge – Aut.) Mr. Yaroslav Stetsko as a Chairman of the Regional Board of the Western Regions of Ukraine. We expect from the government, which He called to life, a wise, fair leadership over the citizens, which would coordinate the needs and good of all citizens, who are living in our land, regardless of what religion, nationality and social strata they belong to. God bless all Your works, Ukrainian people, and let Him give to

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Из слів патріарха Йосифа Сліпого. *Альманах «Гомону України»*. Торонто, 1995. С. 77.

¹⁵⁹ Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1939-1944 рр. Т. III / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2010. С. 114.

all of our Leaders holy Wisdom from heaven”¹⁶⁰. On July 5, 1941 Andrey Sheptytsky urges the believers and the clergy to meet Hitler’s army favorably: “We congratulate with joy and gratitude the victorious German army, which has occupied almost the whole region, for liberation from the enemy... All those, who feel Ukrainians and want to work for the good of Ukraine, let them forget about any party strife, let them work in unity and agreement to restore our economic and cultural life destroyed so much by Bolsheviks. Then there is a hope in God that on the foundations of solidarity and hard work of all the Ukrainians a Cathedral Ukraine will rise not only as a great word and idea, but as a living, viable, healthy, powerful state organism, built by the sacrifice of the lives of some, and by anthill work, iron efforts and labor of the others”¹⁶¹.

In his famous Pastoral Message “Our Statehood”, dated December 1941, Metropolitan convincingly states: “It is clear as the palm of your hand that the Native Hata (Ukrainian state – Aut.) will not appear, that there will be no Ukrainian monolith, when the Ukrainians-independents, between all the differences that divide them, will be not able to make as much unity as possible. This unity is necessary for Ukraine, and this need imposes on us all duties, and the whole future of the Motherland depends on the fulfillment of that obligation. If you want a nation-wide Hut with a deep and sincere wish, if that will is not just a phrase, an illusion, then it must be manifested by action, and that action must lead to unity. To unity in all directions...”¹⁶².

In December 1941 he was convinced that fascism was no different from Bolshevism and would condemn fascist ideology, which contradicted Christian morality. As we can see, Andrey Sheptytsky is quite cautious in his conclusions, since he condemns it only as a minister of the faith of Christ. And in early 1942 he would condemn fascism not only in terms of religion but also in terms of politics. There is no doubt that the fascists’ elimination of the restoration of Ukrainian statehood on June 30, 1941, had the greatest impact on this.

Speaking against the fascist regimes’ occupation, A. Sheptytsky put his personal life at risk. He repeatedly appealed to senior Nazi officials to protest against the persecution of the local population, including representatives of Polish and Jewish nationalities. Many facts are known when he was hiding people, persecuted by fascists. He was not arrested not only because he was very popular among his people, clergy, and in the

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1939-1944 рр. Т. III / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2010. С. 116.

¹⁶² Ibid. С. 147.

church circles, but also because such an act could have led to a backlash from Ukrainian national forces, including OUN and UPA.

Concerning Andrey Sheptytsky's protection of the Jewish population of Eastern Galicia, let us allow ourselves to give a large enough, but necessary in our case, quotation from a book "Meetings and Conversations in Israel" of a well-known Ukrainian diaspora researcher, Dr. Peter Mirchuk: "...Ukrainian Metropolitan, alone in Europe at that time, in a separate letter to Hitler and Himmler, protested against the brutal persecution and extermination of the Jews, and subsequently at his residence in Lviv, in the dungeons of St. George Cathedral, saved the lives of a dozen rabbis with their families and commissioned all Ukrainian priests, monks, and nuns to help the Jews and save them from death.

Metropolitan Sheptytsky's heroic stance and his humanitarian action in favor of the Jews is widely known among the Jews themselves. Jewish scientist Leon Gayman... quotes Rabbi Dr. David Kagan as saying: "I swear to the Bible that Earl Sheptytsky was one of the greatest humanitarian philanthropists in human history and the best friend of the Jews. I testify to this not only because he saved my life, my wife's and my child's life, and not only because he was able to save many other Jews from certain deaths at the hands of the Nazis. Please bear in mind not only what he did, but also the motives behind his actions. At that time Earl Sheptytsky was already an older man, physically infirm, but a giant spiritually. Over 80 years of age, paralyzed and on the eve of his death, he certainly did not seek any political benefits or respect for himself. It was all over him. If the German Nazis found the Jews in the dungeons of St. George Cathedral or in the monasteries, they would shoot or hang priests, monks or nuns on that same place, and burn down a church or monastery, or demolish and convert them into a stable for their horses. And if Metropolitan was willing to risk his own life, life of his priests, monks and nuns, he did so solely on the grounds of true, noble Christianity, friendly to the Jewish people and with a sense of national dignity"¹⁶³.

The same opinion was expressed by Dr. Kurt Levin: "Israel has found few friends in critical moments of its history. The local population was usually indifferent to the fate of the Jews. Few sympathized and even fewer ventured to help. And in that hour of horror the Jews found a true friend in the person of His Excellency, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky... Metropolitan's residence was a small baroque style ward near St. George Cathedral... The doors of Metropolitan's Residence were always open to

¹⁶³ Мірчук Петро. Зустрічі й розмови в Ізраїлю (Чи українці «традиційні антисеміти»). Нью-Йорк – Торонто – Львів: Союз українських полів'язнів, 1982. С. 7-8.

anyone who wished to visit Metropolitan. It happened often that a Jewish delegation from any town in the vicinity of Sheptytsky's area came here with a donation request for Jewish charitable or religious needs. In fact, in those localities many synagogues were built with a donated tree from Metropolitan Sheptytsky's forests...

The Jews thanked for this by their highest reverence and gratitude. As Metropolitan visited a city or a village, he was greeted by a large Ukrainian congregation, headed by Ukrainian priests and, necessarily, a rabbi... During the German occupation Metropolitan helped the Jews and hid them, and in the name of Christ called for such treatment towards the Jews from all the people of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. He issued a special Shepherd's Letter in the case of the Jews under the very eloquent headline: "Do not kill!". He went so far as to send a protest letter against the persecution of the Jews to the "Executioner of Europe" Himmler..."¹⁶⁴.

Following the prohibition of the government of Yaroslav Stetsko, which arose as a result of the Act of June 30, 1941, in Lviv in February 1942 the Council of Seniors emerged, headed by former Member of the Parliament Kost Levytsky, whose moral leader was Andrey Sheptytsky. However, the Council of Seniors existed only until the end of the month¹⁶⁵.

On November 9, 1943 Volodymyr Kubiyovych, Head of the Ukrainian Auxiliary Committee (UDK) and J. Pobihushchy, the captain of the division "Galicia", submitted into the newspaper "Lviv News" information about Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky's commitment to the formation of Ukrainian military units, including the mentioned division in the structure of Wehrmacht. Participation of three dioceses of the Galician province in the German-Ukrainian celebrations also testifies to this. Myroslav Maletsky recalled: "My destiny was decided by Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, though it sounds audacious and strange on my side. The fact is that the underground of the OUN had ambiguous thoughts about the formation of the division. Some believed that the youth should go to the UPA, while others, on the contrary, believed that unarmed and untrained soldiers should go from the UPA to study in the division. There were also other thoughts.

Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky – a man of tremendous popularity and enormous authority – supported the idea of creating a Ukrainian division and said the prophetic words: "There is almost no price that should not be given for the creation of the Ukrainian army". It finally decided my fate and I went

¹⁶⁴ Ibid. С. 8.

¹⁶⁵ Косик В. Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні. Париж – Нью-Йорк – Львів, 1993. С. 177.

to the division”¹⁶⁶. Interesting in all respects is the book of memories of a former German officer of that division, Wolf-Dietrich Haike, who shared his thoughts on the internal climate in this military unit. “The Ukrainian soldiers,” he wrote, “mostly volunteers, came from Galicia and rarely came from other Ukrainian lands. Most of them were a raw human material, with almost no military training, only rarely with military capabilities. Still, everyone wanted to become soldiers. Their age ranged from 16 to 70 years old, 90% from 18 to 30 years old... In Himmler’s order to all the chiefs of staff from July 14, 1943, the next was said: when mentioning the Galician division, I forbid ever to speak of the Ukrainian division or Ukrainian nationality”¹⁶⁷. However, the question of the fate of Galician Metropolitan and his congregation in these cases remains open. But it is a fact that before his death, Metropolitan Andrey called on the UPA to end the fight. In a conversation with the Head of the Department of History of Ukraine at Lviv State University, who at the same time was an agent of the NKVD, of which, of course, Sheptytsky did not know, Metropolitan said that he “had been fighting the UPA for two years, and in his messages he strongly condemned it”¹⁶⁸.

In 1944 the Bolsheviks reappeared in Lviv. The eyewitness wrote: “The Bolshevik cavalry, moving towards us, was dirty, shabby and looked like an horde”¹⁶⁹. The coming of the Soviet army in 1944 differed little from their coming in 1939. A. Sheptytsky had to conduct a moderate policy, seeking concessions from the new occupant. So, on August 29, 1944 he wrote a letter to the secretary of the Lviv Regional Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, I. Hrushetsky, asking him to allow the God’s service in hospitals: “I ask to leave the churches with the Church Services in all the hospitals of Lviv region, in all city hospitals in Lviv and in the parish of the Medical Institute in Lviv”¹⁷⁰. Grushetsky’s answer was standard: “1. According to the Soviet constitution, the church is separated from the state. 2. There are Soviet laws in all Soviet institutions. 3. A hospital is a Soviet institution that applies Soviet laws accordingly. 4. Soviet medicine treats all citizens

¹⁶⁶ Малецький М. «У моїй долі вирішальну роль відіграв митрополит Андрій Шептицький». *Українська дивізія «Галичина»: історико-публіцистичний збірник. Київ – Торонто, 1994. С. 155.*

¹⁶⁷ Гайке В.-Ф. *Українська дивізія «Галичина»*. Тернопіль: Мандрівець, 2018. С. 25.

¹⁶⁸ *Культурне життя в Україні. Західні землі. Документи і матеріали. Т. 1. 1939-1953.* К.: Наукова думка, 1995. С. 217.

¹⁶⁹ *Літопис нескореної України: Документи, матеріали, спогади. Книга 1 (Підготували Я. Лялька, П. Максимук, І. Патер та ін.). Авт. передмови Я. Лялька, Р. Бачинський. Львів: Просвіта, 1993. С. 250.*

¹⁷⁰ *Культурне життя в Україні. Західні землі. Документи і матеріали. Т. 1. 1939-1953.* К.: Наукова думка, 1995. С. 200.

regardless of their religious beliefs; the patient should receive help from our doctors. 5. Religion is a personal matter of every citizen of our country, which he or she may carry out at home or in appropriate religious institutions. 6. Nuns or Sisters of Charity, when they get a job in hospitals – medical institutions – must obey the internal regulations of the hospital facilities”¹⁷¹.

In addition, Andrey Sheptytsky demanded that the “students of the Theological Seminary” should not be taken to the Red Army, and that the Soviet authorities should leave the printing press in the theological consistory¹⁷². In a letter to the Chairman of the Soviet People’s Commissar of the UkrSSR M. Khrushchev, Hrushetsky wrote: “We believe that there should be a Soviet order in the Soviet hospital, and therefore the chapel should be closed... What about the conscription to the army of students of the Theological Seminary, we instructed the Military Commissariat to refrain from recruiting for a time, but we believe that they should be subject to the same rules as the Soviet students. The printing press has remained in the monastery so far, we ask for your permission to take it for the needs of the Executive Committee of the Regional Council of the Workers’ Deputies and the Bureau of the Regional Communist Party”¹⁷³. Hrushetsky asked to open a special committee in Lviv region, and to send to a permanent job there a “highly skilled specialist of the church issues at the Executive Committee of the Regional Council of Workers’ Deputies”¹⁷⁴, which was done soon.

The Bolsheviks made mass arrests against the local population. At St. George’s Cathedral, they conducted searches and arrests among the students of the Theological Seminary, where Banderites and weapons were found¹⁷⁵. The State Security Authorities, through their agents “Halytskyi” and “Vyshnyakov”, have “established close supervision of Metropolitan”. People’s Commissar of the State Security of the UkrSSR Savchenko reported to M. Khrushchev that “in Sheptytsky’s opinion, the arrests of the clergy of the Greek Catholic Church are the result of machinations of the Orthodox Patriarch in Moscow”¹⁷⁶. On September 17, 1944 Colonel Voloshchenko and Lieutenant Colonel Alekseev reported to the State Security Commissar Savchenko: “...Germanophile Sheptytsky was deeply disappointed with the

¹⁷¹ Ibid. C. 237.

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ Культурне життя в Україні. Західні землі. Документи і матеріали. Т. 1. 1939-1953. К.: Наукова думка, 1995. С. 238.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. C. 265.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid. C. 266.

Germans. On July 29, 1944 Metropolitan turned 79 years old, and he had a great reception for the clergy. Metropolitan, in his own words, expressed such an extreme optimism in his speech that he surprised the clergy: “Everything is in the hands of God,” Metropolitan said, “and everything will end, without a doubt, very well”¹⁷⁷. However, many reports from the NKVD authorities were of the opinion that such a sharp change in Sheptytsky’s attitude to the new government was only a hidden dissatisfaction with the Bolsheviks.

They watched not only Sheptytsky, but also his supporters, who were later arrested and sentenced. Academicians of the UkrSSR Academy of Sciences Kolesa, Shchurat, Wozniak, who appeared in the operational reports of the NKVD as “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists”, were accused of a favorable attitude towards Sheptytsky. D. Manuilsky accused the composer Vasily Barvinsky: “You raised Sheptytsky on the shield, this Polish tycoon, who, by pulling on the lace, supported by the Vatican on the one hand, and by the nationalist circles on the other hand, carried out his reactionary, hostile to the people, policy, and you supported him, you raised him on a shield, and you did not have the courage now to speak to the youth, just to kneel down and say: “Judge us, we have fooled you, we have betrayed you, we are guilty, but we ask you to forgive us, we acknowledge our mistakes. Not everyone stated this”¹⁷⁸.

Even after the death of Andrey Sheptytsky, the authorities forced Ukrainian writers to stain the light image of Metropolitan of Galicia. Thus, in a letter to the poet Petro Karmansky, the deputy editor-in-chief of the UkrSSR State Political Publishing House, G. Zatsepilin wrote: “We considered it necessary to supplement your manuscript a little with the materials about Sheptytsky, about his relations with nationalists, about the treacherous role of the Greek Catholic Church during the Patriotic War... If you consider it necessary to add something, then it can and should be done... If these facts outline any new aspects of the “activity” of the Vatican and its agents in the person of Sheptytsky and Uniate Church, then such additions certainly should be made”¹⁷⁹.

However, all this will take place after the death of Metropolitan of Galicia. “On Wednesday, April 11, 1945, at about 8 o'clock in the evening the NKVD, in the force of about 600 people with three tanks, laid siege to St. George’s Mountain, they got inside and began to “rage”. From the Metropolitan Chapel it was taken more than 100 thousand rubles, intended

¹⁷⁷ Ibid. C. 217.

¹⁷⁸ Культурне життя в Україні. Західні землі. Документи і матеріали. Т. 1. 1939-1953. К.: Наукова думка, 1995. С. 272-273.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid. C. 675-676.

for the needs of the Metropolitan Ordinary, Theological Seminary and others. From the Metropolitan Office they took away all the ancient, as well as the modern, archive, all acts, etc. They took away everything else that belonged to it. Two cars of prayer books and other spiritual books were taken away, and the rest of the books and prayer books were thrown out, trampled and destroyed»¹⁸⁰. There were actions that are more immoral: “From St. George Cathedral they took away all the gold things, they left no tangibles. The audit was extremely brief and detailed. On Tuesday they broke the Ex’ Metropolitan Sheptytsky’s cellar in the pub. From there they took away a whole supply of wine, intended for the Church Services in the whole Galician Eparchy. The amount of wine exceeded 1600 liters. They took more than two hundred kg of candles. For two weeks they had been taking away all goods from the Metropolitan Chamber: Persian carpets, furniture, packed suitcases, packs... All the rooms, as well as the Metropolitan Chapel, were sealed and there was an inscription: “Do not pen the door, for breaking the seal – the punishment of death”. Until now (June 25, 1945 – Aut.) the NKVD agents continue to manage there, and in the Metropolitan’s bedroom the NKVD “sergeant” sleeps with an unmarried woman”¹⁸¹. But Metropolitan could not see this all. Andrey Sheptytsky died on November 1, 1944.

The church and political activities of Andrey Sheptytsky, closely intertwined, make it possible to evaluate his ideas, ideals and his actions of the universal significance, they can not be limited by only one single historical phenomenon or one nation. The most important values of the Christian-politician and the Christian of God’s Church exist in his person.

¹⁸⁰ Літопис нескореної України: Документи, матеріали, спогади. Книга 1 (Підготували Я. Лялька, П. Максимук, І. Патер та ін.). Авт. передмови Я. Лялька, Р. Бачинський. Львів: Просвіта, 1993. С. 251.

¹⁸¹ Ibid. С. 254.

PART 4.
EDUCATIONAL, CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITY
OF METROPOLITAN ANDREY SHEPTYTSKY

At the end of the 19th century, under Metropolitan Sembratovych, the church was in a real crisis. Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky tried to overcome this crisis, to bring the church to the level of new tasks, make it a fact not only of national revival, but also of national state formation, to make it as a completely national, Ukrainian religious association. A. Sheptytsky clearly stated his life credo in a pastoral letter “To the Ukrainian intelligentsia”: “In every work and in every word... I seek only the good of the people, for whom I feel like my heavy and holy duties. These responsibilities are imposed on me not only by my position as Metropolitan, but also by the solemn swear, made on the day of joining the monastery, that I will, according to my strength, work for the Ukrainian community, because I have a strong conviction, that puts me in the ranks of patriots, of which I wanted to be the best”¹⁸².

Metropolitan’s devotion to his swear and to his vocation was carried through the years and never receded from its foundations, though his life’s journey was difficult. Therefore, bearing in mind his own ascetic activities, he rightly noted in a sincere “Word to Ukrainian Youth”: “And it is easier to shed blood in one minute of enthusiasm, than to hardly fulfill the duties through long years and move the heat of the day, and the heat of the sun, and the malice of the people, and the hatred of the enemies, and the lack of our people’s confidence, and the lack of help from the closest one’s, and in the midst of such labor, do your task until the end, without waiting for the laurels before the victory, nor the reward before the merit!”¹⁸³

The very appearance of A. Sheptytsky in the bosom of the Greek Catholic Church was sensational, and the sacrifice of his step – undoubted (title, position, career, estate – to a persecuted “khlop church”). The most impressive was not a fact that he became a Greek Catholic from a Roman

¹⁸² Митрополит Шептицький Андрей. Твори. Т. 2. Торонто, 1965. С. 190.

¹⁸³ Гайковський М. Нація і держава в богословській спадщині митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Науковий збірник УВУ*. Матеріали конференції «Народ, нація, держава і українське питання у європейському вимірі» (Львів, травень 1993). Мюнхен – Львів, 1995. С. 195.

Catholic, but how he became a Ukrainian from a Pole¹⁸⁴. This was an important factor in raising the national consciousness of the Galician people and the reason for continued hostility towards him from the Polish authorities and the community.

It should be noted, however, that both Ukrainian politicians and the national press met him, to put it mildly, without applause. Brilliant abilities and education, rapid advancement in the Greek Catholic ecclesiastical hierarchy caused to first treat him as a Polish agent. Speeches and actions of Sheptytsky in defense of the Ukrainian movement seemed to dispel doubts about the sincerity of his religious and national approach. But when he, feeling moral necessity, took on some unpopular position, the critics were not afraid to say that his true Polish aristocratic colors were manifested in him, and compared him to Valenrod of A. Mickiewicz.

Another reason for this hostile attitude was a comparatively tolerant treatment of Moscophiles by A. Sheptytsky. Before coming to the Metropolitan throne, he was a bishop of Stanislav for one year. At that time, he did not yet orient himself in public life and cooperated with the Moscophiles, who were the majority among the clergy of the Stanislav diocese. At the same time, he understood that the Moscophiles' tendencies were related to the serious and real problems of religious and national identification. As I. Khymka notes, "Greek Catholics had an Orthodox face, Roman Catholic citizenship and... an enlightened Austrian soul. All these elements did not reproduce the new religious synthesis"¹⁸⁵. It was very difficult to choose your own right path in such circumstances. That is why A. Sheptytsky stated that in solving any national or religious issues, it is not enough to be guided by feelings, but, above all, by the mind. However, even much later, in 1943, he had to state bitterly: "Such thunderous manifestations as Moscophiles in many reviews are almost a mystery to us. I have never had the opportunity to re-read the notorious research about this national ulcer, and I do not even remember whether there are at all any brief,

¹⁸⁴ This Ukrainian nature of a future Metropolitan is described well by S. Herman in his novel: "– Sir made a mistake, Mr. Sheptytsky, – secretary of the dean's office of the law faculty of Jagiellonian University, a small, thin man in silver pence, gave Roman a questionnaire, submitted a minute ago. – A mistake? What's the mistake? – Roman asked. – Here, in the column "nationality", Mr. wrote "Rusyn". For Count Sheptytsky, you agree, it sounds like ... uh ... not quite, to say, okay... Roman took the questionnaire, re-read it and, without making any corrections, gave it to the secretary. – Everything is written correctly here. – Right? You say everything is spelled correctly? Well ... I wish my lord, Count Sheptytsky, all successes, – said the secretary, and his pence flashed with a cold glare" (Герман С. Віа Романа. Життя митрополита А. Шептицького. К.: Ярославів вал, 2019. С. 9).

¹⁸⁵ Химка І. Греко-католицька церква і національне відродження у Галичині 1772-1918. *Ковчез*: Збірник статей з церковної історії. Число 1. Львів, 1993. С. 77-78.

but deeply considered, observations of this ulcer in our literature. When the struggle between these two parties [the “Moscophiles” and the “Ukrainephiles” – Aut.] was most severe in our region, there were no serious judgments from both sides about the mutual relations or intentions of the two parties. They mutually quarreled, they accused each other of treason, and no one came up with a question to ask what causes them and their opponents to think as they think¹⁸⁶.

Such a moderate attitude of A. Sheptytsky caused dissatisfaction in the certain circles of the Ukrainian intelligentsia not only during the beginning of his activity, but also during his stay at the Metropolitan’s throne. The open conflict of A. Sheptytsky with the editor of the newspaper “Dilo” L. Tsehelsky in 1908 is a good example of this.¹⁸⁷

New Metropolitan was welcomed with some caution in the church community. The reason for this was his dissimilarity to his predecessors. Prominent Ukrainian writers I. Franko and M. Pavlyk, who often visited A. Sheptytsky with scientific affairs, were surprised by the way of life of the Earl-Metropolitan. He lived as an ascetic: a small room, alone in a woolen black monk’s cowl, belted by an ordinary black belt, with prear beads on his belt or in his hands, the most modest dish, the doors of his wards at St. George’s Mountain are always open to all around him and to everyone else, even to the enemies.

However, not only the extraordinary personal modesty of A. Sheptytsky caused the general astonishment and attention to his personality, but also another extraordinary circumstance at that time. Even in the Stanislav period of his life, he addressed a pastoral message to the believers of the Kosovan deanery – “To my beloved Hutsuls”¹⁸⁸. In its content this message is not exceptional: A. Sheptytsky later will return repeatedly to the moral problems raised here. But the form of the message is a kind of a manifesto – it is written in the Hutsul dialect. To understand the significance of this act, it should be mentioned that at that time even a common orthography did not

¹⁸⁶ Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1939-1944 рр. Т. 3. Львів: Видавництво «АРТОС», 2010. С. 570.

¹⁸⁷ Левіцький К. Історія політичної думки галицьких українців, 1848-1914. Жовква, 1927. С. 494-495. This conflict did not prevent Lonhyn Tsehelsky from praising the Metropolitan’s longstanding actions: “Metropolitan Sheptytsky... extended his authority to all Ukraine and to Ukrainian emigration in Europe and overseas. And since Orthodox Ukrainians do not have any prominent ruler, Metropolitan Kyr Andrey became the spiritual leader of the entire Ukrainian people, and Orthodox Ukrainians bow to His respect and recognize His authority” (Цегельський Л. Митрополит Андрій Шептицький. Короткий життєпис і огляд його церковно-народної діяльності. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «МІСІОНЕР», 1995. С. 20-21.)

¹⁸⁸ Шептицький А. Послання любови. Брустури: Дискурсус, 2015. С. 104-139.

exist and it was used an extremely complex mix of Church Slavonic language with Ukrainian. Although A. Sheptytsky never used the dialect again, all his further messages were written in a language accessible to the people, clearly and understandable, in Ukrainian. I. Franko paid a special attention to this side of his activity: "...Since his coming to the bishopric, A. Sheptytsky began to accustom us to a different tone, other forms... Instead of the moldy pseudo-church language, a discerning mishmash of Church Slavonic vocabulary with modern morphology, which was used by his predecessors, he writes letters in purely Galician-Rus vernacular, and sometimes, for example, in a strong message to the Hutsuls, he is not ashamed even of speaking a dialect – an impossible matter in the speech of our dignitaries.

He does not speak as his predecessors, highly, authoritative, hypocritical, as if having a static tone, does not walk on the walkways and does not 'proclaim', but speaks simply as equal to equal, as a man to people, advises, mentions and sometimes flames without being afraid to use a vigorous word when situation requires it"¹⁸⁹.

Despite such a biased attitude, Metropolitan Andrey's activities in the social, political and cultural spheres, his courage in the name of the nation and religion won him recognition in Ukrainian society, the respect and commitment of recent opponents.

Sheptytsky's cultural and educational activity was aimed at raising the morale and spirituality of the people to the level at which there appeared a conscious and mass readiness for practical work in the matter of national state building. A. Sheptytsky was engaged in extensive philanthropist activities, he provided material assistance to individual artists, to talented youth, conducted pedagogical work at schools, sports and educational societies ("Prosvita", "Native School", "Plast"), maintained newspapers and magazines, organized mass events with the obligatory combination of the two principles – national and religious. "The Church of Christ", Metropolitan stated, "is always far from resisting the development of culture, the arts and sciences; on the contrary, it helps and powerfully develops it.

¹⁸⁹ Франко І. Соціальна акція, соціальне питання і соціалізм // Франко І. Зібрання творів у 50 тт. Т. 45. К., 1986. С. 378.; In the deep conviction of J. Hrytsak, Sheptytsky "treated his flock with sincere sympathy... developing the mentality of the Ruthenians out of the ritual practices of the church, he headed..." (Грицак Я. Пророк у своїй вітчизні. Франко та його спільнота (1856-1886). К.: Критика, 2006. С. 41); For more on I. Franko's attitude to Metropolitan's figure, see: Будівничий української державності: Хрестоматія політологічних статей Івана Франка / Упоряд. Д. Павличко. К.: Видавничий дім «Киево-Могилянська академія», 2006. С. 29, 30, 336, 498-511, 513-515, 519-521.

The church neither lightens nor disrupts those good signs of culture that serve man...”¹⁹⁰.

Metropolitan looked at the Galician people through the eyes of a politician. He understood that in order to rise to a level of statehood, the Galicians needed knowledge and printed editions. Sheptytsky generously financed printing houses, “Biblos”, etc., he founded a Ukrainian publishing house in Zhovkva in Basiliyan Monastery and started the magazines “Missionary”, “Our Friend”. In 1930, Bishop founded the Ukrainian Catholic Union, which published the weekly “Meta” and the literary and scientific journal “Dzvony”.

Taking care of the economic development of Galicia, Metropolitan purchased several estates, which were divided among the peasants. He was an initiator and co-founder of the “Land Mortgage Bank” in Lviv (1910), which loaned peasants money for the land they acquired. By contributing to the parceling of large land holdings, A. Sheptytsky aimed not only to solve the purely economic problems of the region, but also to develop agricultural science, to spread its achievements among various, especially the poorest, sections of the population. In the divided folwark at the Korshiv village, near Kolomyia, the company “Agricultural Master” became the owner of the land, on which the bakery school was founded. In Mylovan, near Tovmach, a yard and several dozen morgens of the field were obtained were given to “Prosvita” for the establishment of the first Ukrainian horticultural school; the summer camp for children from poor families also worked there. In Sknyliv, the courtyard and the large garden were occupied by the students, who open workshops of handicrafts, mechanics, and so on. In Zarvanytsya, 300 morgens were given to the students for farming and 250 for the orphanage. M. Marynovych made the most complete and thorough analysis of Metropolitan’s pastoral messages on economic topics¹⁹¹.

The above list clearly characterizes one of the main directions of A. Sheptytsky’s multifaceted activity – his constant concern for the future of the nation – children, especially orphans. He helped the kindergartens and orphanages. The first Ukrainian Women’s Gymnasium “Native School”, where Basilian sisters gave orphan girls a secondary education, was built at his expense. Not the Polish government, but Sheptytsky after the First World War gathered orphans to give them custody. Spending a million dollars, he arranged several orphanages for them, where they were educated and mastered with various crafts.

¹⁹⁰ 150 думок Митрополита Андрея Шептицького / Упор. Тереза Ференц. Львів: Свічадо, 2015. С 58.

¹⁹¹ Маринювич М. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і принцип «позитивної суми» / передмова Андріана Сливицького. Львів: Видавництво Старого Лева, 2019. 248 с.

Every year Metropolitan conducted a wellness campaign for poor children. He built a number of houses for children in Pidliuta of the Dolyna district, among the Carpathian forests. Here in great climates and under the tutelage of good educators, several thousand children between the ages of 4 and 14 have gained strength and intelligence. Here they were taught prayers, history, Ukrainian studies, Ukrainian language and behavior.

Health problems also played a prominent role among A. Sheptytsky's interests. In September 1903, he founded the People's Hospital, which later turned into an extremely huge hospital. The impetus for its creation was the activity of a doctor E. Ozarkevych, who, concerned about the fact that Ukrainians were not accepted to Polish hospitals, dreamed to open a Ukrainian hospital, where our doctors would acquire and improve difficult medical professions. To this aim he founded a voluntary medical society in 1903. Metropolitan supported the initiative, provided considerable financial assistance, formulated the direction and scope of its activity: "for the lower and suffering humanity without difference of nationality". Treatment and medication were free. Nursing courses were opened at the Theological Seminary, 228 girls graduated, and, as a result, the hospital was provided with its' support medical staff¹⁹².

However, this hospital was not the only one that functioned at A. Sheptytsky's expense. In 1925, in the Yaniv suburb of Lviv, he transferred a house for the branch of the Lviv medical clinic – the "Society for the Tutelage of Youth", where the "Mothers' Advice" was also located. In the village of Pidliute, on the territory that belonged to Metropolitan, a sanatorium, based on sulfur-iodine sources, was organized. In the Sokal district, in the mountains, in cooperation with the "Teachers' Community", a permanent "Plast" camp functioned at his expense, and in 1911-1912 the students' medical community, with his assistance, created a sanatorium for the students¹⁹³.

Admitting the healing value of nature, A. Sheptytsky took care of its protection. In 1925 he was elected a member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. At the request of the Commission of Nature Protection under the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Metropolitan ordered to create on the lands of the Lviv metropolis a reserve of cedar forests on the Egg Mountain near Pidliute and the steppe vegetation near Devil's Mountain (in Rohatyn Parish). These were the first nature reserves established in Ukraine.

¹⁹² For more details see.: Заборовський Я. Ю. Нарис про життя і служіння церкви та народові (1865-1944 pp.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. С. 19-20.

¹⁹³ Медики і медицина в житті та діяльності Митрополита Андрія Шептицького (До 150-річчя від дня народження): бібліографічний покажчик / уклад. М. С. Надрага, О. М. Криль, С. В. Васільєва, Л. С. Метельська; наук. ред. А. В. Магльований. Львів, 2015. 94 с.

However, most of all, Metropolitan Andrey was interested in the cultural development of the Ukrainian people, their education and upbringing. He assisted artists, choral art, church and folk art and other societies and communities. Metropolitan established dozens of scholarships, which gave the opportunity to hundreds of young men to get education as a medical doctor, a lawyer, a teacher in the universities of Western Europe. He helped H. Krushelnytska, F. Lopatynska and A. Hayek to receive an art education. A. Sheptytsky purchased a separate room for Lviv artists (the villa of Polish artist J. Styk), where the art school of O. Novakivsky and the workshops of M. Sosenko and O. Kurylas were located. The culmination of the cultural and educational activity of Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky was the founding and material support of the “National Museum” in Lviv. In 1905 he founded a Church museum in Lviv, which the curatorium renamed as the National Museum named after Metr. A. Sheptytsky. For this museum A. Sheptytsky bought 15 thousand exhibits, paying two million kroons. Sheptytsky managed to buy a magnificent palace for a museum for 34,000 USD, though the owner-chauvinist didn't want to sell it to Ukrainians. On December 13, 1913 Sheptytsky presents a unique collection of Ukrainian art of the XI-XX centuries to the museum. Art historian Hilarion Swiencytsky organized the museum exhibits, making the National Museum the largest treasure in Ukraine: by 1939 it had more than 80,000 exhibits in 10 departments, it published 16 volumes of scientific notes, and organized about 70 exhibitions. The museum had a unique library: more than 30 thousand volumes of albums from different sections of Ukrainian studies and art history. According to K. Korolevsky, the catalog of ancient Slavic books, published by I. Swiencytsky could “compete with a similar Russian edition made by Karatayev”¹⁹⁴.

It is important to note that A. Sheptytsky considered art not only as a prominent means of forming the general cultural level of the people, but also as one of the main factors in the upbringing of a nationally and religiously-conscious society. This is clearly evidenced by his letter-message of April 25, 1941, “On Church Singing” and by a letter of August 8, 1942, to prof. V. Kubyovych on the project of the art school for drawing teachers. “Undoubtedly”, he writes in the letter, “an awakening factor in education is the awakening of the aesthetic sense and the cultural direction that education gives to that sense. But drawing teachers, Ukrainians, have a second overriding importance: they must give a noble and sublime direction to patriotism... Our young people, who had to go to the Polish secondary

¹⁹⁴ Королевський К. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький (1865-1944). Львів: Свічадо, 2016. С. 107.

schools for a long time, often have no idea about the most important figures of the Ukrainian people. We do not yet have the illustrated history of Ukraine, but we have famous and great artists, about whom the youth has never heard of in the ordinary, even Ukrainian high school. We have such Murashko, Narbut, Novakivsky, even Repin, and, in the 19th century, Levitsky. Only a drawing teacher can acquaint the Ukrainian youth with them, and only wise and well-educated drawing teachers can awaken in the Ukrainian youth the talents and artists, who would show us how Khmelnytsky or Mazepa looked like. Or, better to say, not only how they looked like, but how they should look in our thoughts, hearts, concepts”,¹⁹⁵.

Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky made great efforts to develop a system of national and religious education, which was attached by him to a great importance. In his first pastoral letter to the believers of the Stanislaw Diocese of August 2, 1899, “The First Word of the Shepherd” the future Metropolitan states that education is more valuable than wealth¹⁹⁶. As mentioned above, Sheptytsky constantly took care of secondary education, Institutes’ education of the Ukrainians, and not only in the territory of Galicia. In particular, thanks to his personal mediation, the Ukrainian Economy Academy in Podebrady was saved from liquidation by the Czech authorities.

Naturally, Metropolitan paid the highest attention to the development of spiritual education. The seminaries in Przemysl and Stanislaw were built with his help. The last one, when opened in 1906, was given perhaps the most valuable gift – 4000 books from Sheptytsky’s personal library, among them many rare and ancient editions and manuscripts. On September 1, 1901 a pastoral letter was issued with a plan for the complete reconstruction of the Lviv Grand Seminary, which was central to all of Galicia: almost a third of the teaching staff and the board were renewed, and the Seminary rules were simplified.

However, “feeling that the results of this reorganization will be slow, Metropolitan for his family money often sends the best seminarians to theological studies in Rome, Innsbruck and Augustineum (in Austria), Friborg (Switzerland). Soon these efforts gave a successful result and the most important ecclesiastical positions were held by people of European

¹⁹⁵ Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність: Документи і матеріали 1899-1944. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Кн. 2: Листування. Львів: Місіонер, 1999. С. 978-979.

¹⁹⁶ Владика Андрей. *Альманах «Гомону України» на рік 1994*. Торонто – Онтаріо, 1994. С. 44.

education (no lower), and often much higher than in other Catholic dioceses of Western Europe or America”¹⁹⁷.

It is important to note that A. Sheptytsky never divided education into “purely religious” and “purely secular”, on the contrary, he constantly emphasized their interdependence and interconnectedness. Metropolitan sought to equip the clergy and believers not only with theological knowledge, but also with “sufficient knowledge of Philosophy, Sociology and Political Science, world general science”, to give impetus to the development of Law education, because he rightly believed that “in our people there is a general lack of a clear and firm sense of law, ... a lack of talented legislators between our people, because even a famous lawyer can be a weak legislator”¹⁹⁸.

Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky’s ideas were largely realized in the activities of the Theological Academy, founded by him, which opened on October 6, 1929. in Lviv. At that time it was the first and only one higher theological Ukrainian school, which was to continue the traditions of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, on the one hand, and on the other, to be guided by the models of foreign theological schools. A few years later Academy became not only an important center of the theological sciences, but also a center of studies in history and literature.

A. Sheptytsky was not only the founder of the Academy, but he also constantly took care of it, participated directly in its activities. Since 1933, he taught the asceticism of the Western and Eastern Churches. He appointed as the Academy’s rector such a prominent religious and cultural figure as the future Cardinal J. Slipyi¹⁹⁹. Metropolitan involved the most famous scientists, who were in Galicia at that time, into the scientific activity and into teaching at the Theological Academy: lawyers L. Hlynka, R. Kovshevych, O. Nadrag; art historians V. Sas-Zalozetsky, I. Svencitsky; historians I. Krypiakevych, M. Chubaty, V. Struten; philologists V. Sonevytsky, K. Chekhovych; archaeologist J. Pasternak; geologist Y. Polyansky; philosopher M. Konrad; physician Z. Hordynsky; anthropologist I. Rakovsky; sociologist B. Kasymyr. This list is far from complete, but it makes it possible to evaluate the wide range of teaching courses taught at the Academy.

It is no wonder then, that contemporaries treated the development of the Academy as a nationwide affair, as an important step towards the creation of

¹⁹⁷ Заборовський Я. Ю. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Нарис про життя і служіння церкви та народові (1865-1944 рр.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. С. 18.

¹⁹⁸ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 33-34.

¹⁹⁹ Ленцик В. Визначні постаті Української Церкви: Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і Патріярх Йосиф Сліпий. С. 429-446.

a new Ukrainian national university. The Academy lived up to these expectations. “The national tasks of the academy,” was written in the journal “Our Call”, “in the sphere of preparation for the social work... are, to some extent, accomplished. Graduates of the Academy are well-versed in all major movements of philosophical thought and in the major problems of sociology, and can well fulfill their role as leaders and organizers of different sections of our national life. Some knowledge of modern law will be a good weapon for them in the modern struggle for the individual and national interests of those Ukrainians, among whom they will have to work. Knowledge of Ukrainian ecclesiastical art and archeology among the younger generation of Ukrainian clergy can be helpful in the case of preservation from destruction of many valuable monuments of our ancient culture and it can be helpful in the creating of our museums”²⁰⁰.

However, it was not destined for the Theological Academy to turn into a national university, as A. Sheptytsky wanted it. The Polish chauvinist authorities vetoed this plan by Metropolitan, declaring that they would not recognize diplomas from such an educational institution. It should be noted that this was not the first and, unfortunately, another failed attempt by Metropolitan to create a Ukrainian National University in Lviv. As early as 1908, at the Pan-Slavic Congress convened in Prague on his own initiative, a resolution was proposed to promote the opening of a university in Lviv. It was failed at the suggestion of the head of the Russian delegation V. Bobrynsky, who was then a member of the State Duma, leader of the National Party, and later, during the World War I, as a governor of Galicia and Bukovyna, became famous for his Russification policy and, in particular, for the deportation of Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky to Russia²⁰¹.

A. Sheptytsky’s great speech of June 28, 1910 at the 11th meeting of the 22nd session of the Imperial Council in Vienna, where he presented the case of establishing a Ukrainian university in Lviv, became very famous not only in Galicia, but also throughout Western Europe. The deep argumentation, given by A. Sheptytsky, influenced the authorities, and despite the opposition of the Polish ruling circles in 1913, as well as the official note of the Russian ambassador in Vienna, where the opening of the Ukrainian university was called a “hostile act” towards Russia, the Emperor issued a decree on the opening of such a university on September 1, 1916. Unfortunately, these plans of A. Sheptytsky failed to materialize because everything was crossed by World War I.

²⁰⁰ Наш клич. 1933. 16 квітня.

²⁰¹ For more details look: Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і греко-католики в Росії. Книга 1: Документи і матеріали, 1899-1917 / Упорядкували Юрій Аввакумов і Оксана Гайова. Львів: Видавництво Українського Католицького Університету, 2004. 924 с.

Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyy did not limit himself only by patronage and organizational activity in the field of culture, education and science. Three times the doctor – of theology, philosophy and law – he was a scientist of the European scale, and he had considerable personal scientific achievements²⁰².

Paying particular attention to the problems of education and pedagogy, A. Sheptytsky was aware that the grounds of any system of national education are spiritual, philosophical and methodological foundations. They are intended to determine the meaning and valuable orientations of pedagogical activity, as well as the relationship between the universal, national and personal in the “human–world” system.

In existential terms, education as a cognitive aspect of human being and as a concept is much broader in its content than institutionalized activity within its specific historical forms, it is one of the aspects of human education. This understanding of education and the detailed development of the philosophical foundations and moral principles of educational activity can be found in the works of A. Sheptytsky.

Referring to Ukrainian youth, Metropolitan wrote: “You go to every kind of school... you do well when care for education and knowledge. Because, after Christian righteousness and the grace of God, knowledge is the greatest power that man can command”²⁰³.

It is important to emphasize that, while highly appreciating education and science as a manifestation of the cognitive activity of the human mind, A. Sheptytsky constantly pointed to the interconnection of the goal and the ways of education with Christian principles, the very essence of Christianity. Already at the beginning of his Metropolitan activity, in 1901, worried about the spread of religious indifference, agnosticism and atheism in the circles of educated Ukrainians, he wrote a special pastoral letter to the Ukrainian secular intelligentsia, explaining why Christianity is still important in the age of rationalism. “Jesus Christ and His Holy Church”, he stated in another pastoral epistle, “is not at all opposed to science and enlightenment. On the contrary, they spread and spread it”²⁰⁴. To support this words A. Sheptytsky cited numerous statements of Jesus Christ, in which he called himself “the light of the world”, “the Truth”, the “way” and for the purpose of his coming into this world he considered freedom for people, which they could attain through enlightenment, if they will understand the testimony of truth.

²⁰² Ленцик В. Названа праця. С. 195-205; його ж: Слуга Божий митрополит Андрей Шептицький та українська наука. *Богословія*. Т. 55. Рим, 1991. С. 166-181.

²⁰³ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 6.

²⁰⁴ Твори слуги Божого Митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Пастирські листи (2. III. 1899 – 7. IX. 1901). Т. 1. Торонто, 1965. С. 5.

Therefore, “education is about one thing: knowledge should be a true knowledge, it should relate only to the truth, and not to falsehood, not to lies. True knowledge is the power of human and false knowledge, based on iniquity, is a true ailment for a human, an injury and a misery for the whole life”²⁰⁵.

Linking the progress of European culture with Christianity, which freed people from the darkness of paganism, A. Sheptytsky noted that true culture and education in Ukraine have Christian roots. “In all our history”, he wrote, “you will not find an era of such great and such impetuous progress in culture and education as it was during the time of St. Volodymyr the Great, when Rus-Ukraine adopted Christianity”²⁰⁶.

With the primary aim of achieving an organic union of national revival with the spiritual revival, Metropolitan rightly believed that “there is no greater sign for our people today, as unity, and no more important work for our clergy than the work on national and Christian unity of the people”²⁰⁷. The precondition for such unity is the awareness for all strata their common interests, regardless of party or congressional affiliation. In order to achieve such a situation, in his opinion, Ukrainians, first of all, should abandon their provincialism and rise to the level of the world culture and seek solutions to their problems on the basis of human values and Christian morality. Science and education must say their weighty word in the case of formation of the national consciousness. Meanwhile, A. Sheptytsky states with annoyance that the question “where is everything that makes the Ukrainian people a human organization so infinitely far from the natural organism, that our community seems more like a pile of sand, single grains of which have nothing to do with the others, than a mighty tree, in which life develops, full of strength and health”, this question remains open, because “we either have very few or do not have at all any philosophers or moralists who would study our national psyche”²⁰⁸.

This situation is also typical for the other spheres of national and social life, in particular, for politics. “In many ways, we are still primitive people, for whom demonstration, phrase and noise often seem more important than quiet cold thought and long-lasting work. In our society there are too many people, who consider themselves professional politicians, although they have no specialty and no specialized knowledge. This situation itself changes professional work into rhetoric”²⁰⁹.

