

Paul Yuzyk

**The Ukrainian
Greek Orthodox
Church of Canada**

1918-1951



University of Ottawa Press, 1981

**The Ukrainian
Greek Orthodox Church
of Canada,
1918-1951**

Printed and bound in Canada

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Yuzyk, Paul, 1913-

The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, 1918-1951

Revision of thesis (Ph.D.) — University of Minnesota, 1958.

Bibliography: p.

Includes index.

ISBN 2-7603-0927-4

1. Ukrainś'ka pravoslavna tserkva v Kanadi — History. I. Title.

BX743.3.Y89

281.9'71

C82-090048-4

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the
Canada Council.

© University of Ottawa Press, 1981

ISBN 2-7603-0927-4

**The Ukrainian
Greek Orthodox Church
of Canada,**

1918-1951

by
PAUL YUZYK

University of Ottawa Press
Ottawa, Canada
1981

DEDICATION

*On the occasion of the
90th Anniversary of Ukrainian Settlement in
Canada*

*this book
is dedicated
to the memory of the
hardy Ukrainian pioneers
and their leaders*

*whose devotion to the ideas of freedom, democ-
racy and honest work has substantially con-
tributed to the development of their adopted
country in all walks of life, with religious and
patriotic faith as an impelling force, making Can-
ada a better place for all citizens who have in-
herited this rich cultural legacy.*

Foreword

The writing of this history was beset by many difficulties, mostly of a pioneering nature. It required extensive research using several early Ukrainian newspapers — *Kanadiiskyi Farmer* (Canadian Farmer), *Ukrainskyi Holos* (Ukrainian Voice), *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk* (Orthodox Herald, later *Vistnyk*) — and in other published sources. Interviews were arranged with many who played prominent roles in founding the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church, and all available correspondence was studied. Although the archives of the church were not open, the church leaders co-operated in all other respects and the writer feels that the account is both authentic and objective. A long chapter on the history of the Church in Ukraine was included, since there is, as yet, no complete history of this topic.

The basic research was done in Winnipeg, in the editorial offices of two of the oldest Ukrainian weeklies in Canada, the *Kanadiiskyi Farmer* and the *Ukrainskyi Holos*. Much time was also spent in the archives of the Legislative Library, amidst the files of the defunct *Kanadiiskyi Rusyn* (Canadian Ruthenian), which became *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets* (Canadian Ukrainian) in 1919, and other papers from this period. The libraries and archives in Winnipeg of the Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Centre (Oseredok), the University of Manitoba and the Consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada^{*} were of inestimable value. The co-operation of all is gratefully acknowledged.

I am especially indebted to the Very Reverend Semen W. Sawchuk, president of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church consistory, and to the Reverend Wasyl Kudryk,[†] editor of *Visnyk*, for their help and information. Metropolitan Ohienko[†] and Judge John R. Solomon were also most helpful. I was fortunate in obtaining the issues of *Ridna Tserkva* (Native Church) and other church publications from Mr. Nicholas Sowsun. Documents in the possession of Mr. Wasyl Swystun[†], president of the Association for Cultural Relations with Soviet Ukraine, were unavailable to the writer.

A grant from the Canadian Social Sciences Research Council enabled me to interview the following prominent church leaders in western Canada: Judge Michael Stechishin, Wynyard, Saskatchewan; Mr. Julian W. Stechishin,[†] Saskatoon; Father Ambrose Chrustawka,

Dr. John Verchomin,[†] Messrs. Peter J. Lazarowich, William A. Czumer,[†] Dmytro S. Ferbey[†] and Harry Michalyshyn[†] of Edmonton; and Mr. Peter Svarich[†] of Vegreville, Alberta. In Ottawa, I am indebted to Dr. Vladimir J. Kaye-Kysilewsky[†] of the Canadian Citizenship Branch and to four parish leaders: Messrs. William Tuskey, Dmytro Kostenuk[†], John Tokaryk[†] and Eugene Lewicki[†].

Especially helpful was Judge Michael Stechishin,[†] a founder of the church, who supplied me with original documents, carried out special research studies and supplied much valuable information. His many letters and reports constitute a large and important file.

I discussed problems with many priests and other people too numerous to list here, but their assistance is also gratefully acknowledged.

This publication is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation for the Department of History, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, in 1958. For obvious reasons no books on the Church published since 1957 are included in the notes and bibliography.

I am especially and profoundly grateful to Professor Manoly Lupul of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton, for his assistance in the preparation of the manuscript for publication. I also wish to thank Professor Bohdan Bociurkiw, Carleton University, Ottawa, whose knowledge of Ukraine's church history, particularly in the twentieth century, was most helpful in updating events.

In particular, reference is made to his chapters in the following publications: "B.R. Bociurkiw, 'The Church and the Ukrainian Revolution: The Central Rada Period'", in Taras Hunchak (editor), *The Ukraine, 1917-1921: A Study in Revolution*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977, and B.R. Bociurkiw, "The Orthodox Church in Ukraine since 1917", in V. Kubijowyc (editor), *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia*, Vol. II, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Recently, the Sixteenth Sobor of the Church, held in Winnipeg July 3-6, 1980, approved a change in the name to The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada.

PAUL YUZYK
Ottawa, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	ix
Chapter One: The Orthodox Church in Ukraine to 1951	1
Chapter Two: The Growing Sense of Independency Among the Canadian Pioneers	29
Chapter Three: Precursors of the New Church	55
Chapter Four: The Founding of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada	79
Chapter Five: The Formation of the Hierarchy and the First Parishes	97
Chapter Six: The First Ukrainian Bishop and the Acceptance of Autocephaly	119
Chapter Seven: Dissension Within the Church	143
Chapter Eight: Further Difficulties and Lawsuits	169
Chapter Nine: The Consummation of the Hierarchy	185
Bibliography	203

CHAPTER ONE

The Orthodox Church in Ukraine to 1951

Traditionally, the beginnings of Christianity in Ukraine are associated with the legendary missionary activities of the Apostle Andrew, the brother of St. Peter, who is said to have been so impressed with the site of present-day Kiev on the upper Dnieper River that he blessed the hills and planted a cross, thereby making him the city's founder.¹ During the first centuries A.D., Christianity is known to have existed in the Greek colonies north of the Black Sea and farther north among the Scythians and Goths. Early in the fourth century seven proselytizing bishops were martyred at Chersonesus (now Kherson), an event that is commemorated annually by the Orthodox church on 7 March (O.S.).² For several centuries Chersonesus was the main centre of missionary activity, first among the Scythians and later among the Slavs, but repeated invasions by Asiatic nomads caused severe setbacks to the growth of Christianity.

The beginnings of organized Christianity among the people of Rus' (the ancestors of the Ukrainian people) date back to 866, the

1. O. LOTOTSKY, *Avtokefalii*, 2: 228-30; I. OHLENKO, *Ukrainska Tserkva*, 1: 12-25; I. VLASOVSKY, *Narys Istorii Ukrainiskoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy*, 1: 19-20. Such noted church historians as Evgenii E. GOLUBINSKY, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvy*, and Aleksei A. SHAHRMATOV, *Razyskaniia o Drevneiishikh Russkikh Listopisnykh Svodakh* do not discount the possibility that St. Andrew visited the Black Sea coast, but have found no evidence to support the claim.

2. V. LYPRIVSKY, *Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva, Korotka Istoriia*, 7. O.S. designates the Old Style dates of the Julian calendar, adopted in 46 B.C. by Julius Caesar and incorrectly calculated according to a year 365 1/4 days long, with every fourth year extended to 366 days. To convert the New Style (N.S.) dates of the Gregorian calendar, ten days are added to dates from 5 October 1582 to 28 February 1700, eleven days to dates through 28 February 1800, twelve days to dates through 28 February 1900 and thirteen days to dates in the twentieth century. In 1918 the Soviet Russian government adopted the Gregorian calendar and decreed that the day after 31 January O.S. would become 13 February N.S. Unless otherwise indicated, all dates in this book are New Style.

year of an unsuccessful attack on Constantinople (the capital of the Byzantine empire) by Askold and Dyr, the ruling princes of Kiev, which resulted in the conversion of Askold and many of his warriors. Photius, the Byzantine patriarch, then sent priests and a bishop to work among the *Rusyny*, and the see for Rus' was formally created in 891 in Tmutorokan, subject to the patriarchate of Constantinople.³ Later, Princess Olha (945-64) accepted Christianity and was baptized in Constantinople in 957. Her influence over Grand Prince Volodymyr (Vladimir) (980-1015), her grandson, paved the way for his conversion and the adoption of the Byzantine form of Christianity as the state religion in 988.

From the outset the Kievan hierarchy was dominated by the Greeks, bringing the state under the sway of Byzantine culture and its caesaropapist orientation. Under a system initiated by Emperor Constantine, the Eastern church was subjected to imperial domination, with the Byzantine emperors free to call and preside over church councils, to appoint and dismiss patriarchs at will and to administer their own communion during mass. Although the Seventh Ecumenical Council (787) had proclaimed the harmonious equality of patriarch and emperor,⁴ the church leaders were in reality mere pawns of the emperor. This legacy of caesaropapism was later continued by the rulers of Muscovy in the north.

As contemporary chronicles make no mention of the establishment of a metropolitan see at Kiev, one may speculate that the early hierarchy of the church in Rus' was autocephalous or independent.⁵ Volodymyr would allow no encroachment on his sovereignty from Byzantium and "could accept only an independent, autocephalous metropolitanate. Such he was not given and any other he would not accept. A situation arose similar to the one in Bulgaria, where there was no head, nor a bishop."⁶ One scholar suggests that Byzantium's hostile attitude to Kievan autocephaly prompted Volodymyr to establish ecclesiastical and political ties with Bulgaria and Rome.⁷

The first metropolitan bishop was either Leon or Michael, both Greeks, who were followed by the Bulgarians, John and Alexius; but they were not canonically recognized by the patriarch. It was not until 1037 that Rus' received a canonical Greek metropolitan, Theopomtus, who was nominated by the Byzantine emperor and con-

3. The Kievan chronicler, Nestor, and the *Codinus Catalogue of Bishops' Sees* (Constantinople patriarchate) record these facts.

4. John S. CURTIS, *Church and State in Russia, 1900-1917*, 5.

5. VLASOVSKY, *Narys Istarii Tserkvy*, 36.

6. LOTOTSKY, *Autokefalia*, 2: 259.

7. S. TOMASHIVSKY, *Istoria Tserkvy na Ukraini*, 89.

secrated by the patriarch.⁸ But the Kievan prince, Iaroslav (1019-54), was just as hostile as his predecessors toward Byzantine caesaropapism. He had secured canonical recognition from Rome for his metropolitan, Alexius (the Bulgarian), only to be forced by considerations of political expediency to accept Theopompus from Constantinople.⁹ In 1051 the monarch convened a council of bishops at Kiev, which declared the national church to be autocephalous in accordance with Regulation 28 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council.¹⁰ For the first time in the church's history, a native-born Slav, Ilarion (1051-4), was consecrated metropolitan and enthroned without the sanction of the Byzantine patriarch. With the exception of Klym Smoliatych (elected in 1147 by a council of bishops that declared autocephaly), all the metropolitans of the Kievan period were either Greeks or Bulgarians, nominated and consecrated in Constantinople. However, the internecine strife which subsequently arose among the appanage princes weakened the Kievan state and undermined all attempts to maintain the autocephaly of the church.

The Church of Kievan Rus' took no direct part in the Schism of 1054 which divided the universal church into two sections.¹¹ The chronicles and writers of that day make no mention of the rift, and the synodal act of anathema against the Roman Church significantly lacks the signature of the Kievan metropolitan.¹² Although the autocephalous Metropolitan Ilarion and Grand Prince Iziaslav (1054-78) maintained ties with the Roman pope, the church of Rus' aligned itself with Byzantine Greek Orthodoxy and became Byzantinized.¹³

The successive Tatar invasions eventually crushed the Kievan state in 1240, bringing about the collapse of civil government. The church, however, was allowed to function without interference and became the sole cohesive force of the people of Rus'. The privileges and benevolence extended to it by the Tatars strengthened the hand of the church, which once again became increasingly independent of the Greeks. In time, metropolitans came to be chosen by the grand princes with the help of the bishops, who simply petitioned the patriarch of Constantinople for formal confirmation.

The Tatar onslaught, however, also caused a considerable depopulation of Ukrainian territories and a northwesterly migration to the Galician-Volynian principality, where the relative isolation reinforced

8. LOTOTSKY, *Autokefalia*, 2: 257, 259, 262.

9. TOMASHIVSKY, *Istoria Tserkvy*, 95.

10. LOTOTSKY, *Autokefalia*, 2: 265.

11. The Orthodox interpretation of this schism is given in I. CHURCHAK, *Profil Iedynoi Khrystoi Tserkvy*.

12. TOMASHIVSKY, *Istoria Tserkvy*, 121.

13. *Ibid.*, 123-5.

the power of the ruling appanage princes. As a result, the metropolitans "of Kiev and all Rus'", while officially maintaining the see in the metropolis, actually lived in the northern strongholds of the Russian nation, then beginning to emerge from a mixture of Slavic and Finno-Ugrian peoples. In 1299 Metropolitan Maxim (1283-1305) transferred the ancient metropolitanate to Vladimir, the capital of the strong Rostov-Suzdal principality. Finally in 1325, at the request of Grand Prince Ivan Kalita, the see was moved to Moscow,¹⁴ from where the next twenty metropolitans and ten patriarchs ruled (1589-1700).

The kings of the Galician-Volynian state, who claimed to perpetuate the rule of the Kievan state, resented the subservience of the Kievan metropolitans to the "semi-barbaric" rulers of the north, who also claimed the legacy of Kievan sovereignty. King Iurii I (1301-8) established the Galician metropolitan see in Lviv under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. It lasted until 1347, when Polish incorporation of that state brought about a pro-Catholic policy hostile to the Orthodox see.¹⁵ In the meantime, the Tatars were expelled from the Ukrainian territories along the Dnieper by the Lithuanians, who controlled the area by 1340. The Lithuanian rulers, disturbed by the fact that the church in their lands was under the jurisdiction of their Muscovite enemies, demanded that either the "Metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus'" return to Kiev or the patriarch of Constantinople again consecrate a separate metropolitan, which lasted for the brief period 1315-61.¹⁶ With Constantinople slow to act, Prince Vytyvt (Vitautas) in 1415 sent a Bulgarian named Gregory Tsemblak to Constantinople for consecration. However, Photius, the Moscow-based metropolitan, intervened, and when the patriarch degraded and anathemized the candidate, Vytyvt called a synod of his own bishops who consecrated Gregory as metropolitan of Kiev. Further, citing the acts of Iaroslav and Iziaslav, the synod declared the right of the church to autocephaly on canonical and historical grounds.¹⁷ Four years later Metropolitan Gregory died and Vytyvt came to terms with Photius, who received jurisdiction over the Ukrainian and Belorussian dioceses within the Lithuanian state.

The negotiated settlement, however, did not last long. After Metropolitan Photius' death the Muscovite Grand Prince Vasilii III (1425-62) sent his candidate, Iona, to be consecrated at Constantinople — only to find that the patriarch had already consecrated

14. This transfer was not approved by the patriarch of Constantinople until 1334. See VLASOVSKY, *Narys Istorii Tserkvy*, 1101.

15. LOTORSKY, *Avtokefalia*, 2: 286-91; VLASOVSKY, *Narys Istorii Tserkvy*, 102.

16. LOTORSKY, *Avtokefalia*, 2: 294-6, 298.

17. *Ibid.*, 301-2.

(in 1435) a Greek named Isidore. The move had been made to support a projected union with Rome, whose aid the Byzantine emperor desired against the Turks, then threatening Constantinople. Not surprisingly, Isidore was coldly received upon his arrival in Moscow, and his proclamation of union with Rome after his return from the Council of Florence (1439) resulted in his imprisonment for heresy. Only his escape prevented execution.¹⁸ In 1441 the Russian synod of bishops condemned the church union as a departure from true Orthodoxy. After Iona (1448-61) was installed, future metropolitans were not sent to Constantinople for consecration. The Muscovite church thus became autocephalous, even though the patriarchs of Constantinople did not recognize the Russian metropolitan as canonical.¹⁹

The Turkish conquest of Constantinople in 1453 confirmed Russian suspicions that a curse had fallen on that city, and thereafter Moscow increasingly asserted its claim to be the *new* holy city. Not only did it declare itself the inheritor of the glorious traditions of Constantinople, but by the fifteenth century the belief was widely accepted in Muscovy that since the first two Romes (the second being Constantinople) had fallen for their heresies, Moscow was the third and final Rome, the spiritual capital of the Christian world.²⁰ In 1547 Ivan IV (1533-84) assumed the title of tsar (applied previously to the Byzantine emperors and the Mongol grand khans) to designate his position as ruler of Muscovy. In the role of emperors and protectors of the Orthodox church, the tsars perpetuated the legacy of Byzantine caesaropapism.

In this caesaropapist tradition Tsar Fyodor (Ivan IV's son) and Boris Godunov (a regent of Tatar lineage), rather than the church, decided to establish a patriarchate in Russia. When Patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople refused to accept the position (offered to him in 1587), Fyodor appointed Metropolitan Iov as the first patriarch of "Moscow and all Great Russia." Patriarch Jeremiah was induced to participate at a Russian church council and to sanction the step, signing a manifesto proclaiming Moscow to be "the Third Rome." A council of the Eastern church in 1593 then sanctioned the Muscovite patriarchate as the fifth in the hierarchy of honour. The new patriarchate lasted until the time of Peter the Great (1689-1725), who, following the death of Adrian in 1700, simply decided not to appoint a successor. In 1721 Peter formally abolished the

18. CURTISS, *Church and State*, 11.

19. LOTOTSKY, *Archiepiskop*, 2: 322.

20. A good account of the significance of this theory is given in Nicolas Zernov, *Moscow, the Third Rome*.

patriarchate and established "the Most Holy Synod", which was sanctioned two years later by the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, but not by the other two patriarchs.²¹ The eleven members of the synod, appointed by the tsar, were required to swear supreme loyalty to the "Emperor of all the Russians" and the priests were instructed to inform the government about persons confessing involvement in subversive activities or expressing evil intent against the sovereign or state.²² With the creation of the post of "overprocurator" to serve as "the eye of the tsar", the church became completely subordinate to the state and remained so until the synodal system collapsed with the downfall of the monarchy in 1917.

As noted earlier, Metropolitan Isidore's support for church union with Rome in 1439 led to the autocephaly of the Muscovite church in 1448, with both Isidore and Iona styling themselves "Metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus'". When Isidore stepped down in 1458 in favour of his colleague, Gregory, Moscow's protests were to no avail. King Casimir and all but one of the Orthodox bishops in Lithuania accepted the new metropolitan in Kiev, thereby dividing the Orthodox church in eastern Europe into two metropolitanates corresponding to existing political boundaries and national territories: the Muscovite (eight eparchies) serving the Russians and the Kievan (nine eparchies) serving the Ukrainians and Belorussians within the Polish-Lithuanian state.²³ In 1461 Iona's successor, Theodosius, adopted the new title "Metropolitan of Moscow and all Rus'"; thereby confirming the jurisdictional division. Gregory, "Metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus'", was officially recognized by the Uniate patriarchs of Constantinople and by the pope.²⁴ But when he found his Orthodox faithful to be uncompromisingly hostile to church union, he abandoned the scheme (in 1470) and returned to Orthodoxy, accepting his designation as the "Orthodox" metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus'. (The Muscovites, meanwhile, remained loyal to their own metropolitan.) Although the Kievan metropolitans in the sixteenth century (1518-89) were staunchly Orthodox and anti-Uniate, as the century drew to a close the Uniate movement reappeared and remained a permanent force.

The Union of Lublin (1569), which marked the absorption of Lithuania (including the Ukrainian territories) into Poland, provided the Roman Catholic Church with the opportunity to pursue an aggressive policy against Orthodoxy. The power of the Kievan metro-

21. LOTOTSKY, *Autokefalia*, 2: 409.

22. CURTIS, *Church and State*, 24-5.

23. LOTOTSKY, *Autokefalia*, 2: 305.

24. OMENKO, *Podil Turkey*, 315-19.

politan to nominate bishops was given to the Council of Nobles, who often selected Roman Catholics or their sympathizers. This brought about the gradual disorganization and degradation of the Orthodox church in the united state. Although the Orthodox population defended its faith through its secular brotherhoods (*bratstva*), it found it increasingly difficult to stem the state-supported Catholic movement once the Ukrainian nobility began to join it (often to prevent the complete disintegration of the Orthodox Church).²⁵ The Polish ruling elite consistently favoured the idea of union, and the establishment of the Russian patriarchate in 1589 only increased Polish fears of Russian encroachment on the Orthodox population under Polish rule.

