

# ФИЛОСОФИЯ НА РЕЛИГИЯТА

## INCORPORATION OF UKRAINIAN CHURCH (KYIV METROPOLITANATE) RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL PROJECT ON 2 ACTIONS (2<sup>nd</sup> ACTION)

**Mykola Shkribliak**

PhD, Department of religious studies and theology  
Chernivtsy National University (Chernivtsy, Ukraine)  
*transcendere@ukr.net*

### Анотация

**Николай Василиевич Шкрибляк. Включването на украинската църква (Киевска метрополия): религиозно-политически проект в две действия (действие второ).** Тази статия е продължение на кратко исторически очерк под общото заглавие „Включването на Украинската Църква (Киевска метрополия): религиозно-политически проект в две действия“, в която авторът нагледно показва положението на Православието в Църквата на Речи Посполита в XVII век. и анализира основните обществено-политически фактори за присъединяването на Киевската метрополия в състава на Московската патриаршия. Основният акцент е върху ролята на московския царизъм, на хетман Иван Самойлович, на казашките старшини и на духовното ръководство на Украинската Църква и на Константинополската патриаршия в изпълнението на религиозно-политическия проект, насочен към присъединяването и поглъщането на Киевската метрополия от Московската патриаршия в 1686 г.

**Ключови думи:** Украинска Църква, Киевска метрополия, Константинополска патриаршия, Московска патриаршия, инкорпорация, събор, църковни канони, апостолски правила, постановления на съборите.

### Анотація

**Микола Шкрибляк. Інкорпорація української церкви (Київської митрополії): релігійно-політичний проект на дві дії (дія друга).** Ця стаття є продовження стислою історичного нарису під загальною назвою „Інкорпорація Української Церкви (Київської митрополії): релігійно-політичний проект на дві дії“, в якій автор унаочнює становище Православ'я в Речі Посполитій Церкви у XVII ст. та аналізує основні суспільно-політичні чинники приєднання Київської митрополії до складу Московської патріархії. Головну увагу зосереджено на ролі московського царату, гетьмана Івана Самойловича, козацької старшини та духовного проводу Української Церкви і Константинопольської патріархії у процесі реалізації релігійно-політичного проекту, спрямованого на приєднання і поглинання Київської митрополії Московською патріархією 1686 р.

**Ключові слова:** Українська Церква, Київська митрополія, Константинопольська патріархія, Московська патріархія, інкорпорація, собор, церковні канони, апостольські правила, постанови соборів.

In 1667 as a result of the Truce of Andrusovo, Ukrainian lands that form present Ukraine were divided between Russia and Poland. The border passed along the Dnieper, and the metropolitan department of Kyiv moved to Russia. Thus, the Moscow government was given a free hand for unimpeded implementation of their own religious and political project of incorporation of the Kyiv Metropolitanate, outlined while formulating the Pereyaslav pact [15, 247]. It should also be said that both Ukrainian state and the Church remained without real protectors of its state and religious interests: the metropolitan and the defender of the Ukrainian Church independence Dionysius died and hetman Y. Khmelnytsky abdicated his post. It was also dealt with Ivan Bryuhovetsky who although did not have either clearly defined external or internal political and religious priorities, nevertheless, strived for the canonical independence of the Ukrainian Church from Moscow.

However, the situation was not in the Moscow Patriarchate's favor: it was also in a rather difficult position. On one hand, internal Church crisis, struggle for spheres of influence of metropolitan Pitirima, scandal around "rebellious" Patriarch Nikon (Izvekov), preparation for the Moscow Cathedral 1666 –1667 years, and on the other - just indignation