²⁰⁵ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 6.

²⁰⁶ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 6.

²⁰⁷ Ibid. С. 408.

²⁰⁸ Ibid. С. 409.

²⁰⁹ Ibid. С. 410.

On what basis should a system of national education, that would overcome our “primitive patriotism”, be built? In general terms, A. Sheptytsky tries to answer this question in the great theological work “Christian Righteousness”, where he thinks about the nature and interconnection of knowledge, wisdom and faith, theory and practice, where he reveals the connection of these epistemological concepts with the category of good.

By the natural human knowledge he understood the right reasoning about things, which are gained with experience and with the reasoning of that experience. Wisdom is the knowledge of the highest cause of all, of God, it is the highest and most perfect knowledge, which does not come from human experience, but is a reflection of God’s knowledge. Faith itself applies to wisdom and to human knowledge. The source of faith is the first truth, God. Human knowledge is not so directly related to God. However, in another sense, faith, as a revealed truth, is linked to knowledge, because in the process of knowing one is free to choose what to believe in and what to believe not²¹⁰.

The concept of faith is also considered in relation to the categories “theoretical-practical”. Faith as a reflection of God’s truth is attributed to theory, because the human mind is united with God through it. At the same time this truth of God is the supreme goal of cognitive activity, a kind of theoretical ideal for which practical activity takes place. Faith emerges as a concept that encompasses both theory and practice. The theoretical (higher) knowledge, obtained through faith, is the first and the most important, because it relates to the truth of God. However, the appropriate practice, that is predetermined by this truth and is in need of this truth, is a very important moment in people’s lives, as it is related to human progress.

The epistemological categories of knowledge, wisdom, faith, theory and practice, which are being in some moving interconnections, turn out to be a system, the structural element of which is the category of grace. In this system a true knowledge cannot be in a soul, which has no grace. So is with faith. Only a person, sanctified by grace, can know what to believe in (theory) and how to act according to that belief (practice). Therefore, human cognitive activity can be righteous and successful both in its immediate and subsequent consequences only if it is combined with grace.

Thus, the philosophy of education, proposed by A. Sheptytsky in the work “Christian Righteousness” proves logically, harmoniously and

²¹⁰ Шептицький Андрей. Християнська праведність // Шептицький А. Твори-ореча. Рим, 1978. С. 258.

philosophically that between knowledge and wisdom, knowledge and goodness, theory and practice there should be no antagonistic contradictions.

On the contrary, knowledge becomes a true knowledge only when the logical-epistemological (theoretical) and praxeological (practical) aspects are combined with axiological (valuable), and when they are interpreted by the understanding of good (grace). In fact, the separation of human knowledge from its spiritual and moral foundations, the loss of good (grace) as the main reference point, leads to the “pride of mind”, which is a direct path to the “trouble from the mind”, an example of what is the current ecological state.

A. Sheptytsky assured that knowledge should not be a weapon, it is not a force in the positivist sense of the term, it is the basis for the ascension to a higher wisdom – Divine revelation through spiritual self-perfection. “The wisdom of God is the best, highest and most valuable sign of the human mind. It is the reason that a wise child stands higher than a man, who undertakes to teach others. Such a child may not have all the information, he possesses, but if he does not have the Wisdom of God, then the child exceeds him with the bright, clear and powerful sign of mind that puts that child above his intellectual conditions of life. The power of the mind and its light is not in knowing many details, but in knowing well what is known, in being as far from errors and deceptions as possible, and in having the most correct notions of common questions, bypassing, perhaps, millions of details about the conditions, the one cannot get in. The one who knows that our earth is a ball and it rotates around the sun, knows much more than the one who does not know this, but he cannot count all the grasses and their roots on the whole morgen”²¹¹.

This somewhat long quote clearly shows how far Sheptytsky was ahead of his time in his understanding of the process of knowledge. After all, he lived and created at a time when in European (and not only European) philosophy, science, education, almost individually dominated the various streams of positivism, in which knowledge is reduced to experience. For Sheptytsky cognition is an active process of consciousness activity for knowledge production. To know is not only to get certain information about the object, that is being studied, but also to understand its meaning. Information activity, which is often reduced to knowledge, is only a technical work of the mind. That is why cognition should be taken in the unity of informational and mental (hermeneutic) activity. However, this is not enough. At the end of the XX century humanity has finally realized that cognition must answer not only the questions “how?” and “why?”, but also the question “what for?”, it means that it has to carry self-esteem from the

²¹¹ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 7.

standpoint of good and evil. It is on this integrity of the process of cognition, that A. Sheptytsky focuses his attention.

Later A. Sheptytsky repeatedly returned to these problems. In particular, in the Decree of Ep. Council (1942) “On Liberal Conscience”, written by Metropolitan, he thoroughly analyzed such concepts as psyche, consciousness, conscience and morality. He points out that in some languages, including Greek and Latin, the definitions of conscience and consciousness are denoted by the same word. In the Ukrainian language these two definitions are also combined, though they are denoted by different words: so-vist (conscience), so-vidomist (consciousness). The word “sumlinnia” (conscience) consists of the same two roots – so-mninnia. Therefore, conscience should be considered as a special kind of consciousness – moral consciousness. The definition of “consciousness” in its own sense is used only to define psychological consciousness. The latter “is the sum of those observations that a person makes, while paying attention to its psyche, its inner life. It is an observation of internal phenomena, of impressions, expressed by thoughts, feelings and expressions of desire and manifestations of thinking and understanding”²¹².

Such internal observation, on the one hand, is self-awareness, a state of consciousness, when the human personality is both an object and a subject of cognition. On the other hand, consciousness cannot be reduced to self-observation: a person “only in the work observes the manifestations of actions, thoughts, desires, feelings, impressions, meanings, but it has no consciousness, no will, no mind or power to withdraw impressions from the outside world”²¹³. Therefore, the way to comprehend the powers of the soul, of own spiritual intelligence, lies through the study and understanding of the external manifestations of these powers.

A. Sheptytsky, however, states that even after going through a long and difficult path of knowledge, after discovering the presence of a spiritual being in itself, after reaching the concepts of spirituality, complexity, intelligence, immortality, etc., a human being still remains an unknown abyss for itself, an unsolved mystery, because the nature of spirituality remains beyond the limits of conscious, in the realm of the unconscious.

The supernatural world also belongs to the unconscious of a human being. The grace of God as a state, the virtues, gifts of the Holy Spirit as the power of the soul are not known in themselves, but become the object of knowledge only in actions, manifestations, and are revealed through experience and reasoning in a vague, unclear, incomplete form.

²¹² Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 310.

²¹³ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 311.

Finally, the sphere of the unconscious includes the manifestations of the organic nature of man, as well as the acts of will or reason that occur in the subconscious.

Thus, the psychological consciousness is not identical at all to the psyche, and even more – to human spirituality, it has certain limits of existence. However, the boundaries between the conscious and the unconscious are not inviolable, they depend on the abilities, experience and general education of man.

According to A. Sheptytsky, psychological observations are grouped around two objects of knowledge: on the one hand – an unchanging being, God as the Absolute-Being and the reason for everything that exists; on the other hand – the outside world, first of all – the human society. At the same time, psychological consciousness is not reduced to a simple, more or less clear, statement of the presence of phenomena and their signs. In this consciousness the object of knowledge is also our relation to God and to the outside world, to other people. “In these observations, consciousness passes into conscience, in relations with God and other people we also observe our responsibilities. Conscience is the consciousness of the moral side of our relations to God, to ourselves and to people. Just as psychological consciousness explores, understands, seeks knowledge of internal phenomena, so does conscience explore those signs or shortages that make our actions morally good or evil. It is – our actions with the knowledge of the rules of that action, with the natural law”²¹⁴. The law-maker of the natural order – law is God.

As already noted, psychological consciousness depends on the speed of reason, on the gift of observation, on education and personal experience. Conscience, in addition, is also influenced by passions, human habits, the influence of the environment, education, moral atmosphere. That’s why conscience embraces a narrower circle of phenomena of inner life than consciousness.

Moral principles, and especially the rules of applying them to life, do not lie on the surface, their awareness, their transformation into conscience requires the work of the mind, which is not always sufficient. This leads to false forms of conscience. One such form of false conscience is, according to A. Sheptytsky, a liberal conscience that denies or diminishes the meaning of moral laws, based on the individualistic principle of permissiveness. What is the result of this position is well demonstrated in the novels, written by Fyodor Dostoyevsky. However, the liberal conscience also had its apologists, the most famous of whom is F. Nietzsche. His superhuman,

²¹⁴ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 312.

blond bestia is the result of this very understanding of conscience: God is dead, so he is God himself, that is, the creator of morality.

Drawing attention to the danger of such perversions of conscience, A. Sheptytsky asks pastors and all believers to fight them. The bearer of the liberal conscience “reverses the moral order: instead of judging one’s wishes according to the prescriptions of the conscience, one judges the duties of the conscience according to the prescriptions of one’s desires. Sin becomes a second nature, the element, in which man lives, and when there are still traces of faith in him, he slowly applies the truth of faith to his way of life, transplanting the mercy and goodness of God and attributing to the Almighty the granting of such freedom, which only his own liberal conscience allows”²¹⁵. That’s why such conscience leads to a state of deep moral decline and is a severe illness of the soul, which is difficult to treat.

At the same time, A. Sheptytsky states that liberal conscience should be distinguished from the broad conscience. “The broad conscience, how it is called by the theologians, is a wise and peaceful judgment, which, in some circumstances or for some good reasons, is not bound by human law”²¹⁶. In other words, it is a conscience that is based on the so-called principle of probabilism, the essence of which is that not all moral norms have the meaning of natural, divine law and are eternal, some of them are created by humans and, therefore, can be rationally rethought, refuted and changed in the process of the historical development of mankind. However, broad conscience never leads to the denial of morality as such, which distinguishes it from the the liberal conscience.

Another very important mistake in the science of conscience, according to A. Sheptytsky, is the fact that “conscience replaces the moral law and conscience is considered to be a single rule of moral action with the objection of objective rule, which is the law”²¹⁷. Such an error is peculiar to atheism, which, inspite of its contradiction to God’s laws, acknowledges the existence and necessity of moral norms in human society. Nevertheless, moral standards must have the feature of law, which means, that they should be universally recognized and universally respected. Such status, according to atheists, is given to them by social will, public opinion. According to A. Sheptytsky, such social morality inevitably acquires the character of an imperative, an absolute, which means that it doesn’t allow not only disobedience but also criticism, and declares everything, that does not recognize it, a crime. In its relation to individual

²¹⁵ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 314.

²¹⁶ Ibid. С. 313.

²¹⁷ Ibid. С. 318.

consciousness, it will have the character of coercion, and not a voluntary duty, without which, in fact, there is no morality.

However, public opinion is not absolutely timeless, it is changing, and its declared generality cannot be a guarantee against error. “History also teaches how general thought bent in front of tyrants and how its outside look differed for its inside look”²¹⁸. In addition, a society, where all social groups and the individuals would be in total agreement on all moral principles, does not exist at all.

Thus, taking morality as the basis for public opinion, atheists, in the first place, inevitably come to deny the existence of unchanged and stable moral norms, and, secondly, they “dissolve” the individual in the society, make him a little screw in the social system.

Analyzing this issue, A. Sheptytsky raises an actual problem of the modern society. In the philosophy of morality from the time of Hegel, it is customary to distinguish between moral and morality. Special attention to this distinction was paid by the prominent Russian philosopher V. Solovyov, with whom A. Sheptytsky was personally familiar in his younger years and who influenced both the formation of the outlook and the choice of the life path of the future Metropolitan²¹⁹, which will be discussed further. According to Solovyov, morality is always corporate – it includes the principles of behavior of a particular community (class, nation, etc.), which are based on certain preferences. Moral is universal – it includes the tenets of behavior of the individual as part of the human race. Moral is an absolute morality, one at all times for all nations, for all mankind. Solovyov calls it God. That is why talking about class or national moral is groundless.

Corporate morality knows such definitions as “our”, “stranger”, “friend” and “enemy”. And from here – if the enemy does not surrender, he is destroyed, and if he surrenders – he’s also destroyed, together they destroy both the potential enemy and, in general, the suspects. Morality recognizes the absolute importance of each individual, regardless of their predicates and corporate affiliation. The murder of a savage, says Solovyov, is the same crime as the murder of a genius and a saint²²⁰.

²¹⁸ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 319.

²¹⁹ His Beatitude Lubomyr Husar noted in his doctoral dissertation: “The influence of V. Solovyov on A. Sheptytsky cannot be denied. The similarity of the ideas of these two men is striking, so we can simply say that A. Sheptytsky learned a lot from V. Solovyov. He did not take V. Solovyov literally, did not follow him in everything, but the general vision of the unity of the Church and the unification of the Churches was clearly borrowed from Solovyov” (Гузар Любомир. Андрей Шептицький Митрополит Галицький (1901-1944) провісник екуменізму. С. 59).

²²⁰ For more detail see: Соловьев В. С. Спор о справедливости: Сочинения. М.: ЗАО Изд-во ЭКСМО-Пресс, Харьков: Изд-во «Фолио», 1999. 864 с.; Соловьев В. Россия и Вселенская церковь. Минск: Харвест, 1999. 1600 с.; Соловьев В. Чтения о богочеловечестве. Духовные основы жизни. Оправдание добра. Минск: Харвест, 1999. 912 с.; Соловьев В.

Such a position is completely shared by A. Sheptytsky. In his view, neither individual nor social conscience can be the basis for moral sanctions. These sanctions belong only to a conscience, which is based on the acceptance of natural and divine law.

According to A. Sheptytsky, synthesis of psychological and moral consciousness is achieved through the unity of education and pedagogy. Therefore, the problems of education have always been in the focus of Metropolitan's attention, and he constantly mentioned them in his pastoral messages. A kind of generalization of his views was the speech "On education", proclaimed at the Ep. Cathedral in 1942. Basing on this report, on December 10, 1942 Cathedral adopted the Rules "On the Education of the Youth", which were developed by Metropolitan and, in his expression, they form a small code of Christian education. It should be noted that A. Sheptytsky himself considered this work far from complete and planned to return to it in a few years²²¹.

According to A. Sheptytsky, education is not only extremely important but it is also extremely difficult. It is "the highest and wisest problem a person can meet"²²². Therefore, following Hryhory Nazianzin, Sheptytsky calls education "the art of the arts" and "the knowledge of all knowledge".

The purpose of education, according to A. Sheptytsky, "is such a development of the child that he or she would become an adult with developed and carefully nurtured all the possibilities of mind, will and heart. That development depends, obviously, on the concept of a person, who is the leading mystery of education. This concept again depends on the whole outlook that a human has to live with"²²³.

A. Sheptytsky distinguishes three types of outlook that determine the appropriate directions and ideals of the educational process. The first is the materialistic, in which man is treated as a natural being, and therefore education is directed to develop the abilities and forces that a man has to have to meet material needs.

The second is the humanistic outlook. Here, a man is the supreme autonomous being capable of endless development of science, art and culture. The bearers of this worldview in education will seek the development of all human nature with all its attributes and powers, they will do it to flush out the bearers of the highest and most comprehensive

Философское начало цельного знания. Минск: Харвест, 1999. 912 с.; Лосев А. Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время. М.: Молодая гвардия, 2000. 613 с.

²²¹ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 255-257.

²²² Ibid. С. 255.

²²³ Ibid. С. 231.

civilization; will nurture a comprehensive knowledge, poetry and all kinds of art, creative or critical²²⁴.

The third type of outlook is Christian. In it, a person is treated as a child of God, combining natural and supernatural, and education is directed to the development of all the virtues of the Christian life, the most important of which is love for one's neighbor.

A. Sheptytsky draws attention to the fact that human love is twofold: one is the love of reason and will, the love, that Christians have to love all their neighbors; second – is the love of the heart, which encompasses all human nature and soul, it is not a subject to the order of will. "...This is the love that people naturally love their closest ones – it is the love of family, of relatives to children, of children towards relatives and among themselves. It is the love of friends and fellows, it is the love of own people"²²⁵.

The love of the mind and the will is more complete in the nature that is not spoiled, but because of perversity of human nature, because of original sin, there is a rebellion of passions against reason and will. Therefore, only the love of heart is truly Christian. According to A. Sheptytsky, this is indicated by the fact that in the Holy Scripture God represents His love to the people in expressions and images that are inherent to a human love of heart.

"The love of one's neighbor, and rather the love of God", emphasizes Sheptytsky, "the love, which embraces all our neighbors as the children of God, or at least called to become the children of God, this love raises man above all creation, above the whole material world, and teaches him, in the example of Jesus Christ, to give even his own life for salvation, for the life of neighbors. The top of that love reaches to heaven, but its foundation rests so much on human nature that there is no man, who would not feel the need for love in that natural inclination of the human heart for compassion and mercy"²²⁶.

Thus, the love of the heart is the supernatural nature, the embodiment of God's grace. However, the concept of the heart, which is widely used in theology and philosophy, but often in different meanings, needs to be invaded here. In his understanding of this concept A. Sheptytsky relies not only on the theological tradition, where, by the way, there was no unanimity in its interpretation, but also continues the traditional for the Ukrainian philosophy cordocentric line, which dates back to the times of Kievan Rus, but finds its highest incarnation in the works of H. Skovoroda and

²²⁴ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 232.

²²⁵ Ibid. С. 136.

²²⁶ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 168.

P. Yurkevych. He rightly believes that the appeal to this concept will solve the eternal problem that “divides the philosophers of antiquity, the Fathers of the Church, and all theological schools into two opposing groups, which are only rarely complemented: on the one hand, the intellectualist Aristotle and all the intellectualists of the Christianity with St. Thoma and the thomists, and on the other hand, all mystics from Plato to Bonaventure and the followers of Duns Scotus. The problem that divides them is next: whether the center of the human psyche is mind or will, intellect or affect”²²⁷.

The same problem, though in a different aspect, is inherent, in Sheptytsky’s view, to a modern theology and philosophy: identifying the concept of the heart, including Christ’s, with a certain physiological organ, which is done by some representatives of theology, leads to their confrontation with philosophy and science, “because modern philosophers place love, hatred and other affects of the spirit not in the heart as a centre, but in the brain”²²⁸.

The reason of the problem, according to A. Sheptytsky, is that there is a change in the content of concepts: the heart as a symbol for defining the inner spiritual life of a person begins to be understood as a certain material organ, and this, in turn, leads to the identification of psyche and soul, that is, in fact, to denying the latter. In addition, a human as a person is integrity, and this integrity is emphasized by the concept of “heart”, which characterizes a certain synthesis of such spiritual essential forces as reason, feelings, will, etc. Therefore, it is unlawful to take a one-sided approach to determining the essence of man, proclaiming him the bearer of reason or will, reducing the essence of man to the totality of social relations, or, conversely, extorting his fundamentally asocial individualistic-biological nature.

These are the theological and philosophical foundations of Christian education, which must make a person “a holy citizen of heaven”. A. Sheptytsky, however, notes: “Education itself, obviously, cannot do everything; the will of the man and his work over himself are very much involved. But to encourage him to do the work, to teach him to work properly over himself, to instill the love of that work in his heart and to enrich his mind with the knowledge of everything that is needed for that work, is the task of education”²²⁹.

The main link in education should be the family, because “the Christian family is a school of Christian life, and also a school of mutual, national and

²²⁷ Ibid. C. 142.

²²⁸ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 140.

²²⁹ Ibid. C. 232.

universal life. For how long this school is healthy, for how long it gives out numerous and healthy units – for so long the people are both healthy and strong²³⁰. However, the process of upbringing is not limited only to the family. Moreover, A. Sheptytsky is aware that in our time, for various reasons – circumstances of life, public school, etc. – the family has no proper influence on the upbringing of children. Therefore, in his concept, he gives a thorough analysis of the other elements and foundations of education.

To the main elements of education A. Sheptytsky includes, first, suggestion, that is, the influence of the environment on the child; secondly, science and, thirdly, the Christian atmosphere.

Suggestion is caused by the fact that a human by its nature is a social creature, therefore it is able to imitate others, to fall under the influence of the environment as a whole, and of individuals, and therefore it is not independent in concepts and actions. The value of the environment is extremely important, because it is mainly involved in the formation of outlook. The central place in this process belongs to the family, but the street, the school, the older comrades, and the whole society also significantly influence it. Therefore, the task of education is to develop in youth a kind of instinct for self-preservation, able to protect against evil suggesty.

The second element of upbringing is science, which is given to children by relatives and teachers and to which the child reaches himself through reading. It should have a good impact on the person, when, first, mind and heart of a human are developed together with knowledge and, secondly, when it gives a true and comprehensive knowledge. Otherwise, science can harm a person. “We had the opportunity”, A. Sheptytsky writes, “to learn about the influence of the materialist school. We have seen how it is able to product really good experts, but we have also seen how the materialistic worldview harms the human mind, taking away from it almost entirely the ability of abstract thinking, that is, taking away the ideas and the power of ideological thinking²³¹”.

Moreover, science, including Christian Science, can fulfill its educational function only when it is appropriately exalted, when it arouses interest, and its truths are connected with the practice of life, because even “faith without acts is dead”.

The third factor in upbringing is the Christian atmosphere. It includes, first, Christian relations in the family, that is, mutual love, respect, following

²³⁰ Ibid. C. 377.

²³¹ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 234.

of other Christian virtues in life. Secondly, it includes the Christian worldview, following the faithful, not false ideals. When parents consider “the highest and the only good a material well-being, a well-paid job for children, regardless of sphere of work and regardless of service to the Church and motherland, then such ideals will slowly instill in the souls of children. Then icons and books will not help much; they will only be the cover of gross materialism”²³². Therefore, wise parents must consciously cultivate in their children the highest ideals of Christian righteousness and holiness, the sacrificial service to God and the Church, the sincere and sacrificial love to the homeland. Third, the Christian community and the activities of pastors play an important role in shaping the Christian atmosphere. The main requirement here is not to be satisfied with the clear presentation of the truth, but to pave the way for the Word of God to human hearts, to influence the will and feelings. Because, as A. Sheptytsky notes with a humor, for the Slavs the belief of the mind has little meaning in comparison with what can be called “to get into the heart”²³³.

A. Sheptytsky considers that the basics, the most important principles of education are next: a) preservation of innocence in youth; b) fostering humility; c) fostering courage; d) fostering prayer.

The sense of innocence is to abstain from sin, of moral evil, the indignity of God, and it is the center of all the work of Christian education.

The essence of humility is the elimination of the most important obstacle to God’s Grace, which is the pride and disordered non-Christian desire for self-elevation. In applying to life, humility is the virtue that shows a person all its shortcomings and needs.

Courage is a major virtue not only in the Christian but also in the secular system of upbringing. Both these systems of education can form heroes, that is, people who are capable with their extraordinary actions “to be carried beyond their own nature and to unite some divine power in themselves”²³⁴. The difference between them is in the impetus to courage: in Christianity, such a motivating factor is the love to God, embodied in the love of one’s neighbor.

Fostering prayer means building a system of Christian upbringing in which prayer and adherence to the Holy Mysteries are not the acts of compulsion but they are voluntary acts, an indispensable element of one’s spiritual life.

²³² Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 236.

²³³ Ibid. С. 238.

²³⁴ Ibid. С. 247.

An important component of Christian education, according to A. Sheptytsky, is the formation in youth of the correct concepts of the Church and the doctrine of the Gospel. Love for the Church should be based on clear concepts of Church unity and a deep faith that there is no salvation outside the Universal Church. At the same time, youth must be nurtured in a spirit of love for the not united Orthodox, an awareness of the necessity and ways of bringing and uniting the Churches, and the church unity should be seen as an integral and dominant element of patriotic education, the formation of national unity. Only under such a condition, according to Sheptytsky, one can get rid of the false idea of patriotic upbringing as creating hatred against enemies. You can judge, you can hate the wrong concepts, mistakes, but people should always be loved everywhere.

This part of the Christian educational system seems to be the weakest in Andrey Sheptytsky's opinion. "Why do pagans come out of our Christian schools?" he asks. "Why do not Christians sometimes come out of the priestly families but worshipers of Perun, or some other god, or just people for whom "God's a stomach"?.. This is a terrible question, it is a problem that the Clergy needs to think well about. This is almost the same or exactly the same problem as if Ukrainians, who are coming out of Ukrainian families and schools, were enemies of Ukrainianness! "Could a school, or system, or family which bring up the traitors, enemies of the people, be genuinely considered a Ukrainian school, or a system, a family?!"²³⁵.

According to A. Sheptytsky, the reason for the failures and sores of our ecclesiastical and national life is that Christianity, the doctrine of the Gospel, is often treated and communicated too utilitarianly, as the doctrine of the true system of earthly life. The gospel is indeed such, but it is still the doctrine of holiness, the way to heaven. "Life, according to the doctrine of the Gospel, is the supernatural life of God's grace, the life of God's love and the sacrifice for God, or simply: the life in which one looks for holiness and moves to it"²³⁶.

It should be noted that when analyzing the problems of education, Metropolitan Andrey in his pastoral messages to the clergy and the believers constantly draws attention not only to the question of what virtues should be cultivated, but also to what Christian education should be opposed to. Destruction of people, physical and spiritual, drunkenness and the system of limitation of the posterity, neglect of labor – "are such social and folk ailments that simply lead people to the destruction. And while they are bringing it to a complete ruin, they provoke such a degeneration, such a

²³⁵ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 252.

²³⁶ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 254.

decline of every culture, such a ruin of physical health and all Christian righteousness, that those objects cannot be touched without a terrible fear about our future”²³⁷.

Thus, in his cultural, educational and pedagogical activities, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky relied on a well-reasoned, logically argued, sophisticated theological-philosophical system of beliefs that he tried to bring into life. His writings include, in addition to the above, such deeply scientific philosophical-theological and ascetic works as “God’s Wisdom”, from which only the third section (1936) is published, then a great work (in three volumes) on Metropolitan V. Rutsky, which is still a manuscript, and also translation of the works of St. Basil the Great, etc.

Metropolitan also had a great interest in church and general history. In 1921 in Rome, he founded the Ukrainian Historical and Church Mission, whose purpose was to search, register and copy the previously unknown documents from the Vatican and Roman archives that are directly related to Ukraine. Sheptytsky himself found more than 6,000 valuable documents from the times earlier than 17th century, including those, which were published after his death in the original languages in ten large-format volumes (9 books). A. Sheptytsky has been engaged in scientific work throughout his life. Even at the end of his life, despite the paralysis of his right hand and both feet, which he did not possess for the last 14 years of his life, despite the difficult duties of the Metropolitan, he spent all his free time in the personal library, which, incidentally, was one of the best not only in the Western Ukraine. However, despite its importance for the church and for him personally, his cultural, educational, pedagogical, scientific, social and political activity was not the main one. First of all, Andrey Sheptytsky was Metropolitan, for all 44 years, and even if in his actions he went beyond purely church affairs, there he also acted as the Kniaz of the Church.

²³⁷ Ibid. C. 396; 14-15; 25-28; 222-231.

PART 5.
ECUMENICAL ACTIVITY
OF METROPOLITAN ANDREY SHEPTYTSKY

In the multifaceted activity of the eminent ecclesiastical figure Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, the central issue was the problem of the unity of the Churches and the ecumenical action, associated with it, which manifested itself throughout his conscious life. According to Metropolitan, at the pan-Slavic and then at the Ukrainian level, the essence of the unification problem is the establishment of relations of cooperation and, later, the unity between the Catholic and Orthodox churches. In modern science, the term “ecumenism” (from the Greek *oikumene* – the universe, the inhabited world) – the movement for the unification of religious confessions – includes at least three directions: 1) the movement for the unification of Christian confessions; 2) integration processes of non-Christian religions; 3) coordination of the actions of Christian ecumenical organizations with non-Christian ones²³⁸. The term “ecumenical movement” is also used, it means the unification movement of Christian churches, initiated at the 1910 World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh (Scotland). P.L. Jarotsky rightly points out that “Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) takes an active part in the ecumenical meetings from the side Ukraine. However, Ukrainian Orthodoxy, which is divided into several churches, remains outside the global ecumenical movement. It has a different general goal: to reach agreement, reconciliation and unification in Ukraine by establishing a Ukrainian ecumenical movement, supported by other Ukrainian Christian churches... The development of an ecumenical movement is a complex, contradictory process...”²³⁹.

Most researchers of A. Sheptytsky’s life path and works agree that ecumenical ideas captured the future Metropolitan in a young age²⁴⁰. This was caused by the general spiritual atmosphere of the late nineteenth

²³⁸ Філософія політики: Короткий енциклопедичний словник / Автор-упорядник Андрущенко В. П. та ін. К.: Знання України, 2002. С. 213.

²³⁹ Політологічний енциклопедичний словник / Упорядник В. П. Горбатенко; За ред. Ю. С. Шемшученка, В. Д. Бабкіна, В. П. Горбатенка. 2-ге видання, доповнене і перероблене. К.: Генеза, 2004. С. 181-182.

²⁴⁰ See.: Жуковський А. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і православ’я. *Науковий збірник УВУ*. Мюнхен, 1992. С. 37-38.; Баран О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і його екуменічні ідеї. *Український Історик*. 1-4 (120-123). Т. 31. Нью-Йорк – Торонто – Київ – Львів – Мюнхен, 1994. С. 183-184.

century, when, as a result of the technological revolution, humanity had largely put international unity at the forefront and it seemed to be the right time to pursue the intention of creating or restoring the Universal Christian Church. It was no accident that at this same time such people lived and worked: V. Solovyov in Russia, Bishop J.-J. Strossmayer – in Croatia, A. Sheptytsky – in Galicia, and on the Pontifical Throne – Leo XIII with Secretary of the Secretariat of State, Cardinal M. Rampolla. Each of them, in their own way, however, all thought of one thing: how to keep the covenant of Jesus Christ about one Shepherd and one spiritual flock. It is not accidental that the named persons sought contacts with each other and were closely acquainted and sympathetic to each other.

Family traditions also played a role in the choice of A. Sheptytsky's life path. The Sheptytsky family gave Ukraine several prominent ecclesiastical figures of Catholic rites. Thus, in particular, Hieronym-Anton (1700-1799) was a bishop of the Roman Catholic rite of Polotsk, while Athanasius-Anton (1677-1746) was a bishop of Lviv, Galicia, Kamenets and also the honorary Archbishop-Metropolitan of Kyiv and of all Rus of the Greek Catholic rite; Leo (1714-1779) occupied the same positions as Athanasius-Anton, and Athanasius-Andrey (1734-1779) was a Bishop of the Catholic Rite of Perechyn²⁴¹. In spite of the fact that in the middle of the XIX century the Sheptytsky family experienced a fate, typical for the Ukrainian nobility – the final transition to Roman Catholic rite and, as a consequence, polonization – these traditions continued to live on. No wonder that in 1911, taking from Lviv citizens a portrait of a son, made in honor of the 10th anniversary of his Metropolitan's activity, A. Sheptytsky's father, Ivan, said: "I assure you, gentlemen, that I am Ukrainian. In fact, I gave you the best I had and the most expensive"²⁴². Something similar to this we can read in the memories of Sophia Sheptytska, Roman's mother: "Roman said to me more than once: "I know in detail what awaits me – the Poles will consider me Ukrainian, and the Ukrainians will treat me as a Pole, and in vain!"²⁴³. In the same work S. Sheptytska also noted that her son "suffered from a tribal strife of his people, and he depended not so much on bringing them together, but rather on obtaining for the Church of Christ the peoples, who were not true believers or who were unbelievers, even the Indians and Japanese"²⁴⁴. Therefore, at the age of 22, the future Metropolitan did not limit his ecumenical work solely to the conversion to Rome of Ukrainians who inhabited other territories and entered different states.

²⁴¹ Тожецький Р. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. *Ковчег: Збірник статей з церковної історії*. Львів, 1993. С. 101-112.

²⁴² Владика Андрей. *Альманах «Гомону України» на рік 1994*. Торонто, 1991. С. 47.

²⁴³ Молодість і покликання о. Романа Шептицького. Львів: Свічадо, 2015. С. 119.

²⁴⁴ Молодість і покликання о. Романа Шептицького. Львів: Свічадо, 2015. С. 119.

Significant influence on the formation of the views of young A. Sheptytsky and his decision to enter the bosom of the Greek Catholic Church had a trip to Kiev, made in 1887. Here he becomes acquainted with the history, art, culture of Ukraine. In Kyiv, Sheptytsky found himself in the midst of a patriotic Ukrainian intelligentsia. He was greatly impressed by the historian Volodymyr Antonovych, a Pole by descent, who broke with the Polish and joined the Ukrainians, as well as the young Mykhailo Hrushevsky. In the same year, A. Sheptytsky visits Moscow, where he meets the eminent philosopher and poet Vladimir Solovyov, who defended the idea of unity of the Christian churches as one of the main foundations of the formation of God's humanity²⁴⁵. That meeting marked the beginning of something more than just friendship. It was a rare meeting of minds during which V. Solovyov, without realizing it himself, left his legacy of unification to Sheptytsky – perhaps the only person who consistently but also critically tried to make his theory a reality²⁴⁶. It is necessary to agree with the great influence that V. Solovyov made on A. Sheptytsky. L. Husar noted: "...The similarity of the ideas of these two men is striking, so we can just say that A. Sheptytsky learned a lot from V. Solovyov. He did not take V. Solovyov literally, did not follow in everything, but the general vision of the unity of the Church and the unification of the Churches was clearly borrowed from V. Solovyov"²⁴⁷. Noteworthy is L. Husar's view that Metropolitan Sheptytsky "was not an ordinary blind imitator – he was so independent in his views that he could give a critical assessment. He could, no matter what, continue the fight where Solovyov clasped his hands and plunged into the apocalypse"²⁴⁸.

However, not only external influences led to the emergence of A. Sheptytsky's ecumenical worldview. Back in 1884, while studying at the Law Faculty of the University of Krakow and at the same time at a one-year military school, a studying that was interrupted by a serious illness, Sheptytsky became interested in the austerity of the Eastern Church and became fascinated with Greek patristics. Therefore, he supplemented his law education with philosophical and theological studies, receiving the title of Doctor of Laws, Theology and Philosophy.

Thus, long before becoming a monk, A. Sheptytsky had a clear purpose for his future activities, preparing for a difficult but noble mission: the

²⁴⁵ More on V. Solovyov's ecumenical views see: Соловьев В. С. Россия и вселенская церковь. Минск: Харвест, 1999. 1600 с.

²⁴⁶ Гузар Л. Андрей Шептицький Митрополит Галицький (1901-1944) провісник екуменізму. Жовква: Місіонер, 2015. С. 52.

²⁴⁷ Ibid. С. 59.

²⁴⁸ Гузар Л. Андрей Шептицький Митрополит Галицький (1901-1944) провісник екуменізму. Жовква: Місіонер, 2015. С. 68.

struggle for the rapprochement and unification of the Western and Eastern Churches. On March 24, 1888, A. Sheptytsky received a special audience by Pope Leo XIII, whom he confessed of his desire to become a monk of the rank of St. Basil the Great and of his plans for the union of the Churches. That same time the Pope blessed the young enthusiast for the realization of these unusual designs. It should be noted that this was their third meeting: the first was held on May 9, 1886, the second was held on February 8, 1888.

Thus, the case of the union of the Orthodox believers – Ukrainians, Russians and Belarusians – with the Apostolic Capital was the main motivation for Roman Sheptytsky's conversion from Roman Catholicism to the Union. He did not stop working to achieve this goal for the rest of his life.

However, while remaining invariably the main nerve of his multifaceted activity, the Metropolitan's views on ways to solve the problem of unity of the churches were not constant, they had been always concretizing. This gave a basis to the misrepresentation and falsification of his ideas in tsarist-Russian, Polish and Soviet official historiography. These accusations have the only source, which is embodied in the slogan: "Whoever is not with us, he is against us" – an attempt to impose a single, eternal and unchanging truth (of course, their own), which is often implicated in hatred of all "dissenters". Therefore, the convictions of Metropolitan, who was "a person belonging to the whole nation and standing above parties"²⁴⁹, provoked a fierce opposition from the enemies of the Ukrainian people. However, it would have been strange otherwise: if A. Sheptytsky did not reconcile his activity with the change of socio-political and economic realities, which Ukraine repeatedly suffered during his stay in the Metropolitan's order.

In justifying the possibilities of joining the Churches, A. Sheptytsky turns first to the Holy Scriptures, to the New Testament commands of Christ. Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky believed that church separation was a denial of the Spirit of Christ and the commandment of Christ, and an evil example for non-Christians. However, the presence of this separation is not a basis for pessimism, because it can be overpassed. According to A. Sheptytsky, in the Christian doctrine there is a union everywhere: in the Holy Trinity, in the God-human, and between God and people. Although a human was individually accepted into the body of God, now, in the mystical body, he is becoming part of the mystical community. It must contain harmony and love, which, according to A. Sheptytsky, are the reflection of the "unity" of the Holy Trinity. He describes his vision of church unity in such an example where Church is the bridge between God and people. People who want to unite with God must cross this bridge together because only this path leads

²⁴⁹ Український прапор. 1921. 21 лютого.

to the Lord. There is no room for controversy or strife on that bridge, no room for obstacles – there is only one direction and one purpose.

Finally, A. Sheptytsky emphasizes, the Doctrine of Divine Revelation needs the unity. Although, “in the depths of the revealed truth there is already everything that the Church will ever proclaim and that the Church Fathers, bishops and priests will ever preach”²⁵⁰, the Holy Scripture “is not as clear as Luther and most of the reformed theologians claimed”²⁵¹. The reason for this is the symbolic and figurative presentation of the Holy Scripture. That is why the famous Ukrainian philosopher H. Skovoroda called the Bible a symbolic world. Such a form is polysemantic, that is, it allows for multivariate content, including inadequate ones. Therefore, Kyr Andrey likens the construction of the Doctrine of Divine Revelation to the construction of a great temple, which is the work of God Almighty, but also requires the cooperation of all Christians. “Even though people of all nations and all generations of the world work in that structure, it is one-of-a-kind, such one case, which clearly shows that it is the fulfillment of God’s plan, Christ’s plan. One style, one greatness, one power, one beauty is in that temple, one spirit is in that science. Those millions of people working on that science are something one, something united by the spirit of Christ, and they are no more than a harmonized choir composed of thousands of voices. They all are unmistakable together, because St. Spirit leads them, but everyone in particular can be wrong, and very often they are wrong. Even the greatest ecclesiastical teachers, in some details, had different opinions from the general community, and because of that they were mistaken... But every mistake was always fixed by a guess, by the common science”²⁵².

Concretizing the general ecumenical ideas of the universal unity of the Christian churches, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky in his numerous works gives a thorough analysis of the question of what is common in Catholicism and Orthodoxy, and what hinders their union²⁵³. It is naturally that in the Ukrainian context these two branches of Christianity are the focus of his attention.

A. Sheptytsky refers to issues in which there are no differences between them. He mentions the common Symbol of the confession of faith, books of the Old and New Testaments, acknowledgment of all decisions of the Ecumenical Councils from the First Council of Nicaea (325) to the Second

²⁵⁰ Ibid.C. 31.

²⁵¹ Ibid. C. 74.

²⁵² Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 31-32.

²⁵³ It is appropriate to note that some researchers consider the definitions of “union” and “ecumenism” different in content. In the first case, in their opinion, it is a question of the unity of churches, in the second – only their mutual knowledge and rapprochement. (See: Жуковський А. Названа праця. С. 46-47). We use these definitions as similar.

Council of Nicaea (787). So, he states, until the XI century there was a single Ecumenical Church, the doctrine of which was accepted by St. Volodymyr during the christening of Rus.

The main definitions of the Catholic Church, given by the following Ecumenical Councils, which are not accepted by the Orthodox Church, according to A. Sheptytsky, are next: the Immaculate Conception of Virgin Mary, the origin of St. Spirit from the Father and the Son, and recognition of the primacy of the jurisdiction of the Roman Archiereus over the whole Church. The last definition was the main reason for the split of the churches. However, Sheptytsky notes, without accepting these truths, the Orthodox Church did not deny them, because such an act as the proclamation of the dogma of faith requires a decision of the Ecumenical Council, which, by their own admission, is not valid.

Of course, A. Sheptytsky goes on to say, there are other differences: “we do often hear the remark that we are so different in the most basic concepts of Christianity that even if there were not dogmatic divisions that divide us, we would still be divided by the the understandings of Christianity, of the Gospel, of salvation”²⁵⁴. Probably not, if only we perceive the church connection not as the establishment of complete unity, but as the unity of differences. “All our notions of Christianity and God-proclaimed Doctrine,” A. Sheptytsky writes, “are just a copy of God’s vision. There can be so much subjective element in that copy, or so many different definitions of objective science, that people can differ from each other in many very basic quests”²⁵⁵. This also applies to ritual differences, which, according to A. Sheptytsky, are of secondary importance, because “faith is more important than ritual”²⁵⁶.

A. Sheptytsky believes that, despite all the differences, the realization of ecumenical ideas is possible, since the union does not force the unconnected Orthodox to abandon their traditional rite or belief, but it only asks about the addition of the truths of faith, which are in the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils since the X century and till the latest days. However, there are certain conditions that have to be mutually fulfilled on this way. First, one must equally treat religion as religion, and not consider it a political tool for achieving another purpose. Second, there should be a common language, and that language is the Christian worldview. “He, who does not have a Christian worldview, uses a language that we do not understand. For whom, for example, religion is not a matter of worshiping God Almighty, then he means by that word something that I do not know. Those, who do not see in the religion the work of their eternal salvation, the obligation against God,

²⁵⁴ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 337-338.

²⁵⁵ Ibid. С. 338.

²⁵⁶ Ibid. С. 266.

the Divine Law and danger, when that Law is not fulfilled – for them religion is obviously something different than what it should be for the Christian. For whom Christ is not God and Savior, for whom His Sacraments are not instruments of salvation, not only in the theory of catechism, hidden somewhere in the library, but as real needs and everyday concepts of life, so it is difficult to understand him or her in the case of religion, no matter what religion they belong to”²⁵⁷.

Finally, third, the movement to the understanding and unification of the Eastern and Western Churches must be based not only on the unilateral concessions, but it should be also based on the mutual agreement. It cannot be declared from the “top” by church institutions, but it must be based on the activity of the believers. A. Sheptytsky most clearly stated this opinion at the Roman Conference of the Eastern Churches in 1923 in his programmatic report on the universal union of the Churches and religious cooperation between East and West. He said next: “Eastern communities came to a Church unity not because of decrees that came from above, but rather because of the ideological movement that moved in them and constantly strengthened, until it shook the inert masses of people. It is clear that in the future only in this way, that is, through ideas, we will be able to reach unity, and only in this way we will be able to persuade the masses and bring them together. We hope and believe that the concept and prejudice of Eastern Christians will change in the direction of moral integrity, which will lead them to the ideas of universality. – And because this can be expected, it is necessary to create a similar ideological movement in the Catholic Church”²⁵⁸.

In the deep conviction of Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky, an important place in the process of unification of the Western and Eastern Churches belongs to the Greek Catholic Church, which combines the universal faith with the rite, “which is also called the Greek rite, the Byzantine rite and Eastern rite”²⁵⁹. Therefore, because of the isolation of the rite, and because the fact that Greek Catholic Church, together with language and culture, is a factor that distinguishes Ukrainians from their eastern and western neighbors, it must become a link between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, the Western and Eastern worlds in general.

However, in order to fulfill its missionary action, the Greek Catholic Church must also undergo some changes. It is worth discussing this issue in more detail, because during the life of Metropolitan and in the modern theological, scientific, and journalistic literature of some sort, there is an

²⁵⁷ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 339.

²⁵⁸ Баран О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і його екуменічні ідеї. *Український Історик*. 1-4 (120-123). Нью-Йорк – Торонто – Київ – Львів – Мюнхен, 1994.. С. 185.

²⁵⁹ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 266.

accusation of A. Sheptytsky that his ecumenical activity was an attempt to convert the Orthodox into the Catholics. In reality, the activities of Metropolitan combined two directions: first, the struggle for the preservation of the features of the Greek Catholic rite and, secondly, the attempts of spreading the ideas and affairs of the union, not only to the East but also to the West.

This is evidenced by the history itself. XIX century for the Greek Catholic Church was marked by the struggle for the preservation of its national character. Moscophilia from the inside, Latin and Russian influences from the outside led to complete chaos in the rite's affairs. If Moscophilia in the late XIX – early XX century was gradually losing its influence, the processes of Latinization continued to threaten the loss of identity of the Greek Catholic Church. Metropolitan Sheptytsky's first steps were in order to restore the rite's affairs, to return to the true Eastern Orthodox tradition. This question remained the focus of his attention throughout his life.

First of all, A. Sheptytsky tries to find out the internal and external causes of Latinization. "Since the Union of Brest", he writes, "Holy See left us a wide freedom, expressing only the desire that we keep our ordinances and customs unchanged. And we, while exercising that freedom, eventually separated in ceremonial practices, because some of our priests adhered to one ritual customs and some adhered to other."²⁶⁰

Such separation was exacerbating by the absence of a single center for the publishing of liturgical books. The scattered book publishing led to arbitrary changes and omissions in the liturgical books at the initiative of book publishers, or even the Ordinaries of some eparchies.