The impetus behind the union of the Orthodox church and Rome came from the aggressive Polish Jesuit, Peter Skarga, and the papal legate, Antonio Possevino. They proposed the acceptance of the Latin credo in its entirety, the recognition of the Pope as the supreme head of the Church, the preservation of the Byzantine rite and seats for the bishops in the Polish senate on an equal basis with the Catholic bishops. In accordance with the Council of Florence, there was to be unity in faith and variety in rite.²⁶ The proposal's appeal to some Ukrainian and Belorussian bishops was enhanced by the increasing interference in internal church affairs by the patriarch of Antioch in 1585, and particularly by Patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople in 1588-9.²⁷

Knowing that the Orthodox faithful would be antagonistic toward union, four bishops met secretly in 1590 and drafted terms for the union, which were then sanctioned by the Polish king. They subsequently persuaded Metropolitan Mykhail Rohoza to join them. In 1594 these bishops wrote a joint declaration to the Pope and the King, recognizing papal supremacy in matters of dogma on condition that the Orthodox rite and organizational structure of the church be retained, the clergy be allowed to marry, the Uniate bishops have seats in the Polish senate and Uniates to have equal rights with Roman Catholics in holding state offices. In 1595, at the sacred convocation in Rome of all the cardinals and the Pope, Bishops Terletsky and Potii, in the name of all the bishops, pledged loyalty to the Pope and the Catholic Church. Pope Clement VIII accepted the terms and formally proclaimed the union in the bull *Magnus Dominus et laudabilis*, at the same time issuing a commemorative medal with the inscription "Ruthenis receptis."

25. E. WINTER, *Vizantizm ta Rym v Borotbi za Ukraïnu, 985-1699*, 67; M. HRUSHCHYNSKY, *A History of Ukraine*, 209.

26. N. BRIANCHANINOV, *The Russian Church*, 75.

27. HRUSHCHYNSKY, *History of Ukraine*, 206-10.

The news of the secret union stirred the masses of the Orthodox faithful and clergy, and the bishops involved in the negotiations were accused of betraying both the faith of their fathers and their nationality. The ensuing crisis reached such explosive proportions that three of the bishops had a change of heart and publicly repudiated the union. The general council of the Orthodox Church, meeting in Brest on 6 October 1595, split into two mutually hostile camps, each side excommunicating and anathematizing the other. Despite the fierce opposition of the defenders of Orthodoxy, the Polish king gave official recognition to the Uniate Ruthenian Church, declaring it to be the only legal "Ruthenian" church.²⁸

With the Polish government forces on their side, during the next two decades the Uniates gained control of most of the Orthodox churches. Potii, who became Metropolitan of Kiev (1600 — 1613), mercilessly persecuted and punished the recalcitrants, thus crushing the opposition of the Orthodox, who often fought back vengefully. The idea of Church Union even produced a martyr, Archbishop Josaphat Kuntsevich (Kuncevius), who was killed on November 12, 1623 at Vitebsk by Belorussians (later canonized a saint in 1867).

With the authority of the state firmly behind the Uniates, the Orthodox opposition began to crumble and might have disappeared altogether had it not been for a new social and political force in the Dnieper region of the Polish state — the Ukrainian Cossacks. Championing the ideals of democracy, the Cossacks regarded the Uniate church as a tool of the hated Polish aristocracy, and under the leadership of Hetman Petro Sahaidachny (1614-32), who joined the Kievian Brotherhood with all his Cossacks, the disorganized Orthodox Church was revitalized. In 1620, with not a single Orthodox bishop on Cossack territory, the Cossacks took advantage of the visit by Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem to arrange the secret ordination of a metropolitan, Iov Boretsky, and five bishops for the two dioceses. (Lviv and the two Belorussian dioceses were still under Orthodox bishops, never having lost them.) The prelates remained in Kiev under Cossack protection for over a decade, since it was not until 1632, with Wladyslaw IV's ascent to the Polish throne, that the Polish government granted the Orthodox the right to practice their religion and to hold municipal office. The Metropolitan of Kiev was

28. All histories of Ukraine treat the Union of Brest and the emergence of the Uniate Church. Additional sources from the Orthodox viewpoint are W. KUDRYK, *Malovidom'e : Istoriia Hreko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy*; V. ANTONOVYCH, *Nichek Prymusa Ukraïni Unii*. The Catholic viewpoint is presented in E. LYKOVSKY, *Brestytska Unia*; J. PELIETZ, *Geschichte der Union der Ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom*; I. Nahayevsky, *Katolytska Tserkva v Myślimani i Suchasnomu Ukraïni*; J. B. KOSCEVICIUS, *Russia's Attitude Towards Union with Rome*.

recognized as the official head of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine with jurisdiction over the dioceses of Lutsk, Lviv and Peremyshl, while the Uniates received four bishoprics (Kholm, Vladimir-Volynsky, Turiv-Pinsk and Polotsk) and had to return a large number of churches and monasteries seized over the years.

Another victory for the Orthodox Ukrainians was the election in 1633 of a new metropolitan, Petro Mohyla (1596-1647),²⁹ who was acceptable to both the Polish king and the patriarch of Constantinople. A Moldavian prince, who entered the Orthodox church in Poland after being driven from his homeland by the Turks, Mohyla not only had a comprehensive western education (Paris and Oxford) but also great personal wealth, which afforded him considerable autonomy. He used the wealth and prestige of his office to rebuild and restore order in the church and to establish a high level of education within the Ukrainian territories. He also encouraged literary development and subsidized the publication of a large number of books, most notably the famous *Orthodox Catechism* (1640), which he personally supervised and which was (and is still) used by Orthodox churches throughout the world.³⁰ Significantly, the eminent historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky noted that Mohyla remained unswervingly loyal to the Polish government and "organized education and schools not upon the Byzantine-Slavic traditions... but upon the Latin-Polish Catholic, and especially Jesuit models. The Ukrainian Church remained faithful to the Greek Church in dogma and rite, but with all its ideological and cultural structure it formed a branch of the contemporary Catholic reaction which reigned in southwestern Europe and had its most distant outposts in the Slavic lands of Austria and in Poland to the east."³¹

Although Mohyla's activities revitalized the Orthodox church and greatly advanced Kievan cultural, academic and national life, Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky's Treaty of Pereiaslav (1654), which recognized the authority of the Russian tsar,³² gave Moscow the opportunity to bring the Ukrainian church under the jurisdiction of the Russian patriarchate. A thirty-year struggle by the Kievan metropolitans against Muscovite encroachments followed the Russian Patriarch Nikon's assumption in 1654 of the title of "Patriarch of

29. For a concise scholarly article on this ecclesiastic, see G. W. STURSON, "Peter Mohyla, Ecclesiastical Educator," *Ukrainian Quarterly* 3, no. 3 (Spring-Summer 1947): 242-8.

30. Mohyla's catechism was reprinted in Latin translation in 1927 in Rome by "Curiae Romae."

31. HRUSHEVSKY, *Z Istorii Relihiinoi Dumky na Ukraini*, 74.

32. Khmelnytsky's biography and a full account of the Treaty of Pereiaslav is given in GEORGE VERNADESKY, *Bohdan, Hetman of Ukraine*.

Great, Little and White Russia" ("Little Russia" referring to Ukraine).³³

To subordinate the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the Muscovite government resorted to tactics which included bribery, deceit, treachery and the systematic consecration of Ukrainian bishops and metropolitans who then advocated Russophile policies.³⁴ Upon the tsar's request, in 1661 the Patriarchal *locum tenens* of the Russian church appointed Maksym Fylymonovych as bishop of Mstyslav and the successor to the Kievan metropolitan — an uncanonical act which caused both Patriarch Nikon and the Patriarch of Constantinople to anathemize the former *locum tenens* and Bishop Fylymonovych.³⁵ Although the anathema was withdrawn under Russian government pressure, the move was legally sanctioned by the patriarch of Constantinople. Upon the death of Metropolitan Dionysius in 1663 the Ukrainian synod continued its boycott of Fylymonovych and refused to elect him. When the Russophile hetman, Briukhovetsky, demanded a Russian metropolitan for the Kievan see,³⁶ the Russian synod responded in 1667 by elevating the bishopric of Chernihiv to an archbishopric, thereby placing a Russophile bishop in line for the metropolitan see. Although the Patriarch of Constantinople temporarily nullified the act,³⁷ in 1685 the Russophile hetman, Samoilovych, arranged for the election of a new metropolitan, Bishop Gedeon Chetvertynsky (his relative), who was enthroned in Moscow, taking an oath which recognized the primacy of the Muscovite Patriarch. The Russian rulers confirmed the traditional rights of the Ukrainian church, but the patriarch changed the metropolitan's ancient title to read "Metropolitan of Kiev, Galicia and Little Russia", significantly omitting "and all Rus'", which was now reserved exclusively for the patriarch in the modified form of "and all Russia."³⁸

As most of the clergy had boycotted the synod which elevated Bishop Chetvertynsky, the Ukrainian hierarchy called a second synod to declare the earlier one illegal and uncanonical and to voice the fear that under Moscow the Ukrainian church would lose its ancient rights and privileges.³⁹ The protests, however, fell on deaf

33. LOTOTSKY, *Archeologiya*, 2: 374.

34. LYPRIVSKY, *Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva*, 19-20.

35. Metropolitan Ilarion OHTUSKO's documented monograph, *Priyednannia Tserkvy Ukrainskoi do Moskovskoi v 1666 rotsi*, relates the Russian designs and events leading to the act.

36. *Ibid.*, 35. Elected as Kievan metropolitan was Iosyf Tukalsky (1663-76), a staunch supporter of Ukrainian independence.

37. *Ibid.*, 39.

38. *Ibid.*, 54-5.

39. *Ibid.*, 50.

ears. The Russian government and the church hierarchy knew well that the incorporation of the Ukrainian church was uncanonical. The approval of the Patriarch of Constantinople for such an act had been sought on previous occasions, but even valuable gifts from the tsar had failed to move him. However, with Turkey at war with Poland, Austria and Venice and thus anxious to maintain peaceful relations with Russia, Moscow seized the opportunity and pressured the Turkish sultan to have the Patriarch of Constantinople sanction the jurisdictional rearrangement in 1686. Although the Patriarch of Jerusalem rightly called the affair an act of simony, he nevertheless accepted a reward for his sanction, as did the Patriarch of Constantinople. Thus in 1686 the Ukrainian Church came under the jurisdiction of Moscow and remained in a subordinate position until after the First World War.

In this difficult situation the Patriarch of Constantinople, Dionysius, had tried unsuccessfully to safeguard the rights of the Ukrainian church by insisting that the Kievan Metropolitan be chosen according to Ukrainian church traditions, that the candidate not be required to go to Moscow for consecration and that the Patriarch of Constantinople be mentioned before the Patriarch of Moscow during church services. In 1688 a council of the eastern patriarchs denounced and dismissed Patriarch Dionysius for simony and violation of canon law, thus nullifying his enforced sanction, but the move came too late, for Moscow had already firmly established political control over Ukraine.⁴⁰

The factor contributing most to Muscovite hegemony over the Ukrainian Church was the consistently hostile attitude of the Polish government toward Orthodoxy. The Polish-Russian Treaty of Andrusovo in 1667 brought Right-Bank Ukraine (the area west of the Dnieper River) under Polish domination and allowed the Poles to renew their efforts to annihilate the Orthodox church, which they feared was gravitating toward Moscow. The Polish Sejm immediately passed laws granting special privileges to the Uniates and imposing such severe restrictions on the Orthodox⁴¹ that by the end of the seventeenth century only one Orthodox bishop, Iosyf Shumliansky, remained in Right-Bank Ukraine. In 1700 even he joined the Uniate church, and in 1708 the famous Brotherhood of Lviv capitulated under the weight of Polish pressure. Despite its former promises, the Polish government saw the Uniate Church primarily as a "peasants' church", hardly equal to that of the Roman Catholics. The masses, however, clung to the Byzantine Orthodox rite as part of their national heritage.

40. *Ibid.*, 61.

41. ANTONOVYCH, *Shcho Prynesia Ukraini Unia*, 20-3.

The three partitions of Poland (1772, 1793, 1795) brought the Ukrainian regions of Galicia, Kholm (until 1815) and Bukovyna under Habsburg rule. (Sub-Carpathia, now known as Carpatho-Ukraine, was at that time already part of the Austrian empire and Uniate-dominated.)⁴² Acting on the traditional fear that Orthodoxy would incline their new subjects toward Russia, the Habsburgs favoured the Uniate church, which at this time became known as Greek Catholic. The latter flourished in the supportive atmosphere and gradually supplanted the Orthodox as the national church.⁴³ In 1807 a Greek Catholic metropolitanate was established in Lviv by papal decree. The Greek Catholic Church lasted until the Red Army's occupation of western Ukraine during the Second World War and the subsequent incorporation of that region into Soviet Ukraine. In 1946 the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church was liquidated and a small number of apostates proclaimed union with the Russian Orthodox Church.⁴⁴ There is no legal Uniate church in Soviet Ukraine today, but it exists in the catacombs.

The jurisdictional usurpation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church by the patriarch of Moscow in 1686 was as tragic an event in Ukrainian history as Bohdan Khmelnytsky's signing of the Treaty of Pereiaslav in 1654. In violation of the tsar's solemn promise to safeguard the ancient Kievan rights, the Ukrainian Church's autocephaly was subsequently revoked and in the eighteenth century the Kievan Metropolitanate was ignominiously demoted to a regular Russian archbishopric governed directly by the Holy Synod in Moscow — a move which was part of the tsarist policy of Russification. The Ukrainian Church lost its autocephaly by means of two acts. The first, as already noted, curtailed the official title of the Kievan Metropolitan to restrict his spiritual authority to "Little Russia" instead of "all Rus'". (Under Catherine II the title was further limited to "Metropolitan of Kiev and Halych.") The second act abolished another important title, "Exarch of the ecumenical throne."⁴⁵ Professor Ivan Ohienko (Metropolitan Ilarion of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada after 1951) argued later that both acts were violations of the thirty-fourth apostolical canon and the eighth regulation of the Third Ecumenical Council.

42. NAHAYEVSKY, *Katolytska Tserkva*, 70.

43. HRUSHENSKY, *History of Ukraine*, 470; D. Doroshenko, *History of the Ukraine*, 527.

44. *Dilannia Soboru Hreko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy v Lvovi, 8-10 bereznia, 1946*; also *First Victims of Communism: White Book on the Religious Persecution in Ukraine*.

45. I. OHIENKO, *Ukrainska Tserkva*, 2: 83, 84.

To bring the Ukrainian Church into line with the interests of Russian autocracy, Tsar Peter abolished its self-rule and all its democratic features. The "Spiritual Regulation" of 1721, which radically transformed the Russian church by establishing the state-controlled "Most Holy Synod", ended the synods of the Ukrainian church for almost 200 years (the sobor of 1917-18 was the first independent assembly of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine since 1667).⁴⁶ Subsequently, the metropolitans and bishops were not elected by synods composed of clergy and laity, but appointed directly by the Holy Synod in St. Petersburg; the duties of the ecclesiastical court of the Kievan metropolitanate were also taken over by the same synod; parish meetings, too, were prohibited and the right of congregations to elect their own pastors was abolished.⁴⁷ Heavy restrictions on church brotherhoods quickly ended their existence also.⁴⁸ These changes virtually ensured that the prelates and clergy would become the political tools of tsarist autocracy.

Acting on behalf of the state, the Russian church pursued a policy designed to Russify and completely subordinate the Ukrainian Church and the Ukrainian people, whom the government officially designated as "Little Russians." Russians or Russified Ukrainians were appointed to positions in the Ukrainian Church, Ukrainian prayer books were replaced by Russian texts, churches had to be built and icons painted in the Russian manner, and ecclesiastical robes and vestments in the ancient Ukrainian style were abolished and replaced by Russian Orthodox attire.⁴⁹ Characteristically, Ukrainian bishops and clergymen were required annually to anathematize the Ukrainian Cossack hero, Hetman Ivan Mazepa, who in 1709 had allied himself with Charles XII in a revolt against Peter the Great that came to symbolize Ukrainian aspirations for freedom.⁵⁰ Up to the time of Alexander I (1799-1825), clergymen suspected of "wrong-doing" were arrested and fettered even before their case was considered by the consistory court, justice being meted out in the form of corporal punishment.⁵¹ Ukrainian bishops suspected of anti-government opinions or activities thought to be subversive were deprived of their positions, tonsured, severely punished or exiled to distant non-Ukrainian bishoprics. The Church was made totally dependent on the state after Catherine II destroyed the Cossack Sich, established serfdom in Ukraine and seized and secularized all church property

46. *Ibid.*, 89.

47. LOTOTSEY, *Archiepiskopiia*, 2: 420.

48. OHIENKO, *Ukrainska Tserkva*, 2: 90.

49. *Ibid.*, 96.

50. CURTIS, *Church and State*, 28.

51. OHIENKO, *Ukrainska Tserkva*, 2: 100.

in 1786. A system of ranks was introduced within the church which made the bishops essentially "civil servants" paid out of the state treasury.⁵²

The Uniate Church also suffered under Russian rule. The three partitions of Poland (1772-95) and the Congress of Vienna (1815) brought eastern Ukrainian lands and the predominantly Uniate population that formerly had been ruled by Poland under imperial Russian control. Despite Catherine II's promise to grant Greek and Roman Catholics complete religious freedom, steps were immediately taken to liquidate the Uniate Church, and by ruthless means most of the Uniate population was "won back" to Orthodoxy. By 1839 the Uniate Church was practically non-existent in all parts of Russian-dominated Ukraine, the sole exception being the Uniate stronghold of Kholm, which managed to survive until 1875.

In the nineteenth century the Russian Church grew steadily more reactionary. In 1824 the Overprocurator — elevated to the status of a minister with control over the synod and its bureaucratic apparatus — became the sole intermediary between the tsar and the church hierarchy. The Synod thus lost all vestiges of independence and became a tsarist pawn.⁵³ Under Constantine Pobiedonostsev (overprocurator from 1880 to 1905), a former professor of civil law and Alexander II's tutor and undisputed mentor, the Church became "the surest and stoutest prop of theocratic absolutism: it was the spiritual police of the state", known for its reactionary character, intensified Russification and ruthless suppression of every democratic tendency.⁵⁴

The Russifying mission of the Orthodox Church in tsarist times was actively promoted among potentially sympathetic Slavs, especially Ukrainians beyond the borders of the Russian empire. Russia's part in the crushing of the independent Magyar state in 1849 by Emperor Franz Joseph impressed many local Slavs in Austria-Hungary and caused some "Little Russians" to view imperial Russia with favour. A Russian Orthodox movement also sprang up among the Uniates. Denying everything that was Ukrainian and embracing the Russian language, religion and culture, the "rusophile" for "Muscophile" movement⁵⁵ was heavily subsidized and promoted from Russia. Among prominent Russophile leaders were Mykhailo Kachkovsky, Ivan Naumovych and Adolph Dobriansky.⁵⁶

52. *Ibid.*, 117-25; Lototsky, *Archeofilia*, 2: 447.

53. CURTISS, *Church and State*, 44-5.

54. Matthew SIRSICA, *The Church and the Russian Revolution*, 10, 41.

55. For an account of the movement see Andrusiak, *Narys z Istori Halytskoho Monachofilstva*.

56. W. B. WALSH, "Pobedonostsev and Panslavism," *The Russian Review*, 8, no. 4 (October 1949): 316-21.

Although the movement experienced a steady decline in the early part of the twentieth century in the wake of the rising tide of nationalism, it was precisely at this time that peasants began to leave the overpopulated and poverty-stricken districts of Galicia, Bukovyna, Sub-Carpathia and Lemkivshchyna (Lemkoland) for North America. As a result, in addition to the Orthodox settlers from Bukovyna, some of the immigrants who came to Canada were adherents of the Russian Orthodox Church. It was also during the term of office of Overprocurator Probedonostsev that the Russian church made its greatest headway in Canada and the United States.

On the eve of the First World War, the fate of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and the plight of the Ukrainian people were thus particularly grim. The influence of the enlightened Ukrainian clerics, administrators and teachers, who did much to raise the level of Russian culture in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,⁵⁷ was stifled in the nineteenth century by the oppressive autocracy of the tsarist regime. Only with the latter's collapse could the idea of an autocephalous Ukrainian church be resurrected.

Thus it was the Russian Revolution, which began in March 1917 and effectively destroyed the power of the tsars, that also unleashed the Ukrainian Revolution.⁵⁸ In April the Ukrainian Central Rada, consisting of representatives of various Ukrainian parties and organizations throughout Ukraine, was established in Kiev. In the elections that followed at political party congresses, professional and class associations chose deputies to the Central Rada, which was proclaimed the Ukrainian parliament. Protracted arguing with Kerensky's provisional government about the nature and scope of Ukrainian autonomy ended with the government's collapse in November 1917 and the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks. The Rada then announced the creation of a Ukrainian National Republic in federation with Russia. On 22 January 1918 all ties with Russia were severed and an independent Ukrainian state was proclaimed.