of the Constantinople patriarch because of Moscow's encroachment upon the Ukrainian Church that was in its jurisdiction. These circumstances forced Russia to quench their own religious and political intrigue for some time, as the tsarist government and the Moscow Patriarchate had to change tactics, and so the first measures were taken to minimize the administrative and spiritual impact of the Kyiv metropolitan on dioceses, monasteries and other church and religious institutions of the Ukrainian Church. The next step was removing from Constantinople's jurisdiction those episcopacies that were outside Ukraine (Mstyslavsk and Turov-Pinsk). Moreover, in order to destabilize the church administrative order of the Kyiv Metropolitanate, Chernihiv diocese was elevated to the rank of archepiscopacy. At the time, when the exclusive right to carry out this kind of action had only the metropolitan of Kyiv and the patriarch of Constantinople, and only with the consent of all Ukrainian church leadership. So, as we can see, Moscow, despite the canons, grossly interfered with the internal ecclesiastical life of the Kyiv Metropolitanate. Decisions on these destructive measures were adopted at Moscow's Cathedral in 1667 [8, 602]. From the text of charter we see that granting a Chernihiv chair the higher rank is an initiative of the Moscow autocrat. Olexiy Mykhailovych particularly noted that he, "multiplying in his kingdom various metropolitan, archepiscopacies, also commanded to establish and strengthen the archepiscopacy of Chernihiv that existed over 600 years [1, 9 – 10]. Moreover, the king demanded that the patriarch Paisius (participated in the cathedral, as a representative of the East), addressed himself to the Kyiv metropolitan Joseph Tukalsky-Nelyubovych, who, in his turn, addressed to all his subjects, with urgent advice to pass under the supremacy of Moscow. But the patriarch refused to do essentially anti-canonic step and explained the king that "he doesn't dare to write and point to a foreign diocese" [10, 371]. At the same council it was decided to form one more episcopacy – an eparchy of Bilgorod, on the territory of which lived mostly Ukrainians. By the way, today it's the only territory of the Russian Federation, where diocese of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Kiev Patriarchate still operates. Diocese was founded in 1995 and is headed by the Archbishop of Bilgorod and Obovansky, Iosaf (Shybayev). [See more: Orthodox church calendar for 2011. – K.: Information agency of UOCKP, 2010. – 160 p. + illustrations].

Less than in two years after the Moscow council, the metropolitan Anthony Vynnytsky died in 1679. King Jan Sobieski, to impede Moscow in its religious and political plans, issued a special privilege, by which he established the post of Kyiv Metropolitanate administrator (Bratslav, March 10, 1675). Bishop of Lviv, Joseph Shumlyansky, a reliable ally and adherent of the Polish monarch's policy took this post. According to the royal universal Joseph Shumlyansky had reserved the right to an administrative, church and religious influence in Peremysh, Lutsk, Mstyslavsk and even Chernihiv dioceses [12, sheet 1]. In fact, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth government did everything so that all the eparchies which belonged to Joseph Tukalskomu, metropolitan of Kiev passed to the jurisdiction of Joseph Shumlyansky. It was due to the fact that Joseph Shumlyansky not only supported Jan Sobieski, but also showed a desire to transfer Orthodox dioceses of the Right-bank Ukraine to the union with Rome.

The administrator of the Kyiv Metropolitanate, bishop of Lviv, Joseph Shumlyansky having received de jure enormous powers from the king, strove to give them the canonical basis. He petitioned the Moscow patriarch Joachim, that he restored historical justice and raised Lviv episcopacy to the level of metropolitanate [1, 276], and the king in his decree banned the other two metropolitans of Kyiv to intervene in the lives of Orthodox dioceses within the Commonwealth, as according to the decree it is exclusively Shumlyansky's prerogative [17, 141 – 142]. Later bishop of Lviv appealed to Moscow with a request for restoration of Galician Metropolitanate [15, 246].

Ecclesiastic power of Joseph Shumlyansky in the Church began to grow, but hetman Ivan Samoilovich who "sincerely tried to unite Ukraine" interfere with him. In fact, it was dictated by his Russophilistic desire and ordinary zealous conformity instead of a decent fight for independence of the state entrusted to him. It appears that united Ukraine was necessary to be "handed over" to Moscow monarchy, not in parts, but at once. He suggested Moscow tsars Ivan and Peter to command the Moscow Patriarch Yoakym to bless personally Barlaam Yasinski to the archimandrite of Pechersk [1, 212 – 214].

Moscow successfully used each of the contradictions that arose among Ukrainian spiritual guidance. Therefore, neglecting the Orthodox church canons, patriarch Joachim on February 26<sup>th</sup>, 1685 sent a letter to Ukraine, where the blessed Barlaam Jasinski to an archimandrite [1, 219 – 222]. So Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra was also removed out of Constantinople jurisdiction.

Meanwhile, hetman Samoylovych faced the problem how to resist the intentions of the bishop of Lviv, Joseph Shumlyansky in his desire to expand an influence in the Church. For this purpose he thought over a plan to give the metropolitan post to someone from his entourage. The optimal candidate for hetman as a metropolitan was a former bishop of Lutsk, Gedeon (I.Samoylovych's matchmaker, the latter gave a daughter in marriage to a duke Svyatopolk-Chetvertynsky's son), who in summer 1684 "left his diocese, saying that Poles hampered him" and in search for the "better place" he came to the hetman's capital Baturin. On this occasion, I. Samoilovich decided to convene a council to elect a new metropolitan. An applicant for metropolitan post immediately sent to Moscow his written assurance about his passing over the jurisdiction of the Moscow patriarch [3, 217]. Council, as planned, was held on July 12<sup>th</sup>, 1685 [10, 216].