The Zamostia Council in 1720 had to restore the unity in ceremonial matters. However, approving the two ceremonial changes, the Council silenced everything else, which meant their toleration. All this contributed to the spread of tendencies towards the convergence of Greek Catholic and Roman Catholic rites.

In addition, as A. Sheptytsky emphasizes, "to our parents... it seemed that they needed, at least through small customs and practices, to get as close as possible to the Latin rite, in order to earn for themselves the opinion of true Catholics in the eyes of the Latins, the closest neighbors, as in the eyes of the Latins from the western parts of Europe and in Rome. This thought pushed many of our priests to receive an unlawful customary from the Latin rite, because it was not approved by the Holy See and even by the church authority in our Church"²⁶¹.

²⁶⁰ Баран О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і його екуменічні ідеї. *Український Історик*. 1-4 (120-123). Нью-Йорк – Торонто – Київ – Львів – Мюнхен, 1994. С. 123.

²⁶¹ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 154.

External factors also significantly influenced the spread of the Latinization of the rite. During the counterattack of Polish chauvinism in Galicia, which took place after 1848, the Latinization of church was considered and was used as one of the most effective factors of the spread of Catholicism, and later on, the polonization of the region's population.

Latin tendencies also strengthened the actions of the Russian tsarist authorities aimed at the destruction of the Greek Catholic Church, first in the Belarus, in Polotsk and Viennese eparchies and in Volyn in the 1830s, and then in the Chelm Land in the 1870s. The struggle with the church was carried out here under the slogan "purification of our rite from all Latinizations", and, in fact, it was aimed at the outburst of Russian state orthodoxy and the russification of the population. Therefore, Latinization began to be seen as a means of preserving national identity and defending one's religion. The situation was complicated further by the fact that the prohibition to change ceremonial practices in Eparchy, issued by Holy See after the events in the Chelm Land, was perceived by the proponents of the Latin direction as the full approval and sanctification of the Latin practices of the Greek Catholic rite in general.

The actions of the Russian occupying power in Galicia during the First World War also contributed to the spread of Latinization. This authority, which, according to Hrushevsky, was represented by police and bureaucratic powers, proclaimed the transition to Orthodoxy as one of the most important measures of loyalty of the population. And it did not only proclaim, but also persistently began to implement the official ideology of autocracy by the most violent methods. No wonder the leader of the Cadet Party, P. Miliukov, in 1915 stated: "We have pushed out our dear Ukrainian people with our actions in Galicia and have darkened the clear face of the liberation war"²⁶².

Thus, the struggle against Latinization was also difficult because "ceremonial questions were always considered as political and political questions always had a dogmatic coloring. It was not a question of whether such a practice was legitimate, but whether that practice brought us closer to the Russian Church, or vice versa"²⁶³. At the same time, as Metropolitan notes, often they do not pay attention even to the fact that the Russian Church under the patriarch Nikon underwent ceremonial reforms, during which many valuable parts in the Holy Scripture, that were contained in the the texts of Skaryna and the Ostroh Bible, had been removed.

Overcoming Latinization was not only indispensable for the preservation of the identity of the Greek Catholic Church, but was also a necessary prerequisite for the further development of inter-church unification

²⁶² Заборовський Я. Ю. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Нарис про життя і служіння церкви та народові (1865-1944 рр.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. С. 30.

²⁶³ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 155.

processes. Almost throughout the XIX century, the theologians of the Latin Church have little interest in the problem of uniting the Churches, considering it irrelevant. The neglect of the Eastern Church, neglect of its peculiarities, led to the fact that “when long ago the Ecumenical Bishops in their encyclicals considered the question of the Eastern rites, and when they always returned to the principle that the Universal church wants to pass on its faith to all the united Churches and the believers, and not the Latin rite (ut omnes catholici fiant, non ut fiant latini) – the theologians, were not very animated by this principle, many of them had a desire that The Church also resisted the unity of the rites, and wanted the Eastern rites to be close as much as possible to the Latin rite”²⁶⁴. A. Sheptytsky emphasizes that such an opinion was quite widespread not only among our closest neighbors, but also among many theologians, prelates, priests, bishops of the Western Europe. Much of the Greek Catholic clergy supported the need for rapprochement in religious affairs, even those who had completed their studies at foreign universities, seeing this as a surefire way to create a good opinion about them between Western theologians. For this reason, “who dared to wear a beard, a wide-sleeved cowl, and to hold the ordinances during the Church service, as prescribed in the church books, then he could be easily suspected that he had a tendency to break away from the Universal Church”²⁶⁵.

However, in the last third of the XIX century the situation is radically changing. If earlier Byzantine history, law, art, religion were considered to be of little interest and were hardly explored, now they have begun to arouse the interest of scholars. In Western Europe, there are numerous studies on these issues, and the departments of Byzantinism are opened in the universities. The fall of tsarist power in Russia led to a resurgence of hope for the unification of the Churches and a complete change in the perception of the Eastern Church and its rite among Western theologians. But, unfortunately, these processes had little impact on the situation in the Greek Catholic Church, where Latin trends continued to grow. Therefore, in A. Sheptytsky’s deep conviction, only a return to the original liturgical law, the restoration of ceremonial practices and customs, “which would not offend or push away our brothers from us and from the universal faith”²⁶⁶, will allow the Greek Catholic Church to fulfill its historic purpose.

Consequently, it is from addressing the internal problems of the Greek Catholic Church that A. Sheptytsky begins his activity towards the union. He kept repeating to his believers that he requires three things: first, to know their faith well, secondly, to know the faith of the Orthodox brothers, and third, to pray for unification. Moreover, he expected the believers to treat the

²⁶⁴ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання. Львів, 1991. С. 155.

²⁶⁵ Ibid. С. 160.

²⁶⁶ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 150.

Orthodox honestly and cordially, he emphasized, referring to the practice of the Holy See, that those who are not unified should not be called schismatics, asked to avoid in the communication with them, “such conversations that would stimulate abandonment of the Orthodox faith or its’ renunciation”²⁶⁷. But A. Sheptytsky demanded the same attitude towards the Greek Catholic Church from the side of the unconnected Orthodox.

However, the main place in the ecumenical struggle of Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky was occupied by the work on the spreading of the ideas of union and the mutual rapprochement of the Churches. It, like other Metropolitan’s affairs, has undergone a significant evolution, in which, of course, it is quite possible to distinguish several stages. The first of them covers the period from the 1880-90’s to the beginning of the XX century. During this period, A. Sheptytsky thought that he would be able to achieve church unity in all the expanses of the Russian Empire.

In the Roman decree, which gave A. Sheptytsky the authority of the Metropolitan, it was written that he, like his predecessors, also became Bishop of Kamyanyets-Podilsky, along with the dignity of Archbishop of Lviv. The Eparchy of Kamyanyets-Podilsky belonged to the Halician Metropolitan since 1807, but its territory was within the Russian Empire. Therefore, A. Sheptytsky addresses a letter to Pope Pius X, in which he questions the possibility of exercising jurisdiction in the territory of the mentioned empire. Pope Pius X confirmed this jurisdiction, noting, however, the need for favorable political circumstances. In his letter of February 1906, the Pope, at the same time as Metropolitan Andrey was named Apostolic Administrator of the Eparchy of Kamyanyets-Podilsky, granted A. Sheptytsky authority throughout the Russian Empire. These extraordinary rights and powers were confirmed by Pope Pius X (in 1909, 1910 and 1914), by Benedict XV and by Pius XI. For the sake of caution before the Russian government, full ownership was kept secret and was known only to the Pope and the Metropolitan.

However, certain opportunities for the work on union in the territory of the empire emerged only after the revolution of 1905, when freedom of conscience was established in Russia. In the first half of 1907, A. Sheptytsky presented to Pope Pius X his plans to organize a Catholic church in the territories of Ukraine, Belarus and Russia. It was a about consecrating priests and bishops of the Greek Catholic rite, to which the Pope agreed. In the autumn of 1907, A. Sheptytsky makes a secret trip through the territory of the Russian Empire under the name of Dr. Olesnytsky. This trip was fraught with great risk because Sheptytsky could be seized and charged with espionage, especially after someone had stolen his illegal passport on the

²⁶⁷ Ibid. C. 79.

way. Metropolitan visited Vilno, Minsk, Slutsk, Moscow, and St. Petersburg. In Belarus, A. Sheptytsky conducted secret negotiations with the local intelligentsia and the university youth and found many supporters of the church unification. And in Russia, with the help of some Old Believers, the pro-Catholic intellectuals and the clergy of the Russian Orthodox Church, committed to the Catholic Church, A. Sheptytsky established several secret Greek-Catholic congregations²⁶⁸. He also appointed Fr. Alexei Zerchaninov as a General of the Kamyanets-Podilsky eparchy and a pastor for Catholics of the Byzantine rite in Russia. Unfortunately, during this trip, A. Sheptytsky was unable to visit Ukraine, because Austrian government circles feared that the tsar's secret service could catch him and send him to Siberia²⁶⁹. Metropolitan was able to visit Kyiv only in 1912. Here he sent a memorial service for Taras Shevchenko in the church of St. Nicholas and delivered a patriotic sermon about Great Kobzar. In order to fully appreciate the significance of this act, it should be mentioned that in those days the tsarist government forbade public celebrations of Shevchenko's anniversaries.

In 1906, the Brotherhood of Prayer of the Cyril and Methodius Apostolate in Moravia put forward the idea of the annual congresses of the Slavic peoples and the Slavic Churches, Catholic and Orthodox, at the tomb of St. Methodius in Velehrad for the purpose of mutual knowledge and cooperation in the unification of the Christian world. Having learned about this idea of the Moravian clergy, A. Sheptytsky supported it fervently and soon, according to the Duke von Otrahsen, became the soul of this idea²⁷⁰. Thanks to its activities, the Congress of Velehrad became a kind of flag of church unity. They substantiated the thesis of the equality of ordinances in the Ecumenical Church, created a solid nucleus of the ecumenical movement, which sincerely desired church unity, and put this movement on solid theological and dogmatic foundations.

The first congress in Velehrad took place on July 24-27, 1907. Its program included reports from all of the best theologians and scholars of the East and West, which sparked lively discussions. Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky presided at this congress and in his opening address outlined a number of issues that, in his opinion, should have been raised at the Congresses of Velehrad: "1) scientific, theological and historical questions about both Churches and clarifications of the basics of both Churches doctrines, 2) practical issues such as: possible elimination of existing misunderstandings and gossips between Catholics and Orthodox, and

²⁶⁸ See.: Кравченко О. Велетень з Святоюрської гори. Йорктаун, 1963. С. 16-20.

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Кравченко О. Велетень з Святоюрської гори. Йорктаун, 1963. С. 20.

establishment of friendly relations on a purely scientific basis between Catholic and Orthodox theologians”²⁷¹.

At the second congress in 1907, Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky was again elected a chairman and he proclaimed a program report, in which he thoroughly substantiated ecumenical ideas and outlined his views on possible ways of their realization. Unfortunately, Metropolitan could not attend the third congress, because in July 1911 he was bedridden with illness, but the congress did not forget about him and elected an honorary chairman. Due to the First World War, the periodicity of the congresses was broken and the fourth Congress was held only in 1924. However, Metropolitan could not attend at this Congress because the chauvinistic authorities of Poland did not issue visas to either him or J. Slipyi.

The last Congress of Velehrad, at which A. Sheptytsky was present and delivered the report, the fifth in number, took place in 1927. At the following congresses – VI in 1932 and VII in 1936 – delegation of the UGCC included bishops who, in their activities, relied on the ecumenical ideas of Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky. Unfortunately, the VII Congress, appointed in 1939, did not take place due to the outbreak of World War II. However, it is difficult to overestimate the significance of the Congresses of Velehrad and the work A. Sheptytsky did there.

Metropolitan paid great attention to the communications with the Roman Catholic clergy and the intellectuals of Galicia and Volyn at the Union Conferences in Pinsk, initiated by the Holy Conference for the Eastern Churches. Unlike the congresses in Velehrad, the conferences in Pinsk were practical. There were six in total: in 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1935 and 1937.

In December 1936, again on the initiative of Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky, the fifth Union Congress was convened in Lviv. For three days, more than 150 participants were present in the walls of the Theological Academy – mostly clergy from three eparchies of Galicia. Rector of the Theological Academy Fr. J. Slipyj, on the instructions of A. Sheptytsky and relying on his ecumenical ideas, made a Main report, titled “A Look at the United and Not United Churches of the East and the Dogmatic Differences Between Them”. The purpose of the report was to “look closely at the Eastern Churches, of which we know, unfortunately, very little and with whom we maintain very weak links, even though we have inherited Christ’s faith, rite and culture from them. Undoubtedly, this approach will broaden our knowledge and will place the case of union in its original breadth, allowing us to make some necessary conclusions. We, fascinated by the splendor and power of Western culture, did not pay much

²⁷¹ Ibid. C. 21-22.

attention to the ancient East and therefore lost our perspective on the area and the history in which we grew up”²⁷².

Having considered in the report the main groups of the Christian Churches of the East, Fr. J. Slipyi, following A. Sheptytsky, sharply opposes the attempts of the Latinization of the Eastern Churches, indicating that “the cognition of the East, the love and preservation of its traditions – this is the path to unity, as indicated by the Popes. The United Churches must keep the Evidence faithfully in order not to be separated from their unrelated brethren in the rites and scriptures of their Church. The fewer accusations, biases and differences, the faster the rapprochement will become.

Theologians do not dare to destroy, as Latin theologians themselves rightly claim, what oriental Christianity created in the rite and discipline. Because they would break the valuable heritage of the Church, which is neither Greek nor Latin, but it is Catholic”²⁷³.

Josyf Slipyi emphasized the special role of the Ukrainian Church in the ecumenical movement, initiated by Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, its mission among the Churches of the Christian East. Thus, Metropolitan had a worthy assistant and a follower in his person.

At the same time, according to Ukrainian researchers (S. Baran, V. Doroshenko), at the beginning of his activity on unification A. Sheptytsky felt an acute shortage of educated staff capable of working on the rapprochement of Western and Eastern Christian churches. Therefore, in addition to sending the most gifted seminarians to theological studies to the best religious institutions in Europe, Metropolitan restores the activity of the ancient – since the XI century – the rank of the fathers of the Studites. He founded the first monastery for them in 1903 in the suburb of Lviv – Sknyliv. It is important to note that the rank adhered not only to the Eastern rite, but also to the rules of monastic life. In 1905, A. Sheptytsky developed a new monastic charter for the rank – Tipikon, which was approved by all bishops of the archdiocese the following year. Archimandrite of the Rank was Metropolitan himself. In 1919, the monastery was moved to Unev near Przemysl. In 1939, the Rank consisted of 132 monks and nearly 50 nuns.

For the same purpose, Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky invites the Fathers of the Belgian Order of the Redemptorists for missionary work in Galicia in 1913. In order to act more successfully, the monks accepted the Eastern rite and subsequently created an eastern branch of the Order. In 1938, after 23 years of activity in the territory of Galicia, the Order numbered 50 priests,

²⁷² Гринів О. Йосиф Сліпий як історик, філософ, педагог. Львів, 1994. С. 28.

²⁷³ Ibid. С. 29.

20 students of theology, 34 brothers-assistant, 14 novices and candidates, and 115 students of the Little Seminary²⁷⁴.

However, Metropolitan's hopes that these two monastic congregations would have a significant impact on the revival of the processes of unification were not fulfilled, since their activities were mainly limited to the Lviv Archdiocese.

World War I hit a hard blow to the ecumenical ideas of A. Sheptytsky. The outrageous behavior of the Russian occupation administration in Galicia has already been discussed. It also paid its "attention" to Metropolitan himself. On September 3, 1914, Russian troops captured Lviv. The Orthodox Archbishop of Zhytomyr and Volyn Evlogiy arrived with the Russian army. Having a frankly anti-Ukrainian position, he saw a great danger to his plans in the speeches of Metropolitan Andrey against the violent introduction of the Russian Orthodox Church, his activity on unification, and, therefore, he insisted on the arrest of A. Sheptytsky²⁷⁵. In this he was supported by the tsarist governor of Galicia and Bukovyna, Count Y. Bobrynsky. As the fullness of power was in their hands, the fate of Metropolitan was predetermined. They needed only a formal occasion. On Sunday, September 6, 1914, A. Sheptytsky had a service in the Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Lviv, after which, as always, he delivered a short sermon. In it, Metropolitan asked to pray for millions of soldiers on both sides of the front, described the terrible state of Galicia, which became an arena for war battles from the first days of the war, called for mutual understanding between Galicians and Russians. "We must know ourselves", he said, "though in many respects we are like ourselves. They have a service the same as ours, they call themselves "Orthodox" and we are "Orthodox". Our Orthodoxy is ecclesiastical, their Orthodoxy is the state Orthodoxy, that is to say, a "treasury" one, which means that they base their Orthodoxy on the state power, we derive that power from the unity with the Holy Catholic Church, through which the grace of God emerges and in which there is a true source of salvation"²⁷⁶.

It was these words that led to the arrest of Metropolitan on September 19, 1914 and to his the exile first to Kyiv and then to Russia: to Nizhny Novgorod, Kursk, Suzdal, Yaroslavl. In Suzdal, A. Sheptytsky was imprisoned in a monastery-prison. The conditions of imprisonment were

²⁷⁴ Заборовський Я. Ю. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Нарис про життя і служіння церкви та народові (1865-1944 рр.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. С. 24-25.

²⁷⁵ Often the fate is very bizarre – it is good or cruel. In 1919, escaping from the Bolsheviks, the Metropolitan of Kiev Anatoly Khrapovytsky and Archbishop Evlogiy Georgievsky (that same) arrived and were arrested by the Polish authorities. A. Sheptytsky not only sought their release, but also granted them, as well as Bishop Alexei Dorodnitsyn, a shelter in his ward for any term they needed.

²⁷⁶ Світильник Істини. Торонто – Чикаго, 1976. Т. 2. С. 133-134.

very harsh: the low cell did not allow him to stand in full height, Metropolitan was forbidden to talk, to write letters, to leave the cell and even the church.

In defense of the “tsarist prisoner”, progressive figures of Russia, including the writer V.G. Korolenko, the European press, the Austrian and German governments, the Spanish king, the European aristocratic nobility, the Apostolic See, made a protest. Following the retreat of the tsarist troops, the Lviv community twice appealed to Nikolai II to release Metropolitan, because there was no need in hostages any more. However, months, years passed, and there was no answer.

Only in March 1917, at the request of Nikon, Metropolitan of Krasnoyarsk, the government of O. Kerensky finally released A. Sheptytsky from imprisonment. Nikon demanded: “...to release the great sufferer Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, who in the difficult moment for his peoples did not leave them, but remained with them, and for that he was imprisoned, which disgraced the whole Russia to the world”²⁷⁷.

However, even under such unfavorable conditions, A. Sheptytsky tried to use his captivity to attempt to register the Greek Catholic Church in Ukraine and Russia. During his brief stay in Kyiv in 1914, Sheptytsky dedicated Fr. Joseph Botsian, Rector of Lviv Theological Seminary as Bishop of Lutsk. After his release, at the end of May 1917, Metropolitan convened a Synod of the Russian Catholic Church in Petrograd, consisting of 8 Orthodox priests, during which he nominated Fr. Leonid Fedorov as his exarch of the whole of Russia, and two other exarchs were appointed for Belarus and Ukraine, in particular, Fr. Volodymyr Hromnytsky – as an exarch for Eastern Ukraine, and Fr. Mykhailo Tsehelsky – as the General Vicar. The newly created structure of the Greek Catholic Church in the East existed until the arrivals of the Bolshevik power, when it was liquidated, like all other churches.

During his forced stay in Russia, A. Sheptytsky had the opportunity to get acquainted with the upbringing, the structure of the Russian Orthodox Church, to feel its prejudiced attitude towards the West. Here he also realized that the West did not know the East sufficiently. Therefore, in order to increase and unite the Churches, the West must study not only Eastern theology, but also the psychology and ideology of Eastern Christianity. In his view, several institutions had to be set up in the West for an in-depth study of Eastern Christianity.

On the advice of A. Sheptytsky, Pope Benedict XV created the Roman Oriental Institute and handed it over to Benedictines. However, Metropolitan Andrey was not satisfied with the establishment of only one institute. He

²⁷⁷ Заборовський Я. Ю. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Нарис про життя і служіння церкви та народові (1865-1944 рр.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. С. 28.

personally addressed the Benedictines to establish their own institution or the center for oriental studies. This led to appearance of the Eastern Benedictine Monastery in Anei. In response to the formation of this monastery, the Dominicans set up a “True” – an Orthodox Studies Center in Paris; and in the Netherlands Kyr Andrey started personally the “Apostolate of the Unification” to learn about the East. All these institutions began to publish scientific journals. Due to the efforts of A. Sheptytsky, ecumenical ideas also spread in Spain – a review “Obza del oriente Kristiano” was published here – and in England, where the journal “The Eastern Churches Quaterly” began to be published.

However, A. Sheptytsky did not limit himself only to organizational activities. Being in Rome in 1921-22, before and after his great pastoral journey, during which he visited the Ukrainian diaspora in France, Belgium, Holland, England, Canada, USA, Brazil, Argentina, A. Sheptytsky not only met Pope Benedict XV and Pius XI personally, described them the terrible state of Galicia under Polish occupation and told them about his plans, but he also gave several public lectures on the idea and missionary capabilities of the union.

For the same purpose, that is, to encourage and prepare the Galician clergy for missionary work in the East, on December 16, 1923, Metropolitan founded the Theological and Scientific Society. At the scientific sessions of the Society, up to 1939, 25 reports were listened, most of them ecumenical.

In February 1928, Metropolitan opened the Greek Catholic Theological Academy in Lviv, which was to become “the foundation of the spiritual revival of Our People and the preparation of our Holy Church to fulfill the great mission in the vineyard of Christ, on Ukrainian Land and among the peoples of Eastern Europe...”²⁷⁸, to serve the case of the religious union between East and West. A. Sheptytsky also directed other educational institutions of the Greek Catholic Church to accomplish this task.

It is clear that during the period between the two world wars, Metropolitan’s major efforts were directed towards the restoration of the Greek Catholic parish in Galicia, which upon his return from exile he found in complete ruin. This work took place in the difficult conditions of the advancement of Polish chauvinism, which could not bypass Metropolitan himself. Repeated arrests, systematic harassment in the press, both Polish and “homegrown” – radical, pro-communist, as well as in the autocephalous periodicity of Canada and the USA, constant slanders on A. Sheptytsky from the top of the Polish clergy to the Apostolic See, and to Pope personally – such was an atmosphere in which Metropolitan had to act. However, the

²⁷⁸ Греко-Католицька Богословська Академія у Львові в другому трьохліттю свого існування (1931-1934). Львів, 1934. С. 28.

very fact that A. Sheptytsky was almost constantly in the spotlight testifies to the importance of his activity and undeniable personal authority.

However, as can be seen from the above, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky did not leave ecumenical issues even in this situation, although the conditions for the practical realization of his plans on unification worsened.

Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky's pastoral letter of August 2, 1938, "In the case of the Chelm Land", which referred to the protection of the Orthodox Church in the Ukrainian lands that were part of Poland, caused the great public resonance and had positive consequences. In this letter addressed to the Greek-Catholic clergy, Metropolitan sharply condemns the brutal action of the Polish government, which, with the help of administrative and police factors, pursued a policy of banning Orthodox churches in the Chelm Land and forcing the Orthodox to convert to Catholicism.

Destruction of the Orthodox churches led by starosts of the povits and by Polish state police began in the winter of 1937 and acquired a large size in the spring of 1938. It was held under the slogans of "equalization of historical injustices" and "destruction of traces of captivity". In the Chelm Land and Pidliashia region, the Poles out of 389 Orthodox churches turned 149 into Roman Catholic churches, and they completely destroyed 189. There were unique monuments of church architecture among the destroyed churches. At the same time, the cemeteries near the churches were often destroyed, the remains of the Orthodox were thrown out of the graves with the greatest abuse, the religious and national feelings of the Orthodox believers were ridiculed.

In his message, Metropolitan Andrey stood up for the protection of "persecuted brothers, of our not-united Orthodox Christians of Volyn, Chelm Land, Pidliashia and Polissia"²⁷⁹. After listing the devastation caused by this action, Metropolitan of Lviv and Galicia states: "The whole Orthodox population of Poland is alarmed. The population of the Chelm Land is wounded into the most holy and noblest of feelings. And all those, who are united with the Universal Church in the East, are feeling sorry for the blow, that a case of the union..."

The events in the Chelm Land obliterate in the souls of the Orthodox, our not-united brothers and sisters, the very idea of the possibility of union, present the Ecumenical Church as hostile and dangerous to the Orthodox people. In the eyes of the multi-million population of Poland, the Apostolic Capital is represented as an accessory in the case of destruction. A new abyss is opening up between East and West"²⁸⁰.

²⁷⁹ Науковий збірник УВУ. Т. 15. Мюнхен, 1992. С. 49.

²⁸⁰ Науковий збірник УВУ. Т. 15. Мюнхен, 1992. С. 49.

According to the author of the message, the anti-Christian acts and facts of religious persecution are a triumph for the enemies of the Church – the Masons, who have caused a “moral blow to the very idea of uniting the Churches and to the authority of the Universal Church and the Apostolic Capital”²⁸¹.

The message was published on the front page of the newspaper “Dilo” (dated August 23, 1938) and was immediately banned by Polish censorship. However, the Polish police could not confiscate the circulation of the newspaper: anticipating this, the printing and editorial staff was able to get ahead of the police and take out and distribute the entire printing of the issue. Sheptytsky’s protest became widely known not only in Poland but throughout Europe. The Vatican intervened, and the violent Catholicization of the Orthodox Ukrainian population was stopped.

The beginning of World War II, the annexation of Western Ukraine and Western Belarus to the USSR, in accordance with the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, revived the hopes of A. Sheptytsky to carry out an ecumenical action in the territory of the whole East. As early as September 7, 1939, he convened a secret meeting of the Exarchs to discuss his plans about union. Using the powers granted to him by Pope Pius X and confirmed by his successors, Metropolitan Sheptytsky on October 9, 1939 created four new exarchates, covering the entire Soviet Union: exarchate of Volyn and Chelm Land, headed by bishop Mykola Chernetsky; exarchate for Belarus (Father Anthony Nemansevych); exarchate of Great Russia and Siberia (Father Abbot Clementiy Sheptytsky); exarchate for Great Ukraine (Dnieper Ukraine) (Archbishop Josyf Slipyi)²⁸². At the same time, on October 10, 1939, Metropolitan writes a letter to Pope Pius XII asking him to confirm the authority given to him by Pope Pius X and permission to consecrate Archbishop Fr. Josyf Slipyi as his helper with a right of succession. Two weeks later, the Congregation for the Eastern Church fulfilled the request of Metropolitan. However, his new powers canceled the previous ones. Therefore, on October 12, 1940, Metropolitan Andrey informed the four exarchs that he no longer had even the power to accept their release from the duties and that he leaves them with a conscientious choice of further course of action.

A. Sheptytsky connects certain new prospects for his traditional work on the unification of the Churches with the advance of German troops and the occupation of Ukraine, Belarus and a part of Russia. He was quickly convinced, however, that the occupation policy of the Third Reich in the East would not make it possible to carry out an action on unification in full.

²⁸¹ Ibid. C. 50.

²⁸² See: Артикули для започаткування процесу беатифікації і канонізації Слуги Божого Андрія Шептицького. Рим, 1958. С. 26.

The Germans forbade the missionary activities of Catholic priests; they arrested and executed Exarch Nemantsevych and many lower-ranking clergy...

That is why, from the end of 1941 a new stage of A. Sheptytsky's activity on unification begins: from now on his Christian "oikumen" is restricted to the territories of Ukraine. He directs all his efforts towards rapprochement and the future unification of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic churches, because "no people suffered in education so much from the unhappy separation of the Churches as the Ukrainian people"²⁸³. According to A. Sheptytsky, church unity is indispensable because of three main considerations. First, such unity, he believed, would be an important factor in the union of Ukraine with the West, because in a cultural and spiritual sense, Ukrainians belong to the European, rather than Euro-Asian (or Asian-European, according to the apt expression of the famous poet M. Brodsky) continent. Therefore, A. Sheptytsky writes, since ancient times, "in Ukraine, as today, smarter people have seen... that the future of the people is in conjunction with the West, because only this union is able to distinguish our nation from the neighbors of the north and northwest. They understood that only a religious connection could secure a future connection with the culture of the West, because the West would not recognize us, if we will be for a long time religiously connected with Asia. And we have no other way of getting connections with Western culture, except with the help of some direct connection that would jump over our closest neighbors from the West. And such a connection can only be a religious connection"²⁸⁴.

Secondly, the union with the Universal Church would become a model of national unity, of which the Ukrainian people dreamed for centuries. "In church unity," A. Sheptytsky noted, "we will have not only strength but also an example of what national unity should look like. From the structure of a single, holy, universal apostolic Church, we will be able to learn and attest to what should be the sovereign leading unity of the Ukrainian people"²⁸⁵.

Finally, thirdly, the religious and national processes of unity of the people are interconnected and interdependent and do not exist without one another. According to A. Sheptytsky, "Ukrainians are faced with such an absolute need to do everything in their power to achieve national unity, without which all our ideals and works for church unity will be dispelled, that is again one of the most important conditions of national unity"²⁸⁶.

However, the real state of affairs at the time was disappointing: the war sharpened religious, national, and political contradictions. "There is no need

²⁸³ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 76.

²⁸⁴ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 356.

²⁸⁵ Гриньох І. Слуга Божий Андрей. *Благовісник Єдності*. Мюнхен, 1961. С. 198.

²⁸⁶ Шептицький Андрей. За одність Церкви. *Логос*. 1952. Т. 3. № 3. С. 163.

in other enemies”, A. Sheptytsky notes with pain and bitterness, “when Ukrainians themselves are enemies of Ukraine, who hate each other and do not even feel ashamed of that hatred! As long as there is no Christian unity between us, for so long will our weakest opponent be stronger than we are! As long as Ukrainians in their national affairs will be remembered more for their own individual good, for so long the common cause will not be able to develop successfully. Because there will be no common cause, because it will not be in the minds and in the conscience of the people!”²⁸⁷.

Therefore, the main task that Metropolitan set before the clergy and believers is next: “There is no greater sign for our people today, as unity, and no more important work for our clergy than the work on the national and Christian unity of the people. These two works are complementary”²⁸⁸. Such activity, according to A. Sheptytsky, should not only be considered as one of the main manifestations of the moral obligation of the love of God, which is embodied in Christian love for one’s neighbor, but it also should be considered as the most important element of Christian patriotism. This is not a political, not a pagan patriotism, in which “love to ours is received with the hatred of all others”²⁸⁹. The essence of Christian patriotism, according to A. Sheptytsky, is that, while loving all peoples of the world with the love of one’s neighbor, own people, the Ukrainian people, must be loved with a Christian love more than other peoples, and we must be prepared to give our people a lifetime’s work, and if it is needful – the life itself.

Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky conducts his activities, aimed at the formation of a unified Ukrainian Church, in two directions. On the one hand, he does not lose hope in the more thorough support of his plans on unification by the Apostolic See. With this aim, on October 29, 1941, A. Sheptytsky wrote an information letter to the Pope. In a letter, written in French, he presents an analysis of the situation of the Church in Ukraine under the Bolshevik, and subsequently German occupation, and raises the question of “the return to the Church of Christ of millions of Eastern believers, still excommunicated from unity”²⁹⁰. This requires priests, but the Germans forbid both Greek Catholics and Orthodox from Volyn and Chelm Land to do missionary work in the Dnieper Ukraine. Among the intelligentsia in Ukraine, there are also people who are sympathetic to the Greek Catholic Church; they need only a bishop who is willing to promote church unity. “If it was possible for us to send one bishop to Kyiv,” A. Sheptytsky writes, “it seems that with his hard work and caution, he could take the lead of the movement and bring at least a healthy majority of the

²⁸⁷ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 230.

²⁸⁸ Ibid. С. 408.

²⁸⁹ Ibid. С. 413.

²⁹⁰ Kozlevskij C. Metropolitane Andre Szeptyckyj. 1865-1944. Rome, 1964. P. 375.

whole people to Catholic unity. We cannot send anyone out because of a formal ban by the Germans, but if there were some pious and reasonable people among Orthodox Ukrainians that could fulfill this task of spreading church unity throughout the country, the Catholic Church could have won²⁹¹.

Therefore, Metropolitan once again asks Pope Pius XII to confirm the authority given to him by Pope Pius X, and to confirm the already named exarchs, which will help him in his work in the East. On November 22, 1941, the Pope confirmed the exarchs and named Metropolitan Andrey as a delegate to the Apostolic See. However, the Pope did not dare to grant Metropolitan's request for the ordination of several bishops among Orthodox converts.

On the other hand, at the same time as he wrote the letter to Pope Pius XII, Metropolitan Sheptytsky appealed directly to Orthodox bishops and later to the Ukrainian Orthodox believers from intelligentsia, with letters calling for ecclesiastical and national unity. These letters were partly printed in the Ukrainian press of that time, and then published in a collection of documents "In the Case of Understanding" (left unfinished), with the preface by Metropolitan, with the responses to his letters, and with A. Sheptytsky's answers to his opponents. The following documents are in chronological order:

1. Letter from Metropolitan Sheptytsky to I. Ohienko, Archbishop of Chelm, dated October 21, 1941;
2. An open letter from A. Sheptytsky to the Warsaw Orthodox Metropolitan Dionysius of December 30, 1941;
3. Letter from Metropolitan Andrey to Orthodox Bishops in Ukraine and the Ukrainian lands of December 30, 1941;
4. Letter from Metropolitan to the Ukrainian Orthodox believers from intelligentsia of March 3, 1942

A. Sheptytsky was acquainted with professor I. Ohienko – a well-known specialist in the history of Ukrainian culture and the Church, Minister of Education within the Government of the UPR (from January to May 1919), the founder and first rector of Kamyanets-Podilsky University –since the 1920s, when I. Ohienko as an emigrant arrived in Lviv and found refuge in Metropolitan's premises. Recalling the old acquaintance and friendship, Metropolitan congratulated Hilarion on his recent consecration, wished him to restore "St. Volodymyr's and Metropolitan Hilarion's faith"²⁹²; asked to clear the Ukrainian Orthodox Church from non-canonical, harmful, forcibly

²⁹¹ Жуковський А. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і православ'я. *Науковий Збірник Українського Вільного Університету*. Мюнхен. 1992. Т. 15. С. 54.

²⁹² Баран С. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Життя і творчість. Мюнхен, 1947. С. 123.

imposed institutions or laws, and, above all, from the Moscow intolerance and anxiety that marked all Moscow Orthodoxy.

Archbishop Hilarion replied to Metropolitan by letter dated November 14, 1941. The main point is that the rapprochement between the two Ukrainian Churches will be possible when not only the Ukrainian Orthodox Church is cleansed of Moscow's influence, but also the Greek Catholic Church will be rid of alien Latin additions. Then "both Ukrainian Churches will come closer to each other like two sisters"²⁹³.

An open letter from A. Sheptytsky to the Orthodox Metropolitan of Warsaw Dionysius was published, despite the prohibition of German occupying power, in the "Krakiwski Visty" of February 15, 1942. In it, Metropolitan proposed a broad program of action to bring the Churches closer together. The reply to this letter, as well as to A. Sheptytsky's appeal to the Orthodox Archdiocese, which will be discussed later, was given by the Council of the Orthodox Church of the Governor-General, which took place on May 27, 1942, and it stated unequivocally: "We are delighted to welcome the Greek Catholic brothers in our Orthodox Church"²⁹⁴. This decision was prepared by Hilarion Ohienko, and Metropolitan Dionysius Valedynsky and Archbishop Palladium Vydybida-Rudenko also participated in the Council, the latter considering the decision to be too sharp. Naturally, ecumenical dialogue could not be reached at such a level and with such a tone.

Central place in Metropolitan Andrey's action on the rapprochement of the Ukrainian Churches takes the open letter "To all the Most Reverend and Blessed Orthodox Bishops in Ukraine and the Ukrainian lands", which was written on December 30, 1941 and published in the diary "Krakiwski Visti" on February 15, 1942. In this small message, A. Sheptytsky closely links religious affairs with Ukrainian national affairs. "To reach our national ideals," he writes, "we need unity... Among the differentiations that divide Ukrainians, religious affairs in which we are so divided take not the last place. And, of course, religious unity would be a powerful impetus for national unity. So, I think, every Ukrainian patriot must do everything he can to achieve such religious unity"²⁹⁵. Such unity, according to A. Sheptytsky, is possible, because the cases that divide the Churches happened a long time ago. These were disputes between the Greeks and Latins, between the traditions learned from the Greek and Moscow churches. However, there are also some prerequisites for a union, namely: a common desire for reconciliation, that all people pray for unity, and finally, concessions are needed from both sides, elimination of all that impedes union. "Therefore, it

²⁹³ Ibid. С. 126.

²⁹⁴ Ленцик В. Ідея Церковної Єдності у Митрополита Шептицького. *Богословія*. Рим, 1971. Т. 35. С. 175-201.

²⁹⁵ Шептицький Андрій. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 339.

will surely be necessary for us to express our sincere thoughts and to openly discuss all the life and theological affairs connected with the union of the Churches, to seek a way to a union”²⁹⁶. This letter was an invitation to such an open and objective dialogue.

There were few responses to Metropolitan’s message. In his letter of March 1, 1942, Palladium, Archbishop of Krakow and Lemkivshchyna states that A. Sheptytsky’s appeal “to the Orthodox Ukrainian Hierarchy is what our Church has been expecting for more than 300 years... The discord, that was artificially largely implemented by the enemies of the Ukrainian Church and the Ukrainian people, must be stopped”²⁹⁷. However, in doing so, he offers his vision of the path of uniting the Churches: “With the knowledge of our Kiriarkh, I have the honor to announce that from the side of the Orthodox Church, we will endeavor to remove all obstacles to the great case of unification, which will be based on returning to the state, that we had before the official collapse of the Orthodox Ukrainian Church in the 16th century”²⁹⁸. Obviously, this was in fact a call for the elimination of the Greek Catholic Church and the return to the pre-union status.

Olexiy (Alexei) Hromadsky, Metropolitan of Volyn and Zhytomyr, Exarch of the Ukrainian Autonomous Orthodox Church, remaining in the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate, in a letter dated April 1942, agrees, factually, with Metropolitan Andrey’s idea of unity, but expresses doubts about the possibility of its implementation. “...Theoretically, I fully conjecture our union,” he writes, “because nothing can prevent that in thought, but practically this combination could be realized only when there is no sin and damage to human nature”²⁹⁹. According to him, the obstacles to unification not only lie in the ages, but they also find nourishment in the present, they are eternal. “History, politics, selfishness, individualism and many different isms, from which so much misery on earth, these are obstacles that will probably not be overcome until the end of the world, and they will not allow the union of Christians with each other on earth”³⁰⁰. Pointing to the difficulties that he encountered in trying to establish cooperation between the Autonomous Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, Fr. Olexiy thought that “...the difference in religious views may be needed on earth, because it is not for nothing that they say that beauty lies in diversity”³⁰¹.

²⁹⁶ Ibid. C. 340.

²⁹⁷ Ibid.

²⁹⁸ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 343.

²⁹⁹ Ibid. C. 345.

³⁰⁰ Ibid. C. 344.

³⁰¹ Ibid.

Painful for Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky was the silence of the bishops of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, which formed itself under the direction of Metropolitan Polikarp Sikorsky and spread its activity in the territory of the Dnieper Ukraine, in the so-called Reichskommissariat Ukraine.

An open letter of A. Sheptytsky to the Ukrainian Orthodox believers of March 3, 1942 was an addition to Metropolitan's message to Orthodox Archiereus. In it, Metropolitan addresses the representatives of Ukrainian science, literature, art, public figures, as well as patriotic clergy, whom he regards as a leading section in society that also has a strong voice in church affairs.

The letter to intelligentsia specifies Metropolitan's plans of unification and indicates which ways to complete unity should be chosen. First of all, A. Sheptytsky explains his personal condition: he cannot become a Metropolitan of Kyiv as a Greek Catholic. In addition, he has neither desire nor physical fitness because of his age and illness. According to him, "Metropolitan of Kyiv should be chosen from Orthodox or Autocephalous Bishops or priests. If he was united with the Universal Church, we, all Greek Catholics, would be subject to him and I would be the first to gladly submit to his supreme power"³⁰². Writing this letter, A. Sheptytsky emphasizes that he has no personal interest and will only fulfill the duty of the Ukrainian patriot. Metropolitan is aware that the complete unity of Greek Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox denominations is a matter of the very far future. Such unity would only be possible after the long efforts to bring the Churches closer together and to know each other, which in turn is necessary to achieve national unity. Future unity should be pursued through reconciliation, while eliminating mutual misunderstandings between Ukrainians and between Ukrainian denominations. A. Sheptytsky particularly emphasizes that union with the Universal Church does not require renunciation of the customs, giving up the rite of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, since the difference between Greek Catholics and Ukrainian Orthodox in these matters is very small. Asking the Ukrainian religious intelligentsia to actively work on interfaith spread, A. Sheptytsky notes that even if this work does not lead to full unification, it will still be of great benefit to the Ukrainian people, because it will lead to national unity.

Metropolitan's letter to the Ukrainian intelligentsia received more responses than his appeal to Orthodox bishops. Some of them were positive, others were polemical and with a negative attitude to the proposals of unification, with accusations of the Apostolic See of disrespectful attitude not only to the Orthodox but also to the Greek Catholic Church. Even the

³⁰² Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 341.

fact that A. Sheptytsky himself, despite his undisputed services to the Church, was not proclaimed a cardinal, was cited as proof of the latter. Only the “Letter to His Eminence Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky”, dated April 1942, was published by some Ukrainian figures from Prague and Warsaw, old emigrants. This letter, written in a polemical tone, strongly condemns the historical aspect of the Union and the Catholic Church. The authors of the candid letter regard the Church Union as one of the saddest days of the Ukrainian past, which can be compared with the times of serfdom. In their view, all the epic and historical literature in which Zaporizhia Sich appears in one role or another is an evidence of this. According to the authors of this letter, no efforts towards union are directed at the unification of the Greek Catholic and Orthodox Church, but at the annexation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church to the Roman Catholic Church, which the Polish Catholicity in Eastern Europe has always represented. “How it represented the Roman Church,” they write, “is witnessed by many monuments of the Christophile polish clergy – destroyed, closed and converted into Polish kosciols the Orthodox Churches in the Chelm Land and Volyn in 1937-38”³⁰³. Moreover, this destruction was carried out on the tolerance of the Roman Curia, which, through the Warsaw Nuncio, even advised Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky to appease the defense of not-united Orthodox.

Protecting themselves from criticism that “Ukrainian Orthodoxy has too much Moscow appeal”, the authors of the letter argue that it will be easier to get rid of it than for the Greek Catholic Church to get rid of the influence of Roman Catholics, such as celibacy, for example. But “in the end, it is the internal affair of both churches and it’s not of essential importance for the action of unification”³⁰⁴.

Much space in the letter is devoted to the generally traditional dogmatic arguments about the primacy of the Pope and the role of the Eastern patriarchs. It is claimed that in the X century it was the Roman patriarch, equal among other patriarchs, who broke away from the cathedral Church, represented by the four universal patriarchs, and made a number of innovations, both ceremonial and dogmatic. Therefore, “in the understanding of all Orthodox, Ecumenical Church is a majority (four Ecumenical Patriarchs) who remained true to all the decrees of Ecumenical Councils, not a minority (one Roman Patriarch) who did not want to be equal with the latter in the spirit of Councils and departed from them both in dogmas and in church practice”³⁰⁵. Thus, even while maintaining the traditional Eastern rite, the psychology of the Orthodox will not be able to agree with many of the latest tenets of the Roman Church.

³⁰³ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 346.

³⁰⁴ Ibid. С. 347.

³⁰⁵ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 347.

While declaring their desire to work for the greatest possible understanding and agreement between the Greek Catholic and Orthodox Churches in the spirit of Christian love, the authors of the letter, however, believe that connecting the churches would be harmful to the Ukrainian people, and, therefore, propose to establish an inter-denominational cooperation only to help in the revival of the Orthodox Church, destroyed by the Bolsheviks. Among other things, in their opinion, “only our Orthodox hierarchs... can solve the problems of the relationship of our Orthodox Church with other churches, or only consider them”³⁰⁶.

Despite such a frankly destructive attitude to his proposals, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky does not abandon his attempts to reach the mutual understanding. He again tries to explain to the intelligentsia what his action of unification (1941-1942) was all about. To this end, A. Sheptytsky prints his answers to the letters in the collection of documents “In the Case of Understanding”.