The newly established Ukrainian Republic had many enemies. Attacked by invading Bolshevik and tsarist armies, and under great economic pressure from the resource-hungry Central Powers, the Central Rada was replaced on 28 April by a monarchical Hetman state, dominated by Russophile and pro-tsarist elements and supported by the Central Powers. The Hetman state lasted until the German surrender on 11 November 1918. Its power was undermined, triggering the republican uprising led by the armies of General

57. For a documented account of Ukrainian influence on Russia, see OHTENKO, *Ukrainska Perslva*, 142-90.

58. For the revolution in Ukraine, see J. S. RESHETAR, *The Ukrainian Revolution*.

Symon Petliura and supported by the Ukrainian Galician Army. The Ukrainian National Republic was restored and in January 1919 enlarged by union with the three-month-old Western Ukrainian National Republic (formerly the Austro-Hungarian provinces of Galicia and Bukovyna). The infant republic, which made a valiant effort to defend itself against numerous adversaries (tsarist and Soviet Russian armies, Poland and Romania), succumbed finally to overwhelming odds in the fall of 1920. Ukrainian territories formerly ruled by the tsars were then formed into a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in federation with Soviet Russia; Galicia and the formerly Russian-ruled Kholm, Volyn and Polissia regions were incorporated into Poland; Bukovyna was annexed by Romania; and Sub-Carpathia joined the republic of Czechoslovakia. Later, at the end of the Second World War, virtually all ethnic Ukrainian territories were reunited in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The steady growth of Ukrainian nationalism and the spread of liberal ideas in the opening decades of the twentieth century also had repercussions on religious affairs, but because the clergy tended to be conservative in outlook, developments in the church awaited political events. Of utmost significance was the fact the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine in 1917 was totally controlled by anti-Ukrainian elements — the thirty prelates in the thirteen dioceses were either Russians or Russified Ukrainians.⁵⁹ It was the laity and a small group of progressive clergymen who became the spearhead for the establishment of a Ukrainian national church.

The overthrow of the Russian monarchy provided the opportunity to free the Ukrainian Church from the oppressive jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church, which at the time was in the throes of a crisis. In April and May 1917, synods (*sobory*) were held in almost every diocese of Ukraine.⁶⁰ For the first time in 250 years, lay members participated with the clergy, thereby reviving the democratic character of the Ukrainian church, which had been eradicated under the tsars. Very few of the synods, however, favoured the convocation of an All-Ukrainian Church sobor to discuss the establishment of a Ukrainian national Church and relations with the Russian Church. As a result, it was mostly pro-Russian delegates who represented Ukrainian bishoprics at the First All-Russian Sobor in Moscow (August 1917 to September 1918),⁶¹ which restored the

59. "U Dvadsiatu Ruchystia U.A.P.T.S." [The twentieth anniversary of the U.A.O.C.], *Vistok*, 15 November 1941.

60. LYPRIVSKY, *Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva*, 24.

61. For a good analysis of the Russian church during this period, see SPINKS, *Church and Revolution*; W. C. EMBARDT, *Religion in Soviet Russia*; N. S. TIMASHOFF, *Religion in Soviet Russia, 1917-1942*.

Moscow Patriarchate and installed Tikhon, the former head of the Russian Church in North America (1898-1907) as Patriarch, without mentioning the Ukrainian Church issue.⁶²

Meanwhile a committee elected by the Kiev Diocesan Council to convene an all-Ukrainian sobor appealed to the Most Holy Synod at Petrograd and later to the All-Russian Sobor at Moscow for permission to call such a sobor, but no reply was forthcoming. In early December 1917, following the proclamation in Kiev of the Ukrainian National Republic, the committee transformed itself into the Provisional All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council and began organizing an All-Ukrainian Church sobor. Sixty members, representing various dioceses in Ukraine, were added to the original committee. Retired Archbishop Oleksii Dorodnytsyn, a Ukrainian, was elected honorary chairman, with curate O. Marychiv as acting chairman. The real force behind the council, however, was the Kievan Archpriest Vasyl Lypkivsky.

The council effectively pressured the newly elected Russian Patriarch, Tikhon, to consent to the convocation of the All-Ukrainian Church Sobor, at which the bishops of the Ukrainian dioceses would have a leading role, including the power to veto any of its decisions. The sobor, assembled in Kiev in January 1918, was attended by 279 delegates. Although it had a pro-autocephalic character, the sobor accomplished little because a Bolshevik attack on Kiev forced the delegates to disperse. Before doing so, however, the members of the All-Ukrainian Church Council voted to transform themselves into the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood to continue the work of the council informally. As the socialist government of the Ukrainian National Republic was indifferent to religious affairs, it did little to support the nationalist elements within the Church, which gave the shaken pro-Russian hierarchy an opportunity to regroup and consolidate its position.

In May, following the establishment of the Hetman state under Pavlo Skoropadskyi, the Kievan *guberniia* sobor elected a well-known Ukrainophobe, Antonii Khrapovitsky, as Metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia. One of the defeated candidates for the Moscow Patriarchate and a member of the Union of the Russian People which directed the reactionary "Black Hundreds", his confirmation by the second session of the All-Ukrainian Church Sobor in June, by a vote of 160 to 130, was a severe blow to Ukrainian nationalists. The reactionary nature of the pro-Russian majority at the sobor was demonstrated by the expulsion of the members of the All-Ukrainian Church Council, which had convoked the sobor in January. The

62. WINTER, *Vizantizm to Rym*, 67.

June sobor then adopted a new "Statute for the Provisional Administration of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine", which provided for a limited autonomy of the Ukrainian Church under the canonical supremacy of the Moscow Patriarch.⁶³

The Hetman regime, considering the constitutional proposals for the church an infringement of the Ukrainian state's sovereign rights, appointed an avowed supporter of true autocephaly — Professor Oleksander Lototsky — as the new minister of confessions. At the third session of the sobor in November, Lototsky declared the proposed church constitution *ultra vires* and stressed the need for an autocephalous Ukrainian church. The ministry of confessions under the Hetman regime consistently supported autocephalous tendencies, including the proposal that a separate patriarchate be created independent of Constantinople and Moscow, suggesting even that the Greek Catholic metropolitan (Andrii Sheptytsky) might become the first Patriarch of the Ukrainian Church.⁶⁴ His candidacy was abandoned, however, because of Orthodox fears that he could lead the Church into an undesirable union with Rome. Throughout this period the stronger pro-Russian Orthodox forces also continued their intensive campaign against autocephaly.

The Directorate, which replaced the Hetman regime in December 1918, not only gave full support to an autocephalous Ukrainian Church, but took decisive measures against its opponents. Khrapovitsky and Archbishop Evlogii were banished to a Greek Catholic monastery in Galicia to counter opposition within the Orthodox Church, and on 1 January 1919 the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was legally established and proclaimed independent "with its synod and spiritual hierarchy in no way... subordinate to the All-Russian Patriarch."⁶⁵ An attempt to gain recognition for the Church's autocephaly by Constantinople, the spiritual centre of world Orthodoxy, failed when the acting patriarch of Constantinople (Patriarch Herman V had died in 1918) was unable to render a decision, though he personally favoured the move.⁶⁶

Preparations for a national sobor that would officially launch the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and elect a consistory were under way when the Red Army again disrupted arrangements by occupying Kiev on 26 January and forcing the Directorate to

63. LYPIVSKY, *Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva*, 24, 26; D. DOBOSHENKO, *Kotolnyi Narva Istorii Khrystianakoi Tserkvy*, 94, 95; LOTOTSKY, *Autokefalia*, 2: 459-61.

64. O. LOTOTSKY, *Ukrainski Dzhereła Tserkovnoho Prava*, 133-4 (hereafter *Dzhereła Prava*); Winter, *Vizantia to Rome*, 198.

65. LOTOTSKY, *Dzhereła Prava* 297-8.

66. I. WLASOWSKY, *Kanoniches' i Istorychni Pidmury Autokefali Pravooslavnoi Tserkvy*, 15.

transfer its base to western Ukraine. In this government Professor Ivan Ohienko, later Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, held the portfolio of religious affairs and did much to promote the cause of autocephaly and to Ukrainianize the Church. Even after it went into exile in 1920, the government of the Ukrainian National Republic was generally supportive of the church and church autocephaly.

With the Bolshevik seizure of power in Kiev, church buildings and property were confiscated and it became necessary to obtain permits and leases to use them. The first parish of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was organized in March 1919, and the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council was revived in April to organize parishes throughout the country. The Ukrainian Church slowly acquired more parishes, but not without protests from the Russian episcopate. From July to December, during the brief takeover of Kiev by the tsarist General Denikin, the Ukrainian parishes were once again brought under the jurisdiction of the Russian church, only to be recovered by the Ukrainians when the Bolsheviks reoccupied the capital.

Under the Bolshevik regime with its hostility to the Russian Tikhonite Church, the Ukrainian Church gained a new lease on life. On 18 May 1920 the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council proclaimed the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church. Toward the end of the month a conference of over 200 representatives of Ukrainian parishes of the Kiev region nominated candidates for bishops but failed to decide on the method of their consecration. Subsequently, the Church Council came to an agreement with Archbishop Parfenii of Poltava, who took the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church under his jurisdiction and ordained thirty clergymen to serve its needs.

Hoping to give the Ukrainian autocephalous movement a decisive death blow, the Russian bishops in Ukraine called a synod in February 1921, which unfrocked the Ukrainian clergy, ordered the dissolution of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council, and anathemized all those who would not comply with the synod's orders. The autocephalist sobor of the province of Kiev retaliated in May 1921 by annulling the actions of the Russian Church. Archbishop Parfenii Levytsky of Kharkiv was elected Metropolitan of Kiev *in absentia*, but under pressure from the synod of the Russian Church in Ukraine, he rejected the office and denounced the Autocephalous Church, thereby leaving it without a bishop. The provincial sobor then set 14 October as the date for an All-Ukrainian Church Sobor. Before the sobor's convocation, however, the council tried to send two of its candidates for the episcopacy to be consecrated by the

Catholicos (patriarch) of the Autocephalous Georgian Church re-established in 1917). The candidates were arrested and turned back from Kharkiv by the Bolsheviks, who had closed all the borders, thus leaving the Ukrainian Church without a hierarchy.

The All-Ukrainian Church Sobor, which assembled in Kiev on 14 October 1921, was faced with insurmountable problems. All the bishops invited from the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine boycotted the sobor; at the same time, the young Bolshevik regime forbade any communication with foreign churches. The exarch of Patriarch Tikhon, Metropolitan Mykhailo Iermakov, attended the sobor, only to denounce it as uncanonical. He refused to ordain any bishops, and his proclamation was intended to destroy the autocephalous movement.⁶⁷

The Ukrainian leadership, however, would not surrender. Patristic literature was cited to show that during the first centuries of Christianity presbyters sometimes ordained priests and consecrated bishops. The chief passage was I Timothy 4:14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." This practice was followed for many years in Alexandria, where the patriarch was ordained by a presbytery of twelve priests when there were no other patriarchates.⁶⁸ The Alexandrian method was discontinued after 237 and declared uncanonical at the First Ecumenical Council of 325, which limited the ordination of priests to bishops and restricted the episcopal rite of consecration to two established bishops. Unable to find bishops sympathetic to the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, the Ukrainian sobor decided to adopt the Alexandrian practice as the only available means under the difficult circumstances.

On 21 October the sobor elected its most active clergyman, Archpriest Vasyl Lypkivsky, as the Metropolitan of Kiev and all Ukraine. Following three days of continual liturgical celebration, he was consecrated by "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery", which consisted of thirty priests and twelve deacons with the prayerful participation of all the delegates at the sobor and the attending faithful.⁶⁹ A priest named Nestor Sharayevsky was consecrated a bishop in the same manner. The third priest to be elevated, Ivan Theodorovich, later a bishop and metropolitan in the United States and Canada, was ordained in the traditional manner by the first two bishops. All subsequent ordinations followed the regular practice

67. The account of the church under Bolshevik rule is based on LYPKIVSKY, *Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva*, 27-33.

68. I. Theodorovich, *Blahodatstva Ierarkhii U.A.P.Ts.*, 124-39; and V. VOLOVSKY, *Polkhodzhennia Episkopatu*.

69. S. RANENSKY, *Ukrainskula Autokefaluia Tserkva*, 5.

of established Orthodox churches. Significantly, one of the original bishops officially interpreted this act not as a restoration of the church hierarchy but as "the restoration of the totality of the hierarchical system of the Orthodox Church adopted by the ancient, historical tradition. There was a hierarchy in the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the year 1921. It was not necessary to restore it." The existing hierarchy had only to be given the "traditional totality of its system" through the "restoration of the episcopal functions which were for a time lost by the Church through the treason of bishops of the Muscovite hierarchy in Ukraine."⁷⁰

Having decided to establish the episcopate, the sobor of 1921 adopted a set of canons for the guidance of the Church.⁷¹ These canons are important in that they were later accepted or rejected by some of the Ukrainian Orthodox Churches in North America and in other parts of the world. Several sections were unique and the source of controversy in Orthodox Christendom. For example, the first section resolved to maintain staunchly the Orthodox faith accepted by St. Volodymyr and confirmed at the seven Ecumenical Councils, but deemed that canons of church order and government established by the same councils could be rejected if they no longer suited the demands of church life. To further "the redemption and the moral improvement of people", the same section replaced both the existing episcopal self-governing system of the Church with a "church council-governing (conciliar) system suitable to the spirit of the Orthodox faith" and councils composed exclusively of bishops (a state which does not "conform with the true spirit of Christ's faith") with councils of representatives from all the Orthodox Ukrainian population. The sobor was also recognized as being canonical, the means "through which the voice of the Ukrainian Church resounds with the grace of the Holy Ghost."

The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church claimed that Ukrainians had the right to autocephaly on the same grounds as Greeks, Bulgarians, Russians and others. Recognition by existing autocephalous churches and patriarchs was therefore vital, and the second section of the sobor's canons sought to establish relations with other churches, at the same time condemning the subordination of the church of one nation to that of another and favouring the expulsion of those advocating such subordination. It declared that although the Ukrainian Orthodox Church may have enjoyed "daughterly relations" with the Greek Church during its early years, it had

70. ТИМОШЕВИЧ, *Благодатний Ієрархія*, 15-61.

71. See *Діяння Всукраїнського Православного Церковного Собору в.м. Києві 14-30 червня, р.с., 1921г.*

quickly become autocephalous. Its freedom had been curtailed not by a Ukrainian church sobor but by "the oppression of the nobility and the Muscovite tsardom" — a condition which was "contrary to Christianity." As a result, once the rule of nobles and tsars was abolished, it again became autocephalous and free from subordination to the Muscovite church. This section thus declared the Ukrainian Orthodox Church to be a "free member of the Universal Conciliar Apostolic Orthodox Christian Church" in "inviolable fraternal union with all the Orthodox churches", and authorized it to inform all the other autocephalous churches about the restoration of its autocephaly.

A separate section (the fourth) was devoted to "The Restoration of the Ukrainian Church Hierarchy." It legitimized the ordination of the first two bishops by the laying on of hands by the presbytery. Stressing the direct continuance of the Holy Ghost's authority from Jesus Christ and the Apostolic Church to the Conciliar Orthodox Ukrainian Church, the sobor's canons sanctioned the election of an archbishop and metropolitan of Kiev and all Ukraine, and in "carrying out the will of the Founder and Head of the Church, Jesus Christ", the ordination also of "two persons elected from among the priests as bishops by means of the ecclesiastical imposition of the hands." Future consecrations would be through "the participation of two or more bishops according to the act of the Universal Eastern Church."

Other canons were devoted exclusively to church-state relations and the use of Ukrainian in the liturgy. The mixing of church and state affairs was viewed as "a transgression against the will of Christ and His testaments", while Ukrainian was important not only because prayer was most effective if conducted in one's native language, but "because Christ, the apostles and their successors, preached in the native languages of the populations." A departure from custom, with revolutionary implications, was the removal of the restriction that candidates for the office of bishop had to be celibate; monks, too, were to have no privileges in seeking such office.

Of the resolutions passed by the sobor, the most noteworthy dealt with church relations to the state and to other Orthodox churches. The sobor dismissed the accusation that the Church acted through political motives as "spiteful slander which has as its aim the defence of the position of the old ruling class in exploiting the lesser brother in Ukraine" and called for a preparatory conference in Kiev on 22/9 May 1922 of representatives of the autocephalous churches of the world to discuss the assembling of an Ecumenical Orthodox Church Council in the near future.

The Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine under the jurisdiction of Patriarch Tikhon immediately attempted to counteract the work

and influence of its newly established rival. Shortly after the 1921 sobor, the patriarchal exarch in Kiev (Mykhailo Iermakov) convened a synod of the Orthodox bishops of Ukraine and in a pastoral letter condemned the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church as uncanonical. The faithful were reminded that married clergy were ineligible as episcopal candidates and that the canonical consecration of a bishop had to be enacted by at least two other recognized bishops.⁷² The bishops of the new Church were dubbed "self-consecrators" (*samosviaty*) and the movement labelled "Lypkovskyism."

No recognition was forthcoming for the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church from any other Orthodox church or patriarch. To complicate matters, in 1922 the rival Ukrainian Living Church, later known as the Renovationist Synodal Church, in communion with the Holy Synod of the Russian (Living) Church, came into being. It proclaimed autocephaly at its sobor on 21/8 May 1925 (a move confirmed by the third sobor of the Russian Renovationist Church), claiming to consist of sixteen eparchies with thirty-three bishops and 3,000 congregations in Ukraine.⁷³ (By supporting Soviet authority, this Church made great headway for several years, only to decline rapidly later and be completely absorbed by the Patriarchal Russian Church at the end of the Second World War.) Isolated from the outside world and beset by aggressive enemies, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church defended itself as best it could, particularly through pamphlets such as *Memorandum of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council Concerning the Union of Churches and the Universal Christian Church* and *A Historical Record of the Past Life of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church*, which supported the original acts of the Church and defined its stand in matters of dogma, canon law, recognition and church union.

Despite its problems, the Autocephalous church surged ahead under Metropolitan Lypkivsky's able and vigorous leadership. Its strongest appeal was to nationalist sentiment. At its height in 1927, the Church consisted of twenty-eight bishops with jurisdiction over some 3,000 parishes served by approximately 10,000 priests and deacons, who ministered to the needs of about ten million faithful.⁷⁴ Although this occurred during the period of the New Economic Policy (NEP) when a more tolerant attitude existed toward civil

72. RASHEVSKY, *Ukrainskoho Tserkov* 5-6.

73. STENKA, *Church and Revolution*, 304, 308; Emhardt, *Religion in Soviet Russia*, 265.

74. C. A. MANNING, *Ukraine Under the Soviets*, 208. DOROSHENKO, *Narys Istorii Tserkvy*, 95, puts the figure at "over 2,000 priests." The number of faithful is given in *First Victims of Communism; White Book on the Religious Persecution in Ukraine*.

liberty and national expression, the Church still faced great difficulties, as bishops were seldom allowed to travel and the printing of religious literature was severely restricted.

With Stalin's rise to power and the implementation of the first Five-Year-Plan and its policy of militant atheism, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was subjected to severe persecution. Many of its leaders were identified with the "nationalist bourgeois, counter-revolutionary, anti-Soviet" Union for the Liberation of Ukraine and with other underground societies of a conspiratorial nature. Metropolitan Lypkivsky was forced to resign in 1927 and his successor, Metropolitan Mykolai Boretsky, had to step down in January 1930. At the same time the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council was also liquidated, with its members either imprisoned, sent to slave-labour camps or executed. The same tragic fate met the metropolitans, most of the bishops and many of the clergy. On 9-12 December 1930 the fourth sobor of the beleaguered Church, attended by delegates of some 300 surviving parishes, elected Archbishop Ivan Pavlovsky as Metropolitan and in a conciliatory move approved new canons which not only placed the Church directly under the Soviet government but condemned any hostility to the Soviet state as "an act harmful to the church" and "liable for church punishment."⁷⁵ The principle of conciliarism was abandoned and the word "autocephalous" was dropped. Thereafter, the ruthlessly repressive measures of the state effectively destroyed the hierarchy and the Church.

During the Second World War the Soviet regime recognized the value of the Russian Orthodox patriarchate as a political weapon against the Nazis and the West. A government-approved sobor was held in September 1943, and under government pressure all factions of the Orthodox Church were absorbed by the Patriarchal Russian Orthodox Church, which proclaimed itself completely loyal to the state. Today the Ukrainian Orthodox Autonomous Church, as an integral part of the Russian Orthodox Church, is the only recognized legal Orthodox church in Soviet Ukraine. With the Soviet annexation of Western Ukraine and Sub-Carpathia (Carpatho-Ukraine) at the end of the Second World War, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church was "reunited" during the 1946-9 period by terror and force with the Russian Orthodox Church through the Ukrainian Kievan exarchate.⁷⁶ The use of the MVD (the Soviet secret police) in liquidating the Greek Catholic Church on Soviet

75. *Ridna Tserkva*, July 1938.

76. The Soviet version and that of some Orthodox groups is given in W. SWENSTON, *Kryzys v Ukrainiskii Pravoslavnii (Autokefaliu) Tserkvi*, chap. 5.

territories and in support of the Kremlin-directed Patriarchal church is indicative of the Russian Church's subservient character.

But terror and brute force did not completely destroy the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, and events in interwar Poland, where the movement made great strides among the Orthodox Ukrainians, allowed it to arise phoenix-like from its ashes in Ukraine during the Second World War. At the request of the Polish government, which would not allow its Orthodox subjects to be under the jurisdiction of a patriarch of an enemy country (i.e., the USSR), the Patriarch of Constantinople, by the decree (*tomos*) of 15 November 1924, canonically established the autocephaly of the "Orthodox church in Poland." Significantly the decree stated that the Act of 1686 (by which Moscow won jurisdiction over the Ukrainian Orthodox Church) was uncanonical. The new Church was designated to be the successor of the old Orthodox (Ukrainian) Church formerly under the Polish kings, and since the Orthodox population of Poland was 70 per cent Ukrainian and 29 per cent Belorussian,⁷⁷ it was essentially a Ukrainian-Belorussian Orthodox Church, with the Ukrainians coming to dominate it in the 1930s.