Note that in the history of the Ukrainian Church there were a lot of such councils. In fact, it was a collection of laity in favor of secular power, which were completely ignored by the clergy. Even a nominee for the metropolitan post didn't visit the council. The most influential ecclesiastic hierarch of that time and a locum tenens of Kyiv Metropolitanate bishop of Chernihiv Lazarus Baranovych also ignored visiting the council complaining on feeling bad [10, 217]. However, it didn't prevent from electing a new metropolitan. As I. Samoylovych demanded, bishop-fugitive of Lutsk Gedeon Svyatopolk-Chetvertynsky was elected on the highest post of Kyiv Metropolitanate. Hetman informed Moscow that Gedeon was elected unanimously [1, 66].

Veiling his greed for authority a newly-elected metropolitan Gedeon tried to express sympathy with the faith of Ukrainian Church as if it was defenceless, giving everyone to understand that only Moscow can save it and for this reason showed a desire "to receive the archbishop's rod from no one except the Moscow patriarch" [8, 373]. However a newly-elected metropolitan's statement caused concern among the clergy that on seeing these "elective trying experiences" decreed about the reconconvocation of the council and this time without secular delegates. Nevertheless no one dared to go against hetman's will.

The Moscow patriarch Joachim invited Gedeon Svyatopolk-Chetvertynsky to Moscow for the laying on of hands. The blessing was conducted on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 1685 during the solemn divine service at Uspensky Cathedral. At the laying on of hands both tsars were present. Delivering archiereus oath, a newly-elected Kyiv metropolitan swore his allegiance to Moscow: "If I fail to keep any of me promises, show disobedience to his Holiness Joachim, the patriarch of Moscow, the whole Rus and Northern countries, next holly patriarchs of Moscow and the whole Rus and the holly council or willfully decide to change anything in the diocese with one I've been entrusted, let me be unfrocked and deprived of authority without any trials and directions" [4, 188].

After the enthronement, generously gifted, on December 14<sup>th</sup>, 1685 Gedeon Svyatopolk-Chetvertynsky together with his suite left for Kyiv. The metropolitan hoped that after all Moscow will leave the Ukrainian Church its former privileges that were used while it was under the ecclesiastic submission to Constantinople. But Moscow patriarchy had more radical plans. In fact the question was to incorporate the Ukrainian Church completely and to annex its canonical territory. For the logical completion of Kyiv Metropolitanate incorporation into the Moscow patriarchy, this "sad case" [4, 188], according to patriarch Illarion, lacked the consent of Constantinople patriarch. Social and political situation gained such conformation that not only Russia was interested in this consent but also Ukraine (in fact hetman Samoylovych's policy looked as if it didn't fit in with imperialistic church and religious policy of Moscow tsarism, but directly followed from it).

Immediately after metropolitan Gedeon's laying on of hands, Moscow government sent to Constantinople a special legation. Moscow sovereigns ( young tsars Ivan and Peter) and patriarch Joachim addressed to Constantinople with a request to recognize a new status of Ukrainian Church. Tsar's legation was headed by deacon Mykyta Alekseev[8, p.376] . In Ukraine he was accompanied by hetman's envoy Ivan Lysytsa, who carried hetman's decree to patriarch Jacob with the same request.

On arriving to Turkey (Edirne) ambassadors first had to meet patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheos to secure his aid in the negotiations with patriarch Jacob. To win over him, tsar government ordered the ambassador to reward the patriarch with generous gifts [10, 218]. Having found out a true reason of the visit, patriarch Dositheos "who was famous not only as an outstanding canonist but also as a great adherent of Moscow" [7, 56] opposed the intrigue of Moscow patriarch and tsarism. Y. Fedoriv writes that "Dositheos turned out to be unyielding. He claimed that "even for the larger sum" he wouldn't give his blessing for such unlawful affair and censured the Moscow patriarch's behavior as contradictory to the church canons" [10, 218]. Nevertheless, judging from the further patriarch's actions, the faith of Kyiv Metropolitanate and abidance of the church canons interested him the least. Patriarch's opposition and discontent were stipulated only by the fact that while entangling him in this case there was no stimulation for him. Because as soon as M. Alekseev delivered him tsar gifts, patriarch at once stopped talking about the non- canonicity of Kyiv Metropolitanate incorporation. He received 200 gold coins for his tacit consent [7, 56].