In his opening remarks, Metropolitan notes that “the answers were so negative that only with good will one can think that at least some kind of understanding is possible. And many of the answers express an indignation that someone can suppose this. are quite outrageous that anyone can assume. Yet, these answers are such a large material for discussion that they cannot be silently omitted”³⁰⁷. Opening the discussion, Metropolitan Andrey made some preliminary remarks. First, A. Sheptytsky emphasizes that complete unity, that is, the formation of one religion, can only be achieved after a series of understandings. Therefore, the formation of a single church is more a matter of theory rather than practice. In reality, it is about reaching an understanding between different Ukrainian confessions in order to achieve national unity.

Secondly, A. Sheptytsky notes, his invitation to cooperate on the rapprochement of the Churches was understood by everyone only as a call for the complete union of the Orthodox with the Greek Catholics, and through it – the acceptance by all Orthodox the Union with the Apostolic See. Meanwhile, according to Metropolitan, it is possible to talk about different ways of understanding, without merging into one confession. “You could also think about the connection of the Orthodox denominations with Gr. Catholic, in which a new creed of both the united would arise, which would be neither ancient Orthodox nor ancient Gr. Cath. Church”³⁰⁸. No one even thought of the possibility of such a multivariate interfaith relationship, because the idea of uniting the Churches was rudely reduced only to the Union.

³⁰⁶ Ibid. C. 349.

³⁰⁷ Ibid. C. 344.

³⁰⁸ Шептицький Андрій. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 334.

Answering the question about character of the connection, Metropolitan firmly rejects the allegation that it intends to subordinate completely the Ukrainian Churches to the Roman Catholic Church. He writes: “Single churches remain connected with all other churches in the West, they can retain far-reaching autonomy, which can be called autocephaly...”³⁰⁹. Moreover, according to A. Sheptytsky, Greek Catholics are ready, even with a loss for themselves, to surrender themselves to the power of the Metropolitan of Kyiv, if only he accepts the Universal faith.

It is interesting that representatives of the Orthodox intelligentsia – who in their attitude to A. Sheptytsky always tried to hold firmly to the historical ground – did not even notice in polemical passion how close the views of Metropolitan Andrey are to the project of the unity of the Churches, proposed three hundred years before by other great Metropolitan, and not a Greek Catholic one, but an Orthodox – Petro Mohyla...³¹⁰

A. Sheptytsky refutes his opponents’ assertion that the Roman Church is involved in the destruction of the Orthodox Churches and the persecution of believers in the Chelm Land and Volyn, finding them unproven. The appearance of such negative judgments is, in his opinion, because “you are often judging the activity of Roman Church, while being impressed by what the enemies of Christianity say or write about it..., but do not accept what is being told to You about the Roman Church and its influence on us by the Ukrainians, who cannot be left behind by the position of Ukrainian patriotism”³¹¹.

A. Sheptytsky could not also ignore the field of history, to which the representatives of the Orthodox intelligentsia reduced the case of mutual understanding, although, as he himself points out, he is doing it without a pleasure. “I know,” Metropolitan writes, “that when we seek mutual understanding and agreement between different Ukrainian confessions, it would be better to leave aside the arguments of history. During every reconciliation, even when it is not a question of joining and union, one must first say on both sides: “Forget it!” And the Lords would rather say, “We will not forget it to you!”³¹². According to A. Sheptytsky, such an approach, in which Greek Catholics of the XX century are declared responsible for the events of the XVI-XVII centuries and even the X-XI centuries, it is not constructive, it makes it impossible for religious and national understanding.

³⁰⁹ Ibid. С. 349.

³¹⁰ See.: Жуковський А. Петро Могила й питання єдності Церков. Париж, 1969. С. 121; 264; Історія церкви та релігійної думки в Україні: У 3-х книгах. Кн. 3. Кінець XVI – середина XIX століття. К., 1994. С. 62-69.

³¹¹ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 351.

³¹² Ibid.

Metropolitan, however, does not avoid historical discussion, making two remarks. First, in his opinion, the Orthodox intelligentsia knows the history of the Union of Brest and its consequences from the writings of historians, who all, or almost all, were not only enemies of the Union of Churches, but also were enemies of the Ukrainian people. Therefore, their descriptions require careful review. Secondly, only such historical facts should be taken into account during the discussion, which no one can dispute.

In his answers A. Sheptytsky thoroughly analyzes the main arguments of the opponents and presents his own vision of historical processes. First of all, he refers to the events of 1596, that is, to the Union of Brest. “The fact is,” he writes, “that the Union of Brest has been signed by all the bishops of the Kyiv ecclesiastical province, to which Bila Rus belonged. Two of the bishops, of Lviv and Przemyśl, called out their Word”³¹³. Therefore, if we follow the logic of the representatives of the Orthodox intelligentsia, who have declared that only Orthodox hierarchs are competent to solve the issues of inter-church relations, and the believers should follow them, then since the XVI century the history of the union of the Churches would go other ways. So, A. Sheptytsky states, there was a kind of double standard: what is good in the XX century is proclaimed a total evil for the XVI-XVII centuries.

Another objection that the opponents made to Metropolitan is concerned with the historical events of the X century, that is, the split of the Churches. The arguments they put forward, according to Sheptytsky, “are not recorded historical facts”³¹⁴, and he does not recognize them as such. In a letter from the Orthodox faithful intelligentsia, a quantitative approach was proposed to solve the question of what the true Universal Church is – Constantinople or Roman; Metropolitan Andrey proposes to look at the matter from another, qualitative side. Briefly, the essence of his argumentation is as follows: first, none of the Roman Bishops recognized the superstition of the patriarchs of Constantinople, while at least a dozen patriarchs of Constantinople recognized the superiority of the Roman throne. Secondly, there are no texts of St. Fathers who would argue that Constantinople exercised some kind of rule over Rome, while the reverse was recorded in several hundred texts. Thirdly, the Roman Bishops changed at least five Patriarchs of Constantinople, and there was not a single case to be vice versa. These and other facts cited by the Metropolitan in his answers, in his belief, undoubtedly attest to the right of the Apostolic See to be at the head of the Universal Church.

³¹³ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 354-355.

³¹⁴ Ibid. С. 352.

Finally, another accusation of A. Sheptytsky's opponents is that the Roman Bishops "have made a number of innovations, both dogmatic and ceremonial, without asking the opinion of other patriarchs..."³¹⁵. However, Sheptytsky says, Moscow Patriarch Nikon and Metropolitan Petro Mohyla of Kyiv, these great reformers of the rite and the church life, also made innovations, not seeking the consent of not only the Roman Bishop, but also of the Eastern Patriarchs. But for some reason their competence is beyond doubt for the Orthodox. As for dogmatic innovations, Metropolitan Andrey believes that none of them contradicts the teaching of the Church of the first 10 centuries. They are all aimed at "protecting the doctrine of the Divine Revelation against its new false understanding by establishing theological and philosophical terms that would describe and explain the old unchanging faith in a new word"³¹⁶.

Unfortunately, this discussion did not continue. The malevolent attitude of Orthodox bishops and religious intellectuals to the ecumenical ideas of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, the prohibition of the German occupying power to publish any materials concerning the unification of the Ukrainian Churches, made it impossible for further unity.

Summing up A. Sheptytsky's long-standing activity in bringing together and uniting Churches, both Orthodox and Catholic, it should be emphasized once again that Metropolitan considered the matter of unity as priority over all his activities, he was ready to give his life for it. In our opinion, it is impossible to agree with the conclusion of one of the most famous researchers of his life and works, S. Baran: "In practice, Metropolitan's great religious plans came out with very little or nothing"³¹⁷. If Great Metropolitan failed to fulfill the dream of his life, then his preparation did not go to waste, it became a valuable heritage, which can serve as a signpost for solving equally difficult problems of relations between two traditional Ukrainian denominations in modern Ukraine.

³¹⁵ Ibid. С. 358.

³¹⁶ Шептицький Андрей. Листи-послання (1939-1944). Львів, 1991. С. 405.

³¹⁷ Баран С. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Життя і творчість. Мюнхен, 1947. С. 353.

PART 6.
RELIGION AND CHURCH IN CARPATHIAN UKRAINE

The long-standing national liberation struggle of Transcarpathian Ukrainians for their autonomous rights ended with their acquisition in October 1938, when the Prague political power appointed Andriy Brodi as the head of the local government, and soon it appointed Avhustyn Voloshyn. On February 12, 1939, elections to the Soim of Carpathian Ukraine were held, after what it declared full independence on March 15. These vivid and dignified events were caused by Ukrainian political parties, various patriotic societies, including “Prosvita”, a number of well-known socio-political figures of the region, who throughout the interwar period advocated the Ukrainian idea, defended the right of the local population to have their own statehood. An important role in these processes was played by the Greek Catholic Church, which for several decades has brought up a whole pleiad of bright personalities, including the President of Carpathian Ukraine, Avhustyn Voloshyn, patriotic Ukrainian priests and cultural and educational figures Kyrylo Fedelesh, Stepan Sabol (Zoreslav), Karlo Kupa, Yuri Stanynets and many others. At the same time, it should be noted that some Transcarpathian priests did not support the Ukrainian idea and openly campaigned against it. Often, they fought openly against the autonomous government of Avhustyn Voloshyn Voloshyn, and supported the idea of entering Transcarpathia into Horthy’s Hungary. With the occupation of the Carpathian Ukraine by the Hungarian troops, mass repressions against its defenders began. The clergy also went through this.

Taking into account the fact that the true history of the church in Transcarpathia was forbidden before the proclamation of Ukraine’s independence, the first objective scientific publications appeared abroad. Their authors mainly were active participants in the national liberation competitions of 1938-1939, who immigrated to the countries of Europe and America after the occupation of Transcarpathia by the Horthy’s troops. Comprehensive monographs on the above-mentioned events were published by V. Shandor, A. Shtefan, S. Rosokha and Y. Khymynets. A huge factual material is contained in the memoirs and in a published diary of V. Grendzha-Donsky, the editor-in-chief of the governmental newspaper “Nova Svoboda”. Among the historians of the Ukrainian diaspora in the United States who have been researching the history of the Greek Catholic Church of the Carpathian Ukraine for many years, we should mention P. Sterch, O. Danko, V. Markus, P.R. Magocsi, A. Pekar, M. Utrysk,

I. Lysiak-Rudnytsky and others. In Ukraine, the aforementioned problem is most fully reflected in the pages of the three-volume work “Essays on the History of Transcarpathia”, which was published in the early 1990s under the editorship of Professor I. Hranchak. Unfortunately, more space in it was given not so much to Carpathian Ukraine as to the religious situation in Transcarpathia during the interwar period. This issue is most fully researched in the monographs and articles by M. Boldyzhar and M. Palinchak. Issues of religion and church in the times of Carpathian Ukraine were investigated by P. Chuchka, O. Khlanta, N. Benjko and O. Dovhanych. The authors of the monographs on the life path and social and political activity of Avhustyn Voloshyn were M. Tokar, M. Zymomrya, V. Homonnai, M. Klyap, V. Turyanytsya, V. Serhiychuk. Avhustyn Voloshyn’s relationships with Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky were explored by O. Khomenko and V. Basarab. The multifaceted activity of Dionisije Njaradi was researched by I. Likhthey.

The main purpose is to investigate the main aspects of the church-religious situation in the Carpathian Ukraine in the late 1930s, when the young state underwent a sort of evolution from autonomy to declaration of complete independence. Considerable attention is paid to the relationship between representatives of the Orthodox and Greek Catholic Churches, the activities of the most prominent representatives of the clergy of Transcarpathia – Avhustyn Voloshyn, Dionisije Njaradi and Olexandr Stoyka.

In the late 1930s, the Greek Catholic Church in non-Soviet Ukraine counted 4.370.000 believers, 3.040 parishes with 4.440 churches. In five eparchies with two Apostolic Administrators there were two bishops and one metropolitan. According to the calculations of I. Ortynsky, there were 2.950 priests, 520 hieromonks (priests-monks), 1.100 nuns, 540 students of theology, 4 small seminaries, 41 Catholic organizations and 38 magazines, journals and publishers in Western Ukraine³¹⁸. There were 410.000 Greek Catholics in Transcarpathia³¹⁹.

In 1936, 140.000 Orthodox believers were registered in the land, they were served by 67 church representatives (15 nuns and 52 priests)³²⁰. According to V. Markusj, “the movement of Orthodoxy began in the Czechoslovakia in the 1920-30’s, and soon the Greek Catholic Church lost its monopoly position among the Ukrainians. Orthodoxy spread on the

³¹⁸ Оршан Я. Закарпаття. Париж, 1938. С. 118.

³¹⁹ Стерчо П. Карпато-Українська держава: З історії визвольної боротьби карпатських українців у 1919-1939 роках. Торонто, 1965; Львів: За вільну Україну, 1994. С. 85.

³²⁰ Палінчак М. Державно-церковні відносини на Закарпатті та в Східній Галичині в 20 – середині 30-х років ХХ століття. Ужгород, 1996. С. 47.

initiative of mainly Russian, as well as Bukovynian and Galician Russophile, emigrants, and thanks to the support of the Prague government, which saw in the new religious movement a reaction to the political course of the Magyarized Greek Catholic clergy”³²¹. The first Serbian bishop in Transcarpathia was Dosifeus, later Vladimir, whom the Hungarians removed after occupation.

On November 2, 1938, the Vienna Arbitration took place, leaving 35 Greek Catholic parishes, led by Bishop O. Stoyka, who remained in Uzhgorod, under Hungary³²². Thus, in Carpathian Ukraine, there were 280 parishes left without a bishop³²³. As early as November 3, 1938, a memorandum was drawn up on behalf of the Mukachevo Greek Catholic eparchy and a number of political parties and associations, which was transmitted to the governments of Czechoslovakia, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Romania, Hungary and Yugoslavia. It stated that “the Vienna arbitration has taken away from the Carpathian Rus the main city of Uzhgorod and the industrial center of Mukachevo, without which the land cannot exist in economic, cultural and national terms. Therefore, we declare that even after the Vienna Arbitration, we consider this territory a single and inseparable”³²⁴. This memorandum had no effect on the initiators of the arbitration in Vienna and it has a symbolic meaning. Bishop O. Stoyka made an attempt to subjugate Greek-Catholic parishes of the Carpathian Ukraine. He sent the youngest canonist Ludovic Minya to Khust so he could manage 280 parishes. The Vatican, of course, did not take that step.

In the current situation, Dionisije Njaradi, bishop of the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Krizevci, took the initiative and “gave a memorandum to the hands of Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, Secretary of the Congregation for the Eastern Church in Rome, informing that in Carpathian Ukraine more than 400.000 believers remain without a bishop”³²⁵. On November 14, 1938, Pope Pius XI met D. Njaradi at his audience, during which he instructed him

³²¹ Маркусь В. Нищення греко-католицької церкви в Мукачівській єпархії в 1945-1950 рр. Відбитка із Збірника присвяченого пам'яті З. Кузелі. *Записки НТШ*. Т. СХІХ. Париж, 1982. С. 5.

³²² Бенько Н. Міжконфесійні відносини на Закарпатті в політичних подіях 1938-1949 рр. *Науковий збірник Закарпатського краєзнавчого музею*. Випуск другий. Ужгород, 1996. С. 103-119.

³²³ Магочій П. Р. Формування національної самосвідомості: Підкарпатська Русь (1848-1948). Ужгород, 1994. С. 15.

³²⁴ Довганич О. Д., Пашкуй З. А., Троян М. В. Закарпаття в роки війни. Ужгород: Карпати, 1990. С. 18.

³²⁵ Стерчо П. Карпато-Українська держава: З історії визвольної боротьби карпатських українців у 1919-1939 роках. Торонто, 1965; Львів: За вільну Україну, 1994. С. 84.

to “take care of the poorest people of the Subcarpathian region, left without a shepherd and other necessary means”³²⁶. On November 15, 1938, Cardinal E. Tisserant on behalf of the Holy Congregation of the Eastern Church in Vatican issued a decree No. 653/38, according to which “the jurisdiction of the Most Holy Olexandr Stoyka, Rusyn Bishop of Mukachevo, begins in the parishes oh his diocese, which are placed beyond the borders of the Hungarian Kingdom, until the Apostolic Capital decides otherwise. All other decisions, contrary to this, are hereby canceled”³²⁷. The reason for such Vatican’s move was explained by the effects of the Vienna Arbitration, after which “a new distinction was made between the Czechoslovak Republic and the Kingdom of Hungary” and “most of the Parishes of the Mukachevo Diocese of Rusyns were, in fact, excommunicated from the cities of Mukachevo and Uzhgorod”³²⁸. Due to the fact that “Mukachevo Bishop of Rusyns has no possibility to get from one part (diocese) to another within his jurisdiction”, the Vatican has “commissioned the High Blessed Dr. Dionisije Njaradi, the Bishop of Krizevci, to overtake the power of the Apostolic Visitor of the Mukachevo eparchy of Rusyns, who are in the Czechoslovak Republic, and to inform the Apostolic Capital on everything”³²⁹.

As early as 1934, “Blahovisnyk” reported that in the near future a new Greek Catholic bishopric should be established in Khust. This would allow the Vatican to turn the Eparchy of Uzhgorod into a Metropoly. However, the governmental message of the Apostolic Capital in this case came as early as September 2, 1937. World War II crossed out these credible plans. Regarding the appointment of D. Njaradi as apostolic administrator of the region, this act of the Vatican was considered only as temporary, “in anticipation of the creation of own Transcarpathian metropoly”³³⁰. In an interview with the newspaper “Nova Svoboda” on December 12, 1938, D. Njaradi said: “There are, therefore, two eparchies, and ours still will be governed by the apostolic administration, maybe for a long time... According to my guess, the eparchy of Carpathian Ukraine will eventually become definitively separate, because it can already be said that the Eparchy of Mukachevo became two separate eparchies. The residence of the apostolic

³²⁶ Ibid. С. 84-85.

³²⁷ Нова свобода. 1938. 6 грудня.

³²⁸ Ibid.

³²⁹ Нова свобода. 1938. 6 грудня.

³³⁰ Пекар А. Мукачівська Єпархія і Галицька митрополія. *Українські Карпати: етнос, історія, культура*. Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції. Ужгород: Карпати, 1993. С. 402.

administration is now in Khust and I think that the location of the eparchy will be in the Capital of the Government of Carpathian Ukraine”³³¹.

It is necessary to agree with the assertion of P. R. Magocsi that “since Njaradi was a well-known Ukrainophile, such appointment testified that the Vatican recognized the Ukrainian orientation of the autonomous government”³³². At that time Carpathian Ukraine was becoming the center of the struggle not only political but also ecclesiastical. It was not accidentally that A. Voloshyn in the “Manifesto of the Government of Carpathian Ukraine to all citizens of Carpathian Ukraine” (November 3, 1938) called for next: “Let all the religious and class disputes, which the enemies of our people have caused between us, today disappear”³³³. In the deep conviction of V. Shandor, “with the appointment of Bishop Njaradi as an apostolic administrator in Khust, the Greek Catholic Church from the side of jurisdiction was regulated well”³³⁴. What about Hungary, it expressed its dissatisfaction with the Vatican’s appointment of Njaradi as the bishop of Carpathian Ukraine.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Republic informed A. Voloshyn’s government on November 26, 1938 about the arrival of D. Njaradi in the Carpathian Ukraine. “This news,” as “Nova svoboda” wrote, “caused great satisfaction to the people of the Carpathian Ukraine”³³⁵. On November 29, Khust met Bishop D. Njaradi, who came from the Vatican through Yugoslavia³³⁶. On December 4, 1938, he held the first Divine service in Khust, proclaiming the liturgy “for an independent Carpathian Ukraine, for its people, for the Government and for its good – to be all for one! One thing: in Catholicism, in Ukrainian nationality, all in a noble work, in culture: in short, one thing in life and death!”³³⁷. So, from the very first days of his stay in Carpathian Ukraine, D. Njaradi established himself as a sincere supporter of the Ukrainian idea.

The bishop’s Ukrainian orientation is clearly reflected in his “Pastoral Letters” and “Appeals”. In one of his first Pastoral Letters, D. Njaradi said: “I ask all the Fathers to have a Divine service during the week, if there are no other intentions, to the Holy Father’s intention: “About the peace of the

³³¹ Нова свобода. 1938. 13 грудня.

³³² Магочій П. Р. Формування національної самосвідомості: Підкарпатська Русь (1848-1948). Ужгород, 1994. С. 115.

³³³ Волошин А. Початки національного пробудження на Підкарпатській Русі. *Августин Волошин. Твори*. Ужгород: Гражда, 1995. С. 113-116.

³³⁴ Шандор В. Спомини. Т. 1. Карпатська Україна. 1938-1939. Ужгород: МПП «Гражда»; Карпатський Союз, 1996. С. 257.

³³⁵ Нова свобода. 1938. 27 листопада.

³³⁶ Ibid. 30 листопада.

³³⁷ Ibid. 4 грудня.

whole world”, but also for the good of our state. At the same time, I very much entrust all my Faithful people in their prayers to ask for blessings for our whole people, and above all for those in whose hands the God’s Providence has given the power to govern our state and our people”³³⁸. On December 18, 1938, D. Njaradi visited Perechyn, where he delivered a speech in which he “urged believers to stand with confidence by the faith, that only in some faith is our salvation and the success of our revival and the better future of our nation and state liberation”³³⁹. In the “Pastoral Letter” of December 23, 1938, D. Njaradi informed the believers that “I gave our eparchy of Mukachevo in the Czechoslovak Republic under the special care of Virgin Mary, and our state proclaimed her a special Patroness-Protector of Subcarpathian State”³⁴⁰.

On January 1, 1939, the bishop addressed the “Father’s Friendly Word to Fathers, Shepherds of the Soul”, in which he asked them “to be aware of their sacred tasks, to keep themselves away from any anti-state agitation, so that even the smallest shadow would not fall on their activities. Both ecclesiastical law and natural law show us, the shepherds of the souls, which must be our relation to the lawful Authority in the territory in which we have to develop our priestly activity. We must take a positive position towards such a government...”³⁴¹. Despite this warning, Greek Catholic priests N. Silvaj, I. Josyph, Z. Sholtes, I. Minj and I. Emeryk were detained by the Ukrainian police. They were accused of anti-Czech, anti-Ukrainian and pro-Hungarian propaganda and were imprisoned in the Dumen concentration camp. Undoubtedly, the above mentioned persons did not complete the list of priests who openly worked for Hungary. Perhaps that is why some members of the government of the Carpathian Ukraine have made proposals to replace priests in some districts³⁴².

Having begun to perform the duties of an apostolic administrator in Carpathian Ukraine, D. Njaradi outlined his program of actions in an interview with the editor of “Nova Svoboda” V. Grenja-Donsky on December 12, 1938: “My plan is” the bishop said, “that each priest should be an exemplary priest to his believers and perform his duties faithfully and most accurately. My second plan is to introduce our clergy to Catholic Action... The priest is not allowed to remove himself out of the cultural

³³⁸ Ibid. 6 грудня.

³³⁹ Ibid. 21 грудня.

³⁴⁰ Нова свобода. 1938. 23 грудня.

³⁴¹ Ліхтей І. Єпископ Діонісій Няраді і Карпатська Україна (листопад 1938 – березень 1939). *Дзвони*. 1995. Ч. 4. С. 4-5.

³⁴² Вегеш М. Карпатська Україна (1938-1939): соціально-економічний і політичний розвиток. Ужгород, 1993. С. 69.

work among his believers; he must take the initiative and take a lively part in this work. And there is a lot of such work everywhere: a) work of religious content, organization of religious circles, of Catholic youth, etc .; b) work in the reading room of “Prosvita”, care of it and its management; c) charitable assistance to the poor; d) Organizing and conducting anti-alcohol groups... It would also be desirable for the priesthood to provide educational work of economical content... To give lectures and practical recommendations with the purpose of elevating our people to a higher economic level. It would be a good idea to set up a committee in each parish in order to allow the talented poor boys to be educated through financial aid... In Carpathian Ukraine there should be published a weekly newspaper, which could contain, in addition to political and cultural revision, valuable economic advices from the peasants... It is absolutely necessary for the people to publish as many cheap popular books as it is possible”³⁴³.

D. Njaradi actively began to implement his plan. The bishop founded “The Society of Greek Catholic Priests”, headed by Y. Stanynets, and S. Sabol became a secretary. He maintained contact with the clergy with the help of the “Bulletin of the Mukachevo Eparchy in the Czechoslovak Republic”, the first issue of which came to light on January 1, 1939 in Khust. There were five issues in total. The “Bulletin” published the bishop’s messages to priests and to believers, information about the life of the eparchy, and so on. S. Sabol published the “Missionary Calendar”. These editions were published in the premises of the state printing house in Khust.

In the late 1930s, two Greek Catholic teachers’ seminaries greatly expanded the number of students and gave from 200 to 250 graduates each year. In addition, a Greek Catholic seminary was successfully operating in Uzhgorod to prepare priests. On February 1, 1939, on the advice of A. Voloshyn’s government, Bishop D. Njaradi transferred the Uzhgorod Theological Seminary to Olomouc. Basilian monk M. Kalynets was appointed as its rector³⁴⁴.

On March 10, 1939, D. Njaradi signed a decree for the priests to celebrate the Soim of Carpathian Ukraine in the churches: “In a special way, I charge and assign that on the day of the opening of the Soim – the exact date will be announced by the radio – in all parishes of our eparchy in the autonomous territory of the Carpathian Ukraine, the spirit fathers should take the God’s Service; believers and local governments must be informed in advance. Equally, I charge that, on that bright occasion, all the bells in our

³⁴³ Нова свобода. 1938. 13 грудня.

³⁴⁴ Ліхтей І. Єпископ Діонісій Няраді і Карпатська Україна (листопад 1938 – березень 1939). *Дзвони*. 1995. Ч. 4. С. 5.

churches be called in the evening (the last evening before the opening of the Soim – Aut.) and on the very day of the opening of the Soim after the God’s Service – also after a quarter of an hour”³⁴⁵. Three priests were elected as ambassadors of the Soim of Carpathian Ukraine – K. Fedelesh, A. Dovbak and Y. Stanynets. V. Grenja-Donsky wrote about the latter that he is “a beloved priest, a famous preacher and a famous writer of ours”³⁴⁶.

In Carpathian Ukraine, there were 140 Orthodox parishes with five monasteries, two of which were female and one was located in Prešov Region³⁴⁷. In total, there were 155.000 Orthodox in the region. According to P.R. Magocsi, “the Orthodox bishop... did not support Voloshyn’s government. Orthodox population, which was instilled in love with everything Russian, could not adopt the Ukrainian ideology of the Khust government”³⁴⁸. We believe that V. Shandor is more correct, when he states that “the struggle began with the merit of Bishop Savathy in the Orthodox Church. Savathy appeared in Carpathian Ukraine and served the Church services. The Orthodox Church in the Carpathian Ukraine belonged to the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church, while Savathy belonged to the Moscow Church, which was not recognized in Czechoslovakia. It is obvious that Savathy’s purpose was to make a revolt”³⁴⁹.

Minister of Interior Affairs of Carpathian Ukraine Y. Revai received a representative of the “German Information Bureau” during his stay in Prague on December 4, 1938, stating to him: “Hostile propaganda spreads gossip that there is persecution in Carpathian Ukraine on political or religious background, including persecution of the Orthodox population. These rumors are fictional. There are no prosecutions in Carpathian Ukraine. All citizens, regardless of political beliefs or religious affiliation, are equal against the law”³⁵⁰. On November 23, 1938, A. Voloshyn received Archbishop Savathy, “a conversation with whom lasted 40 minutes and concerned the affairs of the Orthodox Church in the Carpathian Ukraine. Archbishop Savathy, after speaking with the Prime Minister, received the editor of “Nova Svoboda” and expressed a great pleasure that the Prime Minister treats the needs of the Orthodox Church in the Carpathian Ukraine

³⁴⁵ Документи свідчать. Ужгород: Карпати, 1985. С. 120.

³⁴⁶ Гренджа-Донський В. Шастя і горе Карпатської України: Щоденник. Мої спогади / Ред. Д. М. Федака. Ужгород: ВАТ «Видавництво «Закарпаття», 2002. С. 223.

³⁴⁷ Стерчо П. Карпато-Українська держава: З історії визвольної боротьби карпатських українців у 1919-1939 роках. Торонто, 1965; Львів: За вільну Україну, 1994. С. 86.

³⁴⁸ Магочій П. Р. Формування національної самосвідомості: Підкарпатська Русь (1848-1948). Ужгород, 1994. С. 115.

³⁴⁹ Шандор В. Спомини. Т. 1. Карпатська Україна. 1938-1939. Ужгород: МПП «Гражда»; Карпатський Союз, 1996. С. 257.

³⁵⁰ Нова свобода. 1938. 4 грудня.

with full understanding and favor”³⁵¹. On November 28, A. Voloshyn received a new bishop of the Orthodox Church, V. Rajich from Mukachevo, who “made a statement of loyalty to the Prime Minister of the Carpatho-Ukrainian state and its authorities”³⁵². On December 21, A. Voloshyn was visited by the Serbian Orthodox Metropolitan Josyph, accompanied by Bishop V. Rajich and Archimandrite O. Kabaliuk. The delegation sent congratulations from Havrylo, the Patriarch of the Orthodox Church. Metropolitan Josyph assured A. Voloshyn that the Orthodox Church would be loyal to the authorities of the Carpathian Ukraine and would not interfere with national affairs.

Thus, the government of A. Voloshyn went on a rapprochement with the leadership of the Orthodox Church, which began to bring the first positive consequences. In the village of Kopashniovo during the celebration at St. Michael’s Church, the Orthodox Archbishop urged to pray for “Our God-keeping Carpathian Ukraine and its Government”³⁵³. Representatives of the Orthodox Metropolis, along with Greek Catholic Bishop D. Njaradi, participated as honorary guests in the Carpathian Sich congress in Khust³⁵⁴. Among the issues discussed on December 29, 1938, at the meeting of the Synodal Committee of the Ukrainian Orthodox Metropolis of the Carpathian Ukraine were the following: “The Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the service of the revival of the Carpathian Ukraine and the development of church organization and our relation to other churches”³⁵⁵. These facts are a proof that the leadership of the Orthodox Church in the Carpathian Ukraine was loyal to A. Voloshyn’s government and the policy pursued by his office.

In the Transcarpathian territory, occupied by Hungary, Olexandr Stoyka was the Greek Catholic Bishop of the Mukachevo Eparchy. A highly educated and experienced man, he pursued a vague and inconsistent policy, often changing his views. On October 26, 1938, when A. Voloshyn became a Prime Minister of Subcarpathian Rus, during a prayer service, Bishop O. Stoyka called him “the father of the people”³⁵⁶. In the first half of March 1939, the bishop stated on the radio: “...The place of the Rusyn people can only be in Hungary, where for a thousand years it has shared good and evil with the fraternal Hungarian people... And now, in these

³⁵¹ Ibid. 27 листопада.

³⁵² Ibid. 30 листопада.

³⁵³ Палінчак М. М., Болдижар М. М. Релігія і церква на Закарпатті в 20-30-х рр. *Нариси історії Закарпаття*. Т. 2. Ужгород, 1995. С. 447.

³⁵⁴ Карпатська Січ. Матеріали наукової конференції. Ужгород, 1996. С. 104.

³⁵⁵ Нова свобода. 1938. 29 грудня.

³⁵⁶ Бенько Н. Міжконфесійні відносини на Закарпатті в політичних подіях 1938-1949 рр. *Науковий збірник Закарпатського краєзнавчого музею*. Випуск другий. Ужгород, 1996. С. 104.

hours, when the heroic army of St. Stephen's Hungary is approaching the Carpathian Mountains to free us, the Ruthenians, from the desperate hell, we see in this the holy will of the good God who cares for the fate of people and nations. These honved-heroes... with brotherly love will unite with our Rusyn soldiers, to provide respect for the faith and church of the Rusyn people forever, to protect our sacred traditions and the possibility of material life, decent to a human. Accept the honveds with trust love"³⁵⁷. O. Stoyka concluded his speech with the words: "Long live our millennial homeland – Hungary, long live our beloved Regent and long live our dear Rusyn people"³⁵⁸. In his Easter message of April 2, 1939, O. Stoyka urged to glorify the Hungarian invaders and to give them with pleasure the wealth of the land"³⁵⁹.

On June 13, 1939, O. Stoyka took an oath of allegiance to Hungary: "I, Dr. Stoyka Olexandr, as it fits to a bishop, I swear by the holy Gospel that I will be a loyal supporter of the Regent of Hungary, and I promise that I will neither directly nor indirectly participate in matters that are contrary to the interests of Hungary. God help me!"³⁶⁰. However, he soon became convinced that the Hungarian authorities were in a double game. In doing so, they discredited themselves in the eyes of the bishop. According to modern researchers³⁶¹, O. Stoyka made every effort to protect his people. His courageous speech did not allow degrading the prelate rector Olexandr Khira, who had been ignored by the new Hungarian authorities for a long time in the seminary. He also made sure that the leadership of the seminary remained in the hands of the priests-narodovtsi. He filled the student places in the seminary with peasant boys and took care of the uplift of the religious and cultural life of the people. Under his leadership, the official body of the Mukachevo-Presov Eparchy "Dushpastyr", the magazines "Blahovisnyk" and "Missionary Bulletin" had been publishing. However, in spite of this, Bishop O. Stoyka undoubtedly did everything to accelerate the occupation of Carpathian Ukraine by Hungary.

Bishop Vladymyr Raic appointed hegumen Aurikius as the administrator of the Orthodox parishes of the western part of Transcarpathia, occupied by the Hungarian troops. Bishop Raic was offered to accept the Hungarian citizenship, but he refused. In this regard, the Hungarian Ministry of Cults

³⁵⁷ Документи свідчать. Ужгород: Карпати, 1985. С. 122.

³⁵⁸ Ibid.

³⁵⁹ Ibid.

³⁶⁰ Ibid.

³⁶¹ Бенько Н. Міжконфесійні відносини на Закарпатті в політичних подіях 1938-1949 рр. *Науковий збірник Закарпатського краєзнавчого музею*. Випуск другий. Ужгород, 1996. С. 107.

stated that V. Raic was a subject of another country and therefore he could not be recognized by the government as an authorized to perform the functions of bishop in their state. He was interned as a person unreliable to the Hungarian authorities. Hegumen Feofan Sabov was appointed in his place, but soon he was also removed³⁶². A famous researcher of the church history, O. Danko wrote: “The general impression of the population of Transcarpathia about the attitude of the Hungarian authorities to the Transcarpathian churches can be summarized in the simplified form: the Hungarian authorities favored the Greek Catholic Church, and their attitude towards the Orthodox was hostile, or at least it acted as a stepmother... The Orthodox Church of Transcarpathia... passed a way from the state of the church, persecuted at the very beginning, to the state of the church, supported by the same Hungarian government”³⁶³. According to Hungarian statistics, in 1940 in Transcarpathia there were 110 thousand Orthodox³⁶⁴.

On March 15, 1939, Hungarian troops began the occupation of Carpathian Ukraine. After a while, mass repression began, which did not bypass the representatives of the church, and it did not matter to which confession the particular priest belonged. P. Chuchka and E. Shwed proved: “Archival materials testify that the attack of the Hungarian authorities on the Ukrainian idea in Transcarpathia did not stop in the interwar years. Some of them illustrate the dynamics and technology of this attack, reveal the specialty of the kimmel-garitov services, naming specific individuals who were approved for physical execution by the Hungarian repressive bodies on the eve of World War II, in particular from the autumn of 1938 to the spring of 1939”³⁶⁵. These scientists have found two archival documents called “List of the Ukrainians who have done a great deal of harm to both the Hungarian and the Rusyn people” and “List of the Ukrainians who tried to harm the Hungarian and Hungarian-Rusyn people”, which include the names of 140 people. All of them were considered fierce enemies of Hungary and had to be eliminated. The researchers proved that the lists were drawn up on

³⁶² Хланта О. Деякі питання керівництва Мукачівською єпархією православної церкви в Закарпатській Україні у 1939-1944 рр. *Науковий збірник Краснявського музею*. Випуск 2. С. 103-119.

³⁶³ Данко О. Угорська політика відносно православної церкви на Закарпатті в 1939-1944 рр. *Культура Українських Карпат: традиції і сучасність*. Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції. Ужгород, 1994. С. 362.

³⁶⁴ Маркусь В. Нищення греко-католицької церкви в Мукачівській єпархії в 1945-1950 рр. Відбитка із Збірника присвяченого пам'яті З. Кузелі. *Записки НТШ*. Т. СХІХ. Париж, 1982. С. 5.

³⁶⁵ Чучка П., Швед Е. На шляху до Ковнера – 42. *За Українське Закарпаття: Дослідження, статті, спогади / Упор. В. Маркусь, В. Худанич*. Ужгород: Гражда, 1994. С. 38.

November 10, 1938, that is, immediately after the end of the Vienna Arbitration and long before the invasion of the Hungarian troops into the territory of Carpathian Ukraine.

The names of five clergymen – Bulyk, V. Lar, O. Khira, S. Pap and Y. Stanynets – were in that lists³⁶⁶. It should be added that only well-known people among the general population are listed. Time has shown that during 1939-1942 they all went through Hungarian prisons and camps. The list does not include the name of D. Njaradi, who was known far beyond Transcarpathia. However, despite the great popularity of the bishop, “two days after the occupation of Carpathian Ukraine, the government of the Hungarians placed Bishop Njaradi in his own apartment in Khust under strict gendarmic supervision, prohibiting him from leaving the house and meeting people. The brutal behavior of the gendarmerie and other Hungarian governmental authorities has made Bishop Njaradi humiliated. Only later Angelo Rotta, the Apostolic Nuncio in Budapest, helped the bishop and his secretary Fr. Reshetyl to leave for Rome”³⁶⁷.

The lack of archival sources regarding the Horthyst repression against priests is somewhat complementary to eyewitness accounts. They testify to the horrific terror committed by the Hungarians: “The middle of the liturgy. Without finishing the church service, Fr. Kupar was seized, his chasuble was removed and he, as a criminal, was taken out of the church... The arrested people were driven into the woods. They stopped at a lawn. One attempted to flee – that was Fedir Rozniychuk – but he was shot dead. The others got bullets into their feet, and all the wounded fell to the ground. Raging sadists in the wild fury were pulling out the eyes of the living people, cutting off their lips, tongues, tearing their bellies. Inhuman cries, moaning, yelling were rushing over the forest. These people died in a great martyrdom. In the Hutsul region, they are called “martyrs of Kvasiv”³⁶⁸. The priest Y. Stanynets recalled: “I was tortured and judged, because “I took part in an underground organization that aimed to drive the Hungarian occupiers from Transcarpathia”. The judges and investigators of my “case” stated this... By beating, bullying they tried to “knock out” a confession. Our judges did not delve into the case”³⁶⁹. Greek Catholic priest Pohorilyak from the village Ternovo in the Tyachiv region was sentenced to five years in prison³⁷⁰. An active participant in the events of 1938-1939 in Carpathian Ukraine, priest

³⁶⁶ Ibid.

³⁶⁷ Шандор В. Спомини. Т. 1. Карпатська Україна. 1938-1939. Ужгород: МПП «Гражда»; Карпатський Союз, 1996. С. 257.

³⁶⁸ Карпатська Січ. Матеріали наукової конференції. Ужгород, 1996. С. 257.

³⁶⁹ Ibid. С. 74-75.

³⁷⁰ Ibid. С. 75.

S. Pap went through torture in Khust prison and concentration camp in Kryva. In 1942, he was sentenced for the second time. The verdict stated: "...the defendants proclaimed that Transcarpathia has always been a Ukrainian territory, and will remain so, in connection with what Transcarpathia should, if necessary, have to break away from Hungary and join Ukraine with an armed uprising and revolutionary path"³⁷¹.

The pro-Hungarian priests assisted the horthyysts in their acts of repression. Such, in particular, was Y. Maryna. S. Pap recalled: "He is a Greek Catholic priest, professor and vice-rector of the Theological Seminary in Uzhgorod, his behavior was too coarse and arrogant. None of the students loved him. He was not an example of a good priest to them. He was a Hungarian spy in the priesthood... And now he is here to look at the death of the last victims of Hungarian violence"³⁷². Bishop O. Stoyka helped many to avoid detention and saved their lives.

The overwhelming majority of the population of Carpathian Ukraine was of Greek Catholic faith. From mid-November 1938 to mid-March 1939, the Bishop of Križevci, D. Njaradi, who had a clear pro-Ukrainian orientation, fulfilled the duties of apostolic administrator in the land. The government of the Carpathian Ukraine has done everything to prevent conflicts between believers of the Greek Catholic and Orthodox denominations. The Orthodox Church, which belonged to the Serbian Orthodox Metropolis, was loyal to A. Voloshyn's government. The bishop of Mukachevo, O. Stoyka, who stayed in the territory occupied by Hungary, served the invaders faithfully, encouraging them to occupy Transcarpathia completely. However, during the occupation he acted less actively, disappointed with the ambiguity of Hungarian politics. With the occupation of Transcarpathia by the Hungarian troops, a brutal repressive regime was established in the land, which had affected the clergy of both denominations.

³⁷¹ Карпатська Січ. Матеріали наукової конференції. Ужгород, 1996. С. 78.

³⁷² Ibid. С. 113

PART 7. PECULIARITIES OF THE CONFESSIONAL SITUATION IN TRANS-CARPATIA: HISTORY AND MODERNITY

The problem of state-church relations in Ukraine is being researched by many scientists. In Ukraine, the church and the state are separated from each other. But the development of state-church relations in the country was not easy. The situation of the church in the Soviet period was especially difficult. The problem of relations between the state authorities and religious organizations relates to current topics of modern Political Science. They have always been extremely important, but apparently no one will dispute that these issues are a hundred times more important for the present Ukraine and Transcarpathia itself. The Ukrainian state and the Ukrainian church have been inseparable in their history. With the adoption of Christianity by Ukraine, they exerted a mutual influence on each other: the state on the church and the church on the state.

Our people adopted Christianity in their own way after being baptized by Knyaz Volodymyr in 988. With the adoption of Christianity in Ukraine, a permanent organization of church management, called the Metropolis, centered in Kyiv, emerged. The first metropolitan came here, his successors also stayed here. At that time it was the church of the whole state of Knyaz, but it was most closely connected with the Ukrainian land and with our ancestors who lived on it. The Metropolis of Kyiv became the church of the exclusively Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples, when the Moscow church arbitrarily (without the consent of Constantinople) put its own metropolitan in 1448 and thus separated from the mother-church in Kyiv. And 10 years later, the Moscow Council formalized this act of separatism. This act of arbitrary proclamation of autocephaly was distinctly non-canonical, but it was not disputed because of the political power of the Moscow State of that time.

The Metropolis of Kyiv has constantly remained a church of the Ukrainian people throughout the thousands of years of its existence, which is why it, and with good reason, bears the name of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The Council of Kyiv in 1621, convened during the difficult struggle of the Orthodox Ukrainians with the Union, confirmed this view and went further, linking the beginnings of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine with the gospel of Apostle Andrew the First-Called. The resolution of the Council stated: "St. Andrew the Apostle was the first Archbishop of Constantinople, the Universal Patriarch and the Apostle of Ukraine; his feet stood on the mountains of Kyiv, and his eyes saw Ukraine, and his mouth blessed, and he

planted the seeds of faith in us. Truly Ukraine is not smaller than other Eastern nations, because the apostle preached in it”³⁷³.

In the context of this study, it is very important to emphasize that from the very beginning of the formation of a church in Ukraine at the initiative of the state authorities, there was a close union between the church and the state. The state helped the church of Christ, and the church, for its part, cared about the authority of the state power among the people and about the moral influence of Christian ideals on the power. The chronicle retained the words of one of the metropolitans to Kniaz of Kyiv: “Kniaz! We are set in the land of Rus by God to keep you from bloodshed”³⁷⁴.

For seven centuries the Orthodox Church in Ukraine lived an independent life, bound only by the formal subordination to the Mother Church in Constantinople, from which it received the faith of Christ.

The synodal period of the history of the Russian Church, which lasted for 197 years (1721-1918) and brought complete enslavement to the Ukrainian church, was grossly non-canonical. Experts in the field of ecclesiastical law have repeatedly asked the question whether this Russian synodal church was canonical and solved it negatively – it was not canonical³⁷⁵. And if so, the whole activity of this church, including all its violence against the Ukrainian church, was not canonical and legal.

From an independent, highly developed, closely aligned with the people, the original Metropolis of Kyiv, the tsars of Moscow and their church quickly made it “non-personal”. Despite the promises of widespread autonomy, given to the Orthodox Church in Ukraine during the change of jurisdiction, Moscow was quick to liquidate its independence and identity. The Metropolis of Kyiv was transformed – first practically, and then formally – into an ordinary eparchy of the Russian Orthodox Church. An immemorial in Ukraine practice of selecting metropolitan and bishops by councils was abolished: candidates for the vacant bishop’s chairs were appointed by the Holy Synod and approved by the tsar. Since 1799 there have been no Ukrainians on the Kyiv Metropolitan throne³⁷⁶.

As a result, Moscow’s “Caesarepapism” ended with the proclamation of the tsar as head of the church.