The joint German-Soviet occupation of Poland in 1939 divided the Orthodox Autocephalous Church in Poland into two sections, with Metropolitan Dionysius Valedynsky and Bishop Timothy Shreter in the German-occupied territories and five prelates, including Bishop Poliharp Sikorskyi, in the Russian-occupied part. In 1940 Metropolitan Valedynsky, together with Bishop Shreter and Archbishop Savatii of Prague, consecrated two new bishops:⁷⁸ Ivan Ohienko (the former Minister of Religious Affairs in the Directorate of the Ukrainian National Republic) as archbishop of Kholm and Pidliasha; and Palladii Vedybida-Rudenko (formerly the Directorate's deputy minister of finances) as archbishop of Cracow for the region of Lemkivshchyna. This was undertaken in anticipation of the revival of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine with a canonically consecrated episcopate.

The German invasion and occupation of Ukraine provided the opportunity for the restoration of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. Bishop Polikarp Sikorsky of Lutsk, who refused to submit formally to the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate,⁷⁹

77. VLADYNSKY, *Politsyry Avtokefali*, 17-18, 19.

78. "Ukrainska pravoslavna tserkva v Evropi v rokakh 1939-1947" [The Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Europe during the years 1939-1947], *Vistrel*, 1 November 1947.

79. Ramevsky claims that Metropolitan Polikarp did swear allegiance to the Moscow patriarchate, *Ukrainskiana Tserkva*, 10. *Entsyklopediia Ukrainoznavstva* N.1.5h., s.v. "Tserkva: Istoriia tserkvy," by Natalia Vasylenko-Polonska and Nicholas Chabuty, which quoted both pro-Soviet and anti-Soviet Russian sources, holds

returned under the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Valedynsky, who raised him to the rank of archbishop and appointed him "Temporary Administrator of the Orthodox Autocephalous Church in the Liberated Lands of Ukraine."⁸⁰ A synod of autocephalous Ukrainian bishops was held at Pinsk, Belorussia, 8-10 February 1942, which consecrated three new bishops and raised Polikarp Sikorsky to the rank of Metropolitan. A resolution was passed to accept into the hierarchy — without any change in rank or status — priests and deacons of the interwar Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. That summer six other bishops were consecrated and dispatched to dioceses in parts of Ukraine overrun by German armies. Among these were Bishop Mstyslaw Skrypnyk and Bishop Mykhailo Choroshy, both of whom later joined the hierarchy of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada.⁸¹ In effect, these acts restored the Church of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky, with the significant difference that priests ordained by bishops who had been "uncanonically" consecrated by the Alexandrian method used in 1921 now received canonical recognition. Seen as a continuation of the earlier church, it has been called the "Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church of the Second Formation", claiming canonicity through its canonically consecrated episcopate and connection with the Orthodox Autocephalous Church in Poland.⁸²

Under Metropolitan Polikarp Sikorsky the Church expanded rapidly, winning the support of a large number of clergy and reopening church buildings previously closed by the Bolshevik government.⁸³ The Church co-operated with nationalist leaders working for the independence of Ukraine, and with the Ukrainian Insurgent Army which resisted Nazi oppression. As the Nazi administration was hostile to the Church, it tried to undermine it by lending its support to the fifteen bishops of the Ukrainian Autonomous church under the Moscow patriarchate, which retained the majority of the churches that reopened in German-occupied Ukraine. The Nazis and the majority of Autonomous bishops were predictably enraged when Metropolitan Sikorsky arranged a reconciliation with the head of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autonomous Church and announced plans for a union of the two churches. They vigorously protested the move,

the same view. However, when Metropolitan Polikarp categorically denied ever recognizing the supremacy of the Russian patriarch, Professor Chubaty retracted his statement (*Svoboda* 19-20 January 1953).

80. "Ukrainska pravoslavna tserkva v Evropi v rokakh 1939-1947," *Vistnyk*, 15 February 1948.

81. *Ibid.*, 15 March 1948.

82. VLASOVSKY, *Podstany Avtokefali*, 20.

83. MANNING, *Ukraine under the Soviets*, 210.

taking steps to suppress all forms of independent Ukrainian church activity. When the Orthodox clergy and the faithful rallied around the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church and its thirteen bishops, the Nazis accused the clergy of nationalism and collaboration with the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and sent large numbers of Orthodox priests to perish at the hands of the Gestapo or in concentration camps.⁸⁴

The retreat of the German forces from Ukraine compelled the bishops and many priests to flee westward. After the war most of them found themselves in the American zone of Germany. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Exile (*v ekzylui*) was then formed — with a synod of bishops which convoked its own meetings — in Munich and presided over by Metropolitan Polikarp Sikorsky until his death in 1953. It is from this centre that many of the bishops and priests have migrated to join Orthodox churches in Canada, the United States and Australia.

This Church, however, has still to be recognized by any Orthodox church or patriarchate. A synod of bishops, meeting in Munich on 10-11 May 1947, passed a number of resolutions related to this problem. The principal one urged the union of all the Ukrainian Orthodox Churches in the world — including the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada — but so far the Canadian Church has not approved the step. The official stand of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Exile is given in the following words of a prominent leader:

The canonical formulations of our Church in the Orthodox world must come. And we are sure that in this matter, in the eyes of those not blinded by enmity, the arguments of the canonical connection of the Ukrainian hierarchy of 1942 with the grace-bearing episcopacy of the Ecumenical Church, of the consecration of bishops in conformity with the canons and the blessings of Metropolitan Dionysius will be convincing and will carry the necessary weight.

The union of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Exile in Europe with the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada and the American Ukrainian Orthodox Church will also have great importance in the matter of recognition of the U.A.O.C. in the Orthodox world. This act may even facilitate the decision on this question, because of the permanency of the church in Canada and America, since the demand for the recognition of autocephaly solely on the basis of the national principle is a very difficult thing.⁸⁵

84. I. KRYPIARENCH and M. HOLUBETS, *Perlyta Istorii Ukrainy*, 882.

85. VLASOVSKY, *Pidsvyaz Avtokefalii*, 21-3.

CHAPTER TWO

The Growing Sense of Independency Among the Canadian Pioneers

In response to the alluring appeals of Clifford Sifton, Canada's Minister of the Interior, and the glowing accounts of the first pioneers, mass Ukrainian emigration to Canada¹ began in 1896 and continued until the outbreak of the First World War.² The figure of approximately 4,000 Ukrainian immigrants in 1897 increased each year until it peaked in 1907 at 20,000; thereafter, it remained fairly constant until the fall of 1913.³ Estimates of the total number of Ukrainians who entered Canada in this period run from 170,000 to 250,000.⁴ A

1. See, in chronological order: J.S. WOODSWORTH, *Strangers within Our Gates*, 1908; W.G. SMITH, *A Study of Canadian Immigration*, 1920; Robert ENGLAND, *The Central European Immigration in Canada*, 1929; C.H. YOUNG, *The Ukrainian Canadians*, 1931; Robert ENGLAND, *The Colonization of Eastern Canada*, 1936; John Murray GIBSON, *Canadian Mosaic*, 1938; Vera LYSENKO, *Men in Sheepskin Coats*, 1947; and, Paul Yuryk, *The Ukrainians in Manitoba*, 1953. These are the most important studies of a general nature that are available in English. Three books in the Ukrainian language merit attention: W.A. CHUMER, *Spomyny pro Perechivannia Pershykh Ukrainskykh Pereselentsiiv v Kanadi, 1891-1941* [Memoirs of the First Ukrainian Settlers in Canada, 1891-1941], 1942; *Propamiatna knyha Ukrainskoho Narodnoho Doma v Winnipegu* [Memorial Book of the Ukrainian National Home in Winnipeg], 1950 (hereafter *P.K.U.N.D. V.*), and Leonid BILICKY, *Ukrainski Pionery v Kanadi, 1891-1951* [Ukrainian Pioneers in Canada, 1891-1951]. This compilation is of interest because it reveals what original source material was available to the author at the time that he wrote his history of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada. This list could be expanded considerably with the titles of books and articles published in the last twenty years.
2. The story of the first pioneers is told in the article by Paul YURYK, "The First Ukrainians in Manitoba", in *Papers Read before the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba*, Series III, no. 8, 1953.
3. Based on reports of the Department of Immigration given in the *Canada Year Book*, 1917.
4. The latter figure is given by J.T.M. ANDERSON in *The Education of the New Canadian*, Toronto, 1919, p. 55, and by Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 209; the former is the estimate of the Department of Immigration.

more accurate figure cannot be obtained because of confusion in the terminology used to identify immigrants.

This first wave of immigrants came from ethnographically Ukrainian territories that were under the rule of Austro-Hungary or Russia.⁵ The overwhelming majority were from Galicia and Bukovyna, which had been incorporated by the Habsburg Crown (in 1772 and 1774 respectively) at the time of the partitions of Poland. Because of the Canadian policy of classifying immigrants according to the country or region of origin, many Ukrainian immigrants were designated as Galicians and Bukovynians, while others were mistakenly identified as Austrians, Hungarians and Russians. A few were registered as Poles because Galicia had formerly been ruled by Poland; others were called Romanians because Bukovyna had once (before 1774) been under Moldavian rule. As subjects of Austro-Hungary, however, they had been officially known as Ruthenians and this designation came into use in Canada in 1905.⁶ That such a confusing range of names could be applied to the same people is not surprising when it is remembered that the early immigrants were predominantly peasants — often with little or no formal education — who had left their homelands with either a muddled or undeveloped understanding of their identity only to find themselves in an alien culture and environment. We shall see how this inchoate mass under the leadership of a relatively small group of aspiring, nationally conscious intellectuals, quickly crystallized its Ukrainian identity in the tolerant political climate of Canada.

It is important to remember the background against which the mass migration to Canada was undertaken. In Galicia, the Ukrainians were a submerged and an exploited people. In 1867 the Austrian emperor, Franz Joseph, had granted the Polish gentry (*shliakhta*) ascendancy over the Ukrainians in return for political support. Polish magnates naturally pushed their own interests at the expense of the Ukrainian peasants, who formed the majority of the population. Employing discriminatory measures and unscrupulous tactics the Polish leaders manipulated elections in their own favour and staffed the government apparatus, at all levels, with fellow Poles. The existence of a Ukrainian nationality was denied, and Ukrainian schools and

5. For English-language histories of these regions consult Dmytro Doroshenko's *History of the Ukraine*, Edmonton, 1939, and Michael Hruschewsky's *A History of Ukraine*, New Haven 1941. For geographical information see G. W. Sumsion's *Ukraine: An Atlas of Its History and Geography*, Toronto, 1941.

6. "Ruthenian" is the Latin version of "Русь", the name of the ancient people of Rus'. It should not be confused with "Russian".

organizations were suppressed.⁷ This oppression by the Poles served to drive some Ukrainians naively into the arms of the Russophile movement, which was financed by the tsarist government and also denied the existence of a unique Ukrainian identity. Russophiles advocated the idea of "one Russian nation, one Russian language, and one Russian Orthodox Church."⁸ Converts to the movement called themselves Russians — making "Rusyn" (Ruthenian) synonymous with "Russki" (Russian) — and some left the Greek Catholic Church to join the Russian Orthodox Church in a move that was later paralleled by a large number of immigrants in North America. The Russophile movement, however, began to decline rapidly after the turn of the century, and by the First World War had lost its representation in the Galician Diet. Other more ambitious Galician Ukrainians, especially wealthy peasants and those seeking jobs in the civil service, simply called themselves Poles and joined the Polish Catholic Church. These pro-Russian and pro-Polish tendencies were largely checked in the late 1890s by the rising Ukrainian national movement and were almost eliminated by 1914. The state-financed Greek Catholic Church throughout this time was the sole Ukrainian Church in Galicia.

The conditions in the Austrian province of Bukovyna were similar to those in Galicia, Bukovyna's northern neighbour.⁹ In 1787, Bukovyna became an administrative district of Galicia, but was dominated by an oppressive Romanian minority. Ukrainian peasants were exploited by Romanian landlords and were harassed by Romanian bureaucrats, who predominated in the administration and used their powers to suppress the Ukrainian language, schools and organizations of a political or cultural nature. Furthermore, the dominant Romanians denied the unique nature of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which was the faith of the majority of Bukovynian Ukrainians (there was also a Greek Catholic following among them), and did their best to blur other Ukrainian/Romanian distinctions.¹⁰ Some Bukovynian intellectuals, aspiring to administrative and church offices, simply declared themselves Romanians, and were branded Romanophiles by their former Ukrainian countrymen. A few of these

7. See Nicholas ANDRUSIAK, "The Ukrainian Movement in Galicia", *Slavonic and East European Review*, London, 1936, XIV, nos. 40 and 41; and E. Levitsky, *Istoria Politychnoi Dumky Halychytskikh Ukrainstiv, 1848-1914* [History of the Political Thought of Galician Ukrainians, 1848-1914], Lviv, 1928.

8. See Mykola ANDRUSIAK, *Narysy z Istorii Halychytskoho Moskophilizmu* [Sketches from the History of Galician Moscephilism], Lviv, 1935.

9. All standard histories of Ukraine deal with Bukovyna.

10. See I.W. PHILUTIAK, *Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva v Rumunskim Iarmi i Bukovyni v Kanadi* [The Ukrainian Orthodox Church under the Rumanian Yoke and the Bukovynians in Canada], Winnipeg, 1927.

Romanianized Ukrainians later settled in Canada. The Russophile movement also found sympathizers in Bukovyna, mostly among those of the Orthodox faith. As in Galicia, by 1900 the Ukrainian nationalist movement took root and flourished in Bukovyna. It should be noted, however, that Ukrainian nationalism did not fully penetrate Bukovyna until after a large number of Bukovynian peasants had migrated to Canada.

The situation in that part of Ukraine under Russian rule was equally oppressive. There, the Ukrainian language was stifled by decree until the Revolution of 1905. Until the time of the First World War there was but one state-supported Russian Orthodox Church, which preached "One Tsar, One Nation, and One Church." The Ukrainians were officially referred to as "Little Russians" and were dominated in the church and government by Russians. Russophilism was widespread, having been absorbed and embraced by all the institutions of public life. Its hold on people began to weaken, however, with the growth of Ukrainian national consciousness after the 1905 Revolution. Significantly, many Russified clergymen from Ukraine carried on missionary work among the Ukrainian immigrants in North America, playing a leading part in establishing the Russian Orthodox Church and in spreading Russophile ideas. However, only a trickle of immigrants came to Canada from Russian Ukraine — where the bulk of Ukrainian population lived — because the tsarist government imposed heavy restrictions on emigration.

To round out this brief survey of the situation in ethnographically Ukrainian territories at the time of immigration, mention should be made of the westernmost corner of what is modern Ukraine — the Lemko region¹¹ and Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia, officially known since 1938 as Carpatho-Ukraine. The poorest Ukrainian regions economically, they provided, in proportion to their population, the largest number of emigrants to the United States, a smaller number choosing to settle in Canada. The Lemko region (Lemkivshchyna) — officially ruled by Austria, but forming an administrative district in western Galicia under Polish hegemony — and Hungarian ruled Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia — often referred to as a "God-forsaken land" — were strongly under the influence of the Russophile movement, fuelled partially by the extreme resentment of the people against their Polish and Hungarian oppressors. The Greek Catholic Church, however, did have a large following among Carpatho-Ukrainians. Ukrainian national sentiment developed the slowest in these regions and did not penetrate the majority until the interwar years. For this

11. The most complete study of the region is that of Julian TARNOVYCH, *Illustrirana Istorija Lemkivshchyny* [An Illustrated History of the Lemko Region], Lviv, 1936.

reason, a large percentage of these people gravitated toward the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States and considered themselves to be Russians. If they wanted to make a distinction they called themselves Ugro-Russians (i.e., Hungarian Russians) or Carpathian Russians, and as a rule were extremely antagonistic toward Ukrainian nationalists.¹² There was, however, a vital element of Greek Catholicism among them, and an increasing Ukrainian consciousness.

In sum, the Ukrainian masses throughout the Ukrainian territories were acutely aware of their political subjection and inferior status. Generally, Russophilism in western Ukrainian lands which did not come under Russian rule was a form of resistance against Polish, Romanian and Hungarian oppression. Unlike western Europe, nationalism came late to the Ukrainian people, but once initiated made rapid headway. Since a considerable portion of the early immigrants to the United States and Canada were illiterate or barely literate, they had not come in contact with the Ukrainian national movement in their native land and still identified with declining Ruthenianism or Russophilism.¹³ As the influx of immigrants continued, however, the nationally-conscious elements in their midsts grew, especially as leadership improved with the appearance of a steadily growing intelligentsia. The rise of Ukrainian nationalism in eastern Europe directly stimulated its growth in Canada, gradually ending the confusion surrounding the identity of ethnically Ukrainian immigrants. It was a difficult process, which, as it turned out, served to strengthen the loyalty of the new settlers and their children to Canada.

Most of the Ukrainians who came to Canada before the First World War settled in frontier Prairie colonies scattered along an approximately diagonal line extending from the southwest corner of Manitoba to the Peace River country in northwestern Alberta. They took up homesteads and company lands, mostly second-rate in quality, alongside newly constructed railway branch lines. There was no plan and no agency to guide their settlement; they "were dumped into the West ignorant of the conditions, laws, and methods of farming."¹⁴ Despite primitive conditions, lack of capital and severe handicaps, the Ukrainian pioneers cultivated the Prairie soil "with

12. For the "Russo-Carpathian" version see Peter KORANIK, *The Most Useful Knowledge for the Orthodox Russian-American Young People*, Passaic, N.J. 1934, pp. 34-68, 741-67.

13. An authentic explanation of the confusion in terminology and ideas is given in G. W. SIMPSON, *The Names "Rus," "Russian," "Ukraine" and their Historical Background*, Slavistica, no. 10, Winnipeg, 1951.

14. Hon. T. A. Calder's statement in the Dominion Parliament introducing the Immigration Act of 1919; quoted in SMITH, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

willing hands and stout backs", making progress and bringing civilization to what was formerly wilderness. Often criticized for living in "bloc settlements" where a strong sense of community made the arduous life of pioneering easier to bear, the rural ghettos made it possible for Ukrainians to open up the wild and sub-marginal tracts of land.¹⁵ While other ethnic groups followed similar patterns of settlement, what made Ukrainians the object of much attention were their numbers, foreign tongue, strange dress and alien Slavic customs.

From the very outset of East European immigration, Winnipeg was the focal point of Ukrainian life in Canada, a logical development of Manitoba's place as the gateway to the West for incoming settlers.¹⁶ Many of the important movements that were to affect Ukrainians originated in Winnipeg or came under the control of leaders based there. Other Ukrainian centres in Canada before the First World War were Brandon, Sifton, Yorkton, Saskatoon, Rosthern, Edmonton, Vegreville, Vancouver, Toronto and Montreal. Of these, Sifton in the Dauphin area of northern Manitoba, Rosthern in northern Saskatchewan, and Vegreville (east of Edmonton) in Alberta, were important rural points in the heartland of extensive Ukrainian settlements. The eastern concentrations of Ukrainians at this time were only loosely organized, but grew steadily in importance over the years.

Among the large numbers of Ukrainians who flooded Canada in the first years of immigration, there were no permanent clergymen. Uncomfortable and confused in the spiritual vacuum of their adopted homeland, the pioneers wrote letters to their bishops in the Old Country pleading for priests and guidance.¹⁷ In his pastoral letter of 1901 Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky sent instructions to the Greek Catholics along with a promise to supply priests. The Orthodox consistory in Bukovyna refused to follow suit out of deference to the jurisdictional claims of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America. So when in 1902 the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia finally began sending priests and nuns, the Orthodox Church of Bukovyna did not respond.

The spiritual life of the burgeoning Ukrainian community in Canada soon entered a critical stage. In some districts settlers gathered in private homes to chant parts of the mass as best they could.

15. This was recognized by Dr. John Mackay in the Community Progressive Competitions of 1930; see ENGLAND, *The Colonization of Western Canada*, pp. 197-8.

16. For an appreciation of the outstanding role played by Winnipeg in Ukrainian-Canadian community life see PAUL YUTYK, *The Ukrainians in Manitoba*, chapter 14.

17. See the pastoral letter of Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky, dated 25 August 1901 (O.S.) and PHILLIAR, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

Closely attached to their ancestral forms of worship, they resisted "foreign" churches and resorted to Roman Catholic, Protestant and Russian Orthodox clergy only in times of dire need: funerals, marriages and christenings. But the absence of Ukrainian clergymen naturally provided an opportunity for various denominations to do missionary work among the pioneers, which served to confuse further the uneducated farmers and labourers. The situation, however, did have its positive aspect. Approached increasingly by missionaries of other faiths, the simple peasant was able for the first time to choose his religion, thereby developing and reinforcing a sense of self-worth and independence. In the democratic atmosphere of Canada self-assertiveness was encouraged and first manifested itself among Ukrainian immigrants in the matter of religious expression.