While the negotiations with patriarch Dositheos continued and he was looking for "canonical" reasons for non-canonical act of Ukrainian Church passing over Moscow patriarchate, bishop Dionisius became the patriarch of Constantinople. The latter personally started negotiations with ambassadors. However, it doesn't mean that he a priori agreed to Kyiv Metropolitanate incorporation into Moscow patriarchate. Authorized by Moscow and Ukrainian government persons started political bargaining and blackmail. The patriarch of Jerusalem advised the ambassadors to ask the Grand Turkish Vizier for help. During the regular meeting he not only "found in the Regulations that every bishop can freely pass his eparchy to another one" but also promised to support the realization of "tsar's will" [2, 467].

At that time Christian alliance against Turkey was formed: the empire lost a war against Austria, Poland and Venice. Under such circumstances the most important task was to save peaceful relations with Moscow. To show solidarity with Moscow tsarism, Vizier ordered to satisfy ambassadors' request immediately [8, 378]. Now not only patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheos and tsar's legation but also official representatives of state authority exert pressure on patriarch Dionisiun. So on one hand pressure and on the other hand moral qualities of Dionisius (Russian professor

A. Levedev calls the patriarch a person “greedy for money and luxurious life”) steadily led to the adoption of a tragic decision – Kyiv Metropolitanate sale to Moscow patriarchate.

For legalization of act of Kyiv Metropolitanate passing over the supremacy of Moscow, patriarch Dionisius announced about convocation of a council. The council was held in May – June 1686 in Constantinople. The text of 10 charters was discussed and adopted there: one council charter according to which Kyiv Metropolitanate passed over the canonical supremacy of Moscow patriarch; two charters addressed to Moscow sovereigns, two charters to patriarch Joachim, two to hetman I. Samoylovych; one charter to Kyiv metropolitan Gedeon Balaban and two to all Orthodox believers of Ukrainian Church, where patriarch Dionisius granted a permission so that every next newly-elected metropolitan received the laying on of hands from Moscow patriarch [2, 469].

For the concessions in Moscow favor M. Alekseev repaid Constantinople patriarch with sable fur and gold chervonets. On this occasion the latter wrote: “we accepted the alms of our holy tsar to the amount of forty three sable furs and 200 gold chervonets from your sir Nikita Alekseevich” [8, 379].

Just like this, devilishly insidiously and in a Moscow way brutally: by means of violence, blackmail and bribe ancient Kyiv Metropolitanate was incorporated into Moscow patriarchate. Illegality of this act was obvious. And the point is not in the forms and methods of the realization of this project but in a rude infringement of ecclesiastic canons, canons of the Apostles and ecumenical councils’ resolutions. Kyiv Metropolitanate incorporation contradicts to the 34<sup>th</sup> apostolic canon: “Bishops of every nation must know the first among them and respect him as a head” [6, 17]. Annexation of its canonical territory also violates the 8<sup>th</sup> rule of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ecumenical council (413 year): “Let no one of pious bishops spreads his authority over another eparchy that from the very beginning was not under his or his predecessor’s power. But if someone spread his authority and by force joined it, let he give it back so that sayings of saints were not disregarded and loftiness of secular authority didn’t sneak up under the mask of religious rite”. So the holly ecumenical council wishes that every eparchy keep in order those rights that were given it from the beginning, according to custom that became consolidated” [6, 56].

Political situation developed in the way that even the government of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was forced to recognize the act of Kyiv Metropolitanate incorporation. On April 21<sup>st</sup>, 1686 Moscow and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth concluded “Eternal Peace Treaty” according to which Orthodox eparchies, situated on the territory of the letter pass over the supremacy of Kyiv metropolitan Gedeon Svyatopolk-Chetvertynsky, though his residence was under the canonical jurisdiction of the neighbouring country.

On December 27, 1686 tsar sent hetman I. Samoylovych a granted charter and golden “collar” with two diamonds for the successful completion of incorporation [9, 456]. Yet besides the reward hetman received righteous punishment for the grave crime against Ukrainian Church. Ironically – also from Moscow. After using the I. Samoylovych’s authority in the incorporation of Kyiv Metropolitanate into Moscow patriarchate, Moscow government at once decided to arrest hetman. The loyal servant was accused of failure in military campaign against Turkey (in fact the lover of tsarina Sophie duke Holitsyn was to blame) and together with his elder son was sent to Tobolsk where in 1687 ex-hetman died. Son was not given a chance to die a natural death – he was cruelly executed in Sivsk.

Hence, thirty two years after Pereyaslav pact the Ukrainian church shared the faith of Ukrainian statehood.

**Conclusions.** Complex research of social, political, church and religious transformations of the second half of XVII century that ended with incorporation of Kyiv Metropolitanate into Moscow patriarchate let us make succession of generalized conclusions.