³⁷³ Огієнко І. Українська церква: Нариси з історії Української православної церкви. У 2-х т. Т. 1. 147 с.; Т. 2. 418 с. К.: Україна, 1993. С. 8.

³⁷⁴ Слобідський Серафим, протоіерей. Закон Божий: Підручник для сім’ї та школи / Видання 3-є. К.: Видавничий відділ УПЦКП, 2004. С. 368.

³⁷⁵ Огієнко І. Українська церква: Нариси з історії Української православної церкви. У 2-х т. Т. 2. К.: Україна, 1993. С. 203, 212.

³⁷⁶ Воронин О. О. Автокефалія Православної Церкви. Кенсінгтон: Воскресіння, 1990. С. 26.

In Ukraine, it was forbidden to print church books other than those published in Russia. In the liturgy it was ordered to use the Russian pronunciation; the Russian Orthodox Church keeps this practice of Russification in Ukraine (except Galicia) and Belarus to this day. It was forbidden to preach in Ukrainian. Moscow continued to be disrespectful of preaching, and if the priest wanted to preach, he could do so only in a foreign to people language – in Russian³⁷⁷.

In XIX century the leveling of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine has accelerated. Priests, whom in Ukraine at the end XIX century were about 12,000, had to serve to a case of Russification. The eparchial bishops completed their administration with Russians or russified Ukrainians who were spiritually close to them. The Russians were also appointed as priests into larger and more important churches. There were people from Russia in many Ukrainian parishes, people who had nothing in common either in language, culture or spirit with the people they were supposed to serve. At the same time, talented priests from Ukraine were being sent to non-Russian peoples, conquered by the tsarist troops, to take part in their Russification³⁷⁸. That is, Ukraine's "mortification" policy was paired with the final "mortification" of the Ukrainian National Church until its total decline.

Scientists highlight the following essential features inherent in state-church relations in Ukraine during XVIII – XX centuries: statism of the church at all levels, transforming it into a component of the state executive mechanism with the status of a spiritual ministry; fulfillment by the church of a number of state and other non-church functions; actual loss by the church of independence from the state structures, its forced apologetic role for autocratic actions; proclamation of the autocratic-Russian version of the Orthodox Church as dominant; state policy of identification of Orthodoxy with the Russian nation; the legal inferiority of other nations and religions, etc³⁷⁹.

The question of restoration of the independent Ukrainian Orthodox Church became relevant again in 1917, when tsar's regime was overthrown and the flames of the national movement erupted in Ukraine. The demands for the independence of church and religious life, the Ukrainianization of the church, the restoration of its cathedral system, and "exclusion of the

³⁷⁷ Слобідський Серафим, протоіерей. Закон Божий: Підручник для сімї та школи / Видання 3-є. К.: Видавничий відділ УПЦКП, 2004. С. 411-413.

³⁷⁸ Слобідський Серафим, протоіерей. Закон Божий: Підручник для сімї та школи / Видання 3-є. К.: Видавничий відділ УПЦКП, 2004. С. 413.

³⁷⁹ Академічне релігієзнавство: Підручник / Під редакцією А. Колодного. К.: Світ Знань, 2000. С. 607.

Russians on the episcopal chairs” were expressed at eparchial councils and other forums throughout Ukraine. At the end of 1917 an All-Ukrainian Church Cathedral was created to convene an All-Ukrainian Church Council. The main purpose was clearly and unambiguously stated in the message of the organizing committee of the council to the Ukrainian people: “Free Ukrainian people! ... You must immediately assemble your All-Ukrainian Orthodox Council of the clergy and laity and restore with its help the ancient independence of the Ukrainian Church, approved by the Treaty of Pereyaslav and illegally destroyed by the Moscow state!”³⁸⁰.

The awareness of the need for independence of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was so widespread by the time of the convocation of the first All-Ukrainian Orthodox Council in October 1921 that the issue of autocephaly was not even discussed at this historic Council. The canons, adopted by the Council, solemnly state: “The Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which forcibly and uncannily was deprived of autocephaly by the tsarist authorities, and which has morally and canonically always remained autocephalous, and by the decision of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Council of May 5, 1920, has completely restored its autocephaly, it is autocephalous, it is not subject to any spiritual government of other Orthodox Churches, and itself commits its church life under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church, as an autocephalous one, is a free member of the World Cathedral Apostolic Orthodox Church and remains in unbroken fraternal unity with all the Orthodox churches”³⁸¹. The Council decided to recognize as an immoral and anti-canonical act the forcible subjugation of the Ukrainian church to Moscow Patriarchate, which destroyed the spirit of its free creativity. “It was not only a hard violation of the canons... but also a violation of the very spirit of Christ’s doctrine of love, equality and brotherhood”³⁸² – declared the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council in its appeal to the clergy of Ukraine in December 1921. The only possible way for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was a way of completely independent life, free from any subjection, and it chose this way.

The communist regime quickly realized that the spiritual and moral power and nation-unifying influence of the independent Ukrainian Church on the people was dangerous to its purpose – to create a society without God, Christian morality and national consciousness. Autocephaly became, in the eyes of the authorities, tantamount to nationalism and separatism,

³⁸⁰ Історія релігій в Україні: в 10 т. / А. Колодний, Р. Крижанівський. Т. 10. Релігія і церква років незалежності України. Київ – Дрогобич: Коло, 2003. С. 408-409.

³⁸¹ Історія релігій в Україні: в 10 т. / А. Колодний, Р. Крижанівський. Т. 10. Релігія і церква років незалежності України. Київ – Дрогобич: Коло, 2003. С. 136-137.

³⁸² Ibid. С. 137.

“counter-revolution” and “petliurism”. In 1930 during the fabricated trial against the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (non-existent organization), the whole Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was blamed in connection with the anti-Soviet activity. By 1937 the bishopry of the church, almost all the clergy were destroyed. Even the believers, who actively supported the autocephalous church in Ukraine, did not miss the “punishing sword of the revolution”. On November 27, 1937 Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky was shot³⁸³.

From this it follows that the Ukrainian church and religion were for the Communists almost the greatest enemy, greater than Christianity of the first centuries was for the authorities of that times. The anti-Church hysteria in the USSR caused the proclamation in September 1937 by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the “godless five-year plan”, during which religion and church had to be “destroyed”.

Destroyed during Stalin’s terror, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was reborn during World War II. It was reborn spontaneously by the will of the people, who, despite two decades of cruel persecution, did not lose faith in God and devotion to their native church. In the summer of 1942 more than a thousand Ukrainian Orthodox parishes were established in Eastern Ukraine³⁸⁴. And there would be even more of them if oppression from the side of the invaders did not increase. More than 100 Ukrainian Orthodox priests and clergymen became victims of German terror. The Germans only in Volyn burned at least 14 villages and 17 churches, in some cases with people locked inside³⁸⁵.

After the return of the Soviet power to Ukraine in 1943-1944, the Russian Orthodox Church, headed by the Moscow Patriarchate, completely ruled it.

The first victim of the Bolshevik-Stalin’s political genocide was the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. The blow first fell to the bishopric, without which the church cannot exist. On April 11, 1945 Metropolitan J. Slipyi was arrested in Lviv, Bishop G. Khomyshyn – in Stanislav (now Ivano-Frankivsk), and Bishop J. Kotsylovsky – in Peremyshl (now Przemysl, Poland) without any protest from the Polish authorities. They were all convicted. Except for Metropolitan J. Slipyi, who had been tortured in prison and exiled for 18 years, none of them returned to freedom.

³⁸³ Гудима А. М. Релігієзнавство: Підручник. Тернопіль: Укрмедкнига, 2002. С. 194.

³⁸⁴ Власовський І. Нарис історії Української Православної Церкви. Нью-Йорк: Саунд Баунд Брук, 1966. С. 234-235.

³⁸⁵ Власовський І. 10 літ тому. *Український православний календар на 1953 рік*. Видавництво Української Православної Церкви в США. С. 98-99.

Now it is the turn for the church itself. Under the direct pressure of the authorities, a so-called “council” was convened in Lviv on March 8-10, 1946, and 214 priests and 19 laymen came to it, while being selected in advance. The content of its “work” was limited to the urgent solution of two major issues: the cutting of connections with Rome and the transition of the church under the authority of the Moscow Patriarch. From the point of view of the canon law of both the Catholic and Orthodox churches, this council and the synod of the Orthodox Church were completely illegal acts. There were no Catholic bishops at the synod, as they were all imprisoned. The Orthodox Church had no right to convene a synod of the existing Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. But for the Moscow patriarchate and for the Soviet regime, the issue of legality was of no importance, since they had no respect for canon law³⁸⁶. Thus, Lviv Council in 1946 is not only a tragic landmark in the history of the Greek Catholic Church in Ukraine. It is also a tragedy of the Orthodox Church in general, since it, in the person of the Moscow Patriarchate, was given by a totalitarian regime a role of a burier of another church.

In 1949 the Soviet government liquidated the Ukrainian Greek Catholic (Uniate) Church in Carpathian Ukraine, abolishing the Union of Uzhorod of 1646. Carpathian Ukraine, which was a part of the Czech-Slovak Republic before the war, was incorporated into the USSR in 1945. Transcarpathian Bishop Theodore Romzha died in November 1947 under mysterious circumstances. The Bolsheviks set up an accident, but when the bishop survived, he was poisoned in a hospital³⁸⁷.

Thus, after the forcible liquidation of the Greek Catholic Church in 1946-1947, the Moscow Patriarchate took control over all eparchies and parishes in Western Ukraine. With a complete monopoly of church activity in Ukraine, the traditionally chauvinistic Russian Orthodox Church has pursued a consistent policy of total denationalization of church life through the decades since World War II.

The Orthodox Church in Ukraine was fully subordinated to Moscow. The Bishops of the Eparchy in Ukraine were appointed by the Holy Synod of the Moscow Patriarchal Church. All decisions about church life were made in Moscow. The name “Exarchate of Ukraine” practically meant only the territory in which the eparchies were located, which in no way differed from similar eparchies in the rest of the Soviet Union. Metropolitan of Kyiv and Halicia was not the first hierarch and spiritual leader of the original church –

³⁸⁶ Ленцик В. Українська Католицька Церква в Советському Союзі. *Російщення України: Науково-популярний збірник*. К.: Видання УККА, 1992. С. 19.

³⁸⁷ Ibid. С. 194.

he was, according to the Ukrainian diaspora writer and public figure O. Voronyn, the deputy of the church-enslaver in the church-colony.

Signs of easing tensions in state-church and especially state-Orthodox relations emerged only in the late 1980s. Religious communities gradually began to get out of party-state control and act independently.

In 1989 an autocephalous movement was revived in Ukraine. In early 1990 the All-Ukrainian Council of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC), held in Kyiv, confirmed the fact of the UAOC's restoration and decided to establish its patriarchate. The first patriarch was elected Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States Mstyslav (Skrypnyk).

Seeking to limit the spread of the UAOC and taking into account the processes of national and religious revival in Ukraine, the leadership of the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) has reorganized its structures in Ukraine. The Ukrainian Exarchate of the ROC was renamed into the Ukrainian Orthodox Church with the rights of autonomy. As a result, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church emerged, remaining part of the Moscow Patriarchate. Part of the Ukrainian clergy, led by Metropolitan Filaret, after the declaration of independence of Ukraine raised the question before the ROC leadership about full autocephaly. However, without obtaining consent, in 1992 it united with the UAOC and formed the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC) of the Kyiv Patriarchate. However, a number of bishops of the UAOC did not support the new unification, and after the death of the head of the UOC of the Kyiv Patriarchate Mstyslav in 1993, they again proclaimed the UAOC, whose head was elected Patriarch Dimitri. In its turn, the Council of UOC of the Kyiv Patriarchate elected Metropolitan Volodymyr as the Patriarch of Kyiv and All Rus-Ukraine (1993-1995). After his death, Metropolitan Filaret, who was elected patriarch, headed the UOC of the Kyiv Patriarchate. Thus, there are currently three Orthodox churches in Ukraine – the UOC of the Kyiv Patriarchate, the UAOC and the UOC of the Moscow Patriarchate³⁸⁸.

Therefore, in the context of large-scale socio-political changes that took place in the USSR in the late 1980s and early 1990s, totalitarian Soviet policy on religion and church collapsed. On April 23, 1991 the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted the Law of Ukraine “On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations”, which significantly influenced the religious situation in Ukraine. This law defined the basic principles of state-church relations, the rights and obligations of the state in relation to believers and

³⁸⁸ Стоцький Я. В. Релігійна ситуація в Україні: проблеми і тенденції розвитку (1988-1998). Тернопіль: Астон, 1999. С. 96.

religious organizations, as well as believers and religious organizations in relation to the state.

Important was the consolidation at the legislative level of such provisions and principles as the separation of church (religious organizations) from the state and school from the church, equality of all religions, denominations and religious organizations before the law, equality of citizens regardless of their attitude to religion, prohibition of privileges or restrictions on the grounds of religious or other beliefs, the acquisition by a religious organization of the right of a juridical person, the protection by the state of the legal rights and interests of believers and religious organizations.

Each citizen was guaranteed the right of freedom of thought, which included the freedom to have, accept and change religion or belief of his choice, and the freedom to practice or not to practice any religion alone or with others, to serve religious cults, to openly express and to freely spread own religious or atheistic beliefs and act due to them.

The state did not interfere in the internal affairs and activities of religious organizations. Religious organizations, in turn, did not perform state functions.

Considering the difficult Soviet religious heritage, one of the tasks of the law was “overcoming the negative consequences of state policy on religion and the church”³⁸⁹.

Religious organizations were given the right to participate in public life, to be engaged in socially significant activities and to use mass-media just like public associations.

Citizens who worked in religious organizations and at enterprises, created by them, were subject to the laws of labor, taxation, state social insurance³⁹⁰.

After the proclamation of Ukraine’s independence on August 24, 1991, it had new opportunities for defining and implementing its own religious policy, for the revival and development of religious church life, for the development of civilized relations between the state and the church.

The state’s strategy for the full protection of religious rights and freedoms was further reflected in the Constitution of Ukraine (1996). Some theses contained in the Law of Ukraine “On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations” (separation of the church from the state and school from the church, the right of freedom of conscience and religion, cases of its restriction, etc.) were enshrined at the constitutional level. Religious

³⁸⁹ Закон України «Про свободу совісті та релігійні організації». Відомості Верховної Ради УРСР (ВВР). № 25. ст. 10.

³⁹⁰ Ibid.

pluralism in Ukrainian society was defined by the constitutional formula – “no religion can be recognized by the state as obligatory”³⁹¹. In the case when the performance of military duty contradicted the religious beliefs of the citizen, the Basic Law gave the right to replace it with an alternative (non-military) service³⁹². The procedure of passing this service was determined by the Law of Ukraine “On Alternative (Non-Military) Service”³⁹³.

Considering the fact that Ukrainian society is multi-ethnic and multi-confessional, the state has assumed a constitutional obligation to promote the development of the religious identity of all indigenous peoples and national minorities of Ukraine. In order to avoid ethno-national and inter-confessional conflicts, to ensure peace and harmony in Ukrainian society, the Constitution of Ukraine prohibited “the formation and activities of political parties and public organizations whose program purposes or actions are aimed at... inciting ethnic, racial, religious hatred”³⁹⁴.

Thus, the legal basis for the formation of such a model of state-church relations, which provided the granting of wide religious freedoms, appeared in Ukraine. Restrictions to the freedom of conscience and religion, to the serving of religious cults, religious activities were established only in the interests of public order, public health and moral, or protection of the rights and freedoms of others³⁹⁵.

Later, a number of sectoral legislative and other legal acts was adopted, which resulted in the creation of a legal system that comprehensively regulated the relations between the state and the church, the activities of religious organizations in various spheres of public life.

Thus, with Ukraine’s independence, the former confrontational model of state-church relations was destroyed and the foundations for forming partnerships between the state and the church were laid.

Each religion was given the opportunity to openly declare about its existence, to carry out its religious and non-religious activities freely, to build its own infrastructure, to communicate freely with fellow believers abroad.

As we can see, Ukrainian society is characterized by confessional diversity, which is a manifestation of the real guarantee of the right to freedom of conscience and religion, as well as the principle of religious

³⁹¹ Конституція України. Відомості Верховної Ради України (ВВР). 1996. № 30. ст. 141.

³⁹² Ibid.

³⁹³ Закон України «Про альтернативну (невійськову) службу». Відомості Верховної Ради України (ВВР). 1992. № 15. ст. 188.

³⁹⁴ Конституція України. Відомості Верховної Ради України (ВВР). 1996. № 30. ст. 141.

³⁹⁵ Ibid.

pluralism, enshrined in the Constitution of Ukraine and the Law of Ukraine “On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations”³⁹⁶.

According to the information of the Department of Religions and Nationalities of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine, which was presented in the Report on the Network of Churches and Religious Organizations in Ukraine as of 01.01.2019, religious differentiation in Ukraine is as follows:

- Number of religious communities: 35,162;
- Monasteries – 531, monks and nuns – 6794, missions – 368, fraternities 83;
- The clergy, including foreigners – 32619/918;
- Spiritual educational institutions – 204, incl. higher / secondary – 136/68, listeners in them (day-time / part-time) – 7939/9947;
- Schools, incl. general education / Sunday – 13211 – 16/13195;
- Massmedia, incl. printed / audiovisual / electronic – 530 – 341/22/167³⁹⁷.

At the same time, multi-confessionality of Ukrainian society causes competition between religions, which in the absence of a proper level of interfaith tolerance can cause tension in the society.

Nowadays, there is a confrontation between the Orthodox churches among themselves, between the Orthodox, on the one hand, and Roman and Greek Catholics, on the other, between the traditional religions and neoreligions. In these circumstances, a dialogue aimed at forming among believers of inter-confessional tolerance, the experience of foreign countries, where representatives of different religions peacefully exist, is relevant for Ukraine.

The level of inter-denominational confrontation could be significantly reduced by the proper provision of cult buildings for religious organizations. Today this need is satisfied for 67 percent. This situation does not remove from the agenda the issue of the return to religious ownership or use of all religious buildings that are still not being used for their intended purpose. At the same time problems of the alternate use of temples by various religious organizations and the new cult construction do not lose the relevance.

This also preserves some potential for conflict, the basis of which is the property issue, which is concerned with the lack of cult buildings for religious organizations (only 75.5%). Their active construction and restoration of formerly unused temples over the past decades has greatly mitigated the problem. It should be emphasized that when joining the

³⁹⁶ Закон України «Про свободу совісті та релігійні організації». Відомості Верховної Ради УРСР (ВВР). № 25. ст. 10.

³⁹⁷ Релігійно – інформаційна служба України. [Електронний ресурс] / Режим доступу: https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/resources/statistics/ukr_2019/75410/

Council of Europe, Ukraine has committed itself to restitution of its former church property. According to paragraph XI of the Conclusion No. 190 (1995) of the Parliamentary Assembly Council of Europe (PACE), Ukraine was advised to settle a “legal solution to the issue of the return of church property”³⁹⁸. PACE Recommendation No. 1556 (2002) of 24 April 2002 reminded Ukraine of the need to “guarantee to religious institutions whose property had been nationalized in the past, the restitution of that property in proper time or, if that is not possible, a fair compensation”³⁹⁹.

It should also be noted that much has already been done in Ukraine in this direction: by 2008, about 3,6 thousand religious buildings and over 12 thousand items of church use were returned to the church or transferred for use⁴⁰⁰. The church remains the only institution to which restitution is applied. Many legal acts have been adopted to complete the restitution of church property. Draft of the Law of Ukraine “On Return of Religious Property to Religious Organizations” was developed”⁴⁰¹.

The experience of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, which have solved this problem at the state level almost completely, is illustrative in this respect.

In contrast to the post-Soviet countries, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe have clearly defined the range of objects and the ways of their return to the church. Each country of the post-socialist space has developed its own strategy of restitution of church property, which is understandable due to different religious traditions and different starting conditions. The example of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe regarding the return of property to religious organizations shows that this process is painful for both the church and the state. It is difficult to set similar rules for cases requiring atypical decisions. At the same time, the experience of the countries of the Visegrad Four shows that in order to complete the restitution of church property, it is necessary to carry out a complete inventory of religious buildings, to create a single register of

³⁹⁸ Висновок ПАРС № 190 (1995) щодо вступу України до Ради Європи. Страсбург. 1995. 25 вересня. *Реституція церковного майна: міжнародний та вітчизняний досвід*: збірник наукових матеріалів. К., 2007. С. 65.

³⁹⁹ Релігія та зміни в у Центральній та Східній Європі: Рекомендація ПАРС № 1556 (2002). *Реституція церковного майна: міжнародний та вітчизняний досвід*: збірник наукових матеріалів. К., 2007. С. 65.

⁴⁰⁰ Новиченко М. Р. Повернення церковного майна як пріоритет державної політики щодо релігії та церкви. *Пріоритети державної політики в галузі свободи совісті: шляхи реалізації*. К.: Світ Знань, 2007. С. 69-70.

⁴⁰¹ Про звернення культового майна релігійним організаціям: Проект Закону України. *Реституція церковного майна: міжнародний та вітчизняний досвід*: збірник наукових матеріалів. К., 2007. С. 76-80.

objects that have to be returned to the church. It is important to provide the sources and procedures for financial compensation to recover damages to persons in connection with the return procedures.

At this stage of development one of the peculiarities of the contemporary religious situation in Ukraine is confessional regionalism, which is based on the different concentration of certain religions in individual regions. Although all regions of Ukraine are largely multi-denominational, some of them are clearly dominated by individual religious organizations.

The struggle for temples in some towns of Ukraine often turns into open conflicts, clashes between believers. If the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate considers this process quite natural and qualifies it as the “unification from below” then the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate qualifies it as “seizing temples”. With the direct support of the Russian Orthodox Church, it tries to use all the possibilities to “protect canonical Orthodoxy”, to prevent it from leaving parishes, temples and property.

Local authorities, citing the separation of the church and the state, try not to interfere in this process. In addition, according to an Internet poll, 74,7 percent of respondents said that a parish council together with a priest and parishioners should determine the religious affiliation of the temple⁴⁰².

An important historical process, witnessed by Ukraine, is the granting of autocephaly to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. This process is a consequence of the centuries-long struggle of the Ukrainian people for their spiritual independence, Transcarpathia also was not left aside this process.

Transcarpathia is a special territory in which various religious denominations exist in mutual understanding. It is a historical and ethnographic region, where for centuries representatives of different peoples and denominations have interacted in the stripe of ethnic and political borderline with Romanians, Hungarians, Slovaks and Poles. The religious and ecclesiastical life of the region has its own peculiarities, because not only the political and economic interests but also the religious interests of the neighboring countries are intertwined here. Many religious confessions, directions, movements are registered in the territory of Transcarpathia, among them:

1. Ukrainian Orthodox Church of KP, MP.
2. Greek Catholic Church.
3. Jehovah’s Witnesses (division into Ukrainian, Hungarian, Romanian districts).

⁴⁰² Церква. Режим доступу: http://www.religion.in.ua/news/ukrainian_news/30152_uapcprijnyalausvoyuyurisdikciyumonastirupcmp.html.

4. Transcarpathian Reformed Church (appeared in the land in the XVI-XVII centuries. It operates autonomously, the center is in Berehovo).

5. Roman Catholic Church (Appearance at the end of XI century. It operates independently, center – Mukachevo).

6. Church of Evangelical Christians – Baptists.

7. Union of Christians of Evangelical Ukraine (Pentecostal).

8. Union of Evangelical Christians (Sabbatarians) (Appearing in 1940s, it operates autonomously).

9. Seventh-day Adventist Church (Appearance in 1912).

10. Church of Christians of the Seventh Day (Appearance in the early XX century).

11. Reformed Adventist Church (Appeared in 1914, center – Oleksandrivka village).

12. Judaism. (Autonomous community, appeared in the XVII century).

13. Union of Free Churches of Christians of Evangelical Ukraine.

14. Methodist Church (1920's).

15. Buddhists.

16. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and others.

As of January 1, 2019 in Transcarpathia there are 1977 religious organizations of 37 denominations, movements and directions, 1860 communities, of them registered 1739 (invalid 13), of which 151 religious communities operate without registering their charter in accordance with part three of Chapter 8 Of the Law of Ukraine “On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations”, 7 spiritual educational institutions, 1076 schools, 1993 clergymen, 82 of which are foreigners (Table 1).

Table 1

Report on the Network of Religious Organizations in Ukraine as of January 1, 2019

№	Names of oblasts	Amount of religious organizations including																	
		Centers		Administrations		Communities			Monasteries		Brotherhoods		Missions		Spiritual educational institutions				
		total	active	inactive	registered	unregistered	total	months in them	total	total	total	total	higher	secondary	full-time education	part-time education			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18		
1.	Vynyckia	2217	15	2158	1937	4	217	26	209	5	8	5	4	1	16	260			
2.	Velyk	1667	3	1619	1494	101	24	19	219	3	7	8	1	7	329	472			
3.	Dnipropetrovsk	1533	5	1477	1477			14	151	3	12	9	5	4	430	200			
4.	Donetsk	1856	6	1784	1558	231		12	385	1	26	11	11	33	35	45			
5.	Zhytomyr	1601	1	1541	1541			28	310	4	13	7	7	7	154	20			
6.	Zakarpattia	1977	3	1875	1710	14	151	61	484	7	9	7	3	4	425				
7.	Zaporozhia	1144	1	1107	1027	33	47	12	153	10	4	4	4	4	175	20			
8.	Ivano-Frankivsk	1438	1	1354	1162	13	179	35	141	10	17	11	6	5	567	65			
9.	Kyiv	1909	4	1846	1846			22	133	2	19	9	6	3	169	512			
10.	Kirovograd	799	2	782	635	95	52	5	35		3								
11.	Luhansk	861	11	832	594	34	4	6	64		7	5	2	3	15	105			
12.	Lviv	3272	4	26	3114	2910	68	136	70	794	11	28	19	13	6	1518	990		
13.	Mikolajiv	793	1	773	728	9	36	5	21		5								
14.	Odessa	1372	3	17	1295	1276	15	4	24	455	2	20	11	11	482	234			
15.	Poltava	1183	11	1153	1153			8	80	4	4	3	3	3	64	555			
16.	Rivne	1620	7	1566	1542	5	19	22	501	1	18	6	4	2	712	1651			
17.	Sumy	602	4	591	591				5		2								
18.	Ternopil	1852	12	1757	1757			46	516	2	4	11	1	10	597	198			
19.	Kharkiv	1034	14	992	819	1	173	11	61	2	8	7	3	4	215	268			
20.	Kherson	973	9	950	949	1		7	33	1	5	1	1	1	100	20			
21.	Kirynohivskij	1974	2	14	1968	1607	301	23	238	2	18	7	4	3	116	22			
22.	Cherkassy	1484	10	1465	1345	60	7	229	1	10	1	1	1		450				
23.	Chernivci	1350	1	1401	1041	118	139	21	988	7	8	8	8		641				
24.	Chernihiv	1066	8	977	862	69	46	14	196	1	5	3	3	3	52	34			
25.	City of Kyiv	1282	55	27	1005	960	5	40	28	988	21	107	49	49	1872	3148			
	TOTAL	36739	92	299	35162	32719	1116	1327	531	6794	83	368	204	136	68	7939	9947		

Source: [Перелік та інформація єврейських організацій в Україні] / [Електрографічний перелік] / Перелік організацій єврейської громади в Україні за станом на 01.01.2019 рр. URL: https://inst.gov.ua/info/index/resources/statusukr_2019/75410/

Table 1 (Continue)

**Report on the Network of Religious Organizations
in Ukraine as of January 1, 2019**

№	Names of oblasts	Schools		Clergy		Amount				
		Total	including General education	Sunday	total	of them foreigners	Periodicals including			
							printed	Audiovisual (radio and television)	electronic	
1	2	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
1.	Vynnytsia	630	3	636	1416	19	4	3	1	1
2.	Vdovna	1072		1072	1614	11	23	6	9	10
3.	Dnipropetrovsk	527		527	1386	20	27	5	25	
4.	Dnietser	271		271	1480	4	66	37	1	28
5.	Zhytomyr	391		391	1020	47	9	9		
6.	Zakarpattia	1076		1076	1993	82	20	15		5
7.	Zaporizhia	493		493	1029	23	22	12		10
8.	Ivano-Frankivsk	528	2	526	1376	41	55	17	5	33
9.	Kyiv	881	1	880	1674	31	8	8		
10.	Kirovohrad	152	1	151	604	8	18	5	1	12
11.	Luhansk	370		370	1205	2	24	17		
12.	Lviv	1938	3	1935	3911	180	25	25		7
13.	Mykolajiv	271	1	270	675	11	19	11		8
14.	Odessa	436	3	433	1241	49	10	10		
15.	Poltava	354		354	953	9	17	17		
16.	Rivne	780		780	1500	39	21	14		2
17.	Sunny				569	8	8	1		
18.	Ternopil	522		522	1300	11	10	3		7
19.	Khmelnytskyi	362		362	1340	43	8	6		2
20.	Kherson	393		393	594	4	9	8	1	
21.	Khmelnytskyi	595		593	1385	47	17	17		
22.	Cherkassy	366	2	366	588	3	12	12		
23.	Chernivtsi	463		463	1685	22	2	2		5
24.	Chernihiv	164		164	78	12	18	13		
25.	City of Kyiv	247		247	1306	192	46	46		
	TOTAL	13211	16	13195	32619	918	530	341	22	167

Source: [Pamirino – informacijnia spravna Vpavani (Enachipennni popyt) : Papano do vnyruy: https://riaa.org.ua.ua/index/reconures/statisties/air_2019_25110/]

From Table 1. it is possible to analyze that as of January 1, 2019 in Transcarpathia there are:

- 1977 religious organizations of 37 denominations, movements and directions, of which 151 religious communities operate under part three of Chapter 8 of the Law of Ukraine “On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations” – without registration of the charter;

- 61 monasteries;

- 7 spiritual educational institutions;

- 9 missionary communities;

- 7 religious brotherhoods, 3 centers and 15 administrations;

- there are 1,076 Sunday schools in religious communities. 1993 clergymen, 82 of whom are foreigners, perform church service⁴⁰³.

Believers meet their prayer needs in 1,602 worship buildings and worship apartments, of which 1,346 are temples and houses of worship, 101 are in use, and 155 have been adapted for worship.

During the period of independence from 1991 to 2018, 733 religious buildings were built by believers. During the period of 1992 – 2018, 127 religious objects (out of 281 identified objects of the former church property) were returned to the religious organizations of the region⁴⁰⁴.

The largest number of religious organizations has got the Ukrainian Orthodox Church – 670 religious organizations. The second position is taken by the Mukachevo Greek Catholic Eparchy – 466 organizations. The Transcarpathian Reformed Church – 117 and the Mukachevo Diocese of the Roman Catholic Church – 102 religious organizations. The Transcarpathian Eparchy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate includes 54 religious communities and one monastery. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the region brings together 24 religious communities and a eparchial administration.

The number of registered Protestant religious associations includes 531 religious organizations. According to the registered charters, there are 14 Jewish religious communities, 6 other Orthodox religious communities, 2 Gentile communities, 1 – Buddhists, Muslims, the Krishna Consciousness Society and the Armenian Apostolic Church.

As for the general religious differentiation of the region. The most influential (in terms of authority and level of influence) and the largest (in terms of confessional structure) are the UOC and UOC of Kyiv Patriarchate. The UOC is dominant in all districts of the region, with the exception of the Berehovo district (where it takes approximately 17% of the total number of registered in the district.) (Table 2).

⁴⁰³ Релігійно – інформаційна служба України. [Електронний ресурс] / Режим доступу: https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/resources/statistics/ukr_2019/75410/

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid.

REPORT
on the network of religious organizations
in Ukraine as of January 1, 2019

№	Names of the oblasts	Amount of religious organizations including													Amount													
		Amount of religious organizations including											Schoools		Energy		Periodicals											
		Admnistrations		Communities		Monasteries		Spiritual educational institutions			Brotherhoods		Missions		including		total		Of them		including							
total	active	inactive	registered	unregistered	total	Monks in them	total	higher	secundary	day-time education	Part-time education	total	general education	Sunday	total	total	total	printed	audiovisual (radio and television)	electronic								
TOTAL																												
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27		
Christianity																												
<i>Orthodox religious organizations</i>																												
1.1 Ukrainian Orthodox Church																												
6	Zakarpattia	670	2	650	630	32	330	1	2	1	1	280	52	0	0	0	0	0	52	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
6	Zakarpattia	56	1	54	44	7	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2. Ukrainian Orthodox Church – Kyiv Patriarchate																												
6	Zakarpattia	25	1	24	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3. Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church																												
<i>Catholic religious organizations</i>																												
Greek Catholic Eparchy of Mukachevo																												
1.	Zakarpattia	466	2	442	412	20	114	2	2	2	73	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
6	Zakarpattia	102	1	92	92	8	39	1	1	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roman Catholic Church in Ukraine																												
<i>Protestant religious organizations</i>																												
Baptist religious organizations																												
All-Ukrainian Union of Churches of Evangelical Christian Baptists																												
6.	Zakarpattia	80	1	75	74	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Релігійно – інформаційна служба України. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: https://religion.in.ua/midok/resourses/statistics/ukr_2019/75410/

During the Soviet Union, the Orthodox Church in Ukraine was under the total control of the Communists. After January 22, 1946, when the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR approved the submission of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the UkrSSR on the formation of the Zakarpattia oblast within the USSR. The resolution on the introduction of the legislation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic on the territory of Zakarpattia oblast was adopted on January 25, 1946.

Thereby, "...the Constitution of the USSR of 1936 and the Constitution of the UkrSSR of 1937 came into force in Transcarpathia"⁴⁰⁵. And according to the legislation of the USSR, according to the Decree of the Council of People's Commissars "On Separation of the Church from the State and the School from the Church" of January 29, 1918 – the church was separated from the state in the Soviet Union.

But despite this, the Soviet leadership tried to control the activities of the churches and interfered with church life (a direct testimony to this was the murder of Bishop T. Romzha and the liquidation of the Greek Catholic Church.). It should be noted that the Orthodox Church in Transcarpathia was in especially difficult conditions under Stalinism in 1946-1953. Orthodox Christians had to adapt themselves to the existence in the atheist USSR. The activity of the church was under total control, because the activity of religious organizations was controlled by two structures in Transcarpathia:

- Council on the affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church;
- Council on Religious Cults⁴⁰⁶.

Catholicism in oblast is represented by the Greek Catholic Church and the Roman Catholic Church. Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church ranks second in the region after Orthodoxy. Founded in 1596, it is represented in Transcarpathia by the Eparchy of Mukachevo. At the end of the XI century a Roman Catholic Church appeared in Transcarpathia, now it is represented by the Mukachevo diocese in the region.

Acute conflicts between Orthodox and Greek Catholics do not arise nowadays, as it was during the communist regime, when state-makers tried to use the ancient disputes between Orthodox and Greek Catholics in the case of liquidation of the GCC in the Western Ukraine; conflicts between them were provoked by the central communist power, and they were mostly

⁴⁰⁵ Макара М. П. Встановлення на Закарпатті Радянської політичної системи. *Нариси історії Закарпаття*. Т. III. (1946-1991). Ужгород: Госпрозрахунковий редакційно-видавничий відділ у справах преси та інформації, 2003. С. 37.

⁴⁰⁶ Данилець Ю.В., Міщанин В.В. Православна церква на Закарпатті в часи «сталінщини (1946 – 1953 рр.). [Електронний ресурс] / Режим доступу: file:///C:/Users/home/Downloads/Nvuust_2013_1_9%20(1).pdf

concerned with property (1945 – 1946)⁴⁰⁷. Most often, conflicts occurred in villages where religious issues had not been resolved. “Every political regime pursued a church policy favorable to the ruling state for its approval in Transcarpathia. For this purpose, along with the use of interethnic contradictions, the emphasis was placed on interfaith differences...”⁴⁰⁸.

Protestant communities are also becoming widespread in Transcarpathia, but their part in different areas of the region is uneven. Despite the fact that in the Soviet times, after the creation in 1944 of the Council on Religious Cults at the Soviet People’s Commissar of the USSR, led by I.V. Polyansky, the Soviet leadership ordered to establish the control and possibility of manipulation over Protestant communities, the Soviet leadership promoted the unification of Protestant denominations resulted in the formation of the Union of Baptist Christians, led by the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists. Joining this organization and registering gave virtually the only opportunity for these communities to exist⁴⁰⁹. At the present time, all Protestant movements act freely in the territory of Transcarpathia and have a moderate religious dialogue with other religious communities of the region.

The Reformed Church is also widespread in the land. It appeared in the XVI – XVII centuries – one of the Calvinist churches represented in Ukraine, the vast majority of believers in Transcarpathia are Hungarians, and the church operates in 8 districts⁴¹⁰. In Berehovo, Vynohradiv, Mukachevo, Uzhgorod and Khust districts of Transcarpathian region. It is a member of the Commonwealth of Reformed Churches of the Carpathian Basin.

The regional state administration, executive authorities and local self-government are making efforts to return former religious buildings to Greek Catholic communities, to the religious communities of the Roman Catholic Church, Transcarpathian Reformed Church, Evangelical baptist-christians

⁴⁰⁷ Доповідні записки уповноваженого Ради у справах релігійних культів Петра Лінгура про релігійну політику на Закарпатті (1945 – 1946 рр.). [Електронний ресурс] / Режим доступу: https://www.publib.sk/web/kniznica/elpub/dokument/Kocvar8/subor/05_Miscanin.pdf

⁴⁰⁸ Макара М. Питання релігійної політики в діяльності Народної Ради Закарпатської України (ХІ. 1944-І.1946 рр.). *Ужгородській унії – 350 років*: Матеріали міжнародних наукових конференцій (Ужгород, квітень 1996 р.). Ужгород, 1996. С. 127.

⁴⁰⁹ Закарпатська реформатська церква у перші повоєнні роки / І. В. Шерстюк. *Історична пам'ять*. 2012. Вип. 28. С. 86.

⁴¹⁰ Костащук І., Синько М. Релігійна сфера Закарпатської області. [Електронний ресурс] / Режим доступу: https://collectedpapers.com.ua/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/696_024_Kostaschuk_2.pdf

and others. Religious organizations are provided with religious buildings for 90%. They receive help in their connecting with associates abroad⁴¹¹.

In Transcarpathia, there is a high degree of trust to religious organizations, and in the region the state policy on religion and church, on protecting the rights and freedoms and keeping the right of the citizens to freely satisfy their needs will continue to be ensured.

Analyzing the inter-denominational relations in Transcarpathia, we can state the inter-denominational concord between the different churches, denominations and movements, which exist in Transcarpathia. There are many ecumenical churches and premises in the territory of the region, where priests of different denominations take turns in church service. And this does not lead to the rise of sharp debates and discussions among the confessional communities.

⁴¹¹ Резеш Й.Й. Про стан та тенденції розвитку релігійної ситуації, державно – церковних відносин в Закарпатській обл. [Електронний ресурс] / Режим доступу: <http://centerkylyr.pp.ua/2018/05/05/1649/>

PART 8.
THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK
FOR THE STUDY OF THE EASTERN ENLARGEMENT
OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

Theoretical and methodological framework for the study is based on *interdisciplinary approach* which provides the opportunity to analyse every element of the European integration process of Central European countries comprehensively, taking into account the impact of economic, institutional and political factors. The application of the *systems approach*, which is the basis of this scientific study, has facilitated clear formulation of the existing problems and finding logical ways of solving them.

With that being said, an important component of the search for European integration theories, which would adequately explain current European integration processes or outline the clear directions for the future development of the EU's eastern enlargement, or the actual development of the Central European region, is *an awareness of the existence of multivariate interpretations of the role and significance of the subjects of international relations*. “Europe will not be made all at once, or according to a single plan. It will be built through concrete achievements which first create a de facto solidarity” – Robert Schuman⁴¹². The aforementioned thesis, that is, in fact, the first principle of the Schuman Declaration, clearly and logically explains the very essence of the European integration process, and moreover, in the theoretical dimension as well. First of all, it proves the incapacity of the federalist approach in the initial phase of the development of European integration – as the inability to create a federal superpower, despite the existence of successful models of the federal system in the world. Secondly, this principle reflects the essence of the philosophy of development of European integration, namely the precedence of practice, and not the formation of a priori ideologemes or theoretical constructs, which should be followed by practice. Essentially, conceptually the theories of integration did not act and did not serve as determinants of political decisions neither at the beginning of the creation of European integration, nor today.

¹ A new idea for Europe. The Schuman declaration – 1950-2000. European Commission. Series: European Documentation. – Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2000. – 15 p.

Thirdly, the subject of research in the theory of European integration itself – the evolution, elements and mechanisms of action of the European Union – indicates the existence of different scientific opinions. Primarily, these interpretations concern the qualitative definition of the EU along with other international, or rather intergovernmental, organizations of the world as *primus inter pares*. From other perspectives European integration is considered as one of the segments of regional integration of the world, or vice versa, is distinguished to be a unique European integration process on a global scale.

However, it should be noted that there is no unanimous opinion on the fundamental questions of the political theory of European integration, and it is hardly possible that there could be one. It is completely clear that the economic theory of European integration has been thoroughly elaborated. According to the key points of integration theory, initially European integration used to be seen as some union such as the USA or faced radical objections with opinions why this path would be not acceptable for Europe.

From the existing array of theoretical generalizations in the context of both deepening and widening of the European Union, first of all, three *basic conceptual generalizations* should be distinguished, which can also characterize the essence of the European integration progress of the countries of Central Europe.

The first one is “*multi-speed*” *Europe* (the term first appeared in the Tindemans Report (1975) which describes a situation where not all member states are able to, or want to, move towards integration in a particular field at the same pace. However, certain measures aimed at reconciling the interests of different groups of states become necessary. In general, the provisions of the Tindemans Report were rejected, but the introduction of the European exchange rate mechanism (in the late 1970s) allowed for the possibility of “different speeds” within the European monetary system. Real threats to the emergence of multi-speed Europe today also emerged after the first unsuccessful attempt at adopting the EU Constitution, which also indicated the possible crisis in the context of creating a single entity in international relations.

The second one is *Europe a la carte* – the so-called “menu” of development strategies for European countries – that is a model of European integration, by which states choose whether or not to participate in a particular integration initiative. Such a model was followed, for example, by the British Government, using the so-called opt-out on the provisions of the “Social Package” of the Maastricht Agreement. This term reflects the idea of a variety of different methods of integration that allows member states to choose strategies “from the menu” and engage in their implementation. The given model may pose a threat to the entire process of European integration,

so there should be at least a minimum number of common goals for the member states of the EU (by the way, another name for this model of European integration is the “*variable geometry*” Europe).

The third one is *Europe of concentric circles* – the concept of European integration proposed by Jacques Delors in January 1989, which envisages an increasing level of integration towards the “center” of the European Community which comprises of the EU countries that have already created a political union, common market and economic and monetary union. Next would be the countries of the European Free Trade Association, which are closer to the EU in economic and legal terms. The outer circle would be made up of associated countries that are eligible to apply for the EU membership in the future. The fourth and the widest circle includes the OSCE member states as a common space for European cooperation⁴¹³.

The analysis of *theoretical models of integration processes*, particularly of European integration, provides an opportunity to investigate the dynamics of the integration process itself. This issue is studied by international law, world economy, international relations, political science etc. In Ukraine this is mainly studied as international integration. Today, Ukrainian scientists are meticulously characterizing the existing integration models of the European Union, which in turn forms the home school of “European studies”. However, the study of theoretical models of integration, as well as the theory and practice of European integration in general, and in the region of Central Europe in particular, requires deep rethinking on the basis of a critical analysis of existing developments and an examination of the correspondence of theoretical foundations to the dynamic development of the modern European integration process.

An issue of current importance for the theory and practice of European integration today is the development of a modern theory of the European integration process, its imaginary or real components, as the ability to understand each of today's, and most importantly, the “tomorrow's” steps of the EU. It is necessary not only for the EU but even more so for the Central European countries and is extremely important for Ukraine. The future of Ukraine should not be limited by the Copenhagen Criteria or any other documents, as these issues are complex but still technical, and we see the solution to the problem in the strategic planning of the European integration policy of the country under the conditions of a *conceptually thought out theory of the European integration process*.

The scientific importance of the problem lies in the fact that today, in the context of continuous dynamic development, which is, in fact, a radical

² Європейський Союз. Словник-довідник. – К.: К.І.С., 2001 – С. 25-26.

transformation of the European Union, it is essential to develop new models of the European integration process, at least of the theory of EU enlargement. It should be noted that some attempts to do this have already been made in the Western scientific literature⁴¹⁴, there are even studies that attempt to “calculate” the benefits and losses of the EU’s eastern enlargement⁴¹⁵, but in fact, the problem is that these theoretical models do not stand the test of time – that is, the theory cannot “catch up” with the flow of time. The inability to develop an effective Eastern policy today for such a respectable international association, and in fact, a real subject of international relations as the European Union, indicates the lack of conceptual theoretical and methodological generalizations about the “newest eastern periphery of the European Union”. Practically, the theory does not keep up with the practice of learning by trial and error currently used by the EU for its eastern policy.