It was natural that the Ukrainian settlers should attempt to transplant their community life to the Canadian Prairie, and it was equally inevitable that the Church would be one of the more prominent institutions. In Galicia and Bukovyna the large bulbous dome of the church — protruding above the thatched roofs of white-washed cottages and flanked by a bell tower in the adjacent cemetery — was symbolic of the central role religion played in village life. With its emphasis on tradition and reverence for the past, the Church was the embodiment of the deeply conservative nature of the Ukrainian peasantry. It cemented all of the important bonds of human relations and marked each stage of earthly passage. Baptism took place shortly after birth, and instruction in the catechism led up to the first communion. Children easily fell into the pattern of attending church services with their parents on Sundays and on holy days, so that when the appropriate time came they were married — and eventually buried, in the cemetery among their ancestors — by the village priest. The church bells tolled on all important occasions, summoning the faithful to mass, announcing holy feasts, or sometimes calling everyone together for meetings. The church was therefore a deeply ingrained and integral part of the psyche of the Ukrainian people. In Canada, however, it would have to survive in completely different circumstances.

The religious uniformity of the villages in western Ukraine, achieved by the gradual processes of time and measures imposed by the government, could not be realized in the Ukrainian settlements in Canada. Since the bloc settlements were often composed of a cross-section of people from different districts in Ukraine, and since government coercion was lacking, the differences between the settlers could come to the fore. Free to follow their own conscience, to express their own desires and social preferences — rights that had

always been denied to them in Austro-Hungary — conflicting factions soon emerged among the pioneers.

The clash of religious sentiments, or rather of religious affiliations, ominously surfaced in the first Ukrainian settlement in Canada, at Star, Alberta (formerly referred to as Beaver Lake, Limestone Lake, and sometimes Edna, in the Vegreville district), about fifty miles northeast of Edmonton. Dating back to 1893, the community had about thirty families in 1896, when mass Ukrainian immigration to Canada began. Most had arrived from the village of Nebyliv, Galicia, in the foothills of the Carpathian Mountains, which was preponderantly Greek Catholic but where the Russophile movement had some sympathizers.

The settlers in the Star district first received news of the arrival of Greek Catholic priests in the United States from *Svoboda* (Liberty), a Ukrainian weekly published in Jersey City, New Jersey, since 1893.¹⁸ Since priests served as its first editors, the settlers decided to write to the newspaper requesting that a clergyman come to minister to the spiritual needs of their new community.¹⁹ In response, Father Nestor Dmytriw, the associate editor of *Svoboda*, toured the Ukrainian settlements, visiting Winnipeg, Dauphin, Drifting River, Stuarthurn, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Rabbit Lake and Star in April and May 1896. As the first Ukrainian clergyman to visit Canada, Father Dmytriw performed a well-intentioned but fateful task in writing a series of articles for his paper, later published in pamphlet form under the title "*Kanadiiska Rus*" ("Canadian Ruthenia").²⁰ The priest spent several days at Star, holding three services in the school-house, hearing confessions, baptizing some twenty-five children and consecrating a cemetery. He also erected a crude popular cross dedicated to "Liberty" in commemoration of the emancipation of the serfs of Galicia in 1848. But the joy he brought to the forlorn peasants was short-lived. His articles in *Svoboda* and the subsequent pamphlet frequently presented conditions in the district in uncomplimentary terms, with derogatory — even racist — references which compared the women to Indian squaws and likened

18. *Svoboda* was the first national Ukrainian newspaper to be established in the "New World" of the North American continent, and continues to be published to this very day; since 1921 it has been a daily. Founded by Greek Catholic priests, the paper maintained an independent viewpoint and was very often critical of the policies of the Greek Catholic Church. As the organ of the large Ukrainian National Association, a fraternal insurance society, it attempts to be objective in its editorial point of view.

19. *P.K.U.N.D.V.*, p. 480.

20. *Svoboda*, 22 April to 3 June 1896.

the men to beggars.²¹ The poor but proud pioneers were naturally offended.

In the meantime, alongside the Greek Catholic efforts in the Star district, a neighbouring group of settlers who lived in nearby Wostok and had Russophile sympathies — some from the village of Nebyliv, others from Brody, Galicia — had written to the San Francisco-based Russian Orthodox prelate, Nicholas, "Bishop of the Aleutians and Alaska." In letters dated 8 January and 5 February 1897, Nicholas thanked God that his correspondents remembered that they were "Russians" and welcomed them back into "that blessed faith from which Popes and Jesuits" sought to separate them "by force and falsehood."²² He also promised to visit them as soon as possible. Both letters were read at meetings of the pro-Orthodox faction and roused a great deal of interest throughout the Star-Wostok community.

Reports of Father Dmytriw's visit to the Ukrainian communities prompted the Russian bishop, who was under the jurisdiction of the Holy Synod at St. Petersburg, to hasten the dispatch of two Orthodox priests to the Star settlement in late June 1897. Father Dimitri Kamenef, assisted by deacon Vladimir Alexandroff, served mass at the home of Theodore Nemyrsky at Wostok on 12 July — Sts. Peter's and Paul's Day — in honour of the founders of the Christian Church. There was a large attendance. After the service, Alexandroff, who spoke Ukrainian, discussed the building of a church. He informed the settlers that a free grant of land and a permit to cut logs for the church building could be readily obtained from the government. Father Kamenef expressed his preference that Wostok be the site of the new church, promising support and missionaries. The more prosperous settlers at Star, however, insisted on building a church of their own. A committee was then chosen to act as trustees and an application was sent to the Land Department at Edmonton.

A report from the community about the visit of the Orthodox priests so alarmed Father Dmytriw that he returned to the Star district in September of that year.²³ With him at his second service in the Limestone Lake School was Bishop Emil J. Legal of the Roman Catholic Diocese of St. Albert, who, because there was no Greek Catholic hierarchy in Canada, had nominally assumed jurisdiction over Greek Catholics. This was the first service of the Eastern rite witnessed by the French Canadian prelate, and he immediately promised to secure land for the congregation and to provide financial

21. *P.K.U.N.D.V.*, p. 481.

22. *The Law Journal Reports for the Year 1906, Privy Council Cases*, pp. 17-24.

23. *Svoboda*, 12 August 1897.

assistance for the new parish. Father Dmytriw did the interpreting and advised the people to take everything offered by the French bishop, but not to make any commitments in writing.²⁴ As a result of the visit, a large number of people became members of the first Ruthenian Greek Catholic congregation in Canada.²⁵

The trustees who had been chosen after the Orthodox service (held in the summer) returned the signed requisition to the Land Office on 7 December 1897, with the following stipulation: "This timber is required and will be used in the erection of a church building for the mission of the Greek Orthodox Church, and for no other purpose."²⁶ In the meantime, Bishop Legal applied to get the land vested in the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese "in trust for the purposes of the congregation of the Greek Catholic Church at Limestone Lake."²⁷ This step was taken by the bishop on his own initiative and without the authority of the congregation, but despite the irregularity, a patent was issued after payment of fees on or about 26 January 1898, over a month after the elected trustees had received their patent for the same land. This oversight on the part of the officials in the Land Department was to have tragic consequences, bitterly dividing the community which resorted ultimately to the highest court in the British Empire, the Privy Council in London.

When the members of the congregation at Star learned that their land had been vested in the Roman Catholic Bishop, they reacted with indignation. A second Uniate priest, Paul Tymkiewicz, who came to the settlement in April 1898, supported local disapproval of Bishop Legal's action.²⁸ A delegation was sent to the bishop, who, unfortunately, was absent at the time. The bishop's representative explained that it was the policy of the Roman Catholic Church to have church property vested in the bishop, and showed his impatience when the delegation was not satisfied. "The tail", he lectured, "cannot wag the cat, the head must be there to wag the tail."²⁹ The delegation's answer was equally blunt: "You are not our head and we are not your tail." — which was underlined by a threat of legal action. Later, the bishop assigned the land to the trustees, but the trust itself remained in his hands. The trustees, however, simply overlooked the implications of the wording in their joy at having recovered the land.

24. *The Law Journal Reports*, p. 21.

25. CHUMER, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

26. *The Law Journal Reports*, p. 21.

27. *Law, cit.*

28. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

29. *Law, cit.*

Father Tymkiewicz's six-month stay in the settlement failed to strengthen the Greek Catholic group; but his youth apparently prevented his having much influence over the older people. At the same time, the Wostek settlers received an active Russian Orthodox priest named Jacob Korchinsky, whose sermons were so effective that many of the Star congregation preferred to attend his services and to support his budding Orthodox parish.³⁰

The church at Star was erected in the summer of 1899, and the first service was conducted by a Greek Catholic priest from the United States, Father Ivan Zaklynski, who was on a tour of the Ukrainian settlements.³¹ Opposed to the jurisdictional claims of the French and Irish Roman Catholic bishops and concerned to prevent Orthodox proselytism, he made the members of the church executive swear solemn allegiance to the Greek Catholic faith.³² Upon his departure, some members of the congregation with grievances against him visited the Russian Orthodox priest, Father Korchinsky. As a result, an Orthodox service was held in the church on the second Sunday of Lent in late winter, 1900, where Korchinsky announced that he would conduct Easter service in the same church.³³

The Greek Catholic faithful, determined to prevent the Orthodox clergyman from serving mass on Easter morning, sent for Father Zaklynski and effectively barred Korchinsky's way. Anticipating trouble, Korchinsky came escorted by a policeman from Fort Saskatchewan, who locked the door of the church and declared it closed until a court ruling clarified the situation. The Orthodox faction, about thirty in number, then withdrew from the church grounds to a neighbouring farm; the Greek Catholic group of about two hundred had their Easter food blessed by Father Zaklynski outside the church.³⁴

The court proceedings proved to be a long, drawn-out, wearying affair. The Supreme Court of the North-West Territories heard the case in May 1902, and ruled in 1904 that the property belonged to the Orthodox trustees. On appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, the decision was reversed on 20 February 1906. A further appeal to the Privy Council in London, England, brought another reversal in 1907, giving the Orthodox trustees final legal claim to the land and church.

30. *P.K.U.N.D.V.*, p. 482.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 484.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 482.

33. *Prospamiatna Knyha Poselentsia Ukrainskoho Narodu v Kanadi: 1891-1941* [The Commemorative Book of the Settlement of the Ukrainian People in Canada: 1891-1941], p. 297.

34. *P.K.U.N.D.V.*, p. 484.

The Privy Council's verdict significantly strengthened the position of church trustees. In Galicia and Bukovyna parishioners had had practically no voice in the administration of the church and stood in awe of the seldom-questioned authority of the priest. The Austrian government had conveniently collected, even extorted, taxes that were then allocated to the maintenance of the church and clergy. The situation in Canada was very different. With no state-supported religion, it was the responsibility of each congregation to build its own church and for members to contribute toward the upkeep of a priest. Having a share in the property soon made parishioners aware of their right to decide matters of policy and even to approve or disapprove the actions of their priests. The laws of Canada, as exemplified in the Privy Council ruling, not only guarded democratic rights, but challenged the immigrants to claim their new heritage of individual freedom. It was this growing awareness of democratic rights which proved to be one of the most disruptive forces within the Greek Catholic Church in Canada.

To understand the rising demands for independence in the religious sphere of Ukrainian pioneer life, it is important to recount some of the important events in the relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Catholic clergymen who came to North America from Ukrainian lands. Crucial to the relationship was the nature of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Canada.

Accustomed to a celibate clergy and generally ignorant of the Uniate, Greek Catholic Church in Austro-Hungary, the predominantly Irish Roman Catholic bishops in North America spurned the married Greek Catholic Priests who began coming to the United States to establish parishes among the growing "Ruthenian" population. The first significant encounter between Greek and Roman Catholics was to have serious repercussions on religious developments in the immigrant Ukrainian community. Father Alexis Tovt, a widower who had emigrated from Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia in 1880 was the first to realize that Uniate Catholicism would get a hostile reception from Roman Catholics in America. When he presented himself to Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul, Minnesota, for permission to serve in Minneapolis, the bishop refused to recognize the legitimacy of his priesthood, stating that neither Tovt nor the Greek Catholic bishop who had ordained him were Catholic.³⁵ The rejected priest, with the approval of St. Mary's parish in Minneapolis, then applied to Bishop Vladimir of the Russian Orthodox Church and was accepted, the Russian prelate, coming all the way from his see in San Francisco to welcome the 361 former Uniates into the Orthodox church on 25

35. P.G. KUBANIK, *The Mother Church of Christendom*, 1948, pp. 112-18.

March 1891. Ironically, the jilted Tovt proved to be a most effective organizer, and before his death in 1909 was responsible for bringing 50 Uniate parishes into the Russian church.³⁶ He thus prepared the way for the conversion to Orthodoxy of some 200,000 Uniates and the establishment of approximately 200 Orthodox parishes.³⁷ To this end, the name "Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church" was adopted. As Ruthenians turned Russian, under the jurisdiction of the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg, Tovt's example was touted everywhere to good effect by Russian priests.

The protests raised by the Roman Catholic bishops in the United States against married Greek Catholic priests serving Slavic parishes were so strong that on 12 April 1894 the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of the Oriental Rites in Rome issued a decree forbidding married priests to serve in America.³⁸ As only 3 per cent of the Ukrainian priests in Galicia at the time were celibate,³⁹ the restriction made it extremely difficult for the Greek Catholic Church to provide priests for the growing Ukrainian population in North America. This regulation also aggravated the problem of religious identification among the immigrants, making it easier for other denominations to follow the lead of Father Tovt and to fill the resulting institutional vacuum. The ruling also meant that the size of the monastic orders in Galicia would have to increase — as they soon did — to meet the needs of organizing the Church in North America. But the coming of Old Country celibate priests caused other problems, for the early Ukrainian immigrants were unaccustomed to having monks serve them and consequently, for some time, viewed the monastic clergymen with suspicion.

On 1 May 1897 instructions of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda placed the Greek Catholic priests under the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic bishops in North America and exacerbated tensions between the two camps. The resentment against "Latin domination" was so great that the Galician priests called a convention in May 1901 at Shamokin, Pennsylvania,⁴⁰ where representatives

36. *Golden Jubilee Album of the St. Mary's Russian Orthodox Catholic Church*, 1937, p. 42.

37. P.G. KOLBANEK, *The Most Useful Knowledge for the Orthodox Russian-American Young People*, 1934, p. 260.

38. *Collectanea G. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide seu Secretis Instructionis Rescripta Pro Apostolicis Missionibus*, 1907, vol. II, p. 303.

39. Joseph JEAN, O.S.D.M., "S.E. Mgr. Adelpard, Archevêque de St. Boniface et les Ukrainiens", in *Rapport 1944-1945. La Société canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise catholique*, Ottawa, 1945, p. 102.

40. A concise account of the situation in the U.S.A. is given by Iulian BACHYNSKY in *Ukrainska Immigratsiia v Zedhenykh Dyrzhavakh Ameriky* [The Ukrainian Immigration in the United States of America], Lviv, Galicia, 1914, pp. 256-309.

of fifteen Uniate Catholic congregations established "The Society of Ruthenian Church Congregations in the United States and Canada" and elected a General Council of six members — half clergy and half lay — with Father Ivan Konstankevich as president.⁴¹ The frustrations felt by this patriotic group of Ukrainian Greek Catholics were finally aired publicly in an article which appeared in *Svoboda* on 13 February 1902. Entitled "Let us frankly tell ourselves the truth" and written by the editor, Father Ivan Ardan, the article bitterly denounced Roman Catholic policies and ended with the cry "Away with Rome!" Father Ardan then wrote to Bishop Hoban in Scranton, Pennsylvania, notifying him that he no longer recognized the Roman Catholic bishop's jurisdiction. This action was approved by all the parishes in the newly formed Society.⁴² Bishop Hoban immediately retaliated by excommunicating Father Ardan and through court action deprived the renegade priest of his parish in Oliphant.

Shortly thereafter, on 26 March 1902, the Society of Ruthenian Congregations called a convention at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, where discussion centred around recognizing the Pope as the head of the Ruthenian churches. The delegates decided not to break with Rome, but demanded a separate Greek Catholic hierarchy, independent of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in America, with a bishop elected by the priests and delegates of the parishes, directly responsible to the Pope rather than the Sacred Congregation for Propaganda. Also pressed was the creation of a Greek Catholic patriarchate with jurisdiction over bishops in Europe and abroad. Finally, all the decrees of the Sacred Congregations pertaining to Greek Catholics in America were to be annulled.⁴³ Not surprisingly, the resolutions were the subject of lively debate in Ukrainian newspapers and communities throughout North America. Nor is it surprising that the Russian Orthodox mission exploited the situation to full advantage. In response to the crisis the Pope sent an "Apostolic Visitor" in April to pacify the situation, but his efforts proved fruitless.

The authors of the "Harrisburg resolutions" were prepared to take further steps, if necessary. Anticipating developments, the president of the Society began to correspond with the Holy Synod in St. Petersburg. If the Synod would recognize a separate bishop for American Ukrainians (who would act independently of the Russian consistory of the Orthodox mission in the United States) elected by the clergy of a "Ukrainian Orthodox Church", the dissident

41. *Ibid.*, p. 300.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 301.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 304.

Greek Catholics would accept Orthodoxy.⁴⁴ The Synod, however, rejected this challenging offer, fearing the consequence that such a move might have in Ukraine, where a similar demand could be made for a separate church independent of the established Russian Orthodox Church. All of the negotiations were conducted in the strictest secrecy.

Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky, the head of the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia, then entered the fray by condemning the "Harrisburg resolutions" in a pastoral letter, dated 20 August 1902. His actions so incensed the General Council of the Society of Ruthenian Church Congregations that it published in New York, in 1902, a seventy-four page pamphlet entitled *Unia v Amerytsi* (*The Union in America*), which defended the society's stand against the discriminatory policies of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in very strong language, and scathingly condemned Metropolitan Sheptytsky.⁴⁵ The brochure was widely circulated among Ukrainians on the North American continent and roused a great deal of popular support for the Greek Catholic opposition to the designs of the Roman Catholic Church, serving to strengthen the forces of independency.

The increased flow of Greek Catholics into the Russian Orthodox fold and the constant complaints of parishes offended by the insulting actions of Roman Catholic bishops finally compelled Metropolitan Sheptytsky to seek a solution with the Roman curia. The papal bull, *Ea semper*, 3 June 1907, established a Greek Catholic bishop for the United States — over the opposition of the Roman Catholic hierarchy — in the person of Soter Ortynski, a Basilian monk from Galicia.⁴⁶ With his powers severely limited, Ortynski did not receive a diocese of his own and became a suffragan of each Latin bishop with Greek Catholic parishes under his jurisdiction. Although seventy-three priests and the bishop launched a strong protest against the limitations, their objections had no immediate effect. When the new bishop withheld details of the papal bull, the storm against Rome subsided appreciably and relations between the churches stabilized, though many church leaders remained dissatisfied.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy in western Canada pursued a different policy regarding the Uniates. The French bishops did not bully Greek Catholic priests as did some of the Irish bishops in the United States. When they realized that Greek Catholics refused their

44. Wasyl KUTYRK, *Mahoridom: z Istorii Hreko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy* [Little Known from the History of the Greek Catholic Church], Winnipeg, vol. II, p. 29.

45. A similar point of view is expressed in KUTYRK, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-28.

46. BACHYNSKY, *op. cit.*, pp. 307-8.

supervision, the concern of Archbishop Adélaïde Langevin of St. Boniface (Manitoba), Bishop Albert Pascal of St. Albert (Saskatchewan) and Bishop Emile Legal of St. Albert (Alberta) led them to make representations between 1896 and 1904 in Rome, Vienna and Lviv, Galicia.⁴⁷ They demanded regular priests, preferably of the Basilian Order, who were celibates, but these, as has been noted, were few in number. In 1900, Archbishop Langevin's personal emissary, Father Albert Lacombe, visited the Pope, Emperor Franz Joseph, and Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky, with a plea for Ukrainian priests.⁴⁸ A year later the Metropolitan sent his secretary, Father Wasyl Zholdak, on a fact-finding tour of the Ukrainian settlements in Canada and the United States. On his return in 1902, Zholdak nominated three Basilians, twelve secular priests and several nuns for service in North America.⁴⁹

Combined, these initiatives resulted in a number of changes: Uniate parishes in Canada began to be incorporated under the Catholic charter; the community received its first permanent Greek Catholic priests; and the first Latin missionary was assigned to work among the Ukrainians. Father Achille Delaere was a Belgian priest of the Redemptorist Order who volunteered for missionary duties among the Ukrainians in Canada. Arriving in Brandon in 1899, he quickly learned Ukrainian and visited the settlements in what is presently Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan. Realizing that his adherence to the Latin rite handicapped him in his work with the suspicious Ukrainians, in 1906 Father Delaere asked and received permission from the Vatican to transfer to the Ruthenian rite. Choosing Yorkton, Saskatchewan, as his base of operations in 1904, he was joined in the next few years by other Redemptorists — Fathers R. Decamp, Henri Bouls B. Tescher and Ludwig Boske — who too adopted the Ruthenian rite.⁵⁰ Archbishop Langevin supplemented their numbers by prevailing upon Fathers Adonias Sabourin, Joseph Gagnon, Derise Claveloux, Arthur Desmarais and Joseph Jean — French Canadians of the Congregation of St. Josaphat — to join the Ruthenian rite for service among the Ukrainians.⁵¹ Of even greater significance was the arrival from Galicia in October 1902 of a group of three Basilian priests, one monk and four nuns, who had the honour of being the first permanent Ukrainian Greek Catholic ec-

47. JEAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-4.

48. Katherine HUGHES, *Father Lacombe, the Black-Robe Voyageur*, New York, 1911, pp. 396-401.

49. Father Nil SAVARYN, *Role Desse Basilien a Kanadi* [Role of the Basilian Fathers in Canada], Mundare, Alta., 1938, p. 17.