1. In the second half of XVII century happened the most tragic event in the history of Ukrainian nation and its Church – violent conformity of Kyiv Metropolitanate to Moscow patriarchate. In fact it was a brutal political play staged by Moscow tsarism and its patriarchy. Ukrainian hetman I. Samoylovych and the first “Moscow” metropolitan in Ukraine – Gedeon, duke Svyatopolk-Chetvertynsky served as scenery. Only the patriarch of Constantinople Dionisius didn’t “harmonise” with this script. At first he didn’t recognize a metropolitan appointed by Moscow for Ukrainian Church and for this reason refused to pass Kyiv Metropolitanate over the supremacy of Moscow patriarchy. However, unable to resist the temptation of simony and political pressure, he legitimated the act of Kyiv Metropolitanate incorporation.

2. Incorporation of Kyiv Metropolitanate into Moscow patriarchate is a durable and systematic process that is a logic result of elimination of Ukrainian statehood. Events that took place on the Ukrainian territory in the second half of XVII century initiated this elimination. Since then and up to the present time, Moscow overtly carries out the elimination of national church and religious originality and russification of Ukrainians.

3. Encroachments upon the autonomous status of Ukrainian Church with variable success lasted until the political power on the territory that forms present Ukraine lapsed to the hands of Moscow-oriented hetman I. Samoylovych and ecclesiastic power – to the hands of Gedeon, the bishop of Lutsk. Tank’s to both mentioned above, Moscow government

managed to obtrude upon Orthodox believers of the Polish – Lithuanian Commonwealth such conditions that deprived Ukrainian lands of its political and then church and religious sovereignty.

4. Since the incorporation of Kyiv Metropolitanate into Moscow patriarchate, the period of autocephaly of Ukrainian Church has ended. As a result of Moscow tsarism's policy of expansion and imperialism, Ukrainian Church rapidly loses its independence, conciliarism and yields to unification like Moscow. Further it was only a technical matter and to transform once the most powerful in Central and Eastern Europe Orthodox Church into an ordinary, provincial eparchy tuned out to be easier than to overcome for example "old believers heresy" or to embody all the elements of Nykon's reform.

## References

1. Arhiv Ugo-Zapadnoi Rossii, izdavaemii Vremannou komisseu dlia razbora drevnih aktov, visochaishe uchrejdennou pri Kievskom voennom, Podolskom I Volinskom General-Gubernatore.–Part. 1-8: in 34 volumes. – K.: Typ. Un-ta sv. Vladimira, 1859–1914. – Part.1. –Vol.1. – 374 p.; Vol.6. – 351 p.; Vol.10. – 403, 22 p.
2. Hrushevskii M.S. Istorija Ukraini-Rusi. – Vol.5. Suspilno-politichnii ustrii I tserkovnii ustrii I vidnosini v ukrainsko-russkikh zemliakh in 14 –17 c. – Lviv, 1905. – Reprint. – K., 1994. – 561p.
3. Gudzik K. Doroga vtrat – Nezalejnist Ukrainskoi Tserkvi // Apokrifii Klari Gudzik / Za zagalnou redakcieu L.Ivshinoi. – K.: Ukrainska press-gruppa, 2005. – P. 212 – 220.
4. Ilarion, mitropolit. Ukrainska Tserkva: In 2 volumes. – Vinnipeg, 1956. – Vol.1. – 242 p.
5. Istorija religii v Ukraini: in 10 vol. // Redcol. : A. Kolodnii ta inshi. – K.: Tsentri Duhovnoi Kulturi, 1996-1998. – Vol.2 Ukrainske Pravoslavia / za red. prof. P. Iarotskii. – 1997. – 376 p.
6. Kniga Pravil Sviatih apostoliv, Vselenskih I Pomisnih sviatih Soboriv, i Sviatih Otciv. – K., 2008. – 368 p.
7. Kushinskii A. Korotka Istorija Ukrainskoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi. – Chikago: Vidannia Bratstva Sv.Volodimira, 1971. –102 p.
8. Lotockii O. Avtokefalia: In 2 volumes. – Warsaw, 1938. – Reprintne vidannia. – K., 1999. – Vol.2: Naris Istorii Avtokefalnih Tserkov. – 400 p.
9. Pravoslavnii tserkovnii calendar na 2011. – K.: Informupravlinnia UPTSKP, 2010. – 160 p. + illus.
10. Titov F. Okonchatelnii perehod Kieva ot Polshi k Rossii //TKDA. – 1904. – №7. – P. 404 – 466.
11. Fedoriv U. Istorija Tserkvi v Ukraini. – Reprintne vidannia. – Lviv: Svichado, 2001. – 362 p.

© **Mykola Shkribliak**