And, in fact, current theoretical generalizations do not meet the challenges of the present-day EU enlargement. Let’s just mention the absence of a clear EU strategy for eastern enlargement, which resulted in Central European countries reaping the “benefits” of it even now, being full members of the EU. Whether it would be unsuccessful but “always relevant” quasi-discussions about the recent borders of Europe, or the separation of the Ultima Thule cultural and civilizational space which includes Ukraine along with all other non-EU countries, or conceptually poorly thought-out ideas of immediate neighbourhood, or the creation of new “financially limited” neighbourhood policies, which are effective neither conceptually nor strategically, and already require substantial modification or, in the best case scenario, the development of some aspects of the new Eastern EU policy – all of the mentioned above directly concerns Ukraine. This is highlighted in more detail in the second and fifth sections of the study.

⁴¹⁴ Kolankiewicz, George. Consensus and Competition in the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union // *International Affairs* – 70. – 1994. – 477 – 495 pp.; Mayhew, Alan. *Recreating Europe. The European Union’s Policy towards Central and Eastern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998; Moravcsik A. *Explaining International Human Rights Regimes: Liberal Theory and Western Europe*, in: *European Journal of International Relations*. – 1. – 1995. – 157-189 pp.; Moravcsik A. *The Choice for Europe. Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht*, London: UCL Press, 1998. – 514 pp.; Moravcsik A. *What Lessons to learn from Europe’s Crises? Is there really a crisis of European leadership?* – Issue 11, 2004; Sedelmeier U. and Helen Wallace (2000): *Eastern Enlargement: Strategy or Second Thoughts?*, in Wallace and Wallace (eds.) (2000): *Policy-Making in the European Union*, 4th edition (Oxford University Press), pp. 427-460.

⁴¹⁵ Baldwin, Richard E., Francois, Joseph F., Portes, Richard. *The Costs and Benefits of Eastern Enlargement: the Impact on the EU and Central Europe* // *Economic Policy*. – 24. – 1997. – 125-176 p.

It will be possible to manage the situation only when we are able to anticipate the actions of the EU at least two steps ahead or at least understand the importance of adapting the countries of the new Central Europe and apply these lessons of European integration for our country.

Undoubtedly, the key constant of a truly effective EU strategy, both at the time of its founding and today, remains the successful, optimal combination of political progress with economic and social progress in the context of taking into account the objective realities of the EU's historical development. In the end, this can be clearly seen both at the first stage (first of all, the dominance of the economic component) of European integration and during the establishment of its organic political component, namely the signing of the Single European Act in 1986, the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1997.

Virtually, both in the twentieth century and today, in the beginning of the twenty-first century, the key issues of theoretical and methodological generalizations, including this scientific research, lie in the role and importance of the nation-state in shaping the theoretical foundations of the European integration process. The wide range of theoretical models of integration – first of all, their evolution in the contradictory process of practice of international relations, led to the development of *multi-concept integration approaches to European issues*. The role and importance of the nation-state in the integration union, in this case within the European Union, still remains the key issue.

Thus, as centuries ago, the key question is the traditional dilemma of defining the phenomenon of the nation-state. According to the definition of the well-known French philosopher and sociologist Raymond Aron, “*international relations* are relations between political entities, the latter concept covering the Greek city-states, the Roman and Egyptian empires, as well as European monarchies, bourgeois republics and people’s democracies⁴¹⁶. As Raymond Aaron rightly points out, international relations are political relations, interrelations between states. However, at the end of the XX century, *regional unions or economic unions*, which by the way are also created by states, as well as by non-state structures, civic movements and initiatives, *more and more often are considered to be the subjects of international relation*.

The fact is that the main tendency of the current stage of international relation hasn’t been changed since the ancient times, as *national interests* remain a constant motive of international politics, and the essence of international politics is the struggle for power, the state remains the main

⁴¹⁶ Реймон Арон. Мир і війна між націями. Київ: Юніверс, 2000. – С. 32-33.

international actor that determines the nature of international relations. The power and balance of powers remains as the main control component, and only the behaviour of states and the international unions, associations and institutions they have created, which, according to representatives of “political realism”, determines the international system and its structures.

However, denying the glorification of the state and its role in international relations, representatives of “political idealism” consider it false to restrict the study of the system of international relations exclusively to interstate relations, since non-state structures, civic movements and initiatives along with states play an increasingly important role in international relations, which is a manifestation of the democratization of current international relations. It is also necessary to separate *the general characteristic of international relations as interstate relations from the characteristic of the kinds of international relations where political relations are a subsystem of interstates relations.*

Thus, methodologically, in the course of the scientific analysis of the European integration of the countries of Central Europe, in our opinion, it is necessary to proceed from the following position – *political relations form the most important subsystem of the system of international relations with its own structure, functions, process of development.* One of the main functions of this subsystem is the *synthesis, determination and reflection of all other types of relations that act as independent subsystems in the system of international relations.*

The history of problematic issues in the theory of European integration is presented by thorough developments of representatives of federalism (neofederalism) (A. Etzioni, G. Pinder), functionalism (D. Mitrani), neofunctionalism (E. Haas, J. Nye, R. Keohane, L. Lindbergh, P. Schmitter), and its alternative presentations as intergovernmentalism (S. Hoffman) and modern theories of integration – such as, among others, institutionalism (P. Pearson, K. Armstrong, S. Ballmer). Separately should be noted Karl Deutsch's theory of communication and one of the most popular today Andrew Moravchik's theory of liberal intergovernmental approach.

The purpose of this study is not to provide a detailed analysis of each of these integration theories or integration approaches, but it is indisputable to note precisely *the basic principles or ideas of the theoretical foundations of the European integration process*, which in one way or another explain the realities of the modern European integration process in Central European countries.

Essentially, lengthy theoretical discussions on *conceptual problems of European integration* have evolved from two opposite approaches – first, but to a lesser extent, is federalism, which can be considered more as a theoretical approach than a theory, and, to a greater extent, *functionalism*

(*neo-functionalism*) and the theory of *intergovernmentalism* (*intergovernmentalism*) and their further modifications to the realities of today. These discussions were centred around a wide range of problematic issues that envisaged forms and mechanisms of limiting, or conversely, strengthening national sovereignty in the integration process.

In this context, we will try to trace in detail the essence of these two opposing theories, but not so much their evolution on a purely chronological principle, but from the point of view of *distinguishing conceptually formed ideas*, which in our time are not only relevant, but also contribute to the critical understanding of modern European integration processes, including Central European countries. Particular attention in the analysis of theoretical generalizations will focus mainly on controversial and not yet solved problems of the modern theory of integration.

In his thorough study "International Theory and European Integration" Charles Pentland, one of the leading researchers in the theory of integration, now a professor at the University of Queens (Canada), points out that the *federalists* saw the ultimate goal of integration in the creation of a supranational state according to the principles of centralization and transfer of political authority to the highest level. At the same time, the scientist distinguishes two features of the federalist approach – sociological, which determines social activity of people, and constitutional, more precisely the establishment of a constitutional "project", to soften the centralized actions of the state and notes that it was from them that the development of a number of areas in integration began⁴¹⁷. By the way, during scientific internship of the author of the monograph at the University of Queens (Canada), prof. C. Pentland was a research supervisor on the topic of European integration studies; the consultations with this scientist contributed to a more thorough study of integration processes not only on the European continent but in America as well.

The relevance and importance of the theory of functionalism is also determined by the fact that, in this sense, the focus was not on form (the search for a federation or confederation, etc.), but on functions, even of a rather specific nature, which should perform the international community. So, today, neo-functionalism has become one of the leading theories of European integration.

In denying the idea of creating a federation and managing continental scale, David Mitranni, the founder of the idea of functionalism, not only reasonably and pragmatically proved the inappropriateness of creating a

⁴¹⁷ Pentland C. International Theory and European Integration. – London: Faber and Faber, 1973. – P.146-150.

static and artificial, more territorially limiting federal association, defining it as "misleading federalization". From today's perspective he formulated and substantiated ideas that are already realities today – namely, the role and importance of creating new subjects of international relations – international organizations, moreover, the form Reference network in the context of the dynamic transformation of international relations. According to Mitran, his denial of the territorial limitations of the ideas and possible practices of the pan-European federation concerned, in particular, the consideration of the geopolitical realities under which these ideas were formed, that is, when Europe essentially controlled a large part of the world through its metropolises.

In view of the current large-scale 2004-2007 and future EU enlargements, it is very interesting that D. Mitrani's theoretical generalization of the clear separation of the dichotomy of the concept of continental unions (where priority is given to the definition of territory between union members and foreigners) and the concept of a world, universal league as defining functions to integrate with as many interests of their participants as possible). In this connection, two Mitranni theses are of key importance. First, regional integration projects will play territorial quasi-state functions, but already at the supranational level, where only the most powerful states will play a decisive role. However, it should be noted that Mitrani notes the undeniable fact of the successful implementation of functional logic practices in the creation of specialized European institutions – the European Coal and Steel Community and the Euratom.

And secondly, what directly touches the present, as the gradual strengthening of the distributive function of the new European border between the EU and Ukraine, namely the denial by David Mitrani of the use of territorial logic – as the establishment of real borders for political purposes and the definition of restrictions on membership in the region integration associations.

In other words, an unbiased and critical approach in general to the theory of European integration and, in particular, to David Mitranni's creative work, allowed Ben Rosamond (we consider his work "Theory of European Integration" (2000) – one of the contemporary deep theoretical analytical developments of the following issues) conclusion about the value of the theory of functionalism. It should be noted that even Mitranni himself did not claim to define his ideas as a coherent theory. "The historical significance of functionalism lies in the fact that it laid the foundations for a non-functionalist theory of integration, the field of international relations theory most associated with the development of the European Communities," Ben Rosamond notes.

Many non-functionalists recognize Mithran as their intellectual father. Indeed, the emphasis on technocratic needs as the basis for deeper and longer-lasting peacekeeping systems coupled with evolutionary logic, which implies a spillover effect (more precisely the idea of a so-called "spillover" process of regional change, such as deepening integration across segments or segments current system) indicates their close relations.

Of interest are the theoretical generalizations of representatives of neo-functionalism, first of all, Ernst Haas, who not only highlighted the key role of the political factor in the integration process, in particular as the creation of post-national political communities, the gradual integration in the spheres of "low" and "high politics". a quality process that cannot be equated with intergovernmental or intergovernmental cooperation. An integral part of the theory of neo-functionalism is the idea of "overflow", but already significantly modified to the problems of the realities of the European integration process. Exploring the processes of European integration through the prism of the principle of supranationality in the economic dimension – as an evolution from a free trade area, a customs union to a common market, economic and monetary union, *ak noles voles* also requires reforms of institutional foundations, as well as a qualitative change in political integration, considered the nationality and political nature of the integration process.

Neo-functionalism (at least in its early manifestations) was an attempt to make sense of it, providing a theoretical basis for the political strategies of the founders of post-war European unity. Such personalities as Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman imagined quite clear the way for an integrated Europe. Their pragmatic approach directly denied the idealism of the federal movement. The Federalists lost their basic arguments regarding the direction of European postwar unity as early as the early 1950s. Although the federal system of Europe was still regarded as the ultimate goal of the integration process, it became apparent that it could not be achieved as a practical goal through certain rational proofs and far-sighted constitutional projects, but only through economic growth and the development of a common development strategy. This approach has been identified as a technocratic and functionalist first and foremost by Ernst Haas.

Of course, the architects of post-war integration had the ultimate goal of achieving political unity between the states of Europe in the context of the settlement of Franco-German relations, and saw political unity in the presence of the creation and operation of supranational institutions as a consequence of economic interaction and interdependence of states.

It is in the context of a thorough analysis of existing conceptual and theoretical approaches that Ben Rosamond characterizes (outlining seven

explanatory proposals) the strategy that formed the basis for the creation of the European Communities:

1-Moderate integration, first and foremost in “low policy” areas, but under the condition that they will represent key sectors of the economy (eg coal and steel).

2-Creation of a supreme Community body, not burdened with heavy baggage of conflicting national interests, with the power to monitor the integration process and to enable it to act as an organizer of further integration.

3-The integration of certain sectors of the economy across national borders creates a functional pressure for the integration of related sectors of the economy. This impetus must continue, especially in the context of a leading role assumed by a higher authority of the Communities. The consequence of these processes is the gradual and progressive intertwining, increasing interaction and interdependence of national economies.

4-Deeper integration will not only be organized and channeled by a higher EU body, but gradually social interests will be channeled from national forms of government to European supranational structures as a more effective way of satisfying those interests.

5-The deepening of economic integration will necessitate further institutionalization at the European level, since wider integration requires more complex governance.

6-In other words, political integration is an inevitable by-product of economic integration.

7-Accordingly, the gradual economic integration, accompanied by a degree of supranational institutionalization, is an effective way of creating a long-term peace system in Europe.

For Haas, the Monet method was rooted in an analysis of the convergence of the preferences and pragmatic self-interests of political actors and subjects of international relations in Europe. In this context, it should be noted that these ideas did not in any way confirm the basic provisions of "political realism" or even neo-realism. So, a kind of implantation ideas of modern political realism, above all, a clear definition of the eternal role of the state as the main actor of international relations can be considered an intergovernmental approach or theory intergovernmentalism. Stanley Hoffman formulated the basic principles of this European integration theory, where states within the framework of integration unification have a substantial advantage over institutions of integration creation.

In essence, Hoffman argued that the logic of Monet-Haas only works in the _{field} of economic integration in the context of the interests of actors, and in political integration, the priority of the ideological and pragmatic interests

of political elites determines the progress of the integration process, in particular, in the sphere of «low politics», to integration and cooperation, while in the field of "high politics" – to surrender their sovereignty is very problematic for the states.

The representative of liberal intergovernmentalism, Andrew Moravchyk, defining the process of European integration as a "two-tier game" – the formation, presentation of interests at the national level as "demand" and strategic negotiations between the states, is defending their "proposals" at the international level, emphasizing the viability, draws on the example of the Single European Act to analyze and conclude on the political and economic convergence of three powerful and influential EU Member States – namely Germany, France and Great Britain. Moreover, in this case the researcher considers realization of the interests of these states as a key factor of integration.

E. Moravchyk expressed a very interesting opinion regarding the current considerations regarding the so-called "crisis of leadership" in the EU. Refuting the myths about the crisis that he thinks are triggered by the myths of the lack of a charismatic European integration leader today and the myths of the so-called bicycle theory (according to which if the integration is suspended, then the consequences will be relevant), Moravchyk claims that it is today that a functional degree of political maturity has been reached within the EU, and the EU has "ridden" a three-wheeled bicycle by drafting the Constitution. So, according to the scientist, the European Union will never fall, even if it stops, and its institutions and especially its leaders simply lack the "main project" around which should be united for the sake of further integration: "And now, after half a century of success "Europe has reached a one-year limit, is entering a period of declining profits, and is developing more constructively, although further economic expansion is not beneficial."

It is clear that the problems related to the formation or actual definition of the theoretical foundations of the modern complex European integration process are objective, which is connected with the deepening and enlargement of the EU in the context of changing theoretical approaches of political realism (neorealism) and political idealism.

The theoretical understanding of the contemporary phenomenon of European integration is considered appropriate in the future through the prism of EU formation – as a real actor of international relations, which ultimately clearly defines the global strengthening of the geopolitical positions of a united Europe as a result of the fundamental and formal reforms. the latest EU enlargement inclusive. Although, the more practical nature of the theoretical provisions of today's complex European integration process, which includes a complex of political, economic and institutional factors of modern European integration processes, is being pursued today.

A qualitative new level of the European integration process in the context of radical geopolitical changes on the continent, marked out the tendency to search for theoretical models or modern modification of traditional theories of integration and theories of international relations to explain contemporary European integration processes.

The complexity of the situation arising from the expansion of the sphere of influence of its interests on the part of the EU in the context of the establishment of the European balance of powers, the balance of interests – is also determined by the fact that absorbing, more precisely "mastering" a new geopolitical space, the EU has come closer to excellent (again, the "other", it is not clear as to the nature of the EU) geopolitical space of Eastern Europe, with subjects which nolens volens he is forced to interact, but still is not carried out effectively. In this context, the search for EU enlargement theory is not something that does not answer the truth, but does not even have time to find out post factum – what is actually accomplished and how it will affect tomorrow.

And it is in this context from the point of view of the formation of theoretical and methodological foundations of scientific research that two very important problematic questions arise. First, it is the separation of theoretical and methodological foundations of the formation and modern development of the region of Central Europe. Secondly, it is a conceptual definition of the role and functions of the new eastern border of Central Europe and the European Union.

Reflections and discourses on whether or not Central Europe exists, whether it is myth or reality, have become relics of history today. The urgent question of today is the dynamic development of a new format of relations between Ukraine and the neighboring countries of the "first order" by the states of Central Europe (full members of the European Union) in the context of a truly functioning single European integration space, which has come close to the borders of Ukraine.

Given the dynamic evolution of the EU's qualitative characteristics, it is desirable to apply a *comprehensive approach* to the study of the European integration process, a *multi-causal, multilinear approach*, to find out a network of interrelated causes of historical changes that, from the perspective of the research methodology, makes it possible to understand the European integration as a *whole process which has internal logic of development*, with specifying the dynamics of change of its qualitative characteristics.

It is essential to analyze, first of all, the theory of European integration, its key provisions, which are still under discussion today, and which are used to varying degrees to explain some of the complex phenomena of today – first of all, international relations in Europe, in the world, as well as development of European integration. Moreover, only by highlighting the

problematic issues of a complex multifaceted mosaic of European integration theory that require comprehensive research – can we formulate conceptual generalizations of certain specific segments of the EU's eastern enlargement – in particular, EU-Ukraine relations, Eastern EU enlargement, and European Eastern issues.

The fact is that today there are many theoretical generalizations about the process of development of integration of sovereign states of the European Community, further – the European Union, as well as scientific explorations on the evolution of theoretical foundations of the European integration process. Moreover, with a significant radical change in the geopolitical situation on the European continent at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries, as well as due to the gradual dynamic formation (note that this process is happening right now) of a new subject of international relations in the global dimension – the European Union, at the beginning of the XXI century, scientists are trying to generalize theoretical models of integration, or at best to develop a new model²⁴⁴. However, it is clear that this is a very difficult task, since the development of a new theory of European integration not only requires a *comprehensive approach in the methodological sense*, but also takes into account the factors of economic, institutional and political nature of the objective dynamic internal development of the EU, along with the analysis of the effect of factors of direct external character, which are also changing dynamically in the system of international relations.

The issue of identity, the formation of political culture is crucial for the development of civil society. Culture and nature are essentially two parameters of the space within which any *nation emerges and develops*. The question is how these two parameters interact and how they affect the specificity and fate of the culture that exists within a particular space in the context of interaction with the environment, in the process of "reproduction" of uniqueness in the context of that interaction. *Culture* emerges and develops in a specific geographical space, the specificity of which is significantly reflected in the characteristics, forms of the culture itself, and understanding the characteristics of geographical space helps to see the *historical geocultural issues* of Central Europe in its diversity.

By distinguishing the specific geographical and therefore *geopolitical space* expanded to the East of the EU, its specificity, which depends on the specificity of the objects located within this unique space of Central Europe, we consider it appropriate to determine that, like any other space, which is considered not abstractly, but from a substantive-substantive point of view, is internally hierarchical and limited, and also assumes the presence of its own "center", a kind of "reference point", in relation to which the "coordinates" of objects in this space. From the point of view of exploring the geopolitical situation in the Central European region, it is especially

important to analyze the so-called *metacultural systems*, in this case, as the *West* and the *East*.

Based on the fundamental axiom that Europe is in fact a set of values, values that are inherent in society, and taken for granted, it should be noted that in the new geopolitical conditions of Central Europe and Eastern Europe, their borders, frontiers, the so-called *cultural maps of a certain space* take on an unmatched importance. In this case, it is not just a process of establishing a new eastern border of the EU, and then its transfer or possible destruction. No. This is a much more complicated process. These are the conditions of its occurrence, the space in which it has existed and will exist for a long time. However, we do not absolutize the border as a thing that lives on its own by its own rules and laws.

It is important to emphasize that there is a connection between the specificity of the *historical-geographical and geopolitical space* within which a certain society is formed and developed, and its culture, *cultural space* – because the geographically defined territory of the society is located not in a vacuum, surrounded by other cultures. In this context, from a theoretical and methodological point of view, we can distinguish such an important phenomenon as *civilization* – as a “unit of measure” of historical existence, a society of longer length, both in space and in time than national states, or states united in any other political unions, as noted by the famous scientist Arnold Joseph Toynbee²⁴⁵.

According to Toynbee, the formation of a particular type of civilization requires interests to be integrated into the system. The integration of qualitative changes in economic, socio-cultural, technological and other spheres of development ultimately creates the conditions for "selection" from the system of interests of a set of civilizational values (landmarks), which are gradually consolidated in the "genetic code" of society. Such a process is indicative of the appearance, in fact, of a type of civilization associated with the transition of first-class local civilization communities to higher-order communities. Thus, the dynamics of human history can be seen: firstly, as the emergence of types of civilizations; secondly, as the increase in number of local and civilizational communities within them; thirdly, as the evolution of types of civilizations and their corresponding communities, both at the expense of their own sources of development, and as a result of the interchange of information, material, cultural and other values; fourthly, as the extinction of first-class local civilizational communities.

The isolation of environmental issues in the Toynbee concept is one of the most important ideas in the context of the idea of the development of society – as a whole system – as a process of interaction, mutual influences of internal and external factors, or, in other words, *as a process of system development in the context of being actively influenced by its environment*.

Based on Toynbee's conceptual propositions, let us identify two important methods of his research which, in our view, contribute to a more adequate and comprehensive analysis of the *EU's new eastern border*.

Firstly, it is the application of an extremely important principle in exploring the EU's new geographical space – as a geopolitical and geocultural space, namely *the principle of alternative*. One of the main ideas of the concept of Arnold Joseph Toynbee (which, in essence, distinguishes not only the concept of civilization from other debatable definitions, such as Oswald Spengler, but above all clarifies the very essence of the concept of civilization) is, in our opinion, the so-called “overcoming” fatalism. According to Toynbee, the evils and subsequent destruction of civilization in history were not fatal, because they are the result of human error, the consequence of the inability of a community to find an adequate Answer to the Challenge²⁴⁶. According to Toynbee, there is always an opportunity to avoid falling into the abyss. It all depends on the living pulsating nucleus of history – on man, on whether he has the spiritual strength to resist world entropy.

Secondly, logically speaking based on the principle of alternative development of history, Toynbee rightly argues that the dynamics of life is not reduced to linear processes, but in reality is the result of complex interpenetration of phenomena. It is only with such awareness that one can understand that in society any process carries with it hidden nonlinear, probably important parameters.

Among the basic principles of the *theory of civilizations* of the English historian Arnold Toynbee, it is worth noting also the essence of the theory, which is cyclical in the sense that it does not view history as a linear progressive movement towards a single purpose in which all peoples go in the same direction, overtaking or falling behind one from another.

The role and place of the new Central Europe, now formed with clearly defined eastern borders for the long term in a new geopolitical configuration on the continent, is beyond doubt. As a real historical region or geopolitical region, Central Europe exists, but it is difficult to delineate it, because it is not a geographical concept with clearly defined borders, but in the historical and cultural sense the borders are even wider. In this paper, the countries of Central Europe are – the Republic of Poland, the Republic of Hungary, the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. However, over the decades, two *conceptual generalizations* have clearly emerged (it is clear that there are too many ideologues or political claims). The first one is aimed at *domination*, the second one is aimed at *protection*. Mitteleurop's concept was, in fact, a reflection of the German-Russian struggle for the region, regarded as a strategic foothold for conquest. After the Second World War, this region fell under the Soviet Union's influence with the imposition of a corresponding ideology, so the efforts of the countries of the Central European region were

initially directed against the Soviet regime in 1956 in Poland and Hungary, in 1968 in Czechoslovakia and of course since 1989, with favorable foreign policy circumstances – Central European countries have clearly defined their strategic goal – the fastest possible Euro-Atlantic integration.

Due to the geopolitical segmentation of Central and Eastern Europe, at the end of the XX and the beginning of the XXI centuries, the process of forming a *new Central Europe* was completed, more specifically, a renewed Central Europe, which "return" process to Europe, has only just begun.

Comprehensive scientific analysis of the powerful collection of works of scientists, researchers, as well as writers, cultural figures, statesmen of the XIX-XXI centuries allows to state with certainty the following generalizations regarding *the methodology of the study*:

Firstly, it is not possible to seriously explore the modern theme, the idea of Central Europe, without a thorough study of the history of the peoples of Europe, Central Europe.

Secondly, the self-identification of Central Europe took place in a complex positioning within – European – non-European, which essentially expresses belonging or a direct demonstration of alienation from a certain geocultural, civilizational space, so the study of the so-called Central European identity is an important issue.

Thirdly, at the heart of the content of the historical, cultural, geographical, geopolitical space of Central Europe – as the definition of the problem of research, lies the world-wide category – civilization.

The real events of the beginning of the third millennium *de facto* and *de jure* testify to the formation of new dividing lines in Europe that clearly distinguish the *omne quod est igitur nulla regione viarum finitum est* for a rather long time period, namely the eastern border of Central Europe, as in the spatial and psychological dimensions, also in the cultural and civilizational dimensions. It is clear that the cultural and civilization maps of Europe do not coincide with the geostrategic dimension of Central Europe's spatial limitations as of 1 May 2004. However, since the 1980s there has been a clear fragmentation of the more or less unified regional space of Central and Eastern Europe. As a consequence of this fragmentation, there is a clear separation of the Central European segment, which has unmatched geopolitical and geostrategic implications, including for Ukraine.

When everyday life radiated in a culture of behavior, a culture of work, a culture of language, of representatives of a certain society, such as conformity to European identity, becomes their immanent essence, the problems of conformity with Copenhagen or any other criteria will become relics of history. According to the logic of gradual development, the latest but not the last enlargement of the European Union to the East at the beginning of the XXI century causes profound changes in the geopolitical situation in Europe, defines a clear geopolitical demarcation on the European

continent, including the Eastern "newer" Union. Among the new members of the EU, four Central European countries are singled out – Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary, whose accession on May 1, 2004 to the European Union both in spatial and temporal dimensions has a direct impact on the formation of a new qualitative system of relations in the field of enlargement between European Union and Ukraine. However, the central position and powerful influence of these Central European states as creators of *the new EU Eastern policy* still requires some time and a strong control policy within the EU.

The geopolitical segmentation of the Central and Eastern Europe regions has a direct impact on Ukraine in the new distribution of forces on the continent, since de facto and de jure in 2004 ended long (though historically it is a small amount of time) and important (but not final) stage of systemic transformation of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

Thus the geopolitical segmentation of Central and Eastern Europe, at the end of the XX and the beginning of the XXI centuries, the process of forming a *new Central Europe* was completed, more specifically, a renewed Central Europe, which "return" process to Europe has only just begun. Therefore, in a theoretical and methodological dimension, the following conceptual conclusion can be formulated.

In our opinion, the formation of a new Central Europe at the turn of the century is a multidimensional process, functioning according to the internal logic of development – as the development of a holistic organism in constant interaction with the new geopolitical and geo-economic space of the EU, which will continuously "synchronize" its interests and indisputably "answers" with the status and response of their newest elements – Central European countries.

Europe, Middle Europe (Mitteleuropa), or as Central Europe (Zentraleuropa, Central Europa), Eastern Europe – these are attempts to divide the western part of the Eurasian continent in theory and in practice continue today. It would seem that strengthening the European integration process, expanding the idea of Europe, Europeaness in the civilizational dimension will contribute to a more active spread of European values, European culture, greater openness and interpenetration of cultures. However, the dynamic unification of sovereign states in the west of the continent in the format of European integration, nolens voles makes it increasingly clear that they are separated from each other both in theory and in practice – the so-called Europeaness from non-Europeaness in the wider context of civilization. First of all, the mental image of Europe, Central Europe in consciousness, the problematic issues of European identity define a very complex, multidimensional, contradictory paradigm of the concept of Europe, in particular Central Europe.

It is not only about the definition and spatial-geographical, but also about the geostrategic definition of Central Europe. It is important to emphasize the fact that the spatial configuration of Central Europe is interpreted differently by historians, politicians, geographers or political scientists, moreover, when one analyzes the research from the point of view of the researcher's belonging to a particular region, that is, depending on his country of origin, the mosaic of views is further expanded.

Traditionally, the concept of Europe, Central Europe is associated with the issues of acquisition or conformity of European identity, the presence of this mental image in the collective consciousness, the historical memory of a particular people. This issue has not lost its relevance today, and it is enough to analyze Eurobarometer data, sociological surveys of "old" Europeans and a certain thing of "neophytes". And more clearly, the latest European Union documents show the recent differences in the desire for a clear division in the "other for Europe" plane, where EU tries to shape its "new, oriental" philosophy, whether it is policy, but to no avail. Unfortunately, the systemic idea is, like, what to do with our new eastern neighbors? – now the EU is missing.

Today, for many, the concept of Europe also serves as a certain ideology. According to others, it is only a mythology that exists only in theory. Certainly, only those who have not studied the history of the so-called "small" (Masaryk) peoples of Europe, who are accustomed to imaging non-alternative ideologues in the right direction, or who have not been able to grasp the significance of the central European cultural heritage.

One of the most pressing issues that is being discussed not only by political scientists and historians is the question of Central Europe, which is also a testament to the need for a thorough coverage of the problem in science. In particular, it is legitimate and historically conditioned to use the current concept of Mitteleuropa. Although this is a fundamental question, there is no unanimous view, despite its broad historiography, which in turn testifies to the revival of interest in this subject. The fact that discourses today are about the validity of the existence of an imaginary or real prospect of Mitteleuropa's revival testifies to the importance of both developing a new theoretical and methodological concept and defining the components of modern Central Europe.

The concept of Mitteleuropa "Central or Middle Europe" emerged during the First World War, although the roots of this category can be found in the early nineteenth century. Thus, for the first time, a more or less clear definition was formulated by economist Friedrich Liszt, who noted that Germany, which did not exist at the time, does not have to look for colonies or zones of influence, but in naturally accessible territories from the Danube,

east to the Black Sea. Other German publicists and scholars, such as G. Daniel, K. Frantz, and F. Ratzel⁴¹⁸, have taken this view. The conceptual justification for the Mitteleuropa category was already received in the work of Lutheran priest Friedrich Naumann in 1915 during the First World War, and it is not a coincidence. The hope of victory in the war between Germany and its adherents also determined the need to develop a clear plan for what Mitteleurope should look like and a military and economic alliance in the German-speaking territories and Austria-Hungary together with the Polish, Baltic and southeastern territories. A number of Central and Eastern European Central and Eastern European states, together with Germany, were regarded as Central Europe (Mitteleuropa) or Central Europe (Zentraleuropa), in fact, as the area of domination of the future Greater Germany. However, the Monarchy collapsed, Germany lost the war, so the implementation of the Pan-German idea of "Central Europe" was for some time "forgotten".

Although it is undoubtedly that, in theory, among the many ideas of consolidation of the peoples of Central Europe, two brilliant and logically formed concepts deserve special attention – as geopolitical alternatives for the formation of Central Europe, which have unfortunately not been realized. First of all, we consider the conceptual ideas of the Danube Confederation of Peoples of Europe, the Central European idea expressed by Yasi Oscar in the framework of the Conference of European Federations⁴¹⁹, as well as the "New European" idea formed by Tomas Masaryk which state that the federations of small nations and the master-states of Europe are the conceptual idea of T. Masaryk's, which existed in such a creation as the "Small peoples' nations" between Germany and Russia⁹. However, based on an objective analysis of the international situation of the "small states" of Europe and the positions of the great powers regarding the post-war ordering of Europe, it should be noted that these ideas of consolidation of the small peoples of Central Europe were not realized.

Strategic direction of development of geopolitics of the states of Central Europe during the XX century. was caused by the presence of major world powers, empires whose struggle for a leading role, spheres of influence in the world systematically determined the geopolitical reorientation of the countries of the Central European region. Historical experience of the twentieth century shows that the possibilities of independent development of

²⁴⁷ Geopolitikai szöveggyűjtemény. Budapest, 2002. – 210-234.old.

²⁴⁸ Jászi Oszkár. A Monarhia jövője. A dualizmus bukása és a dunai egyesült államok. – Bp.: Új Magyarország, 1918. – 41-72.old.

²⁴⁹ Masaryk. T.G. Nová Evropa. Stanovisko slovanské. – Pr.: Nakladem Gustava Dubského, 1920. – S. 58,185-190; Чапек Карел. Бесіди з Т.Г. Масаріком – Львів: Каменяр, 2001.– С. 38-55.

the states of the region were too limited, moreover, during and after the two world wars, the countries of Central Europe systematically lost their main general civilizational landmarks.

Again, during the 1920s and 1990s, the peoples of Central Europe were given the chance to lose their meta-orientation and to clearly define their place and role in Europe and in the world. Of course, the new geopolitical realities require the development of theoretical and methodological conclusions, the development of a new system of the category "Central Europe". As it is absolutely not possible to use the ex post Mitteleuropa category today, even modern studies about this category indicate that there is no consensus among scientists on this issue, especially regarding its spatial configuration. However, again referring to the definitive definitions of Milan Kundera, let us note that the essence of European identity, for the Hungarian, Czech, Polish means not a geographical phenomenon, but a spiritual concept, synonymous with the word "West". As for over a thousand years their states have been part of Europe whose roots date back to Roman Christianity.

However, still today it is possible to note a number of troubled issues that Central European countries have to decide as de jure full members, but before, the so-called "transitional conditions" or "transitional periods" must be de facto determined by them:

- clearly defined quotas and temporary employment restrictions for Central European neophytes;
- defined time lag in the introduction of social guarantees and wages for new Europeans;
- the need for lobbying in the redistribution of funds from the Structural Funds; everyday "fight" with elders on "poverty" and active lobbyists led by Spain;
- the struggle for preferences in the common agricultural policy;
- the desire to participate on an equal footing with the EU "elders" in the formulation of real policy (note that the real involvement of Central European countries in the creation of an effective and prudent EU Eastern policy would be the best event for Ukraine).

All this is happening nowadays with the hard work of the newest Europeans in order to achieve a high socioeconomic level or at least reaching it by all major macroeconomic indicators. It is extremely important in this sense to understand the fact that the real European integration of the peoples of Central Europe is just going to start, but with new opportunities. This category perfectly describes the new possibilities and their use for the modern of European integration.

In our view, attempts of scientific analysis of the concept of Central Europe (as a component of the concept of Europe) is a very important and relevant scientific task, as geopolitical segmentation of the European

continent is now taking place. The consequences of which increasingly place on the agenda the question of conformity to European and civilization choice. This process of formation of a new Central Europe is of paramount importance both in terms of changing the overall geopolitical situation in Europe, as well as in terms of the breakup of the region into Central Europe and Eastern Europe and, accordingly, the formation of a new format of relations within the EU (Central Europe – Ukraine).

Conceptual synthesis of the process of European integration of the countries of Central Europe is possible to be distinguished in three segments:

1. first, it is the understanding of the modern processes of European integration of the states of Central Europe as the "return" of the countries of the region to Europe,

2. second, this process is an extension of the European Union's area of interest to the east,

3. third, due to the current processes of deepening and enlarging the EU, as well as strengthening the geopolitical role and position of the European Union.

The process of so-called "return", "accession", "entry" of Central European states into a single geopolitical pan-European space (or vice versa – the absorption of this Central European space by the European Union) is a much more complicated process, more time-consuming in space and time than it seems, much more complicated than meeting the Copenhagen criteria, and then other always-relevant criteria.

In fact, the two-pronged processes have now taken place in the western part of the European continent: segmentation of Central Europe and Eastern Europe as well as

transformation of the geographic and geopolitical, historical image of Central Europe – the neighbors of the first order of Ukraine.

Today and for some following years, the EU is forming a new system of relations – as the status quo with Ukraine, because the geopolitical situation with the accession to the EU of the states of Central Europe has also changed for both de facto and de jure. And for Ukraine as a subject of international relations, it is of its highest importance first of all an internal need – which must become an immanent essence of our country regarding the need for civilized development of society, development of democracy, formation of the "middle class" and market economy – not in order to meet European standards, but in order to truly become an actor in international arena, under the qualitatively new geopolitical circumstances on the European continent.

The consequences of the EU enlargement process for Ukraine are determined not only by the current relations with the Central European countries on border management, visa application or changes in the trade and economic sphere, but above all, the consequences are caused by internal structural, institutional changes within the EU, including the recent Eastern

policy. Indeed, current European Commission searches for new strategies and mechanisms for reciprocity in the implementation of "new or immediate neighborhood" ideas in the EU-Ukraine plane (since it is difficult to call it a concept) do not correspond to the rapidly changing realities. Although this can be understood as a methodological point of view, these ideas are also so-called one-sided – on the part of the EU, as a defense of a rather wide range of interests, where priority is given to the economic security and immediate security of their new eastern borders. It should be noted that the issues of developing inter-regional, cross-border cooperation or defining a new format of relations with Ukraine have only declarative intentions regarding the importance and necessity of cooperation with Ukraine together with other new neighbors.

Without any doubts, the absence of a truly new format of bilateral relations, of conceptually weighted science-based cooperation strategies and mechanisms of interaction between the subjects of international relations between the EU and Ukraine makes it impossible as today to be a clear perspective.

In our view, a deep rethinking of the geopolitical role and importance of this small but extremely important geopolitical region in the center of Europe, in the context of maximally taking into account the totality of realities and factors, moreover in the context of isolation of alternatives to the historical contradictory nature of the Center an opportunity to formulate new approaches to the study of Central Europe in the context of deepening and expanding the European integration process.

In the third millennium, in the consequence of the deepening and enlargement of the European Union, on May 1, 2004, geopolitical segmentation of the Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) region took place. Its break up into separate segments of Central Europe and Eastern Europe as in geographically, socio-economic and political dimensions. It is clear that, in our view, the new Central European border, which is emerging and does not coincide with the cultural borders of Europe, is not only a simple linear space or a spatial barrier, which, by the way, clearly delineates in this case the region of Central Europe and Ukraine.

In fact, on May 1, 2004, a clear structuring of the geopolitical space of Central Europe and Eastern Europe took place in the Central European region. It may be more correct to formulate these events as a natural and natural process of "returning" the countries of the region to Europe, as the disappearance of distribution lines in Europe. However, rather problematic issues of concern, the realities of today require a deeper, comprehensive study (territorial, socio-economic, ethno-cultural, geopolitical components) of the modern European integration process in Central Europe. The study of this problem is of particular urgent importance for Ukraine, since the

immediate consequences of the EU's enlargement to the East are already available today (mostly of a negative nature).

An important element in the study is the definition of the region of the new Central Europe. It is clear that the rules of the game, which are periodically determined and determined by the major players in the international arena, will change depending on the current state of the future, in the context of the relevant geopolitical situation.

However, it should be emphasized that even if the historical-geographical or geopolitical space, which is studied in the dynamics of its development, is changeable and may change due to certain historical circumstances, then the geocultural images are formed more long-term and do not disappear. Thus, from a theoretical and methodological point of view, it is important to consider the definition of the geocultural space of Central (Central) Europe as an image that, in essence, also determines the scale of the new Central Europe. However, it should be noted that a large-scale image is Europe, but images or symbols or even mental maps that define the internal parameters of a country determine its identity.

At the beginning of the third millennium, the countries of Central Europe returned to the path of European civilization, though as Milan Kundera brilliantly put it: "Central Europe was eager to be a condensed version of Europe itself in all its cultural diversity – a super-European Europe, a smaller model of a European state that would be made up of a state, created by one rule the greatest variety within the smallest space"⁴²⁰. Whether this path will be successful from 2004 onwards within the EU, time will tell, but the success of their European consolidation nature will depend on the ability of the Central European states to "overcome" the so-called eternal images, complexes that are still firmly preserved in the historical memory.

Today there is a kind of implantation of the geographical space, the region of Central Europe, into the sphere of the wider cultural, civilizational space of Europe. From 2004 onwards (let's define it as the first stage of Central European states' adaptation to the EU, which can extend for ten years) the peoples of the Central European region, who are not burdened by their identification by the way, have been experiencing daily problems since 2004. After all, in 2004, the integration of Central European countries into the European space has only just begun – and it will require painstaking work and, above all, a change in mentality to the present – as using existing opportunities, actively working towards using these opportunities, rather than waiting for preferences. Therefore, in the first phase, along with the euphoria of prospects for rapid and dynamic, almost "automatic" integration,

⁹ Jászi Oszkár. A Monarchia jövője. A dualizmus bukása és a dunai egyesült államok. – Bp.: Új Magyarország, 1918. – 41-72.old.

there will be disappointments and a quest to build a truly European identity in everyday life in the context of overcoming the so-called complexes of European inferiority by the peoples of Central Europe.

However, today it is possible to note a number of problematic issues that the Central European countries should address as de jure full members, but so-called "transitional conditions", "transitional periods" will be de facto before them. In particular, these are clearly defined quotas and temporary employment restrictions for CE neophytes today; defined time lag in the introduction of social guarantees and wages for new Europeans; the need for lobbying in the redistribution of funds from the Structural Funds; daily "fight" with elders on "poverty" and active lobbyists led by Spain; the struggle for preferences in the common agricultural policy; the desire to participate on an equal footing with the EU "elders" in the formulation of real policy (note, in this sense, that the real participation of Central European countries in the creation of an effective and prudent EU Eastern policy would be the best event for Ukraine) and all this will take place under the conditions of hard work from new Europeans with a goal to achieve a high socioeconomic level or at least approximating it to all major macroeconomic indicators. It is extremely important in this sense to understand the fact that the real European integration of the peoples of Central Europe is only just beginning, but with new possibilities. It is this category – new opportunities and their use that best explains the essence of the current challenge of European integration⁴²¹.

To paraphrase Fernand Braudel, who quite rightly and logically argued that the world is littered with "periphery", understanding by this expression of the country, zones, belts of underdeveloped economies, clearly defining that the spatial scheme of the world is an assembly, connection of the connected zones, but at different levels, because at least three areas, three categories are defined in space: a narrow center, minor, well-developed regions, and in the end everything is a huge outer neighborhood, peripherals that were everywhere in the world, we can do the following a logical generalization. Today, the EU mutates mutandis will move centers not only to peripheral regions, but also to the center for itself, because the center has several floors, it is shared within itself – and this, in the long run, clearly defines geopolitical changes in Europe, namely the global strengthening of geopolitical the position of a united Europe as a result of the accession of Central European countries to the EU.

The vitality of civilizations, their capacity for high development, depends on their ability to maximize the use and development of their reproductive

¹⁰ Masaryk. T.G. Nová Evropa. Stanovisko slovanské. – Pr.: Nakladem Gustava Dubského, 1920. – S. 58,185-190; Чапек Карел. Бесіди з Т.Г. Масариком – Львів: Каменяр, 2001.– С. 38-55.

potential in response to what Arnold Joseph Toynbee called the "challenge of history." Based on this concept, the development of a new region of Central Europe will be the answer of European civilization to the call of the Universe. By the way, the process of "redistribution" of civilizational space within Central and Eastern Europe leads to profound changes in the socio-cultural and ethnic structures of Eurasia in general.

The geographical boundaries of civilization may not be in harmony with state-political ones, the presence, absence and configuration of which cannot undo the integrity that has emerged and is realized through the totality of human, political, economic, cultural interconnections and interdependencies. Undoubtedly, the fuzzy contours of civilization are one of its characteristic features.

As rightly pointed out, Fernand Braudel cultural maps do not exactly coincide with economic cards, and this is quite logical. Is it not because culture originates from the endless past: economies have changed one another, political institutions have collapsed, societies have emerged one by one, but civilization has continued on its way. Civilization is the old man, the patriarch of world history⁴²². In addition, there was no easily distinguishable cultural boundary that would not be evidence of many completed processes.

The need to understand the consequences of large-scale changes on the European continent at the turn of the century, requires not only the search for new worldviews, values, standards of life and the acquisition of European identity by the peoples of Central Europe and Eastern Europe, but also the study of values, worldview structures more. Of particular importance in this context is geocultural issues, such as the isolation of the specific relationship and interplay between the historical and geographical space and the culture of society of the newly enlarged East of the European Union.

CONCLUSIONS

In the XX century, one of the most prominent figures of Ukrainian history was undoubtedly Metropolitan of Galicia Andrey Sheptytsky. A prominent religious figure of the time, he played a significant role in the growth of self-awareness of the Ukrainian people. It is difficult to overestimate the contribution of Metropolitan to the education, science, cultural progress of the Ukrainians. Although his activity was spread primarily in the Western Ukraine, but it has resonated enormously with the rest of Ukrainian lands.

⁴²² Бродель, Фернан. Матеріальна цивілізація, економіка і капіталізм, XV-XVIII ст. У 3-х т. Т.3. Час світу. – Київ: Основи, 1998. – С. 53.