50. JEAN, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

51. *Ibid.*, p. 105.

clerics in Canada. Establishing themselves in Mundare, Alberta, not far from the historic first settlement of Star, these Basilians plunged into the work of organizing the Greek Catholic Church in the new land. Several secular priests soon joined them in the difficult task of building and defending the church. Wherever possible, Greek Catholic church property was incorporated under the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese, the official title on the deed being given as "The Congregation of Greek Ruthenian Catholics United to Rome." Slowly but steadily the Uniate Church began to take root in Canadian soil.

The frustrating inability of the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia to provide Ukrainian settlers with the familiar figure of the married priests, and the growing democratic consciousness of the pioneers, served to strengthen the autonomous current among the rapidly swelling Ukrainian population of the West. The actions of the rebellious Greek Catholic priests in the United States, who expressed their discontent with the Roman Catholic hierarchy on the pages of *Svoboda* had a strong influence in Canada. The presence of Roman Catholic missionaries and the arrival of the monastic Basilian clergy — who subordinated themselves to Latin bishops — was viewed with great suspicion by the Greek Catholic laity. The real mission of these clergymen was considered to be the "Latinization" of the Greek Catholic Church, which in Galicia had meant treacherously yielding to Polish domination. It must be remembered that in many villages in Galicia the people had not seen or heard of the Basilians, an old order, which after declining was reformed at the end of the 19th century. Initial hostility to them in Canada was therefore quite natural. Disgruntled and apprehensive elements among the faithful soon dubbed the Basilian priests "wolves in sheep's clothing."⁵² It is indicative that in the beginning most of the newly formed parishes did not follow the advice of the Basilians in Alberta and opted for trustee ownership,⁵³ taking their cue from the court verdict of the British Privy Council. If the priests decided to be stubborn about the matter of incorporation, parishioners would simply resort to employing Russian Orthodox clergy.

For a number of years Greek Catholic parishes supporting independency, could procure the services of "independent" secular Greek Catholic priests. But because of their denunciations of Rome and the Union, three of these priests — Timothy Vasylevych, Maksym Humecky and Ivan Krochmalnyj — were suspended by Metropolitan Sheptytsky in 1908 and two subsequently joined the Russian Orthodox

⁵² CHUMER, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

⁵³ P.K.U.N.D.V., p. 49.

Church.⁵⁴ The strong-hold of the autonomous movement was the Sts. Vladimir and Olga church in Winnipeg, which had a large patriotic membership. To counteract the influence of this congregation, Archbishop Langevin, with funds from the Roman Catholic Church, built another Greek Catholic church across the street — named St. Nicholas and served only by Basilians — and had it incorporated under his charter. This rebelliousness on the part of the independent-minded Greek Catholics did not begin to subside until after the arrival in Canada of Bishop Nicetas (Nykyta) Budka in December 1912. Appropriately, the Sts. Vladimir and Olga parish then led the way in becoming incorporated under the charter of the first Ukrainian Greek Catholic bishopric. The bitterness of the struggle, however, is evident in the fact that Basilian enmity towards this parish which was eventually elevated to the status of a cathedral, persisted for many years. One Basilian cleric, Father Nil Savaryn, who later became a bishop, was to make the following accusation as late as 1938: "The centre from which the black blemish emanated was the little church (Sts. Vladimir and Olga) in Winnipeg.... It was the place of rebellion, chaos, and every kind of evil.... From there the affliction spread to all parts of Canada."⁵⁵

The first to exploit the dissension within the Greek Catholic ranks was the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church. The victorious trustees of the Star parish, in winning their lawsuit against the Roman Catholic hierarchy and preferring the priests of the Russian mission, set an example that was soon followed in various parts of the country. But there were many other reasons why Greek Catholic Galicians and Orthodox Bukovynians began to shift their allegiance to the Russian Church. In the first place, the Russian Orthodox Church had a jurisdictional monopoly in North America, which meant that Slavs would always dominate the hierarchy. Secondly, the Russian Church did not require its parishes to incorporate under a common charter, and this freedom appealed to the increasing sense of self-reliance among the settlers. Equally appealing was the Russian Church's use of the Old Church Slavonic and the same type of mass that the settlers had known in Galicia and Bukovyna, making the transition relatively easy. Furthermore, the fact that the Holy Synod in St. Petersburg subsidized the Church in North America — supplementing an annual budget of \$77,850 with regular contributions from the Missionary Society of Russia⁵⁶ — did much to enhance it in the eyes of the thrifty pioneers, who welcomed the financial

54. SAVARYN, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

55. *Ibid.*

56. U.S. Department of Commerce: Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies*, 1926, p. 314.

assistance that was available for building churches and were grateful that the subsidized Russian priests could afford to charge little or nothing for their services.

Another important victory for Orthodox tendencies was the previously mentioned conversion of Father Alexis Tovt and his subsequent reconversion of large numbers of Uniates; the propaganda value of such successes was effectively used to convince Greek Catholics to leave the "forced Union" and revert to the "original Orthodoxy." Even the ignorance of the peasants was exploited for the purpose of proselytization. The educated clergymen — especially the "Little Russian" priests, i.e., Russianized Ukrainians who were brought in to facilitate recruitment — encountered few difficulties in getting the illiterate peasants to believe that *Rusyn* (Ruthenian) was synonymous with *Russky* (Russian). Finally, able administrators within the Russian Orthodox Church at this time, such as Archbishop Tikhon of North America (who later became Patriarch of Moscow) and Archbishop Platon of Odessa, knew how to take advantage of the problems that Uniates were experiencing in the Catholic Church, having learned much of value from personal encounters with Greek Catholicism in Europe and abroad.

In Canada the Russian Orthodox Church made its greatest inroads into the Ukrainian community under the leadership of Archimandrite Arsenii Chekhovstev between 1905 and 1911. Devoting himself initially to the publication of a newspaper — *Kanadiiskaya Niva* (*Canadian Field*) out of Winnipeg — Chekhovstev followed with steps to organize a residence school (*buria*) in Edmonton. In his first year of missionary work this energetic priest won over to Orthodoxy nine Greek Catholic parishes in the Sifton district.⁵⁷ He subsequently recruited with similar success in Alberta, some congregations simply volunteering themselves and being accepted under his jurisdiction. When he lost hope of ever becoming the Canadian bishop of the Russian Church, Chekhovstev left the country and returned to his native Russia. Nevertheless, the Russian Church continued to expand for several years, claiming 110 parishes in Canada by 1916.⁵⁸ A large number of these congregations consisted of Bukovynians, who traditionally were Orthodox. It is noteworthy that the Russophilism promoted by the priests as part of church policy proved to have little effect on the predominantly Galician parishes and generally had no lasting impact among the initially more receptive Bukovynians.

57. BOZYE, *op. cit.* p. 21.

58. U.S. Department of Commerce: Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies*, 1916, p. 250.

But the particular Orthodox sect that most successfully exploited the religious vacuum among the Ukrainians, albeit for a brief period of time, was the "All-Russian Patriarchal Orthodox Church", popularly known as the "Seraphimian Church" after its founder, the pretentious "Seraphim, Bishop and Metropolitan of the Orthodox Russian Church for the whole of America", an imposter who established his credentials with a forged document of an act of consecration by three Eastern Orthodox archbishops.⁵⁹ Coming to Winnipeg early in 1903 after having been spurned by the dissenting faction of Greek Catholic priests in the United States, Seraphim soon realized that his authority was not questioned by the simple pioneers and quickly ordained fifty priests and a number of deacons from among the immigrants — many barely literate. In the Slavic colonies throughout the West, the Seraphimites astutely preached an Orthodoxy independent of any patriarch and upheld trustee ownership of church property.⁶⁰ Because these "priests" had little or no competition from other denominations, the new church movement spread like a prairie fire into almost every Ukrainian community. Within two years this over-night religious sensation served an estimated 55,000 to 60,000 communicants.⁶¹

Seraphim's bubble quickly burst, however, when some of his actions, as well as those of his assistant, Makarii Marchenko, demonstrated that both had qualities of feeble-mindedness. First, the indiscriminate "sprinkling", i.e., ordination of priests, aroused the ire of the more intelligent clerics in Seraphim's service. Then, the crude construction of the "Metropolitan Cathedral" — built of scrap iron, boards, boxes and cardboard, and adorned with an odd assortment of primitive icons and crosses — made it a ridiculous and embarrassing sight instead of a symbol of pride. Finally, Seraphim's infamous drinking sprees did little to enhance the credibility or dignity of his office.

Shocked by their bishop's disgraceful behaviour, but not daring to cast him off at such a critical stage in the young church's development, the more intelligent priests persuaded Seraphim to take a trip to Russia in the autumn of 1903 to seek the sanction and support of the Holy Synod in St. Petersburg. The dissident clergymen then

59. A detailed account with a copy of the forged document and illustrations is given in BOBYK, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-57, 323-5. See also Rev. Father A. DALAIER, *Memoirandum on the Attempts of Schism and Heresy Among the Ruthenians (commonly called "Galicians") in the Canadian Northwest*, Winnipeg, 1909, pp. 11-32.

60. Rev. John BOBYK, *Spomyny* [Memoirs], Toronto, 1949, MS.

61. BOBYK, *op. cit.*, p. 30; and J. A. CARMICHAEL, "Report of the Board of Home Missions", in *The Acts and Proceedings of the Thirty-Second General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada*, 1906, p. 30.

took advantage of their bishop's absence to establish the "Independent Greek Church" in 1904. When Seraphim returned empty-handed in the fall of that year and discovered that he had been outwitted by some of his priests, he immediately excommunicated the leaders,⁶² who reacted by no longer recognizing his ecclesiastical authority.⁶³ Clearly, Seraphim's star was waning fast. His fate took yet another bad turn when the Russian Holy Synod excommunicated the hapless charlatan, along with all of the priests ordained by him, shortly after his return to Canada.⁶⁴ This proved to be the final blow. Abandoned by his followers and by the priests he had ordained, the deeply disillusioned Seraphim left Canada for Russia in 1909. A final absurd touch climaxed this tragi-comic episode in Ukrainian Canadian religious history. Upon Seraphim's departure, Makarii, proclaimed himself "Arch-Patriarch, Arch-Pope, Arch-Tsar, Arch-Hetman, and Arch-Prince" and for good measure excommunicated the Pope and the Russian Holy Synod.⁶⁵

The leaders who engineered the ouster of Seraphim and then founded the Independent Greek Church were: Cyril Genik, the well-known Ukrainian immigration agent who had initially been responsible for bringing the imposter-bishop to Canada; John Bodrug, a teacher educated at Manitoba College; and John Negrych, another teacher and graduate of the same college, who was the editor of *Kanadiiskyi Farmer* (Canadian Farmer). These three had reached an agreement among themselves, even before Seraphim's 1903 departure for Russia, and had negotiated a secret arrangement with the Presbyterian Church of Canada that secured financial support in return for the adoption of certain Protestant teachings.⁶⁶ On August 24 1903 a consistory was chosen without Seraphim's knowledge, consisting of the Reverends John Bodrug (the leader), John Negrych, Michael Bachynski and Alexander Bachynski, to conduct the administrative affairs of the Church during the eccentric bishop's absence. This body, in turn, formed the nucleus of the movement to start a new church.

When Seraphim left, Reverend Bodrug and Negrych drew up a constitution for the new formation, which was then revised by a group of professors and Presbyterian ministers at Manitoba College. The name in Ukrainian was to be the Ruthenian Orthodox Independent Church; in English it was to be known as the Independent Greek Church. Governed according to democratic principles, the church synod — consisting of the clergy and a delegated layman

62. *Winnipeg Telegram*, 6 September 1904.

64. *Scriet [Light]*, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., no. 13, 1905.

65. Bodrug, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50, 332.

66. Based on Bodrug's *Synodary*, MS.

from each parish — was to meet annually whenever possible, or at least every three years, to decide on policy and to elect a consistory that would, among other duties, have the responsibility for ordaining priests. The consistory was to have a superintendent, who would be referred to as a bishop in Ukrainian; and parish properties were to be administered by elected trustees. Although shortened services were to be Orthodox in form and priests would wear traditional vestments, "pagan" rituals would be gradually discarded. The faith was to be embodied in the seven sacraments and the Apostolic and Nicæan Creeds. Mass confession was to be instituted, but individual confession would be granted upon request. Finally, the Church was to be completely independent, having no ties with the Pope, patriarchs or the Russian Holy Synod. Essentially, the Independent Greek Church was to be Orthodox in form and Presbyterian in spirit.

The first synod (sobor) of the new Church was convened in Winnipeg on 26 January 1904. Lasting four days, it was attended by eighteen ministers and a larger number of delegates, who adopted the constitution as presented.⁶⁷ Resolutions that were passed by this gathering: a) launched a campaign to initiate a publication, b) established a residence school (*bursa*) in Winnipeg, c) advised Seraphim's priests to take theology at Manitoba College, d) cautioned that prudence was to be exercised in the matter of church reform, and e) encouraged the wider distribution and use of the Bible. Elected to the consistory were: the Reverend Alexander Bachynski (president), the Reverend John Danylchuk (secretary), Wasył Novak (treasurer) and the Reverend John Bodrug (superintendent, i.e., bishop).

Seraphim's excommunication of the clergy of the Independent Greek Church in September 1904 was completely ineffective because the clergy had already been secretly placed on the payroll of the Presbyterian Church of Canada. The motives of the Presbyterian leaders, initially mainly "samaritan", turned missionary when they realized that Ukrainians had no separate church organization of their own. In the words of one Presbyterian leader:

They did not wish to induce the mass of Ukrainians to turn Presbyterian; this they knew would be impossible in any short space of time. They did want the Ukrainians to study the Bible and to give serious consideration to the arguments in favour of the evangelical interpretation of Christianity, yet they saw that for years to come the religious feelings of the majority would demand their ancestral form of worship.⁶⁸

67. *Ibid.*

68. A. J. HUNTER, *A Friendly Adventure*, p. 35.

When, in 1904, Bodrug and his associates approached the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, the latter was glad to extend its financial support to the Independent Greek Church, especially since it claimed to have no ties with any other church. Each of the priests was made a "missionary", paid a monthly salary, and asked to report regularly to the superintendent of home missions, Dr J. A. Carmichael. He in turn made regular reports to the General assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Thus it was the funding of the Presbyterian Church that made possible the publication of *Ranok (Dawn)*, a small weekly Ukrainian newspaper which began appearing in 1905 and soon expanded under the capable editorship of Bodrug. A residence school for young Ukrainians was established in the same year at Manitoba College in Winnipeg to assist students completing their high school matriculation, arts degrees or courses in theology. Of the two hundred students who attended the school from 1905 to 1912, only three ever completed theology and went on to become Presbyterian ministers.⁶⁹ Similar institutions were established at Teulon and Sifton in Manitoba and in Vegreville, Alberta. In addition, much-needed hospitals were built and maintained at several Ukrainian centres. In sum, these projects reflected the scope and generosity of Presbyterian policy towards Ukrainians, a policy that proved to be as naive as it was ambitious. For the Presbyterians never really understood the Ukrainian farmers or the tentative nature of the Independent Greek Church. As one writer was to comment later, "the experiment was rather too complex for a great democratic body like the Presbyterian Church to handle."⁷⁰

At first the Independent Greek Church surged ahead and quickly took over most of the parishes served by Seraphim's priests. In 1907 it claimed to have thirty clergymen and a following of between 30,000 and 40,000.⁷¹ That year, however, the Presbyterian synod insisted on a number of reforms and abolished the moderatorship of the Independent Greek Church, making the Ukrainian clergymen directly responsible to the synod. Clergymen were required gradually to adopt Presbyterian practices. In 1908 several of the clergymen resigned because of their opposition to Protestantism and its attendant "Anglicization." A series of lawsuits over the possession of churches — in Portage La Prairie and Gimli, Manitoba, Vegreville and Rate in Alberta, in Goodeve, Saskatchewan and in other Prairie communities — went against the independent parish trustees, and vested ownership with the Presbyterian Church. When the people learned of

69. BOBYK, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

70. HUSTER, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

71. *The Acts and Proceedings of the Thirty-Third General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1908*, p. 7.

the Presbyterian character of their church, they began to abandon it *en masse*.

Other factors also combined to hasten the downfall of the Independent Greek Church: the growing strength and appeal of Greek Catholicism as the problem of relationship with the Roman Catholic hierarchy was resolved; the articulate criticism emanating from the growing circle of teachers banded together around the newly established *Ukrainskvi Holos* (Ukrainian Voice), and the undermining influence of the swelling ranks of Russian Orthodox missionaries working in Ukrainian colonies. The Presbyterian Church abolished its maverick subsidiary in 1912 and closed down the residence schools, with the twenty-one clergymen who remained at the time formally joining the Presbyterians.⁷² The founder of the Church, John Bodrug, opposed these measures on the grounds that "the Presbyterian church, being a creation of the Scots and their culture, had no appeal to the Ukrainians and their culture." But his view that reformation would have to "proceed gradually according to the spiritual growth and traditions of the people",⁷³ was ignored.

By now it should be abundantly clear that historical circumstances behind early Ukrainian settlement in Canada caused a great deal of confusion in the religious life of the immigrants. It is possible, however, to discern in that confusion a groping toward the goal of independence. The pioneers of Star-Wostok, in fighting a fierce battle for self-assertion, were merely concretizing a tendency that was becoming manifest in Ukrainian settlements across the land. In contrast to their previous experience in Europe, where churches were state-supported, the settlers discovered that in Canada religion was the responsibility of believers. Having to construct their own churches and provide for their clergy made the settlers increasingly conscious of their rights and their freedom. Hence the growth of the independency movement among the Ukrainian pioneers, who quickly absorbed the ideals and spirit of Canadian democracy. In recognition of this fact of Ukrainian community life in Canada, several competing churches attempted to modify themselves in way that would appeal to the newly acquired sense of self-worth and confidence of the immigrant farmers. Despite certain attractive features, such as allowing ownership and the participation of the laity in the management of church affairs, most of the sects that came and went were doomed to failure almost from their very beginnings. The Seraphimian church was a bad joke; the Independent Greek Church quickly collapsed when its Presbyterian character was unmasked;

72. Bodrug, *op. cit.*, MS.

73. *Ibid.*

and the allegiance of Russian Orthodox missionaries to the St. Petersburg synod, with its Russophile orientation and programme, inevitably negated their early successes among Ukrainians.

What became obvious, however, in the rapid rise and fall of these churches, was that Ukrainians in Canada were ultimately interested in having a church that they could truly call "their own." Such a church would have to be national, i.e., Ukrainian in character, and be governed by the decisions of the laity in accordance with Canadian democratic practice. But the crystallization of this ideal required a slow and often difficult process of evolution.

CHAPTER THREE

Precursors of the New Church

The Canadian government's immigration policy inaugurated by Clifford Sifton in 1896 was directed toward attracting European peasants to the western prairies. Sifton's appeal for "stout backs and willing hands to break up age-old prairie sod" triggered an influx of settlers that did not abate until the outbreak of the First World War. Because of their particularly unfavourable political, economic and social situation in Eastern Europe, Ukrainians formed the largest Slavic group that responded to the Canadian offer of free homesteads and generous opportunities. When Sifton was bitterly denounced by his critics for populating the West with people of alien culture and a low standard of living, he quickly came to their defence: "I think a stalwart peasant in a sheepskin coat, born on the soil, whose forefathers have been farmers for ten generations, with a stout wife and a half dozen children, is good quality."¹

Sturdy as they might have been, it must be acknowledged that the level of intellectual sophistication of these peasants was not very high. State oppression in all spheres of life had thwarted the economic, social and political development of the Ukrainian peasantry; most were denied a formal education and the experience of participating in the administration of their own affairs. Largely through efforts of their own, in the form of reading and self-help societies organized by progressive individuals, Galician and Bukovynian peasants were beginning to take significant strides in the direction of self-improvement by the turn of the century. That an American-sponsored investigator should find only a 51 per cent literacy rate among these peasants in 1900, however, indicates how far they still had to go.² A similar survey conducted in the major Ukrainian settlements in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta in 1916, yielded almost identical results: of 2,495 older children and adults questioned, 52 per cent

1. John W. DAFIN, *Clifford Sifton in Relation to His Times*, 142.

2. Emily Greene BALCH, *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*, 139.

were completely illiterate.³ Since almost no one from the clergy and the rising intelligentsia had accompanied the settlers to Canada from their native lands, they arrived virtually without any leadership. It is therefore not surprising that confusion reigned for several years in the newly established Ukrainian communities in North America. Peasants from other ethnic groups often had a similar early history in the new land.

An intellectual class started to emerge shortly after the arrival of the pioneers. Its seeds were sown among those immigrants who had a high school (*gymnasium*) education in their homeland, a few of whom began to enter Canadian colleges and universities. The first Ukrainian students in Canada to receive university training were John Negrych and John Bodrug, who entered Manitoba College in the fall of 1897.⁴ The former became the first editor of the oldest Ukrainian newspaper in Canada, *Kanadijskyi Ferner*, launched by the Liberals in 1903; the latter became superintendent (bishop) of the Independent Greek Church that came into being in 1904. These two men, along with John Danylehuk, were the first teachers of Ukrainian origin to be employed in Canadian schools, securing positions in 1900 in the Ethelbert district, north of Dauphin, Manitoba.⁵ Most of the early students, however, did not complete their degrees, as they were diverted into teaching and other positions requiring urgent attention. The first Ukrainian to complete a Bachelor of Arts degree was Orest Zerebko, who graduated from the University of Manitoba in 1913. He went on to become editor of *Ukrainskyi Holos*, founded in 1910, and subsequently became a leader in the Greek Catholic Church. The first to gain a law degree was Jaroslaw W. Arsenych at the University of Manitoba in 1916; a public school teacher, Arsenych went on to become a director of *Ukrainskyi Holos* and a prominent leader of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church, climaxing his legal career with an appointment to the bench.

The intellectuals who provided the leadership for the Ukrainians in Canada before 1918 began their education in the elementary and middle schools of eastern Europe and completed it in Canadian high schools, normal schools and universities. It was not until the 1920s that the Canadian-born children of the pioneers began to graduate from institutions of higher learning in Canada and to play an active role in community life. At first this budding Ukrainian "intelligentsia" consisted almost exclusively of teachers in the public schools in the three Prairie provinces. They were the graduates of the Ruthenian

3. Wasyl Swystun, "Ukrainian Rural Communities: Report of Investigation by Bureau of Social Research," 5.

4. Ivan Bodrug, "Spomyny," 7.

5. *Ibid.*, 14.

Training School — founded in Winnipeg in 1905 but moved to Brandon in 1907 — and the "School for Foreigners" that was established in Regina in 1909. A second "School for Foreigners" was started in Vegreville, Alberta, in 1913, and further supplemented the growing cadre of educationalists. All of these pedagogical institutions were either affiliated with or stepping stones to the provincial normal schools. Over the years, approximately 250 teachers — some in the permit category — emerged from these training schools to provide leadership in community affairs for Ukrainian settlements throughout the prairies.⁶

In accordance with the bilingual system adopted in Manitoba in 1897, Ukrainian language, literature and history were taught in addition to the regular subjects at the normal schools.⁷ Teachers at schools in Ukrainian districts taught all of the standard courses in the Ukrainian language, with the aid of authorized *Ruthenian-English Readers*. Only with the abolition of the bilingual system in 1916 did the nature of these schools change.

The first Ukrainian-English teachers did much more than instruct children in the intricacies of grammar and the great deeds of history. To them goes much of the credit for the cultural, economic and political progress made in the backward and isolated Ukrainian settlements in the West. A significant part of each teacher's time was devoted to work outside of the classroom. Besides teaching illiterate adults to read and write in Ukrainian and often in English, he was often instrumental in establishing libraries and building community halls where he would then organize concerts, plays, lectures and various social activities. As the respected leader of the community, the teacher served as the friend and advisor of the inarticulate farmer and the uneducated immigrant labourer; as a most competent interpreter of Canadian laws and ways, he was instrumental in making conscious and responsible citizens of the unenlightened and often indifferent peasants who looked to him for guidance. In sum, each teacher was expected to play a multi-faceted role in the life of a colony. Consequently, educators has a profound influence on the development of most Ukrainian settlements.

In order to carry out their work more effectively, Ukrainian teachers soon organized themselves and began to meet regularly at provincial and regional levels to discuss common goals, problems and standards. The first convention was called in July of 1907 in Winnipeg and brought into existence the "Ukrainian Teachers' Association of

6. Julian W. STECHISEN, *With Ukrainians in Canada*, 12-13.

7. For a fuller account and sources see Paul Yuryk, *The Ukrainians in Manitoba: a Social History*, chap. 10.

Canada." Its aims were "self-education, the cultural elevation of the Ukrainian people to the standards of other nations and material aid for teachers."⁸ Among the initiators and most active members of this body were Jaroslaw W. Arsenych, Taras D. Ferley, O. M. Hyhawy, Wasył Kudryk, Orest Zerebko, F. T. Hawryliuk, Wasył Chumer, D. Yaki-mischak and Theodore Safanik — all of whom were destined to play prominent roles in Ukrainian Canadian life. Many would later become leaders of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada.

The crystallizing Ukrainian intelligentsia was motivated by a strong nationalist sentiment. In Europe, many had been socialistically-inclined "Radicals", who described themselves as "progressives" (*postupovtsi*) and "populist nationalists" (*narodovtsi*).⁹ Inspired by the ideals of Canadian democracy and freedom, these young activists selflessly dedicated their lives to the welfare of their people, fighting the forces of "darkness" and "ignorance" under the twin banners of "education" and the rule of "reason." As the idealistic apostles of Ukrainian national consciousness, they began to mould their fellow-countrymen — previously identified as Galicians, Ruthenians, Bukovynians, Austrians, Russians and occasionally as Poles — into self-respecting and progressively-minded Ukrainians. This intellectual vanguard was also determined to break the hold that "foreign" elements had on Ukrainians in Canada, as well as the monopoly of power traditionally held by conservative ecclesiastics. They strongly denounced the excessive authority of priests, which they derogatorially referred to as "clericalism." In 1909 the French missionary, Father A. Sabourin, who worked among Ukrainian Greek Catholics, characterized the militant teachers as "radical socialists, irreligious and opposing Rome."¹⁰ Another Catholic priest, the Belgian Father A. Delaere, saw them bitterly as being "perverted, imbued with Protestant principles and exercise a very dangerous apostleship... These teachers are adversaries of priests, preach revolt and disobedience towards established religious authorities."¹¹

A momentous decision was made by delegates at a Winnipeg convention of Ukrainian teachers in July 1909, when they formed a

8. *Kanadyskyi Farmer*, 12 July 1907.

9. The Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party was founded in Lviv in 1891 by Ivan Franko, Ivan Pavlyk and Left-leaning students and intellectuals. An anti-clerical agrarian socialist party, the Radical movement took up the ideas of the renowned Ukrainian theorist, Mykhailo Drahomanov. It played an influential role in Western Ukrainian political life for many years, finally ceasing its activities in 1919.

10. Adonis Sabourin, "Les Catholiques ruthènes au Manitoba", 204-218.

11. Father Achille DELAERE, *Memorandum on the Attempts of Schism and Heresy Among the Ruthenians (commonly called "Galicians") in the Canadian North-west*, 25.

publishing company that was to launch a newspaper that would serve as "a non-party, educational and economic organ of Ukrainian teachers."¹² One of the leading teachers, O. H. Hykawy, in an article in *Kanadiiskyi Farmer* (6 August 1909) challenged the constitutionality of the convention, noting that only seventeen out of forty-five members attended, considerably short of the two-thirds required to constitute a quorum. Despite the objection, the project went ahead and on 16 March 1910 the first issue of *Ukrainskyi Holos* appeared. The slogan on the masthead proclaimed "In education and union lies our strength" and the inaugural editorial resolutely declared: "We believe that we can rely on national strength and only through our very own efforts will we be able to improve our life, but never through favours nor begging." In an article entitled "Why We Need Our Own National Newspaper", the shortcomings of the three existing Ukrainian-language publications were pointed out: *Robochyi Narod* (*The Working People*) adequately served and defended the workers but did not concern itself with the needs of the large farming population, while *Kanadiiskyi Farmer* and *Ranok* were backed by non-Ukrainians who had little regard for Ukrainian interests. In short, *Ukrainskyi Holos* was to be a Ukrainian newspaper published by and for Ukrainians. The editor at the time of this auspicious debut was Wasył Kudryk and the manager was Taras D. Ferley, two individuals destined to play an important role in religious affairs in the years ahead.¹³

The new editor had already made his views on religion known in the religiously non-aligned *Kanadiiskyi Farmer* in a long article on "The Church Question in Canada", (22 May 1908) in which he argued that the Greek Catholic faith was derived from Greek Orthodoxy and that the Basilians were really Jesuits intent on "Latinizing" the Ukrainians in Canada. He claimed that people were against the Basilian practice of "signing over" church property to the French bishops, and called for the establishment of a Greek Catholic national church in Canada that would be independent of Rome and have a member-elected bishop at its head. On 30 July 1909 a second article appeared in the same paper, signed K., in which Metropolitan Sheptytsky was denounced as a Pole, the Union of Brest was used to prove the Orthodox origin of the Uniate Church, and Bishop Orlynsky was criticized for his alleged policy of "Latinizing" the Greek Catholic Church in the United States. Kudryk also used the occasion to lash out against the Basilian priests for their subordination to

12. *Kanadiiskyi Farmer*, 23 July 1909.

13. The Board of Directors consisted of T. D. Ferley-president, Wasył Chumer — treasurer, Wasył Kudryk-secretary and W. Karpel, A. Zylych, H. Slipchenko and J. W. Arsenych as members.

French bishops in Canada and to expose the designs of Rome. On 26 November he elaborated, arguing that Father Sabourin and other French priests were primarily interested in bringing Greek Catholics under the complete control of Rome.

The *Holos* during Kudryk's editorship essentially reflected his point of view on religious matters. The editorial in the second issue (23 March 1910) provocatively announced that "With respect to religion this newspaper will be upholding a rational-scientific policy." On 15 June, the editor advised that not only the Bible was to be read, but also scientifically-based books on the Scriptures and religion. A 6 July article by a writer named Paliy critically assessed the Ukrainian Basilian priests active in Winnipeg and expressed the author's belief that "for me that church is best which makes its faithful wiser, better and more learned... It is a great crime to poison children's souls with hate, fanaticism, stupidity." A subsequent editorial (24 August) entitled "Our Uninvited Friends" lashed out against the six French Roman Catholic missionaries among the Ukrainians and sarcastically suggested that they should return to Europe to redeem their native France. The news that Metropolitan Sheptytsky was to make a North American tour prompted Kudryk to ask rhetorically (31 August) "whether our church ought to be in the hands of the French, French priests and bishops or in our own hands." He advanced the claim that "the Basilians are not ours... they lack even a particle of patriotism and stay in the service of the French." And he approved the efforts of the Sts. Vladimir and Olga parish to obtain married priests and a Ukrainian bishop independent of the French-dominated Catholic hierarchy.

Archbishop Langevin's letter to *The Winnipeg Free Press*, dated 2 Septembre 1910, which made public the welcome news that Ukrainians would get a Greek Catholic bishop, only provoked another *Holos* attack (14 Septembre) in which French bishops were contemptuously referred to as "saviours" and accused of being mercenaries in their demands that "all church property must be signed over to the bishops; no layman or committee must have any right to that property." A follow-up piece (21 September) made the criticism even more explicit: "If the foundation of all Catholicism rests on the incorporation of property, and in general on property, then the Catholic church is a business corporation or a company like the CPR. And how much church property was incorporated by the apostles, not to mention Christ?... We shall tell the French 'Stop tampering with us and go and redeem your France, which is perishing.'"

This hostility to Catholicism necessitated an elaboration of the editors' attitude toward religion. An editorial entitled "Read and think" (14 September 1910) presented the *Holos's* rational-scientific

policy, summing up its position as follows: "It is necessary that the people not allow themselves to be led blindly by any kind of religion or church... It is necessary that they should understand the meaning of religion as morality in life about which they themselves can and should think, and which they can and must analyze and understand. The concern is not about religion on paper but about religion in life. Let us remember that learning and justice are the greatest religion."

The reports in the *Holos* on Metropolitan Sheptytsky's 1910 tour of Ukrainian settlements were consistently antagonistic. A provocative suggestion was initially made (7 September) that a delegation be sent to inquire about the purposes of the metropolitan's visit; and the Montreal correspondent pointedly observed that the metropolitan "is silent about the injustices done to the Ruthenian church" while "the higher authorities continue to send Basilians and Frenchmen." Sheptytsky's courtesy visit to the Polish Holy Church, where he "greeted his brothers, the Poles" and his evasive reply to the parishioners of the Sts. Vladimir and Olga Church in Winnipeg — that it would be difficult to send secular priests to Canada "because there are too few in Galicia" — drew predictable reactions from the skeptical writers for *Holos*. Typically, one news item (12 October) ended with the sour remark that "We must have Frenchmen as priests because we have not our own." In the same issue the editorial reminded readers that the metropolitan had received a cold and often hostile reception from Greek Catholics in the United States; they offered the church dignitary some constructive advice. If he revoked his anathema on Myroslaw Sichynsky, who two years earlier had assassinated Count Andrew Potocki, the oppressive Polish Governor of Galicia, and if he were to hold requiem mass for Adam Kotsko, a young student who was killed in 1908 by Polish gendarmes while demonstrating for the establishment of a Ukrainian university in Lviv, he might still find favour among patriotic Ukrainians in Canada. The final report (2 November) on Sheptytsky's tour was submitted by a correspondent from the Basilian centre of Mundare, Alberta. He related in a sarcastic manner Metropolitan Sheptytsky's sermon to 8,000 people, which offered no new hope for an improvement in the church situation. The author concluded his remarks on a pessimistic note: "The sojourn of Sheptytsky in Canada will remain without any kind of physical or spiritual benefit. Here was a sham, it passed away and will be forgotten!"

The antagonism of the *Holos* toward the French Canadian missionaries working in Ukrainian colonies and toward Metropolitan Sheptytsky finally motivated Archbishop Langevin to establish and subsidize a Catholic weekly newspaper for Uniate Ukrainians — *Kanadiiskyi Rusyn* (*Canadian Ruthenian*). It debuted in Winnipeg on

27 May 1911 under the independent-minded editorship of an ex-ecclesiastic named Nykola Syroidiv, who "abused the priests and even Archbishop Langevin."¹⁴ Throughout 1911 the *Holos* tellingly made no mention of the appearance of the new newspaper.

In 1912 the *Holos* — its masthead claiming for the first time (13 March) to be "the largest, Ukrainian (Ruthenian) weekly in Canada" and "the organ of the farmers organization 'Ukrainian Community' in Canada, the Ukrainian teachers and the co-operative union" — avoided for the most part any reference to or discussion of the religious question. Of interest, however, is a letter by Peter Svarich (Zwarych), from Vegreville, Alberta, as it characterizes well the attitude of the intelligentsia supporting the *Holos*. In response to an accusation in the *Rusyn* that he had stated that he was "too wise to be a Catholic", Svarich (25 September) replied: "I do not contradict this and shall even add from myself that every real intellectual cannot be a Catholic... if he claims that he is a Catholic, then he is a hypocrite (a pretending Catholic), and being such (a hypocrite), he is not an intellectual... Although I am a Protestant myself, I never pull anyone blindly to this faith... this is not my business, but that of priests. But be certain that in national matters I work unceasingly and shall not stop working."

The long-awaited announcement, in September 1912, of Nicetas Budka's nomination as the first Greek Catholic bishop for Canada was completely ignored by the *Holos*. For four months, while the *Rusyn* carried long articles and information on the new bishop, the pages of *Holos* made no mention of major developments within the Greek Catholic Church. The silence was only broken with the arrival of Bishop Budka on 19 December 1912. Even then, only a short news item (25 December) acknowledged his presence and a terse note underlined the fact "that the English papers call the Ruthenian bishop a Roman Catholic Ruthenian bishop and not a Greek Catholic one."

Open criticism of Bishop Budka by the *Holos* did not begin until after another four month period of "grace" had ended. On 14 May the editor, T. D. Ferley, commented on the Easter Pastoral letter of the bishop, advising that the church should not "mix" in rational matters and that the French priests should be dismissed. On 4 June Ferley issued a warning — coupled with an insinuating reference to the "fatal number" of thirteen French Greek Catholic priests — that the bishop himself could not assure Ukrainians that people "who are in ever aspect foreign to us" would "sincerely work for the welfare and the rebirth of our people." He closed with a pointed challenge:

14. Joseph JEAN, "S. E. Mgr. Adelard Langevin, Archevêque de St. Boniface, et les Ukrainiens", 108.

"Let the thinking think." A week later another editorial ("Rejoice") returned to attack the French priests: "The bishop arrived, nevertheless the church relations have not changed in the least. The Ruthenian settlements are overfilled with various foreign priests." The bishop, Ferley added, might as well bring in priests of all kinds of nationalities: "then the Greek Catholic Church in Canada would represent a genuine Babylon."

Upon returning in July from a tour of Ukrainian settlements, Wasył Kudryk prepared several editorials on the religious question. There was a strong desire among Ukrainians, he claimed (8 August), for an "independent, national, democratic church", as exemplified by the Sts. Vladimir and Olga Church in Winnipeg until the arrival of Bishop Budka. The situation of the Greek Catholic Church was very bad (13 August), for although there was a Greek Catholic bishop, the Roman Catholic priests still had supremacy and "for us they are nothing else but spies, and emissaries of the Roman Catholic evidential bureau... It is therefore best to stop incorporating the churches altogether until the matter becomes completely clarified." Turning to the powerless Greek Catholic bishop, Kudryk appealed to him (3 September) to hear the voice of the people. More explicitly, he proposed that churches not be allowed to incorporate until the following conditions were met:

1. Rome must abolish the new Belgian-Ruthenian order of Redemptorists;
2. Rome must recall all the French- and Belgian-Ruthenian priests;
3. Rome must revoke the decree banning married priests from coming to North America;
4. The constitution must stipulate that Greek Catholic priests must be exclusively of our nationality;
5. A guarantee must be made that our rite must not be modified in the direction of Roman Catholic practice.

A decree of the Congregation of Propaganda — *Ea Semper*, dated 11 August 1918 — forbidding married priests to have jurisdiction in North America, prompted a Biblical defence of secular priests in yet another controversial *Holos* editorial (1 October). The "celibates only" policy of the Roman Catholic church was condemned on the grounds that "under the priests' vestments are concealed scandalous crimes." Arguing that an unmarried priest is better for Rome but a married one is better for the people", Kudryk boldly encouraged the *Holos* readers to oppose the decree actively.

Protest meetings were organized in several communities around three key demands: the revocation of the decree *Ea Semper*; the expulsion of French and other foreign priests and orders from the Greek Catholic Church; and the safeguarding of the unique Greek Catholic

rite from Latinizing reforms. One such meeting in Sifton, Manitoba, even went so far as to issue a statement that it would be better "to return to the faith of our forefathers, to the true Ruthenian faith, to Orthodoxy, and to send for Orthodox clergy."¹⁵ Of some interest in the light of future developments is the fact that Semen W. Sawchuk, under the pseudonym of S. Chuiko, called for the establishment of an "independent national church"¹⁶ and that Wasyl Swystun — who at one point had been offered the editorship of the *Rusyn*¹⁷ — emerged as the principal speaker at a protest meeting held in the Leland Theatre in Winnipeg on 16 November.¹⁸ It is also noteworthy that a *Holos* serial published at this time under the heading of "The Course of Hundreds of Years" chronicled the history of church relations in Ukraine from a perspective that presented Orthodoxy in a favourable light and consistently criticized the Greek Catholic formation. One significant consequence of this particular controversy was that the free-spirited editor of the *Rusyn*, Nykola Syroidiv, was dismissed from his job in January 1914 for being sympathetic to the critics of the Church. Subsequent statements by him in the *Holos* served to confirm the validity of much of the criticism being directed at Bishop Budka and the Catholic hierarchy.¹⁹

The salvoes fired by the *Holos* clearly found their mark, for a number of Greek Catholic parishes took the newspaper's advice and refused to have the church property incorporated under the charter of the bishop until all the demands presented at the protest meeting were recognized and met. Congregations in the following towns made known their refusal to incorporate: St. Julien, Sokol, Rosthern (Saskatchewan); Sifton, Tolstoi, St. Norbert, Janow, Drifting River (Manitoba); Borszczow (Alberta). Such congregations as Pleasant Home (Manitoba) and Hazel Dale and Parkview (Saskatchewan) even announced they would refuse entry to French priests and demanded that married priests be assigned to their parishes. Such declarations only ceased when the start of the First World War diverted people's attentions to more pressing concerns.

Gradually the *Ukrainskyi Holos* developed a more pro-Orthodox orientation as an increasing number of viewpoints on the religious question were expressed by various segments of the community.

15. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 5 November 1913.

16. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 19 November 1913.

17. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 3 September 1913.

18. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 19 November 1913.

19. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 21 January 1914. *Kanadyiskyi Rusyn* replied immediately with a series of eleven long articles, entitled "Treason", vehemently denouncing the former editor and the "nationalists."

An editorial on 27 May 1914 revealed the direction in which the discussion was heading:

Catholicism is an alien to us as is Muscovite Orthodoxy... when the *Ukrainskyi Holos* has in mind "Orthodoxy" then it is such an Orthodoxy which should be our own national one, and not Muscovite or any other kind... In Catholicism, as in Russian Orthodoxy, Ukrainian patriotism is not compatible. The one and the other desire to make of a Ukrainian a servile slave, not a patriot; not even a man, but only a blind tool of their own interests.

Clearly, pro-Orthodox sentiments were growing and the movement toward the creation of an autonomous Ukrainian Orthodox Church was gaining momentum. Only the start of the war placed a three-year moratorium on further religious developments. The *Kanadliyskyi Rusyn*, however, saw fit to write one more editorial (4 November 1914) on "The Problem of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada." It acknowledged that there were some legitimate Orthodox believers in Canada, but claimed they were not organized and were being manipulated by Russians serving imperial interests. The recent appointment of a Russian bishop for the Canadian church was offered in evidence. It was then argued that since the North American Orthodox Church was a tool of the Russian government, Ukrainians who supported it were essentially traitors. The problem, the editorial concluded, would have to be decided "in accordance with Ukrainian national interests."