Andrey Sheptytsky is a prominent political figure of his time. Although he was raised in a polonized family, he had a clear Ukrainian-national position. However, his attitude towards different political parties and organizations was ambiguous. He, on the one hand, supported the formation of the Division "Halicia", which was part of the German Wehrmacht, and on the other, strongly condemned the terrorist act of OUN members against Polish Minister of Internal Affairs B. Pieracki. His attitude to the OUN and the UPA as a whole was ambiguous. Metropolitan was one of the first to urge UPA soldiers to stop fighting against the Soviet troops, because he understood that this fight would accelerate and intensify repression against the Ukrainian people. His attitude to various political regimes (Austro-Hungarian, Polish, Soviet, German), which at different times prevailed in Galicia, was also ambiguous. Historical documents show that Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky was in opposition to all, no authority considered him a supporter. However, none of the occupying governments dared to repress him, because Sheptytsky was extremely popular and authoritative in not only Ukraine, but also all over the world.

The Greek Catholic Church in Transcarpathia, especially after appointment of D. Njaradi as Apostolic Administrator, continued to serve as a defender of Ukrainian statehood. Throughout the interwar period, cultural relations between Transcarpathia and Galicia did not end. The great merit in this, undoubtedly, belongs to Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, who was well known in Transcarpathia; he has been there many times. Sheptytsky was one of the first political leaders in Galicia to congratulate the formation of an autonomous government headed by A. Voloshyn. Close relations were established between two prominent political, cultural and religious figures of the XX century.

In his cultural, educational, ecclesiastical and scientific activities, Andrey Sheptytsky relied on a well-reasoned, logically-argued, powerful theological and philosophical system of beliefs that he sought to bring to life. Metropolitan was also very interested in the problems of church and general history. He has done a lot in the field of archival studies and museum studies, personally financing them. However, it should be noted that despite the importance of his cultural, educational, pedagogical, scientific, social and political activity for the church and for him personally, it was still not the main one. Andrey Sheptytsky first of all was a Metropolitan, not a layman, but a religious person, and even if he went beyond purely church affairs in his actions, he acted like a Kniaz of the Church.

REFERENCES

1. Академічне релігієзнавство: Підручник / Під редакцією А. Колодного. К.: Світ Знань, 2000. 862 с.
2. Альчук М. Людиновимірність творчості Андрея Шептицького. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 55-61.
3. Андрухів І. Політика радянської влади у сфері релігії та конфесійне життя на Прикарпатті в 40-80-х роках ХХ століття: Історико-правовий аналіз. Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ, 2006. 432 с.
4. Андрушко В., Лучків М., Волошин Л. Вчення Андрея Шептицького про божу любов і милосердя – основа оновлення суспільства. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 78-86.
5. Бабенко Л. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький на зламі суспільно-політичних альтернатив початкового періоду радянизації західноукраїнських земель. *Україна і Ватикан*. Серія збірників наукових праць. – Вип. І.: Українсько-ватиканські відносини в контексті суспільних і міжконфесійних проблем / [за загальною ред. д.філос.н. А. Колодного (гол. ред.), д.і.н. О. Реєнта, д.філос.н. П. Яроцького, д.філос.н. Я. Филипович, д.філос.н. С. Кияка]. Івано-Франківськ-Київ, 2008. – С. 165-171.
6. Базилевич М. Анатоль. Введення у твори митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Праці Українського Богословського Наукового Товариства. Т. XV. Торонто, 1965. 237 с.
7. Байло Н. Музичне мистецтво в житті і діяльності Андрея Шептицького. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 7-15.
8. Бандрівський М. С. Пам'яткоохоронна діяльність Андрея Шептицького. *Записки Львів. наук. б-ки ім. В. Стефаника*. Л., 2006. Вип.7/8. С. 459-467.
9. Баран О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і його екуменічні ідеї. *Український Історик*. 1-4 (120-123). Нью-Йорк – Торонто – Київ – Львів – Мюнхен, 1994.
10. Баран С. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: життя і діяльність. Мюнхен: Вернигора, 1947. 151 с.
11. Басараб В. Основи російської ментальності та православної церкви крізь призму екуменічних ідей А.Шептицького. *Актуальні проблеми політичної науки*. Ужгород, 2017. Вип. 1. С. 91-97.
12. Басараб В. Причини українсько-польського протистояння 1930-1943 рр. крізь призму листів та пастирських послань Андрея

Шептицького. *Східноєвропейський історичний вісник*. Дрогобич: Посвіт, 2018. Спеціальний випуск 3. С. 285-295.

13. Басараб В. Викриття А. Шептицьким сутності нацистської політики в листах до А. Гітлера та Папи Пія XII. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету*. Серія: Історія. Вип. 1(40). Ужгород: «Говерла», 2019. С. 10-16.

14. Басараб В. Державницькі ідеї Андрея Шептицького в період Другої світової війни: концепція незалежності України та засудження політики Гітлера. *IX Міжнародний конгрес українців*. Історія. Збірник наукових статей. НАН України, ІМФЕ ім. Рильського. Київ, 2018. С. 145– 157.

15. Басараб В. Державотворча концепція та національно-патріотичні ідеї митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Ужгород: Гражда, 2019. 232 с.

16. Басараб В. Державотворчі та патріотичні ідеї А. Шептицького в історичному контексті. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету*. Серія: Історія. Вип. 2(39). Ужгород: «Говерла», 2018. С. 11-20.

17. Басараб В. Моделі державотворення у працях А. Шептицького. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету*. Серія: Історія. Вип. 1(38). Ужгород: «Говерла», 2018. С. 11-18.

18. Басараб В. Національно-патріотичні ідеї А. Шептицького [на основі праці «Пересторога перед комунізмом»]. *Держава у теорії і практиці українського націоналізму*. Матеріали VI Всеукраїнської конференції з міжнародною участю. Івано-Франківськ, 26-27 червня 2015 р. / Наук. ред. О. М. Сич. Івано-Франківськ: Місто НВ, 2015. С. 16-27.

19. Басараб В. Осмислення А. Шептицьким сценарію більшовицького перевороту в Іспанії (на основі передмови А.Шептицького до «Пасторського послання еспанських єпископів»). *Матеріали II Міжнародної науково-практичної е-конференції «Мультидисциплінарні академічні дослідження і глобальні інновації: гуманітарні та соціальні науки» (MARGINSS 2016)*, 28-29 липня 2016 року, м. Київ). Київ, КНЛУ, 2016. С. 22-24.

20. Басараб В. Перспективи та реалії становлення незалежної України крізь призму політичних ідей А.Шептицького. *Економічні, політичні та культурологічні аспекти європейської інтеграції України в умовах нових глобалізаційних викликів: матеріали доповідей Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції (м. Ужгород, 16-17 квітня 2018 року)*. Ужгород: «Гельветика», 2018. С. 355-359.

21. Басараб В. Проблема єдності Церков у світлі екуменічних ідей митрополита А.Шептицького. *Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції Волинської православної богословської академії УПЦ КП «Державотворення і помісність Церкви: історичні*

процеси та сучасні реалії» (18.05.2017). Луцьк: Видавництво Волинської православної богословської академії ЕІКΩΝ, 2017. С. 27-34.

22. Басараб В. Революційні процеси 1917-1921 рр. в Україні крізь призму послань митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Література та культура Полісся*. Вип. 87. Серія «Історичні науки». № 7. Ніжин: НДУ ім. Гоголя, 2017. С. 130-140.

23. Басараб В. Роль Греко-католицької церкви у процесі становлення української державності (на матеріалі послань та листів Андрея Шептицького). *Карпатська Україна – незалежна держава*. Матеріали міжнародної конференції, присвяченої 80-річчю проголошення незалежності Карпатської України. Ужгород, видавництво ПП «Аутдор-Шарк», 2019. С. 129-140.

24. Басараб В., Вегеш М. Дві постаті з історії української церкви: Андрей Шептицький і Августин Волошин. Ужгород: Видавництво УжНУ «Говерла», 2011. 210 с.

25. Басараб В., Вегеш М. Життя і помисли митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Ужгород, 2003. 112 с.

26. Батіг М. Болюча рана минувшини: (Доля пам'ятника Андрєві Шептицькому тісно пов'язана з долею самого Національного музею у м. Львові. *Молода Галичина*. 1998. 22 серп.

27. Батій Я. О. Андрей Шептицький. Харків: Фоліо, 2018. 120 с. + іл. (Знамениті українці).

28. Безпалько У. І. Інституалізація католицької церкви Східного обряду в Росії (1901-1917 рр.). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.02 – Всесвітня історія. Тернопіль, 2018. 20 с.

29. Бистрицька Е. В. Східна політика Ватикану в контексті відносин Святого Престолу з Росією та СРСР (1878-1964). Автореферат дис... доктора іст. наук. Спеціальність 09. 00. 11. К., 2009. 40 с.

30. Бистрицька Е. Питання ліквідації греко-католицької церкви в контексті радянсько-ватиканського протистояння. *Мандрівець*. 2009. № 4. С. 26-32.

31. Бистрицька Е. Українське православ'я та екуменічна діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького в роки Другої світової війни. *Українське релігієзнавство*. 2002. № 23. С. 45-55.

32. Біланіч І. Еволюція Української Православної церкви 1917-1942 рр. Л.: Астролябія, 2004. 392 с.

33. Білас І. Органи НКВД-НКГВ і трагедія греко-католицької церкви. *Визвольний шлях*. 1992. № 12. С. 1436-1447.

34. Білас Я. І. Боротьба Митрополита Андрея Шептицького за утвердження ЗУНР (1918–1923 рр.). *Українське релігієзнавство*. № 22. Київ, 2002. С. 107–113.

35. Білас Я. І. Екуменізм Андрея Шептицького і проблема суверенності нації. *Історія релігій в Україні*. Кн. 1. Львів, 1999. С. 45–48.

36. Білас Я. І. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і проблеми національно-визвольного руху українців. Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 09.00.11 – Релігієзнавство. К., 2003. 20 с.

37. Білас Я. І. Парламентська діяльність митрополита А. Шептицького. *Українське релігієзнавство*. № 23. Київ, 2002. С. 67–75.

38. Білас Я. І. Ставлення митрополита Андрея Шептицького до теорії та практики українського національно-визвольного руху (20 – 30-ті роки ХХ ст.). *Вісник Львівського університету*. Серія: філософські науки Вип. 2. Львів, 2000. С. 131–139.

39. Білас Я. І. Християнство в етнокультурні та національному відродженні українців. *Християнство і культура*. Київ – Тернопіль, 1998. С. 8-11.

40. Блажейовський Дмитро. Деякі сумні сторінки з історії України та дещо про її сусідів: Україну краще треба нам самим будувати (Збірка особистих спостережень автора). Львів: Видавництво «Каменярь», 2007. 640 с.

41. Бліхар В. С. Соціально-філософські погляди Андрея Шептицького. Автореферат дис. ... канд. філософ. наук. Спеціальність 09.00.05 – Історія філософії. Львів, 2006.

42. Бляхар В. Християнські принципи розвитку суспільного життя у творчій спадщині Андрея Шептицького. *Мандрівець*. 2007. № 1. С. 69-73.

43. Божко Н., Цубов Л. Благодійницька та меценатська діяльність Андрея Шептицького у царині культурно-мистецької спадщини. *Historical and Cultural*. No 1. Vol. 2. 2015. S. 25-29.

44. Боляновський А. Дивізія «Галичина»: історія. Львів, 2000. 528 с.

45. Боляновський А. Між християнською мораллю і нелюдським злом (реакція митрополита Андрея Шептицького на окупаційну політику націонал-соціалістичної Німеччини в Галичині у 1941-1944 рр.: від формальної лояльності до критики і протестів). *Друга світова війна та долі мирного населення у Східній Європі*. К., 2016. С. 7-70.

46. Боцюрків Богдан. Греко-Католицька Церква і Радянська держава (1939-1950) / переклад з англійської Наталії Кочан, за редакцією Олега Турія. Львів: Видавництво Українського Католицького Університету, 2005. xx + 268 с.

47. Бродель, Фернан. Матеріальна цивілізація, економіка і капіталізм, XV-XVIII ст. У 3-х т. Т.3. Час світу. – Київ: Основи, 1998. – С. 53.

48. Будівничий української державності: Хрестоматія політологічних статей Івана Франка / Упоряд. Д. Павличко. К.: Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2006. 640 с.

49. Бура І., Паскевич О. Андрей Шептицький: сповнення блаженств. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу «Свічадо», 1994. 48 с.

50. Вавжонек М. Екуменічна діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького в Україні та Росії. Рим, 2006. 229 с.

51. Васьків А. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький про проблеми політичної теорії та практики. *Різдво Христове 2000*. Статті й матеріали. Львів: Логос, 2001. С. 198-204.

52. Васьків А., Васьків Л. Митрополит А. Шептицький про теоретичні засади політики. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 41-48.

53. Вегеш М. М. Андрей Шептицький (1865–1944). *Вчені, письменники і політичні діячі про Україну: (Збірник наукових праць) / Ужгород. держ. ун-т., Ужгород. культ.-осв. і благодійницьке т-во «Карпатське братство»*. Ужгород, 1996. Вип. 2. С. 59–85.

54. Вегеш М. М. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: історіографічні аспекти. *Проблеми української історіографії: Матеріали Всеукраїнської наукової конференції, присвяченої 30-річчю Українського Історичного Товариства і журналу «Український історик» (2 березня 1996 р.)*. Мукачеве: Елара, 1996. С. 80–88.

55. Вегеш М. М. Провідник українського національного відродження [Рец. Басараб В. Державотворча концепція та національно-патріотичні ідеї митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Ужгород: Гражда, 2019. 232 с.]. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Історія / М-во освіти і науки України; Держ. вищ. навч. заклад «Ужгород. нац. ун-т, Ф-т історії та міжнародних відносин»; [Редкол.: Ю. В. Данилець (головний редактор та ін.)]*. Ужгород: Вид-во УжНУ «Говерла», 2019. Вип. 1 (40). С. 235-237.

56. Вегеш М. М., Остапець Ю. О. Роль митрополита Андрея Шептицького у налагодженні громадсько-культурних взаємин Закарпаття і Галичини в міжвоєнний період. *Актуальні та малодосліджені проблеми історії України / Ужгород. держ. ун-т., Кафедра політології*. Ужгород, 1998. Вип. 1. С. 12–14.

57. Вегеш М. М., Остапець Ю. О., Хоменко О. В. Громадсько-політична, церковна і культурно-освітня діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Ужгород, 1998. 149 с.

58. Вегеш М. М., Росак В. М., Хоменко О. В. Культурно-освітня, виховна та наукова діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Carpatica–Карпатика: Історія і культура Карпат: (До 10-річчя*

утворення НДІ Карпатознавства) / Ужгород. націон. ун-т, НДІ Карпатознавства. Ужгород, 2002. С.239–271.

59. Вегеш М. М., Хоменко О. В. Екуменічні ідеї митрополита Андрея Шептицького та діяльність по їх реалізації. *Carpatica–Карпатика*: Актуальні проблеми політичного та етнокультурного розвитку Карпатського регіону в ХІХ–ХХ століттях. Ужгород: Вид-во «Два кольори», 2001. Вип. 10. С. 278–312.

60. Вегеш М. М., Хоменко О. В. Культурно-освітня, виховна та наукова діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Carpatica–Карпатика*: Актуальні проблеми політичного та етнокультурного розвитку Карпатського регіону в ХІХ–ХХ століттях. Ужгород: Вид-во «Два кольори», 2001. Вип. 10. С. 250–277.

61. Вегеш М. М., Хоменко О. В. Філософія освіти у спадщині А.Шептицького і сучасність. *Гуманітарна освіта: досвід і проблеми: Матеріали Всеукраїнської науково-практичної конференції «Трансформація гуманітарної освіти» (Ужгород, 25–27 травня 1998 р.)* / Мініст. освіти України, Ужгород. держ. ун-т, Академія Наук Вищої Школи України, Українська Академія Політичних Наук, Закарп. обл. держ. адміністр. Ужгород: МПП «Гражда», 1999. 191–197.

62. Вегеш М. Митрополит Шептицький і Закарпаття. *Радянська Верховина*. 1992. 13 черв.

63. Вегеш М. Могутня постать української історії: [Про Митрополита Андрея Шептицького]. *Календар «Просвіти» на 1995 рік* / Закарп. крайове т-во «Просвіта»; [Упорядн.: П. Федака, Й. Баглай]. Ужгород: МПП «Гражда», 1995. С. 142–144.

64. Вегеш М. Могутня постать української історії: До 130-річчя митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Карпатська Україна*. 1995. 1 серп.

65. Вегеш М., Басараб В. Андрей Шептицький і Закарпаття: Кілька маловідомих фактів із життя видатного митрополита [Між Богом і кесарем]. *Срібна Земля-фест*. 2003. 25 вересня – 1 жовтня.

66. Вегеш М., Басараб В. Тяжкий хрест Митрополита (До 138-річчя від дня народження А.Шептицького). *Карпатська Україна*. 2003. 24 липня.

67. Вегеш М., Задорожний В. Андрей Шептицький: просвітитель, політик, людина. *Срібна Земля*. 1993. 6 квіт.

68. Вегеш М., Фенич В. Сходження на святоюрську гору: (Андрей Шептицький – церковний діяч). *Карпатська Україна*. 1999. 3 серп.

69. Вегеш М., Фенич В. У храмі святого Юра (Андрей Шептицький–церковний діяч). *Верховина*. 1994. 26 квіт.

70. Великі Українці: митрополит Андрей Шептицький, патріарх Йосиф Сліпий. *Музейний провулок*. 2009. № 3. С. 176-178.

71. Верига В. Визвольні змагання в Україні 1914-1923 рр. У двох томах. Т. 1. Жовква: Видавництво Отців Василіан «Місіонер», 1998. 524 с.

72. Верига В. Визвольні змагання в Україні 1914-1923 рр. У двох томах. Т. 2. Жовква: Видавництво Отців Василіан «Місіонер», 1998. 504 с.

73. Верига В. Дорогами Другої світової війни: Дивізія «Галичина». Торонто, 1998. 345 с.

74. Верига В. За рідний край, за нарід свій, або Хто такі дивізійними? К.: Вид-во ім. Олени Теліги, 2006. 288 с.

75. Верига В. Нариси з історії України (кінець XVIII – початок ХХ ст.). Львів: Видавництво «Світ», 1996. 448 с.

76. Винник Н. Постать Андрея Шептицького в оцінці сучасних українських істориків. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослівя. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 40-46.

77. Висновок ПАРЄ № 190 (1995) щодо вступу України до Ради Європи. Страсбург. 1995. 25 вересня. *Реституція церковного майна: міжнародний та вітчизняний досвід*: збірник наукових матеріалів. К., 2007. С. 65.

78. Вихруч В., Антонюк Т. Право на безсмертя: (Культурно-освітня діяльність Андрея Шептицького). *Рідна школа*. 1997. № 9. С. 9-11.

79. Він був великим українцем: (Патріарх Йосиф Сліпий про Митрополита Андрея Шептицького). *За вільну Україну*. 2002. 1-2 лист.

80. Вінчковський Т. С. Політичні діячі України: 1917-2004. К., 2005. С. 48-52.

81. Власовський І. 10 літ тому. *Український православний календар на 1953 рік*. Видавництво Української Православної Церкви в США. С. 98-99.

82. Власовський І. Нарис історії Української Православної Церкви. Нью-Йорк: Саунд Баунд Брук, 1966. 345 с.

83. Войналович В. А. Партійно-державна політика щодо релігії та релігійних інституцій в Україні 1940-1960-х років: політологічний дискурс. К.: Світогляд, 2005. 741 с.

84. Воронин О. О. Автокефалія Православної Церкви. Кенсінгтон: Воскресіння, 1990. 64 с..

85. Вуяно М. Монастирі Івано-Франківська (Станиславова): перша половина ХХ ст. Івано-Франківськ: Нова Зоря, 1998. 216 с.

86. Гаврилів М. Діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького як підстава його беатифікації. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 95-104.

87. Гайдукевич О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький – природоохоронний діяч Галичини. *Схід*. № 1 (141). Січень-лютий 2016. С. 35-39.

88. Гайдукевич О., Концур-Карабінович Н. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький та охорона природи Галичини. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича*. Серія Історія. 2016. № 2. С. 20-26.

89. Гайковський М. Велике протистояння: опір Греко-Католицької Церкви більшовицькому окупаційному режимові. *Київська Церква*. 1999. № 5. С. 25-30.

90. Гайковський М. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький – честь і окраса церкви і українського народу. *Берестейська унія (1596-1996)*. Статті і матеріали. Львів: Логос, 1996. С. 198-204.

91. Гайковський М. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький у радянській післявоєнній історіографії. *Богословія*. Рим, 1991. Т. 55. С. 144-156.

92. Гайковський М. Московська патріархія – спільниця і знаряддя більшовицького режиму в ліквідації Греко-Католицької Церкви. *Київська Церква*. 2000. № 2. С. 14-20.

93. Гайковський М. УГКЦ в часи митрополитування Андрея Шептицького. *Київська Церква*. 2001. № 1-3. С. 32-48.

94. Гайковський М. Функціонування і спроби ліквідації Української Греко-Католицької Церкви в умовах СРСР у 1939-1941 та 1944-1946 роках. *Хресною дорогою: Функціонування і спроби ліквідації Української Греко-Католицької Церкви в умовах СРСР у 1939-1941 та 1944-1946 роках: збірник документів і матеріалів/ упоряд. Гайковський М.І.* Львів: Місіонер, 2006. С.19-90.

95. Гайковський М. Хресна дорога Української Греко-Католицької Церкви (1939-1941 та 1944-1947 рр.). Львів: Місіонер, 2007. 136 с.

96. Гайова О. Християнські засади суспільної діяльності митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Київська церква*. 1999. № 4. С. 47-52.

97. Гайова О. Митрополит Галицький. *Український альманах 2001*. Варшава, 2001. С. 99-103.

98. Галицькі митрополити: біографічний довідник. Львів: Логос, 1992. 94 с.

99. Гель І. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і українська національна ідея. *Молода Галичина*. 2000. 8 серп.

100. Генік Л. Діяльність митрополита А. Шептицького в Галичині в період Другої світової війни. *Карпати: людина, етнос, цивілізація*. 2012. Аип. 4. С. 129-136.

101. Генік Л. Ідеї Андрея Шептицького в історичних реаліях Станіславщини та Івано-Франківщини в ХІХ-ХХ століттях. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана*

Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир». Богослвія. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 100-116.

102. Гентош Л. Митрополит Шептицький: 1923-1939. Випробування ідеалів. Львів, 2015. 596 с.

103. Гентош Л. Постать митрополита Шептицького в українських та польських наукових виданнях останнього десятиріччя. *Україна модерна* / За ред. В. Верстюка, Я. Грицака, Л. Зашкільняка, В. Кравченка, М. Крикуна. К.: Критика; Львів: Інститут історичних досліджень Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка, 2003. Ч. 8. С. 179-210.

104. Герман Сергій. *Via Романа. Життя митрополита Андрея Шептицького: роман.* К.: Ярославів вал, 2017. 360 с.

105. Гладка Г. Л. Суспільно-політична діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького (1899-1939 рр.). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Чернівці, 2000. 20 с.

106. Гладка Г. Українізація духовного життя в Станіславській єпархії в період єпископства Андрея Шептицького (1899-1900 рр.). *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир». Богослвія.* Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 47-53.

107. Гладка Г., Кугутяк М., Москалюк М., Хруслов Б. У боротьбі за церкву, націю й державу. *Галичина.* Науковий і культурно-просвітній краєзнавчий часопис. Івано-Франківськ. 1998. № 1. С.67-92.

108. Гладка Г.Л. Антикмуністична діяльність А.Шептицького напередодні II світової війни. *Історія України.* 1999. Київ. № 19. С.5.

109. Гладка Г.Л. Берестейська унія й єкуменічний процес в оцінках та діяльності А.Шептицького. *Обрії.* Часопис Івано-Франківського обласного інституту післядипломної освіти педагогічних працівників. Івано-Франківськ, 1996. № 1(3). С. 43-47.

110. Гладка Г.Л. Державотворча концепція митрополита А.Шептицького в період Першої світової війни. *Нова політика.* 1999. № 2. С. 56-59.

111. Гладка Г.Л. Єкуменічна діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Добрий пастир.* Часопис, присвячений церковним і богословським справам. Івано-Франківськ, 1996. Ч. 1. С. 99-101.

112. Гладка Г.Л. Проблема релігійної єдності України в унійно-єкуменічній діяльності митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Наукові записки Тернопільського державного педагогічного університету ім. В. Гнатюка,* Серія: Історія. Тернопіль, 1999. Вип. ІХ. С. 37-40.

113. Гладка Г.Л. Суспільно-політична діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького в контексті українсько-польських відносин в Галичині у

XX ст. Матеріали міжнар.наук.-практ.конф. "Українсько-польські відносини в Галичині у XX ст.". Івано-Франківськ, 1997. С.148-151.

114. Гнідик І. І. Початки та розбудова греко-католицької церкви у США (кінець XIX – початок XX ст.). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.02 – Всесвітня історія.

115. Гнот С. Греко-католицька церква і мистецтво Західної України 20-30-рр. XX ст. *Науковий вісник Волинського державного університету імені Лесі Українки*. Серія – історичні науки. Луцьк: Вид.-во ВДУ, 2001. С. 44-48.

116. Гнот С. Греко-католицька церква і організація суспільної опіки Галичини (1921-1939). *Актуальні проблеми державного управління*. Збірник наукових праць / Львівський філіал Української Академії державного управління при Президентові України. Львів: Вид.-во ЛФ УАДУ, 2001. Вип. 6. С. 299-309.

117. Гнот С. Греко-католицька церква і проблема збереження пам'яток національної культури Галичини у міжвоєнний період. *Історичні пам'ятки Галичини*. Матеріали наукової краєзнавчої конференції 21 листопада 2002 р. Львів: Видавничий центр ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2003. С. 126-135.

118. Гнот С. До питання про діяльність Греко-католицької церкви у створенні захистів та захоронок у Галичині в міжвоєнний період. *Історія релігій в Україні*. Праці XI-ї Міжнародної наукової конференції (Львів, 16-19 травня 2001 року). Львів: "Логос", 2001. Кн. 1. С. 179-183.

119. Гнот С. Добročинна діяльність Греко-католицької церкви у 20–30-х рр. XX ст. (за матеріалами української галицької преси). *Наукові зошити історичного факультету Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка*. Збірник наукових праць. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2003. Вип. 5-6. С. 211-219.

120. Гнот С. І. Добročинна діяльність греко-католицької церкви у 1921-1939 рр. (за матеріалами Галицької митрополії). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Львів, 2003. 22 с.

121. Гнот С. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і розвиток національної культури Галичини в міжвоєнний період. *Історія релігій в Україні*. Праці XII-ї Міжнародної наукової конференції (Львів, 20-24 травня 2002 року). Львів: "Логос", 2002. Кн. 1. С. 113-117.

122. Гнот С. Проблема захисту дітей в діяльності Греко-католицької церкви міжвоєнного періоду. *Вісник Львівської комерційної академії*. Серія – гуманітарні науки. Львів: Вид.-во ЛКА, 2002. Вип. 4. С. 54-66.

123. Гнот С. Роль Греко-католицької церкви у суспільно-політичному житті Західної України 20-30-х років XX ст. *Українське державотворення: уроки, проблеми, перспективи*. Матеріали науково-

практичної конференції 22 листопада 2001 року. Львів: ЛФ УАДУ, 2001. Ч. 1. С. 107-109.

124. Гнот С. Співпраця Греко-католицької церкви Львівської архієпархії з українським шкільництвом у період між двома світовими війнами. *Мандрівець* / Видання Національного університету “Києво-Могилянська академія”. Тернопіль, 2002. № 3 (38). С. 13-19.

125. Головин Б. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький – благодійник «Просвіти». Збірник праць. Тернопіль, 2006. Т. 2. С. 98-100.

126. Головин Р. Владика Андрей. *Україна*. 1990. № 40. С. 8-11.

127. Горняткевич Д. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. *Визвольний шлях*. 1954. Кн. 12. С. 5-19.

128. Грабовецький В. Ілюстрована історія Прикарпаття. Тисячолітній літопис Гуцульщини. Т. 3. Видання друге, доповнене. Івано-Франківськ: Видавництво «Нова Зоря», 2004. 464 с.

129. Грабовецький В. Історія Івано-Франківська (Станіславова). З найдавніших часів до початку ХХ століття. Частина 1. Івано-Франківськ: Нова Зоря, 1999. 304 с.

130. Греченюк Н. Культурно-освітня діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Україна – Європа – Світ*. Міжнародний збірник наукових праць. Серія: Історія, міжнародні відносини. 2013. Вип. 12. С. 272-275.

131. Грицак Ярослав. Пророк у своїй вітчизні. Франко та його спільнота (1856-1886). К.: Критика, 2006. 632 с.

132. Грицак Ярослав. Страсті за націоналізмом: Історичні есеї. К.: Критика, 2004. 344 с.

133. Гудима А. М. Релігієзнавство: Підручник. Тернопіль: Укрмедкнига, 2002. 262 с.

134. Гузар Л. Андрей Шептицький митрополит Галицький (1901-1944) провісник екуменізму. Вид. друге. Жовква: Місіонер, 2015. 496 с.

135. Гузар Л. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький та екуменізм. *Богословіє*. Т. 15. Кн. 1-4. С. 34-51.

136. Гунчак Т. Україна: ХХ століття. К.: Дніпро, 2005. 384 с.

137. Гуркіна С. Митрополит Андрей (Шептицький) у період німецької окупації Галичини: найновіша історіографія питання (1989-2000 роки). *Ковчег*. Львів, 2001. Ч. 3. С. 563-565.

138. Гуцуляк М. Перший листопад 1918 року на західних землях України зі спогадами і життєписами членів Комітету Виконавців Листопадового Чину. К.: Либідь, 1993. 408 с.

139. Гучко Г. Андрей Шептицький як меценат української культури. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 87-94.

140. Дарморіз О. Питання співвідношення віри і розуму в богословсько-філософській концепції митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Історія релігій в Україні*. Львів: Логос, 2009. Кн. 2. С. 64-68.
141. Дашкевич Я. Постаті: нариси про діячів історії, політики, культури. 2-ге вид., виправлене й доповнене. Львів, 2007.
142. Дванадцять листів о. Андрея Шептицького до матері / Упор. Г. Меріам-Лужницький. Львів: Світ, 1994. 80 с.
143. Дейвіс Норман. Боже ігрище. Історія Польщі / перекл. з англ. Петра Тарашука. К.: Видавництво Соломії Павличко «Основи», 2008. 1080 с. + іл.
144. Дмитрук Севастіян. Блаженний Климентій Шептицький про молитву у відроджених монастирях Студійського уставу. Львів: Свічадо, 2002. 132 с.
145. Добош О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: період становлення і сходження на митрополичий престол (1865-1900 рр.). *Труди Київської Духовної Академії*. 2010. № 12. С. 154-161.
146. Дорошенко В. Великий митрополит (пам'яті Митрополита Шептицького): спогади і нариси. Йорктон: Друкарня «Голосу Спасителя», 1958. 56 с.
147. Дорошенко В. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і об'єднання Церков. *Логос*. 1955. Т. 6. С. 137-143.
148. Дорошенко Д. Словянський світ у його минулому й сучасному. Т. I-III. Ужгород: Видавництво «Гражда», 2005. 404 с.
149. Євген Коновалець та його доба. Мюнхен: Видання фундації ім. Євгена Коновальця, 1974. 1020 с.
150. Європейський Союз. Словник-довідник. – К.: К.І.С., 2001 – С. 25-26.
151. Жук С. Чистий серцем: (Пам'яті митрополита Андрея Шептицького). *Визвольний шлях*. 1960. № 2/74. С. 223-224.
152. Жуковський А. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і православ'я. *Науковий Збірник Українського Вільного Університету*. Мюнхен. 1992. Т. 15. С. 37-57.
153. Заборовський Я. Ю. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Нарис про життя і служіння народові (1865-1944 рр.). Івано-Франківськ, 1995. 63 с.
154. Завадка Б. Переслідування греко-католицької церкви в Галичині в 1938-1939 роках за участь у процесі національної непокори. *Церква і соціальні проблеми*. Львів, 1993. С. 270-277.
155. Закон України «Про альтернативну (невійськову) службу». *Відомості Верховної Ради України (ВВР)*. 1992. № 15. ст. 188.

156. Закон України «Про свободу совісті та релігійні організації». *Відомості Верховної Ради УРСР (ВВР)*. № 25. ст. 10.

157. Захара І. Боротьба філософських течій у Галичині на початку ХХ ст. Філософські роздуми митрополита Андрея Шептицького та Івана Франка про соціальне питання. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 71-77.

158. Західно-Українська Народна Республіка. 1918-1923. Документи і матеріали. Т. 1: Листопадова 1918 р. національно-демократична революція. Проголошення ЗУНР / Укладачі: Олександр Карпенко, Катерина Мищан. Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ, 2001. 684 с.

159. Західно-Українська Народна Республіка. 1918-1923. Документи і матеріали. Т. 2: Державотворчі й адміністративно-організаційні процеси / Укладачі: Олександр Карпенко, Катерина Мищан. Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ, 2001. 712 с.

160. Західно-Українська Народна Республіка. 1918-1923: Історія / Керівник авторського колективу й відповідальний редактор Олександр Карпенко. Івано-Франківськ: Сіверсія, 2001. 628 с.

161. Зінченко А. Л. Благовісти національного духу: Українська церква на Поділлі в першій третині ХХ ст. К.: Освіта, 1993. 256 с.

162. І просвітитель, і борець: (До 55-х роковин від дня смерті митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Учитель*. 1998. № 9. С. 32-33.

163. Ідзьо В. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький у Росії: курське ув'язнення. *Різдво Христове 2000*. Статті й матеріали. Львів: Логос, 2001. С. 195-197.

164. Ідзьо В. С. Митрополит Андрій Шептицький та шпальтах російської преси та часопису українців Росії «Украинская жизнь» у 1914-1917 роках. Львів: Сполом, 2007. 50 с.

165. Історія релігій в Україні: в 10 т. / А. Колодний, Р. Крижанівський. Т. 10. Релігія і церква років незалежності України. Київ – Дрогобич: Коло, 2003. 612 с.

166. Кавацюк Д. Пастирські послання митрополита Андрея Шептицького про участь духовенства і вірних у виборах до австрійського парламенту і Галицького сейму на початку ХХ ст. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослівя. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 130-135.

167. Калинець І. Митрополит Андрей – духовний будівничий нації. *Матеріали конференції, присвяченої життю і діяльності митрополита Андрея Шептицького*. Львів, 1990. С. 51-56.

168. Кам'янський П. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький та єпископ Григорій Хомишин в боротьбі за українську церкву і державність у першій половині ХХ століття. *Схід*. 2006. № 4. С. 66-70.

169. Касьянов Г. Шептицький Андрей (1865-1944). Малий словник історії України / В. Смолій, С. Кульчицький, О. Майборода та ін. К.: Либідь, 1997. С. 451.

170. Качараба С. Греко-католицька церква у США наприкінці XIX – на початку XX ст. : проблеми становлення. *Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність*. Вип 21: Scripta manent. Ювілейний збірник на пошану Богдана Якимовича [гол. редколегії Микола Литвин, упоряд. Олександр Седляр, Наталя Кобрин]; Національна академія наук України, Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича. Львів, 2012. С. 361-368.

171. Кашіба М. Більшовизм у трактуванні Андрея Шептицького. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 16-24.

172. Кекош О. М. Виховання молоді крізь призму педагогічних поглядів митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Педагогічні науки*. 2013. Вип. 112. С. 53-59.

173. Кекош О. М. Просвітницька діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького в контексті духовного становлення сучасної молоді. *Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка*. Серія Педагогіка. Тернопіль: ТНПУ, 2013. № 1. С. 25-30.

174. Кияк С. Архипастирська діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького в першій половині XX століття. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослівя. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 10-17.

175. Кіндрат К. Андрей Шептицький – праведник України. *Християнські цінності: історія і погляд у третє тисячоліття*: зб. наук. записок Національного університету “Острозька академія”. Т. VI. Острог, 2002. С. 26-31.

176. Кіндрат, В. Кіндрат. Формування основ християнської моралі в процесі духовного відродження України: матеріали конференції. Острог, 1996. Кн. 2. С. 183-188.

177. Кліш А. Суспільно-політичні орієнтації Андрея Шептицького на початку XX ст. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослівя. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 18-27.

178. Клюнь Р. Діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького часів Другої світової війни в українській історіографії. *Інтелігенція і влада*. Матеріали 5-ї Всеукраїнської наукової конференції. Одеса, 2009. Ч. 3. С. 99-106.

179. Колодний А. Андрей Шептицький про будівництво рідної хати. *Християнство і національна ідея* (Науковий збірник). Київ – Тернопіль – Краків: Укрмедкнига, 1999. С. 17-23.

180. Конституція України. *Відомості Верховної Ради України (ВВР)*. 1996. № 30. ст. 141.

181. Концур Н. Ліквідація греко-католицької церкви на Станіславівщині. *Краєзнавець Прикарпаття*. Івано-Франківськ, 2007. № 10. С. 59-61.

182. Концур Н. Львівський собор 1946 року і проблеми виживання греко-католиків. *Наукові записки*. Серія: Історія. Вип. 3. Тернопіль, 2008. С. 268-271.

183. Концур Н. Львівський собор 1946 року та його місце в історії УГКЦ. *Наукові записки*. Серія: Історія. Вип. 2. Тернопіль, 2006. С. 55-59.

184. Концур Н. Наслідки Львівського Собору і їх вплив на систему міжнародних і міжцерковних відносин УГКЦ. *Етнос. Культура. Духовність*. Чернівці, 2006. Ч. 2. С. 93-100.

185. Концур Н. Патріарх Йосиф Сліпий: штрихи до портрета релігійного діяча. *Галичина: науковий і культурно-просвітній краєзнавчий часопис*. Івано-Франківськ, 2008. № 14. С. 397-400.

186. Концур Н. Підготовка до ліквідації Української греко-католицької церкви в Галичині. *Література і культура Полісся*. Вип.27.: Регіональна історія та культура в українському та східноєвропейському контексті. Ніжин, 2004. С. 163-167.

187. Концур Н. Становище Української греко-католицької церкви після відновлення радянської влади в західній Україні. *Мандрівець: Всеукраїнський науковий журнал*. Тернопіль, 2006. № 6. С.14-17.

188. Концур-Карабінович Н. Антиунійна політика комуністичного режиму щодо греко-католицької церкви у 1940-х рр. *Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка*. Серія Історія. 2015. Вип. 2. Ч. 2. С. 38-42.

189. Концур-Карабінович Н. Греко-католицька церква. Початки підпілля. Івано-Франківськ: Нова зоря, 2011. 220 с.

190. Концур-Карабінович Н. Постать митрополита Андрея Шептицького в антиунійній політиці радянської влади. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослвія. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 243-249.

191. Концур-Карабінович Н. Репресивні заходи радянської влади стосовно греко-католицької церкви після смерті Митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича*. Серія Історія. 2016. № 1. С. 56-61.

192. Королевський К. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький (1865-1944) / пер. з фр. Я. Кравець. Вид. 2-ге, виправл. Львів: Свічадо, 2016. 512 с.

193. Косик В. Україна і Німеччина у Другій світовій війні. Париж – Нью-Йорк – Львів, 1993. 660 с.

194. Косів Михайло З його духа печаттю: (До 145-річчя від дня народження Андрея Шептицького). *Літературна Україна*. 2010. 29 лип. С. 6.

195. Кравченко О. Хроніка життя і діяльності митрополита Шептицького. *Патріярхат. За єдність церкви і народу*. 1990. Ч. 6. С. 20-22.

196. Кравчук А. Соціальне вчення і діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького (вересень 1939 – червень 1941 років). *Записки НТШ*. 1994. Т. 228. С. 309-342.

197. Кравчук А. Течії нового мислення на Україні про митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Сучасність*. 1991. Ч. 10. С. 92-104.

198. Кравчук А. Християнська етика під час німецької окупації Галичини, 1941-1944: митрополит Андрей (Шептицький) про солідарність, опір владі та захист святості життя. Торонто: Вид-во оо. Василіян, 1963. 350 с.

199. Красівський О. За Українську державу і Церкву. Громадська та суспільно-політична діяльність Митрополита Андрея Шептицького в 1918-1923 рр. Львів, 1995. 86 с.

200. Красівський О. Дипломатичні місії Андрея Шептицького. *Україна: ЗУНР: Історія і традиції*. Л., 2000. С. 291-296.

201. Красівський О. За Українську державу і Церкву. Громадська та суспільно-політична діяльність Митрополита Андрея Шептицького в 1918-1923 рр. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 1995. 86 с.

202. Красівський О., Пилипів І. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і польська держава (1918-1923 рр.). *Українсько-польські відносини в Галичині: матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції (21-22 листопада 1996 р.)*. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 1997. С. 152-155.

203. Кривенко М. О. Книгозбірня «Студіону» у Львові (1909-1940): Історія, сучасний стан фонду. Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 27.00.03 – Книгознавство, бібліотекознавство, бібліографознавство. К., 2010. 23 с.

204. Крип'якевич І. П. Історія України / Відп. ред. Ф. П. Шевченко, Б. З. Якимович. Львів: Світ, 1990. 520 с.

205. Крупа Л. Аналіз ставлення митрополита Андрея Шептицького до діяльності українського підпілля та збройних формувань – УВО,

ОУН, СС «Галичина». *Збірник праць*. Тернопіль, 2006. Т. 2. С. 160-177. (Терноп. краєзнавч. музей).

206. Крупа Л. Діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького у здобутті та розбудові української держави у першій половині ХХ ст. *Наукові записки Тернопільського державного педагогічного університету імені В.Гнатюка*. Серія: Історія. Вип. VIII. Тернопіль: Літопис, 1999. С.14-19.

207. Крупа Л. Діяльність УГКЦ в час німецької окупації з 1941 по 1944 роки. *Тернопільський комерційний інститут. Наукові записки "Матеріали досліджень викладачів інституту, проведені у 2000 та 2001 роках"*. Тернопіль: ТКІ, 2002. С.129-136.

208. Крупа Л. Діяльність УГКЦ під час німецької окупації України з 1941 по 1944 роки. *Наукові записки: Збірник наукових статей Національного педагогічного університету імені М.П. Драгоманова* / Укл. П.В.Дмитренко, О.Л.Макаренко. К: НПУ, 2000. Ч. 3. С. 160-171.

209. Крупа Л. Значення християнської родини для нації у творах митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Тернопільський комерційний інститут. Наукові записки "Матеріали досліджень викладачів інституту, проведені у 2000 та 2001 роках"*. Тернопіль: ТКІ, 2002. С. 118-128.

210. Крупа Л. Л. Вплив митрополита Андрея Шептицького на суспільне і культурно-просвітницьке життя в Галичині кінця ХІХ – першої половини ХХ століття. Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Чернівці, 2003. 21 с.

211. Крупа Л. Підтримка митрополитом Шептицьким української молоді у міжвоєнний період ХХ ст. *Збірник матеріалів Всеукраїнської науково-практичної конференції "Молодь, освіта, наука, культура і національна самосвідомість"*. У 5 т. Т.2. Київ: Видавництво Європейського університету, 2003. С. 196-198.

212. Крупа Л. Погляди митрополита Андрея Шептицького на християнську родину. *Матеріали наукової конференції, присвяченої 100-річчю від часу введення на митрополичий престіл у Львові Слуги Божого Андрея Шептицького (27 жовтня 2001 р.)*. Тернопіль: Астон, 2002. С. 121-127.

213. Крупа Л. Спроби митрополита Андрея Шептицького через ідеї екуменізму досягти фізичного та духовного об'єднання України. *Наш голос*. /видає Асоціація Українців Америки/, 2000. Вересень-жовтень, ч.9-10. С.4-5,8.

214. Крупа Л. Становище української освіти під владою Австро-Угорщини. *Наукові записки Тернопільського державного педагогічного університету імені В.Гнатюка*. Серія: Педагогіка. №1. Тернопіль. В-во: ТДПУ, 2000. С.45-52.

215. Крупа Л. Створення та діяльність закладів для сиріт під патронатом митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Наукові записки Тернопільського державного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка*. Серія: Історія / За заг. ред. проф. М.М. Алексієвця. Тернопіль: Літопис. 2003. Вип. 1. С.73-76.

216. Крупа Л. Участь митрополита Андрея Шептицького в українсько-польських відносинах у 1918-1944 роках. *Наукові записки Тернопільського державного педагогічного університету імені В.Гнатюка*. Серія: Історія. Вип.10. Тернопіль: Літопис, 2000. С.95-106.

217. Крупник Л. Дискредитація Митрополита Андрея Шептицького та УГКЦ як практика радянської влади. *Друга світова війна та долі мирного населення у Східній Європі*. Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції пам'яті Митрополита Андрея Шептицького. 30 листопада – 1 грудня 2015 року, м. Київ / За ред. Леоніда Фінберга. К.: Дух і Літера, 2016. С. 111-122.

218. Крутоус А. До історії родини Шептицьких: з нових знахідок. *Львівський історичний музей*: Наукові записки. Львів, 1991. Вип. 1. С. 138-143.

219. Кубійович В. Мої візити у митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Український історик*. 1989. № 1-3. С. 121-123.

220. Кубійович В. Українці в Генеральній Губернії. 1939-1941. Історія Українського Центрального Комітету. Чикаго, 1975. С. 3-12.

221. Кугутяк М. Андрей Шептицький у національно-визвольних змаганнях українського народу. *Спадщина митрополита Андрея Шептицького в національному й духовному відродженні України*. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2000. С. 66-75.

222. Кугутяк М. Галичина. Сторінки історії: нарис суспільно-політичного руху (XIX ст. – 1939). Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 1993. 202 с.

223. Кугутяк М. Історія української націонал-демократії (1918-1929). Т. 1. Київ – Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2002. 536 с.

224. Кугутяк М. Українська націонал-демократія (1918-1939). Т. 2. Київ – Івано-Франківськ: Нова Зоря, 2004. 704 с.

225. Кудрик В. Маловідоме з історії Греко-Католицької Церкви. Т. 3 Вінніпег; Манітоба: Тризуб, 1995. 254 с.

226. Культурне життя в Україні. Західні землі. Документи і матеріали. Т. 1. 1939-1953. К.: Наукова думка, 1995. 748 с.

227. Кураєв О. Шептицький і «українська політика» Австро-Угорщини. *Урок української*. 2002. № 2. С. 61-62.

228. Курис Г. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: «Добре робите, що дбаєте про освіту і знання»: (Життєвий і творчий шлях А. Шептицького). *Освітнянин*. 1996. № 4. С. 27.

229. Лаба Василь. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Його життя і заслуги. Люблин: Свічадо, 1990. 63 с.

230. Лазечко П., Лазечко Л. Меценати української культури: (Митрополит Андрей Шептицький). *Дзвін*. 2003. № 11-12. С. 133-137.

231. Левицький К. Історія політичної думки галицьких українців 1848-1914. На підставі споминів. Львів: Накладом власним з друкарні оо. Василян у Жовкві, 1926. 736 с.

232. Левицький К. Українські політики Галичини. Тернопіль: Кафедра українознавства ТАНГ, 1996. 176 с.

233. Ленцик В. Визначні постаті Української Церкви: Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і Патріярх Йосиф Сліпий. Львів: Свічадо, 2004. 608 с.

234. Ленцик В. Українська Католицька Церква в Советському Союзі. *Російщення України: Науково-популярний збірник*. К.: Видання УККА, 1992. С. 187-200.

235. Лехнюк Р. Постать митрополита Андрея Шептицького у висвітленні газети «Руслан». *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 62-70.

236. Лещук Т. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Л.: Палітурник, 2013. 172 с.

237. Лисенко О. Релігійне питання у теорії та практиці українського націоналізму в першій половині ХХ століття. *Український історичний журнал*. 2000. № 6. С. 29-51.

238. Лисенко О. Церковне життя в Україні. 1943-1946 рр. К.: Інститут історії України НАНУ, 1998. 413 с.

239. Лисенко О.Є. До питання про становище церкви в Україні у період Другої світової війни. *Український історичний журнал*. 1995. №3. С.73-81.

240. Листи Митрополита Андрея Шептицького до Іларіона Свенціцького з архіву Національного музею у Львові / Упорядник Соломія Дяків. Львів: Українські технології, 2005. 108 с. + іл.

241. Листування В. Липинського / Редактори Я. Пеленський, Р. Залуцький, Х. Пеленська та ін. Т. 1. К.: Смолоскип, 2003. 960 с. («Архів»).

242. Лисяк-Рудницький Іван. Історичні есе. В 2-х тт. Т. 1. / Пер. з англ. М. Бадік, У. Гавришків, Я. Грицака, А. Дешиці, Г. Киван, Е. Панкєєвої. К.: Основи – Інститут державного управління та місцевого самоврядування при Кабінеті Міністрів України, 1994. 554 с.

243. Лисяк-Рудницький Іван. Історичні есе. В 2-х тт. Т. 2. / Пер. з англ. У. Гавришків, Я. Грицака. К.: Основи – Інститут державного управління та місцевого самоврядування при Кабінеті Міністрів України, 1994. 573 с.

244. Литвин В. М. Україна: міжвоєнна доба (1921-1938 рр.). К.: Видавничий Дім «Альтернативи», 2003. 512 с.

245. Литвин Г. Роль митрополита Андрея Шептицького у розвитку мистецтва Галичини. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослівя. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 324-329.

246. Литвин М. Науменко К. 1939. Західні землі України. Львів: Ін-т українознавства НАНУ, 1999. 152 с.

247. Литвин М., Науменко К. Історія ЗУНР. Львів: Інститут українознавства НАНУ; Видавнича фірма «ОЛВР», 1995. 368 с.

248. Ліквідація УГКЦ (1939-1946). Документи радянських органів безпеки / Упор. Сергій Кокін, Наталія Сердюк, Станіслав Сердюк; за заг. ред. Володимира Сергійчука. Т. I. К. ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2006. 920 с.

249. Ліквідація УГКЦ (1939-1946). Документи радянських органів безпеки / Упор. Сергій Кокін, Наталія Сердюк, Станіслав Сердюк; за заг. ред. Володимира Сергійчука. Т. II. К. ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2006. 804 с.

250. Літопис нескореної України: Документи, матеріали, спогади. Книга 1 (Підготували Я. Лялька, П. Максимук, І. Патер та ін.). Авт. передмови Я. Лялька, Р. Бачинський. Львів: Просвіта, 1993. 800 с.+ іл.

251. Ліщинська О. Концепція християнського гуманізму в релігійній філософії А. Шептицького. *Релігієзнавчі студії*. Вип. 2. Львів: Видавничий центр ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2007. С. 32-40.

252. Ліщинська О. Моральна концепція Адрея Шептицького. *Історія релігії в Україні*. Львів: Логос, 1997. С. 112-113.

253. Ліщинська О. Постаць Андрея Шептицького в контексті культури пам'яті. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 105-113.

254. Лужицький Г. Українська Церква між Сходом і Заходом. Нарис історії Української церкви. Філадельфія: Провидіння, 1954. 725 с.

255. Любашенко В. І. Греко-католицька церква в 1944-1991 роках. *Український історичний журнал*. 1996. № 4. С. 101-115.

256. Магочій Павло Роберт. Історія України. К.: Критика, 2007. 640 с.

257. Майороші М. А. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і Закарпаття. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету*. Серія Історія. Вип. 2012. С. 18-27.

258. Макарчук С. А. Українська Республіка галичан: Нариси про ЗУНР. Львів: Світ, 1997. 192 с.

259. Маринович М. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і принцип «позитивної суми» / передмова Адріана Сливоцького. Львів: Видавництво Старого Лева, 2019. 248 с.

260. Марчук В. В. Українська греко-католицька церква в суспільному житті України ХХ ст. Автореферат дис... доктора іст. наук. Спеціальність 07. 00. 01. Чернівці, 2004. 35 с.

261. Марчук В. Українська Греко-Католицька Церква: історичний нарис. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2004. 464 с.

262. Марчук В. Церква в умовах релігійного підпілля: вибір українських греко-католиків у (1941-1946 рр.). *Галичина*: науковий і культурно-просвітній краєзнавчий часопис. 2008. №14. С.248-255.

263. Марчук В.В. Греко-католицька церква в умовах німецького та радянського тоталітаризму (1941-1946). *Галичина*: науковий і культурно-просвітній краєзнавчий часопис. 2000. № 4. С.66-72.

264. Марчук В.В. Українська греко-католицька церква: історичний нарис. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2001. 164 с.

265. Марчук В.В. Церква, духовність, нація. Українська греко-католицька церква в суспільному житті України ХХ ст. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2004. 464с.

266. Маслюк А. Аналіз психологічного портрету Андрея Шептицького. *Психологічні перспективи*. Вип 32. 2018. С. 193-204.

267. Матвеев Г. Ф. Пилсудский. М.: Молодая гвардия, 2008. 474 с.+ил.

268. Матеріали до історії українського патріархального руху / Упор. А. Сороковський. Львів: Свічадо, 2009. 364 с.

269. Мацьків Т. У 150-ліття галицького національного відродження (1848-1998): (Українська греко-католицька церква зберегла галицьких українців від асиміляції). *Визвольний шлях*. 1999. № 2. С. 187-192.

270. Медвідь Ф. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький як духовний будівничий української нації. *Політичний менеджмент*. № 4. 2005. С. 167-175.

271. Медики і медицина в житті та діяльності Митрополита Андрея Шептицького (До 150-річчя від дня народження): бібліографічний покажчик / уклад. М. С. Надрага, О. М. Кріль, С. В. Васильєва, Л. С. Метельська; наук. ред. А. В. Магльований. Львів, 2015. 94 с.

272. Мельничук Георгій. 1000 незабутніх імен України. К.: Школа, 2005. 288 с.+ іл.

273. Мизак Н. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький про антропологічний аспект Божої і земної мудрості. *Релігія та соціум*. 2012. № 1 (7). С. 37-43.

274. Митрополит А. Шептицький і євреї. *Сучасність*. 1993. № 10. С. 159.

275. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і Матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 1. Пастирське вчення та діяльність / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1998. 572 с.

276. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Оксана Гайова, Андрій Кравчук. Т. II. Церква і суспільне питання. Книга 2: листування / За ред. Андрія Кравчука. Львів: Видавництво отців василіан «Місіонер», 1999. 571-1096 с.

277. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Юрій Аввакумов, Оксана Гайова. Т. III. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і греко-католики в Росії. Книга 1. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1917. Львів: Видавництво Українського Католицького Університету, 2004. 924 с.

278. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: Життя і Діяльність. Церква і Церковна єдність. Документи і матеріали. 1899-1944 / Упор. Андрій Кравчук, Оксана Гайова. Т. 1. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий Відділ «Свічадо», 1995. 524 с.

279. Міненко Т. Відповідь православних українців на заклик митрополита Андрея Шептицького в 1941-1942 роках до поєднання Українських Церков. Вінніпег, 1985. 32 с.

280. Мірчук П. Нарис історії ОУН. 1920-1939 роки. Видання третє. К.: Українська видавнича спілка, 2007. 1008 с.

281. Мірчук Петро. Зустрічі й розмови в Ізраїлю (Чи українці «традиційні антисеміти»). Нью-Йорк – Торонто – Львів: Союз українських полів'язнів, 1982. 128 с.

282. Москалик Я. Концепція Церкви митрополита Андрея Шептицького: Органічно-пневматологічна суть Церкви / Переклад з польської Наталії Николин. *Львівська Богословська Академія. Посібники з богослов'я. № 1.* Львів: Видавництво ЛБА – Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий відділ «Свічадо», 1997. 128 с.

283. Москалюк М. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький та ідеологічні течії в українському християнсько-суспільному русі міжвоєнної Галичини. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир». Богослів'я.* Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 54-60.

284. Мудрий С. Значення Галицької митрополії і Церкви в історії України *Київська Церква.* 1999. № 2-3. С. 20-22.

285. Мудрий С. Нарис історії церкви в Україні. Рим; Львів: Вид-во оо. Василіян, 1995. 404 с.

286. Нариси з історії дипломатії України / О. І. Галенко, Є. С. Камінський, М. В. Кірсенко та ін., під ред. В. А. Смолія. К.: Видавничий дім «Альтернативи», 2001. 736 с.

287. Небесняк Є. Митрополит Андрей. Обширне популярне видання про галицького митрополита Слугу Божого Андрея Шептицького (1865-1944). Рим – Львів: Салвид [Видавництво оо. Селезіян східнього обряду]. 2003. 347 с.

288. Небо. Святому Миколаю через руки Митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Львів: Добра книжка, 2010. 60 с. + іл.

289. Новиченко М. Р. Повернення церковного майна як пріоритет державної політики щодо релігії та церкви. *Пріоритети державної політики в галузі свободи совісті: шляхи реалізації*. К.: Світ Знань, 2007. С. 69-70.

290. Огієнко І. Українська церква: Нариси з історії Української православної церкви. У 2-х т. Т. 1. 147 с.; Т. 2. 418 с. К.: Україна, 1993.

291. Огірко О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький – славетний український педагог, опікун і меценат освіти. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослвія. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 61-70.

292. Онищук С. В. Вплив церкви на процеси державотворення в Україні: історико-методологічний аналіз. Івано-Франківськ: Місто НВ, 2014. 408 с.

293. Опалко Н. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і межцерковний мир. *Освітязини*. 1997. № 1. С. 15.

294. Ортинський І. Хрищення, хрест та харизма України. Рим – Мюнхен – Фрайбург: Видавництво ОО. Селезіян, 1988. 201 с.

295. Панас К. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. *Літопис Голгофи України*. Т. 2. Репресована церква. Дрогобич: Відродження, 1994. С. 37-42.

296. Паньківський К. Роки німецької окупації. Нью-Йорк – Торонто: Життя і мислі, 1965. 479 с.

297. Пасіцька О. Андрей Шептицький у контексті суспільно-економічного розвитку Галичини 20-30-х років ХХ ст. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослвія. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 71-77.

298. Пасіцька О. І. Вплив митрополита Андрея Шептицького на господарське життя галицьких українців (кінець ХІХ – перша третина ХХ ст.). *Гілея*. 2014. Вип. 105 (2). С. 31-35.

299. Паскевич О., Бура І. Андрей Шептицький: сповнення блаженств / Перекл. з англ. Н. Сойки-Легадинь. Львів: Свічадо, 1994. 27 с.

300. Пекар Ат. Ісповідники віри нашої сучасності: Причинки до мартирологів Української Католицької Церкви під совітами. Рим-Торонто, 1982. 232 с.

301. Пекар Ат. Нариси історії Церкви Закарпаття: у 2 т. / Внутрішня історія. Рим; Львів: Місіонер, 1997. Т. 2. 1997. 492 с.

302. Пелех В. Мій святий Працедавець: (Про митрополита А. Шептицького). *Альманах Унсоюзу-1989*. Нью-Йорк, 1989. С. 89-127.

303. Пелещишин Р. Значення поглядів митрополита Андрея Шептицького для виховання молоді в сучасних умовах. *Формування основ християнської моралі в процесі духовного відродження України: матеріали конференції*. Острого, 1995. Кн. 1. С. 24-25.

304. Переvezій В. Служіння Богу і народу: Українська греко-католицька церква між двома світовими війнами. К.: Світогляд, 2004. 203 с.

305. Перейда Ю. Апостол церковного єднання: Життя слуги Божого митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Львів, 1994. 37 с.

306. Перейда Юрій. Апостол церковного єднання: Життя Слуги Божого Митрополита Андрея Шептицького / Перекл. з англійської Романи Кравець. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий відділ «Свічадо», 1994. 39 с.

307. Перепічка Є. В. Феномен Степана Бандери. Львів: СПОЛОМ, 2006. 736 с.

308. Пилипів І. Питання української державності у діяльності митрополита Андрея Шептицького та єпископа Григорія Хомишина. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослівя. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 298-305.

309. Пилипів І. Українська греко-католицька церква в період німецької окупації (1941–1944 рр.). *Галичина: науковий і культурно-просвітній краєзнавчий часопис*. 2002. № 8. С. 108-115.

310. Пилипів І., Делятинський Р. До питання про греко-католицьких капеланів в Українській Повстанській Армії (1942-1946). *Галичина: науковий і культурно-просвітній краєзнавчий часопис*. 2008. № 14. С. 303-318.

311. Пікулик Надія, Сенік Любомир. Климентій Шептицький – Слуга Божий: Популярний нарис. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий відділ «Свічадо», 1997. 67 с.

312. Політична історія України. XX ст.: У 6 т. / Редкол. І. Ф. Курас (голова) та ін. Т. 4: Україна у Другій світовій війні. 1939-1945. Керівник тому В. І. Кучер. К.: Генеза, 2003. 584 с.

313. Політична історія України. XX ст.: У 6 т. / Редкол. І. Ф. Курас (голова) та ін. Т. 5: Українці за межами УРСР (1918-1940). Керівник тому В. П. Трощинський. К.: Генеза, 2003. 720 с.

314. Політична історія України. XX ст.: У 6 т. / Редкол.: І. Ф. Курас (голова) та ін. Т. 1: На зламі століть (кінець XIX ст. – 1917 р.) / Ю. А. Левенець (кер.), Л. П. Нагорна, М. С. Кармазіна. К.: Генеза, 2002. 424 с.

315. Політичний терор і тероризм в Україні. XIX-XX ст. Історичні нариси / [Д.В. Архієрейський, О.Г. Бажан, Т.В. Бикова та ін. Відп. ред. В.А. Смолій]. К.: Наукова думка, 2002. 952 с.

316. Полонська-Василенко Н. Історія України. Т. 2: Від середини XVII століття до 1923 року. К.: Либідь, 1992. 608 с.

317. Про повернення культового майна релігійним організаціям: Проект Закону України. *Реституція церковного майна: міжнародний та вітчизняний досвід*: збірник наукових матеріалів. К., 2007. С. 76-80.

318. Прокоп Н. М. Державно-правові погляди митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Автореферат дис. ... канд. юрид. наук. Спеціальність 12.00.01 – Теорія та історія держави і права; історія політичних і правових вчень; 081 – Право. Харків, 2017.

319. Прокоп Н. М. Дослідження проукраїнської державницької діяльності митрополита А. Шептицького кінця XIX – початку XX ст. *Право, суспільство, держава: Форми взаємодії*. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 15-16 січня 2016 р. Київ, 2016. С. 14-16.

320. Прокоп Н. М. Духовність як засада української державності в доктрині А. Шептицького. *Право як ефективний суспільний регулятор*. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 19-20 лютого 2016 р. Львів, 2016. С. 12-14.

321. Прокоп Н. М. Концепт державності у політико-правових поглядах Андрея Шептицького. *Правоохоронна функція держави: теоретико-методологічні та історико-правові проблеми*. Матеріали Міжнародної наукової конференції. 13 листопада 2015 р. Харків, 2015. С. 239-241.

322. Прокоп Н. М. Правове бачення митрополитом А. Шептицьким українських християнських церков у розбудові національної держави. *Сучасні тенденції розвитку науки*. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції (15-16 березня 2017 р., м. Київ). Київ, 2017. С. 81-83.

323. Прокоп Н. М. Роль А. Шептицького в утвердженні загального виборчого права та національних інтересів українців в Австро-Угорщині. *Держава і право: проблеми становлення і стратегія*

розвитку. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 25-26 грудня 2015 р. Ужгород, 2015. С. 22-25.

324. Прокоп Н. М. Характеристика діяльності політичних партій А. Шептицьким в українському державотворенні другої половини XIX ст. *Рівень ефективності та необхідність впливу юридичної науки на нормотворчу діяльність та юридичну практику*. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 5-6 лютого 2016 р. Харків, 2016. С. 9-11.

325. Прокоп Н. Методологічні засади дослідження проукраїнської державницької діяльності А. Шептицького. *Право і суспільство*. 2015. № 6. Ч. 3. С. 35-40.

326. Прокоп Н. Митрополит А. Шептицький в українському державотворенні 20-30-х років XX століття. *Актуальні проблеми держави і права*. 2016. № 76. С. 159-163.

327. Прокоп Н. Обрис проукраїнської державницької діяльності А. Шептицького. *Право і безпека*. 2015. № 3 (58). С. 35-41.

328. Прокоп Н. Парламентаризм і виборче право в теоретичній спадщині митрополита А. Шептицького. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету*. Серія Юриспруденція. Випуск 17. Т. 1. 2015. С. 60-63.

329. Прокоп Н. Роль А. Шептицького в історії українського державотворення кінця XIX – першої половини XX ст. *Бюлетень Міністерства юстиції України*. 2016. № 1. С. 28-33.

330. Пундій П. Піклування митрополита А. Шептицького народним здоров'ям: До річниці смерті. *Сучасність*. 1989. Ч. 11. С. 63-69.

331. Райківський І. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і лівий радикалізм в українському національному русі (1919-1939 рр.). *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослів'я. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 78-88.

332. Расевич В. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і проблеми національно-політичної консолідації українців (1900-1918 роки). *Ковчег*. Науковий збірник із української історії / Під ред. Б. Гудзяка, І. Скочиляса, О. Турія. Львів, 2000. Ч. 11. С. 189-211.

333. Реєнт О., Лисенко О. Українська національна ідея і християнство. К.: Богдана, 1997. 128 с.

334. Реймон Арон. Мир і війна між націями. Київ: Юніверс, 2000. – С. 32-33.

335. Релігійно – інформаційна служба України. [Електронний ресурс] / Режим доступу: https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/resourses/statistics/ukr_2019/75410/

336. Релігія та зміни в у Центральній та Східній Європі: Рекомендація ПАРЄ № 1556 (2002). *Реституція церковного майна: міжнародний та вітчизняний досвід*: збірник наукових матеріалів. К., 2007. С. 65.

337. Рижак Л. Соціальний капітал у духовно-практичних візіях митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 25-31.

338. Роман Шухевич у документах радянських органів державної безпеки (1940-1950) / За заг. ред. В. Сергійчука. Т. 1. К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2007. 640 с.

339. Роман Шухевич у документах радянських органів державної безпеки (1940-1950) / За заг. ред. В. Сергійчука. Т. 2. К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2007. 584 с.

340. Рощина Л. О. Меценатська діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Наука. Релігія. Суспільство*. 2008. № 1. С. 178-180.

341. Рощина Л. О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: шлях від ченця до митрополита. *Наука. Релігія. Суспільство*. 2006. № 1. С. 61-66.

342. Рощина Л. Політична діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Схід*. Аналітично-інформаційний журнал. 2007. № 2. С. 68-70.

343. Рубльов О. С., Черниченко Ю. А. Сталінщина й доля західноукраїнської інтелігенції 20-50-ті роки ХХ ст. К.: Наукова думка, 1994. 350 с.

344. Руско Н. Роль митрополита Андрея Шептицького у збереженні сакральної спадщини галичан. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослвія. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 330-337.

345. Русначенко А. М. Народ збурений: Національно-визвольний рух в Україні й національні рухи опору в Білорусії, Литві, Латвії, Естонії у 1940-50-х роках. К.: Універсальне видавництво «Пульсари», 2002. 519 с. + іл.

346. Сабадуха М. Проблема справедливості в пастирських посланнях митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослвія. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 306-314.

347. Савчук О., Скринник Н. Філософія національної ідеї у поглядах митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослвія. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 315-323.

348. Сагайдак В. «Гімлер наказав арештувати Андрея Шептицького»: (Розмова з колишнім шефом митрополита І. Гірним. *Високий замок*, 1997. 12 верес. С. 7.

349. Сапеляк Андрій. Київська Церква на словянському Сході: Канонічно-єкуменічний аспект. Буенос-Айрес – Львів, 1999. 232 с.

350. Свищук Ярослав. В душі великого Митрополита. Львів: Свічадо, 2002. 136 с.

351. Сергійчук В. Греко-католицька церква в 1944-1991 рр. *Український історичний журнал*. 1996. № 4 . С. 101-112.

352. Сергійчук В. Нескорена церква. Подвижництво греко-католиків України в боротьбі за віру і державу. К.: Дніпро, 2001. 494 с.

353. Сергійчук В. Постать митрополита Андрея Шептицького в українському національному житті. *Державник, мислитель, богослов*: матеріали міжнародної конференції, присвяченої 60-річчю від дня смерті Митрополита Андрея Шептицького. К.: Українська видавнича спілка, 2005. С. 5-21.

354. Сергійчук В. Українські державники: Андрей Шептицький. К., 2015. 440 с.

355. Сергійчук В. Щоб воля неволю здолала: (Митрополит Андрей Шептицький). *Урядовий кур'єр*. 2009. 9 груд.

356. Сидор О. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і національний музей. *Сучасність*. 1991. Ч. 5. С. 58-62.

357. Скіра Ю. Р. Участь монахів Студійського уставу у порятунку євреїв на території Львівської архієпархії греко-католицької церкви у 1942-1944 рр. Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Львів, 2018. 20 с.

358. Скоропадський Павло. Спогади: кінець 1917 – грудень 1918 / Головний редактор Ярослав Пеленський. Київ – Філадельфія, 1995. 493 с.

359. Скрипничук В. Громадсько-політична й культурно-освітня діяльність митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Спадщина митрополита Андрея Шептицького в національному й духовному відродженні України* / ред.: В. Кононенко. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2000. 158 с.

360. Сліпий Йосиф. Спомини / ред. Іван Дацько, Марія Горяча, вид. 3-тє, виправлене й доповнене. Львів – Рим: Видавництво УКУ. 632 с. + 40 іл.

361. Слобідський Серафим, протоіерей. Закон Божий: Підручник для сім'ї та школи / Видання 3-є. К.: Видавничий відділ УПЦКП, 2004. 654 с.

362. Смирнов А. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і православ'я: від єкуменізму до національної єдності. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»*. Серія «Історичні науки». 2017. Вип. 26. С. 40-44.

363. Соловка Л. Документи Державного архіву Івано-Франківської області на пересувній виставці «Митрополит Андрей Шептицький – Мойсей українського народу». *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослів'я. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 28-39.

364. Соловка Л. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: публічний протест проти злочинів нацизму та ініціювання порятунку євреїв. *Друга світова війна та долі мирного населення у Східній Європі*. Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції пам'яті Митрополита Андрея Шептицького. 30 листопада-1 грудня 2015 року, м. Київ / За ред. Леоніда Фінберга. К.: Дух і Літера, 2016. С. 71-110.

365. Степовик Д. «Пастир неустрашимий»: (До 130-ої річниці від дня народження Андрея Шептицького). *Українська культура*. 1995. № 7-8. С. 8-10.

366. Степовик Д. «Пастир неустрашимий»: (Про шлях графа і доктора юрид. наук Романа Шептицького до митрополита укр. греко-католицької церкви Андрея). *Слово і час*. 1995. № 7. С. 6-10.

367. Степовик Д. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і українське православ'я. *Пам'ять століть*. 1998. № 2. С. 123-126.

368. Степовик Д. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і українське православ'я. *Київ. старовина*. 1992. № 3. С. 70-73.

369. Стеценко В. Особливості томістичної філософської теології А. Шептицького. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 32-40.

370. Стоцький Я. В. Релігійна ситуація в Україні: проблеми і тенденції розвитку (1988-1998). Тернопіль: Астон, 1999. 120 с.

371. Сурмач О. Внутрішньоцерковне життя УГКЦ в роки німецької окупації (1941-1944). *Питання історії України*. Збірник наукових статей. Чернівці: ЧНУ ім. Ю. Федьковича, 2000. Т.4. С.175-179.

372. Сурмач О. Греко-Католицька Богословська Академія в роки німецької окупації (1941-1944 рр.). *Наукові зошити історичного факультету Львівського державного університету ім. Івана Франка*. Збірник наукових праць. Львів: ЛДУ ім. І. Франка, 1999. Вип. 2. С. 185-187.

373. Сурмач О. Діяльність митрополита А. Шептицького в роки німецької окупації. *Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького національного університету*. 2015. Вип. 42. С. 132-136.

374. Сурмач О. Дні кривавих свастик. Львів: СПОЛОМ, 2005. 176 с.

375. Сурмач О. Екуменічна діяльність УГКЦ в роки німецької окупації Галичини (1941-1944 рр.). *Київська Церква*. Київ-Львів, 2000. № 4 (10). С. 72-78.

376. Сурмач О. І. Греко-католицька церква в період німецького окупаційного режиму в Україні (1941-1944 рр.). Автореферат дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Спеціальність 07.00.01 – Історія України. Львів, 2001. 23 с.

377. Сурмач О. Й. Сліпий на чолі Греко-Католицької Богословської Академії // *Історія релігій в Україні*. Тези повідомлень VIII Міжнародного круглого столу (Львів, 11-13 травня 1998 р.). Львів, 1998. С.257-259.

378. Сурмач О. Митрополит А. Шептицький і український національно-визвольний рух у період німецької окупації (1941-1944 рр.). *Військово-науковий вісник*. 2015. Вип. 23. С. 101-113.

379. Сурмач О. Митрополит А. Шептицький у часі німецької окупації. *Історія релігій в Україні*. Тези повідомлень VII Міжнародного круглого столу (Львів, 12-14 травня 1997 р.). – Львів, 1997. – С.188-189.

380. Сурмач О. Польсько-український конфлікт і УГКЦ в часи німецької окупації. *Українське релігієзнавство*. Бюлетень Української Асоціації релігієзнавців і відділення релігієзнавства Інституту філософії імені Г.С.Сковороди НАН України. Київ, 2000. № 15. С. 59 – 67.

381. Сурмач О. Роль УГКЦ у порятунку євреїв під час німецької окупації. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського державного університету*. Ужгород: УДУ, 2000. Вип.5. С.126-129.

382. Сурмач О. Соціальна опіка УГКЦ в роки німецької окупації. *Історія релігій в Україні*. Тези повідомлень IX Міжнародного круглого столу (Львів, 11-13 травня 1999 р.). Львів, 1999. Кн. II. С.161-163.

383. Сурмач О. Структурна реорганізація УГКЦ в роки німецької окупації. *Історія релігій в Україні*. Тези повідомлень X Міжнародного круглого столу (Львів, 16-19 травня 2000 р.). Львів, 2000. Кн. I. С.364-370.

384. Сурмач О., Малик Я.Й. Преса про діяльність української Греко-католицької церкви в період німецької окупації (1941-1944 р.). *Українська періодика: Історія і сучасність*. П'ята всеукраїнська науково-теоретична конференція 27-28 листопада 1998 р. Львів, 1999. С. 169-179.

385. Суханова З. Г., Сулима-Матлашенко Н. «Я буду за вас молитися!»: (Про митрополита А. Шептицького). *Людина і світ*. 1990. № 11. С. 40-48.

386. Суханова З. Г., Сулима-Матлашенко Н. В. Андрей Шептицький: реалії хресного шляху. *Дзвін*. 1991. № 1. С. 89-96.

387. Суханова З. Г., Сулима-Матлашенко Н. В. Андрей Шептицький: реалії хресного шляху. *Сторінки історії України: Посібник для вчителів*. К.: Освіта, 1992. С. 318-334.

388. Твори Слуги Божого Митрополита Андрея Шептицького. Пастирські листи. Т. I. Репринтне видання. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий відділ «Свічадо», 1994. 282 с.

389. Тожецький Р. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький і національні проблеми. *Хроніка 2000*. 2012. Вип. 3 (93). С. 255-275.

390. Тожецький Р. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. *Ковчег*: 36. праць з церковної історії. Львів, 1993. Вип. 1. С. 109-123.

391. Тожецький Р. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. *Літопис Голготи України*: Т. 2. Репресована церква. Дрогобич: Відродження, 1994. С. 29-37.

392. Томин Ю. Митрополит А. Шептицький і Велеградські конгреси. *Спадщина митрополита Андрея Шептицького в національному й духовному відродженні України*. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2000. С. 90-95.

393. Україна в Другій світовій війні у документах. Збірник німецьких архівних матеріалів. Т. 1 / Упорядкування і передмова Володимира Косика. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 1997. 384 с.

394. Україна в Другій світовій війні у документах. Збірник німецьких архівних матеріалів (1941-1942). Т. 2 / Упорядкування Володимира Косика. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича; Львівський державний університет ім. І. Франка; Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. Грушевського НАН України, 1998. 384 с.

395. Україна в Другій світовій війні у документах. Збірник німецьких архівних матеріалів (1942-1943). Т. 3 / Упорядкування Володимира Косика. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича; Львівський державний університет ім. І. Франка; Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. Грушевського НАН України, 1999. 384 с.

396. Україна в Другій світовій війні у документах. Збірник німецьких архівних матеріалів (1944-1945). Т. 4 / Упорядкування Володимира Косика. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича; Львівський державний університет ім. І. Франка; Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. Грушевського НАН України, 2000. 368 с.

397. Україна і Ватикан. Серія збірників наукових праць. – Вип. I.: Українсько-ватиканські відносини в контексті суспільних і міжконфесійних проблем / [за заг. ред. А. Колодного (гол. ред.), О. Реєнта, П. Яроцького, Я. Филипович, С. Кияка]. Івано-Франківськ–Київ, 2008. 576с.

398. Україна крізь віки: Т. 10. Рубльов О. С., Реєнт О. П. Українські визвольні змагання 1917-1921 рр. К.: Видавничий Дім «Альтернативи», 1999. 320 с.

399. Україна крізь віки: Т. 11. Кульчицький С. В. Україна між двома війнами (1921-1939 рр.). К.: Видавничий Дім «Альтернативи», 1999. 336 с.

400. Україна крізь віки: Т. 12. Коваль М. В. Україна в другій світовій і Великій Вітчизняній війні (1939-1945 рр.). К.: Видавничий Дім «Альтернативи», 1999. 336 с.

401. Україна: політична історія. ХХ – початок ХХІ ст. / Редрада: В. М. Литвин (голова) та ін. Редкол.: В. А. Смолій, Ю. А. Левенець (співголови) та ін. К.: Парламентське вид-во, 2007. 1028 с.

402. Українська культура: Лекції за редакцією Дмитра Антоновича / Упор. С. В. Ульяновська; Вступна стаття І. М. Дзюби; Перед. Слово М. Антоновича; Додатки С. В. Ульяновської, В. І. Ульяновського. К.: Либідь, 1993. 592 с.; іл.

403. Ульяновський В. Історія церкви та релігійної думки в Україні: навч. посіб.: у 3 кн. Кн. 2. К.: Либідь, 1994. 258 с.

404. Федик І. Українські патріоти: синтез духу і чину. Львів, 1998. С. 6-9.

405. Федик Л. Б. Погляди митрополита Андрея Шептицького на геополітичне становище України. *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету*. Серія Політологія. 2015. № 5. С. 177-186.

406. Федунь М. Андрей Шептицький у західноукраїнській літературі. *Науковий вісник Івано-Франківського Богословського університету імені св. Івана Золотоустого «Добрий Пастир»*. Богослівя. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 8. Івано-Франківськ, 2015. С. 338-345.

407. Федунь М. Твори Андрея Шептицького в контексті української літератури: (Виступи, проповіді А. Шептицького і відображення їх у творах письменників. *Слово і час*. 2005. № 7. С. 56-60.

408. Филипович Л. Митрополити Андрей (Шептицький) і Іларіон (Огієнко): проблема національної Церкви. *Церква і соціальні проблеми*. Енцикліка “Сотий рік”. Львів, 1989. С. 188-195.

409. Франко І. Соціальна акція, соціальне питання і соціалізм: Уваги над пастирським посланням митрополита А. Шептицького «О квестії соціальної». *Будівничий української державності: Хрестоматія політологічних статей Івана Франка* / Упоряд. Д. Павличко. К.: Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2006. С. 498-522.

410. Цвенгрош Г. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький: 1918-1919. Львів: Місіонер, 1991. 38 с.

411. Цвенгрош Г. Митрополит на сторожі держави. *Літопис Червоної калини*. 1994. Ч. 1-3 (32-33). С. 2-5.

412. Цвенгрош Г. Національно-державотворчі погляди митрополита Андрея Шептицького й польсько-українська війна 1918-1919 рр. *Польсько-українські студії*. Матеріали наукової конференції. 29-31 травня 1992 р., м. Каменець-Подільський. К., 1993. С. 172-183.

413. Цвенгрош Г. Рим і Україна: Апостольський престол і митрополит А. Шептицький у 1918-1919 рр. *Дзвін*. 1992. № 5-6. С. 107-113.

414. Цегельський Л. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький. Короткий життєпис і огляд церковно-народної діяльності. Львів: Вид-во Отців Василіан «Місіонер», 1995. 77 с.

415. Цепенда І. Є. Українсько-польські відносини 40-50-х років ХХ століття: етнополітичний аналіз. К., 2009. 387 с.

416. Чайковський Андрій. Спогади. Листи. Дослідження: У 3 т. / Упорядкування Б. З. Якимовича за участю З. Т. Грень, О. В. Седляра; Редкол.: Б. З. Якимович (голова) та ін. Львів, 2002. Т. 1. 514 с.

417. Чайковський Андрій. Спогади. Листи. Дослідження: У 3 т. / Упорядкування Б. З. Якимовича за участю З. Т. Грень, О. В. Седляра; Редкол.: Б. З. Якимович (голова) та ін. Львів, 2002. Т. 2. 468 с.

418. Чайковський Андрій. Спогади. Листи. Дослідження: У 3 т. / Упорядкування Б. З. Якимовича за участю З. Т. Грень, О. В. Седляра; Редкол.: Б. З. Якимович (голова) та ін. Львів, 2002. Т. 3. 576 с.

419. Черченко Ю. А. Шептицький Андрей (29. 07. 1865 – 01. 11. 1944). *Енциклопедія історії України: У 10 т. / Редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін. К.: Наукова думка, 2013. С. 631-633.*

420. Чолган І. Дванадцять львівських оповідань. К., 1993. С. 92-102.

421. Чубатий М. Митрополит Андрей та його ідея католицької України. *Патріархат*. 2007. № 3. С. 12-14.

422. Чубатий М. Митрополит Андрей та православний світ. *Логос*. 1955. Т. 6. С. 123-136.

423. Чубукова Т. Андрей Шептицький: «Визначні постаті України». *Історія в школах України*. 2009. № 10. С. 25-28.

424. Шептицька Софія. Молодість і покликання о. Романа Шептицького. Львів: Видавництво «Свічадо», 2015. 292 с.

425. Шептицька Софія. Молодість і покликання о. Романа Шептицького. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий відділ «Свічадо», 1994. 155 с.

426. Шептицький А. Послання любови. Брустури: Дискурсус, 2015. 224 с.

427. Шептицький А. Як будувати Рідну Хату? Львів: Свічадо, 1999. 48 с.

428. Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1899-1914 рр. Т. I / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2007. L+1014 с.

429. Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1918-1939 рр. Т. II / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2009. XII+1014 с.

430. Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання 1939-1944 рр. Т. III / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2010. XXXII+828 с.

431. Шептицький Андрей. Пастирські послання. Спільні пастирські послання. Т. IV / Упорядники: Оксана Гайова, Роман Тереховський. Львів: Фундація «Андрей»; Видавничий відділ «Артос», 2013. XIV+1194 с.

432. Шептицький Андрей. Письма-послання (1939-1944 рр.). Львів: Фонд духовного відродження імені Митрополита Андрея Шептицького, 1991. 457 с.

433. Шептицький Ян. К. Отець Климентій Шептицький: Життєпис на підставі архівних матеріалів родини Шептицьких / перекл. з польської Надії Пікулик, Любомира Сеника; перекл. з французької Жінет Максимович. Львів: Монастир Монахів Студійського Уставу – Видавничий відділ «Свічачо», 1996. 95 с.

434. Шеремета О. Екуменізм як етична ідея А. Шептицького. *Філософ. думка*. 2007. № 1. С. 60-69.

435. Шеремета О. Філософський контекст соціальних ідей митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Соціально-економічні, політичні та культурні оцінки і прогнози на рубежі двох тисячоліть*: Зб. тез і текстів виступів на VI міжнародній науково-теоретичній конф. студентів, аспірантів і молодих вчених, 16 квітня 2008 р., Тернопіль. Ч. 2: Загальні проблеми гуманітарних наук / відп. Ред. З. В. Гуцайлук. Тернопіль, ТОВ «АСТОН», 2008. 196 с. С. 182.

436. Шеремета О. Ю. Екуменізм як етична ідея Шептицького. *Філософська думка*. №1. 2007. С. 60–68;

437. Шеремета О. Ю. Етичні ідеї Андрея Шептицького у релігійно-філософському контексті кінця XIX – першої половини XX ст. Автореферат дис. ... канд. філософ. наук. Спеціальність 09.00.05 – Історія філософії. К., 2010. 20 с.

438. Шеремета О. Ю. Ідея совісті в релігійно-філософській думці митрополита Шептицького. *Мультиверсум. Філософський альманах*. Вип. 69. К., 2008. С. 158 – 167;

439. Шеремета О. Ю. Совість як етична ідея у творчості Шептицького. *Традиція і культура. Моральна традиція: інваріантність та поліфонічність*: матеріали міжнародної наукової

конференції (Київ, 30 лист. – 1 груд., 2007 р.) / Асоціація «Новий Акрополь». К., 2007. ч. 2. 52 с. С. 1-2.

440. Шеремета О. Ю. Соціальні ідеї митрополита Шептицького у релігійно-філософському контексті. *Мультиверсум. Філософський альманах*. Вип. 84. К., 2009. С. 101-110.

441. Шеремета О. Ю. Спільне добро народу, держави, церкви в розумінні митрополита Шептицького. *Мультиверсум. Філософський альманах*. Вип. 72. К., 2008. С. 136 – 145;

442. Шуст Р. Шептицький Андрей. С. 1085-1087. *Довідник з історії України (А – Я): Посібн. для середн. загальноос. навч. закл. / За заг. ред. І. Підкови, Р. Шуста. 2-ге вид., доопр. і доповн. К.: Генеза, 2001. 1136 с.*

443. Яроцький П. Митрополит Андрей Шептицький між церквою і політикою. *Людина і світ*. 1999. №. 11. С. 49-54.

444. Ярош Б.О. Сторінки політичної історії західноукраїнських земель (30 – 50-ті рр. ХХ ст.). Луцьк: Редакційно-видавничий відділ "Вежа" ВДУ ім. Л. Українки, 1999. 184 с.

445. Ярош Б.О. Тоталітарний режим на західноукраїнських землях, 30 – 50-ті роки ХХ ст. (історико-політологічний аспект). Луцьк: Надстирря, 1995. 176 с.

446. Яртись А. Концепція українського державотворення у богословській спадщині митрополита Андрея Шептицького. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. Журнал. 2015. № 8. С. 49-54.

447. Яшан В. Під брунатним чоботом. Німецька окупація Станіславщини в Другій світовій війні, 1941-1944 рр. Торонто, 1989. 356 с.

448. 150 думок Митрополита Андрея Шептицького / Упор. Тереза Ференц. Львів: Свічадо, 2015. 144 с.

449. A new idea for Europe. The Schuman declaration – 1950-2000. European Commission. Series: European Documentation. – Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2000. – 15 p.

450. Baldwin, Richard E., Francois, Joseph F., Portes, Richard. The Costs and Benefits of Eastern Enlargement: the Impact on the EU and Central Europe // *Economic Policy*. – 24. – 1997. – 125-176 p.

451. Geopolitikai szövegyűjtemény. Budapest, 2002. – 210-234.old.

452. Jászi Oszkár. A Monarchia jövője. A dualizmus bukása és a dunai egyesült államok. – Вр.: Új Magyarország, 1918. – 41-72.old.

453. Masaryk. T.G. Nová Evropa. Stanovisko slovanské. – Pr.: Nakladem Gustava Dubského, 1920. – S. 58,185-190; Чапек Карел. Бесіди з Т.Г. Масариком – Львів: Каменяр, 2001. – С.38-55.

454. Morality and Reality. The life and times of Andrei Sheptytskyi / Paul Robert Magocsi, editor with the assistance of Andrii Krawchuk.

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies University of Alberta Edmonton
1989. 485 p.

455. Kolankiewicz, George. Consensus and Competition in the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union // *International Affairs* – 70. – 1994. – 477 – 495 pp.; Mayhew, Alan. *Recreating Europe. The European Union's Policy towards Central and Eastern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998; Moravcsik A. Explaining International Human Rights Regimes: Liberal Theory and Western Europe, in: *European Journal of International Relations*. – 1. – 1995. – 157-189 pp.; Moravcsik A. The Choice for Europe. Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht, London: UCL Press, 1998. – 514 pp.; Moravcsik A. What Lessons to learn from Europe's Crises? Is there really a crisis of European leadership? – Issue 11, 2004; Sedelmeier U. and Helen Wallace (2000): Eastern Enlargement: Strategy or Second Thoughts?, in Wallace and Wallace (eds.) (2000): *Policy-Making in the European Union*, 4th edition (Oxford University Press), pp. 427-460.

456. Pentland C. *International Theory and European Integration*. – London: Faber and Faber, 1973. – P.146-150.

457. Sheremeta O. Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky's religious ethics views and his trials in overcoming communism. *Democracy vs. Authoritarianism: Abstracts IV Warsaw East European Conference* (Warsaw, July 15 – 18, 2007) / Warsaw University, Centre for East European Studies – Warsaw: Duo-Studio, 2007. 103 s. S. 74.

Publishing house “Liha-Pres”
9 Kastelivka str., Lviv, 79012, Ukraine
44 Lubicka str., Toruń, 87-100, Poland

Printed by the publishing house “Liha-Pres”
Passed for printing: December 17, 2019.
A run of 150 copies.