The May 1915 election of the Liberal party in Manitoba, with its plank to abolish the bilingual system, forced the Ukrainian leaders to seek alternative ways of teaching and maintaining the Ukrainian language and culture in the Anglicizing environment of western Canada. A meeting called to discuss strategy, held in the parish hall of the Sts. Vladimir and Olga Church on 3 July 1915, decided to establish the Adam Kotsko Bursa (residence school) by the fall of the year.²⁰ Although the majority (82 versus 70) voted that the *bursa* should be national and non-sectarian in character, the Greek Catholic minority was firm in its opposition to the idea of a non-denominational institution. Located in Winnipeg, the school encountered financial difficulties and was forced to close two years later, having received no support from the Greek Catholics, who had set up a separate committee shortly after the vote to establish the Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky Bursa. This rival school opened in St. Boniface in 1917 with the assistance of the French archbishop — and it operated until 1924.²¹

20. Julian W. Stechishin, *Istoria Ukrainshoho Instytutu im. Petra Mohyly v Saskatuni*, 37-40.

21. *Prospahiatos Kyrya Pivselennia Ukrainshoho Narodu v Kanadi, 1891-1941*, 35-6.

After the abolition of the bilingual system, Ukrainian teachers and intellectuals, attending universities in ever increasing numbers, devoted their efforts to establishing residence schools along the lines of the ones they had known in the Old Country. Following the lead of the organizers of the Adam Kotsko Bursa in Winnipeg, the Ukrainian Students' Club in Saskatoon called a meeting in March 1916, to discuss the possibility of founding a similar institution in that city. Speeches by Wasyl Swystun and others led to a committee to spearhead a drive to establish such a school.²² Named after the seventeenth century Orthodox leader and educator, the P. Mohyla Bursa (later renamed the P. Mohyla Ukrainian Institute) was officially opened in the fall of 1916 with thirty-five students — twenty-three Greek Catholics, six Protestants, four Orthodox and two Roman Catholics — under the rectorship of Wasyl Swystun, then studying law at the University of Saskatchewan. It should be noted that the *Kanadiyskyi Rusyn* was initially favourably disposed towards this *bursa*, even though it was named after a prominent figure in Orthodox history. The *Rusyn* printed appeals for money and published several articles in support of the fledgling residence school.²³

The occasion of the "First National Convention" in Saskatoon, convoked on 4-5 August 1916 by the founders of the new *bursa* and attended by Bishop Budka, indicated that something of a rapprochement had been achieved between the two opposing religious groups. About 500 people, representing some sixty localities in Saskatchewan and several communities in Manitoba and Alberta, attended the two-day affair.²⁴ On the surface all the conflicts seemed to have been resolved, with Bishop Budka delivering a lengthy address that indicated ecclesiastical approval of the P. Mohyla Bursa at the same time the delegates were reading an agreement about the "national" character of the institution. The convention also elected an executive to act on its behalf, with O. Megas, a school inspector, as president; W. Swystun, vice-president; Michael Stechishin, another law student treasurer; and A. T. Kibsey, high school student, secretary.²⁵

Shortly after the convention adjourned, however, the *Rusyn* began to question the wisdom of the secular character of the institution. In an editorial (25 October) ominously entitled "Those Same Ones, Everything Just the Same" the official organ of the Greek Catholic hierarchy in Canada accused the *Holos* of ignoring the Catholic schools and *bursy* in Winnipeg, Sifton, Mundare and Ed-

22. *Ukrainskyi Holos* 22 March 1916.

23. An excellent history of this institution was written by J. W. STECHISHIN, *Istoria Instituta*, 221-58.

24. *Ibid.*, 50.

25. *Kanadiyskyi Rusyn*, 16 August 1916.

monton. It pointed out that "in education it is necessary to decide" if the school was to be run according to Catholic, Presbyterian or Methodist principles, or no principles at all. The editorial also asked the independent-minded intellectuals another question. "We want to know explicitly whether the *Ukrainskyi Holos* and 'their' *bursa*, outside of which there are no others in Canada, are those institutions national or do the people have the right to demand the recognition of their life principles?"

Orest Zerebko replied in his dual capacity as editor of the *Holos* and an executive member of the Adam Kotsko Bursa. The question, he wrote (1 November), was not "whether these institutions are Greek Catholic, but whether they are Ukrainian.... We must place first our own Kiev, and not alien Rome." He continued:

Those schools which are under the control of the French must not be polished and called Ukrainian, as does the *Kanadyskyi Rusyn*, when it mentions the Sifton, Yorkton and other schools in the hands of the French. It is a pity that they are not in the hands of our Bishop. They would then be ours. So also the Presbyterian and Methodist *bursa* cannot be regarded as Ukrainian, but foreign.... A secular *bursa* is necessary, and if one did not exist, it would be necessary to establish it even today.

Concomitant with this public statement a letter was sent by the executive of the P. Mohyla Bursa to the Greek Catholic bishop explaining and defending their non-sectarian orientation and arguing for the equality of all denominations. Bishop Budka's response, dated 14 May 1917, elaborated his objections and stated his position in unequivocal terms:

The bursa is Christian, but not Greek Catholic.... because almost all students are Greek Catholics, it ought to be Greek Catholic entirely: yet to break the rule there are several others [i.e., non-Catholics]. Such a position may suit the executive, but is impossible for Catholics.... I do not favour a *bursa* in which various denominations are accommodated.... I shall be forced to urge the people to establish a Greek Catholic *bursa*.²⁶

This statement by the bishop was read with concern by the chief promoters of the *bursa* and set in motion a series of events that were to have great historic consequences.

As the bishop was scheduled to visit Canora, Saskatchewan, on 16 June, the Mohyla supporters decided to send a delegation, which included Swystun, Michael Stechishin and Ferley to put the matter to him directly. Confronted at the railway station, Budka

26. J. W. STECHISHIN *Historia Institute*, 63.

reiterated his disapproval of the interdenominational character of the Mohyla Bursa and argued that it would only lead to indifference and then rejection of religion altogether. It was claimed by Swystun that the bishop also insisted that the *bursa* be incorporated under the episcopal charter and become identifiably Greek Catholic,²⁷ but this was later denied by Budka.²⁸ Swystun, in response to this alleged demand, answered that episcopal incorporation safeguarded the Greek Catholic nature of Ukrainian churches, but not their national character, as the Pope could easily choose Greek Catholic bishops who might be anti-Ukrainian. Such was the case in Hungarian-ruled Carpathian Ruthenia, where Bishop Novak forbade the use of Slavonic in the liturgy and adopted Latin. Swystun argued that it was unwise to place matters of national concern in the hands of a single individual who was not the elected representative of the people. "sensitive" — wrote a lengthy account, "For the Judgment of the People", in the *Holos* (1 August 1917) of his version of the meeting with Bishop Budka. He appealed directly to the supporters of the controversial *bursa*:

What will you say about this, member share-holder of the P. Mohyla Bursa — of which you and all the people with you are joint-owners — not only for himself but for all his successors, and not only for his lifetime but forever and forever?

What is your decision, Ukrainian People? Will you permit the expansion of the clerical clique which wants to control Your property and all Your cultural gains?

The *Rusyn's* response (8 August) to these provocative questions was uncompromising: "Enough taxes for non-demonimational schools! To mix children of various confessions in the same institution and even to pay for it — this is the destruction of any kind of religion in children.... Non-religion and non-denominationalism is far worse than the sects."

With each week, the controversy deepened and the tone became increasingly vitriolic. The *Rusyn* lashed out (15 August) against the upstart critics of the church with unconcealed contempt, "To speak with the *Ukrainskyi Holos* about religion is the same as talking to the blind about colours.... The *Ukrainskyi Holos* does not yet know what faith will become national after the war and for this reason its staff has sold the Greek Catholic Ukrainians in Canada to Orthodoxy at a tea with the Russian Bishop Alexander." Significantly, the leaders of the Greek Catholic Church already sensed the debate's ultimate outcome. A week later, *Rusyn* (22 August) attempted to

27. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 1 August 1917.

28. *Kanadytskyi Rusyn*, 17 October 1917.

"unmask" the enemies of the Church, in the hope of silencing them forever. It characterized the "real" nature of what it described as the "Swystun-Ferley Company" in very explicit terms, claiming that "their principles are 'away with Rome, away with the bishop, and off with the shackles of clericalism: all religion is good — it is only sects — but whoever is a true Ukrainian cannot be a true Catholic. Without religion, without wedding ceremonies, without the christening of children, without the church and without priests — 'we' shall be masters." The bishop's position was contrasted sharply: "The Bishop does not want to be an absolute monarch (*Kniaz*), but the Bishop is the monarch of the Church and a student must not dictate how the people must educate the children; instead he should learn from the Bishop, because the Bishop is the supreme teacher of his people." Article after article drove home the attack on the "false teachers" and it was apparent from their strident tone that there could be no compromise, only repentance.

At the outset of the debate over the orientation and nature of the Saskatoon *bursa*, its executive took the precaution to incorporate the institution on 20 January 1917 as "The P. Mohyla Ukrainian Institute." The move, denounced by the *Rusyn*, was defended by Michael Stechishin in the *Holos* (26 September 1917) as one which guaranteed not only the Ukrainian character of the institute, but also its democratic control by the people.

Projecting into the future, on 3 October Stechishin examined the legal and actual status of institutions incorporated under church charters. His analysis is worth noting because Stechishin still claimed to be a Greek Catholic and as such was a representative member of the dissident leadership that eventually played a vital role in the formation of the new church.

After scrutinizing "An Act to incorporate the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Canada" — the Dominion charter — the author drew the following conclusions:

The authority that the bishop receives according to this act is wholly unrestricted in church affairs. Also, almost the same situation exists in secular and business affairs connected with church purposes, for restrictions may be imposed only by Rome or by the bishop himself.... The episcopal incorporation guarantees us no Ukrainianism. It is not even called Ukrainian. In it no qualifications of our bishops are indicated... According to this act our bishop in Canada could be not only the Frenchman, Sabourin, or the Belgian, Delaere, but also an Italian from Rome or an Irishman from Dublin.... In it, it is stated that he is 'bishop for the Ruthenian Greek Catholics.' This is an important matter. Not a Ruthenian Greek Catholic bishop, but a bishop for the Ruthenian Greek Catholics.

Bishop Budka drew up this charter himself and it was his duty as a Ukrainian Greek Catholic bishop to insert into the charter the distinct stipulation that only a Ukrainian may become the bishop for our people in Canada. The bishop did not do this. Consequently, the bishop did not ensure the Ukrainian people anything in the incorporation. And in spite of this, the very same bishop extends his hand to grasp the property of a purely Ukrainian corporation and even to say that in such a manner he wishes to safeguard Ukrainianism.

It is the bishop's duty to revise this incorporation in such a manner that the Ukrainian people will be guaranteed by law that no one here in Canada may be a Ukrainian Greek Catholic bishop except a person of the Ukrainian nationality.

The provisional charter of the Ruthenian Greek Catholic parishes and missions, according to Stechishin, was equally inadequate, since it did nothing to ensure that the bishop of the Church would always be a Ukrainian. Even greater sins of omission, in the young advocate's opinion, were committed in the charter of an order of nuns based in Yorkton, Saskatchewan, for there was no legal assurance that their order "was a Ukrainian institution, and that it deserved the moral and financial support of the Ukrainian people. Furthermore, there was nothing in the document explicitly identifying the order as Greek Catholic."

But it was the fourth charter examined by Stechishin — "The Ruthenian Catholic Mission Act" — that most aroused his indignation. Citing a paragraph that concluded with a clause stating that the "body shall consist of all persons now members of the said association in the said Province and who shall hereafter become members thereof", the outraged lawyer declared:

This act is the greatest insult to the Ukrainian people in Canada. It is distinctly named Catholic and not Greek Catholic, meaning Roman Catholic. Over in Galicia the Poles attempted, with the aid of our bishops, to convert our people from Orthodoxy to Greek Catholicism, and from Greek Catholicism to Roman Catholicism, and in such a way to destroy our nationality; and here Roman Catholics with the aid of Bishop Budka are converting our people to Roman Catholicism. At the same time, this same bishop pretends to be a Ukrainian, a national trustee, and demands that we give into his hands our national institutions and property, for he wishes to boast before the French of his achievements among our ignorant people.

Impressed, the *Kanadiiskyi Farmer* reprinted Stechishin's article unabridged in its 12 October 1917 issue, and followed it up with a supportive editorial (2 November) by O. H. Hykawy, who observed that in the contentious episcopal charter, Bishop Budka was officially "Titular Bishop of Patara", which meant that he did not possess any real authority.

Although Bishop Budka had declared in the *Rusyn* (17 October) that "nowhere in Canada, before no one and at no time, did I demand — nor do I demand now — the incorporation of the Saskatoon Bursa either in my name or under the episcopal corporation", the sincerity of his statement is questionable. It is obvious that the leaders of the Greek Catholic Church felt threatened by certain tendencies within the ranks of the membership, and that they detested the vocal activists centred around the Saskatoon institute and *Ukrainskyi Holos*. How the bishop expected to safeguard the Greek Catholic character of the education provided by the P. Mohyla Institute without taking over the institution itself is difficult to ascertain. Moreover, the following remarks in the same declaration suggest he had precisely such intentions:

We want the assurance that our youth will be brought up in the religion that we knew in the Old Country. In fact, we want the same kind of *bursas* as do our people. And from this demand, from this sacred principle, we will not retreat even a single step.

And if the present executive of the Saskatoon bursa will not listen to our voice voluntarily, then it will soon have to listen to the voice of the whole people, who will demand their rights but will demand them in such a way that the gentlemen in the executive will feel tremors over their spines. For a long time our people in Canada have suffered from all sorts of tramps who tried to thrust upon them a motley assortment of exuberant and immature religious reforms — the concoctions of youthful fantasy and of the pseudo-progressive system of education. Our people will no longer allow further experiments to be made on the healthy and living organism of their national life. And our people will reject these perverted and morbid principles of the gentlemen-reformers, just as they had rejected the ruinous designs of the Protestant hireling-preachers.... And in this struggle we must also stand on the side of the people and defend their rights against the unscrupulous designs of all sorts of agitators and business-patriots, regardless of whether or not it pleases the executive of the Saskatoon *bursa* or Mr. Stechishin.

Naturally, Swystun and Stechishin could not ignore Bishop Budka's declaration. In sworn affidavits, published in the *Holos* (15 November), they claimed that the bishop had told them in Canora that he would not assist the fledgling institute in any way unless it became Greek Catholic as well as Ukrainian, and came under the episcopal corporation.

For the promoters of the P. Mohyla Institute the "judgement of the people" was to be rendered at the second national convention convened in Saskatoon in the latter part of December 1917. Some 700 delegates from numerous local organizations, and guests from the three Prairie provinces and Ontario, attended the landmark event, giving credibility to the sponsors' claim that the convention repre-

sented "the Ukrainian national soul" and could be regarded as an "unofficial Ukrainian parliament."²⁹ Telegrams reflecting the nationalist tone of the convention were sent to the Ukrainian Central Rada in Kiev — congratulating it for establishing an autonomous Ukrainian state — and to Western powers demanding their recognition of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. Of greater import, however, was the delegates' vote of confidence supporting the editorial policy of the *Holos* and the stand taken by Swystun and Stechishin:

...whereas the newspaper, *Kanadiiskyi Rusyn*, the organ of His Excellency Bishop Budka, and the *Kanadiiskyi Ranek* (organ of the Presbyterian church), as well as the same bishop and part of the clergy subordinate to him, in an unfair manner attack all national work among the Ukrainian people in Canada, and chiefly the P. Mohyla Ukrainian Institute in Saskatoon; and whereas all such subversive work is intended to destroy all educational-cultural work which is independent of the episcopal church corporation; and whereas this is felt very painful in and with great loss to our national life; be it resolved in the face of the above-mentioned facts that the convention condemns these enemies of national progress and gives them a deserved reprimand for their hitherto subversive work, hoping that in the future they will change their behaviour and instead of harming will aid national work.³⁰

Predictably, Greek Catholic leaders and the *Rusyn* did not consider the Saskatoon convention to be a legitimate expression of "the will of the people." Reacting to the outcome of events in an article entitled "The Saskatoon Golgotha", the *Rusyn* (23 January 1918) bitterly charged that "The bishop was not there and so they judged his name and honour. Pilate Swystun announced the decision and the ignorant crowd of Presbyterian preachers bellowed out 'Crucify him, crucify him, people!'"³¹ The allegation that the leaders of the Institute were paid agents of the Presbyterian church was unwarranted, for it contradicted the fact that the convention also condemned the "subversive work" of the Presbyterian Church in the same censuring resolution and ignored the fact that the Institute had recently won a libel suit against the Presbyterian-backed *Ranek* (the sum of the damages amounting to five hundred dollars).³² This association of the leaders of the Institute and the *Holos* with the Protestants and Protestantism was used to discredit the rebel faction for a number of years, as Bishop Budka and his priests launched an unrelenting campaign against the Institute.³³

29. STECHISHIN, *Isouria Institute*, 84.

30. *Ibid.*, 88.

31. *Ibid.*, 88-90.

32. *Ibid.*, 90.

33. Cited from the protocol of the court proceedings, *ibid.*, 92.

The tense situation deteriorated even more when the parish at Tolstoi, Manitoba, acknowledged the influence of the Institute's prior lead and categorically refused to incorporate the church with the bishop. Swystun and Stechishin nodded their approval and advised the Tolstoi parishioners to demand that the bishop revise the charter to guarantee that only Ukrainians could become bishops of the Greek Catholic church, that all "foreign" missionaries working in settlements be recalled, and that the celibacy restriction be abolished. They qualified these demands with a declaration that they spoke as private individuals who were not criticizing the faith, but solely interested in property matters connected with the charter.³⁴ The church establishment interpreted this as the work of the Institute and stepped up its campaign against the *bursa* and all who supported it.

In addition to their verbal assault in churches and in the pages of the *Rusyn*, the bishop and priests also resorted to their most powerful weapon as clerics. Semen W. Sawchuk — at that time a teacher — reported in the *Holos* (15 June 1918) that the Belgian priests out of Yorkton had stopped giving confessions as of Christmas (1917) to anyone who had supported the Institute and refused to recant; and that it was emphasized by Father N. Decamp that anyone dying without confession would not be granted a burial in a consecrated cemetery, but be buried on the Prairie "like a dog." Furthermore, it was alleged that Bishop Budka had stated in an Easter sermon that anyone supporting or sending children to the Institute could not be a Catholic and therefore would be denied the Sacraments of the Church. Budka was supposed to have even gone so far as to threaten the reburial of declared Institute sympathizers who were laid to rest in Greek Catholic cemeteries.³⁵

Swystun, who was present when the bishop delivered his sermon, was infuriated that Budka would use Easter mass to spread discontent among the worshippers. His bitter protestations outside the church resulted in the police being called; when they arrived, however, they found no evidence of disorder. The incident, nevertheless, was referred to extensively in the *Rusyn* on two occasions. In one article, "A Fresh Method of Subversion" (5 June 1918), it was pointed out that only sixteen of sixty students at the P. Mohyla Institute went to Easter confession that year and that the principal, Swystun, had been one of the abstainers. The Institute was denounced and its supporters were confronted with the following ultimatum:

Greek Catholics who are members of the Institute and who support publicly and financially the non-religious education of our young

34. See copy of proceedings in *Kanadyiskyi Rusyn* 31 July 1918.

35. *Kanadyiskyi Rusyn*, 28 August 1916.

generation will not be granted the dispensation of the church unless they publicly renounce their step and withdraw their money. From this there is no recourse. Be either with the devil, or with God. We always believe that it is better to build churches than prisons.

Swystun tried to counteract the campaign of the Church by organizing a series of meetings in various communities to defend the besieged Institute. One such gathering in Meacham, Saskatchewan, was reported in *Kanadiiskyi Farmer* (7 June 1918), where an appeal was made for similar meetings to be held throughout Canada to get popular approval for the following petition:

1. That Bishop Budka's attacks on the Institute be condemned;
2. That a threat be made to embrace Orthodoxy should the bishop not desist from driving away secular leaders from the Greek Catholic Church;
3. That the religious dimension of the Institute be acknowledged in light of the fact that religious instruction was allowed;
4. That priests co-operate with the intelligentsia;
5. That the following guarantees be included in a revision of the charter:
 - i) that bishops must always be of the Ukrainian nationality,
 - ii) that churches must remain the property of the congregations, with no bishops and priests serving in an advisory capacity,
 - iii) that French and Belgian priests must cease their missionary activity among Ukrainian Greek Catholics.

As events unfolded tempers flared and the two factions became increasingly estranged. Bishop Budka was quoted as saying — at a meeting held on a feast day (29 June 1918) in Yorkton, Saskatchewan — that "It is forbidden to bury the unconfessed in a consecrated cemetery because swine are not wanted there." The *Holos* went on the suggest (31 July 1918) that the bishop should advise the faithful to hang out two signs, namely, "Here is a cemetery for people, and here is a cemetery for swine, that is to say for non-practising Catholics."

Just how tense the atmosphere was becoming in Ukrainian communities torn by the conflict, can be gauged from the details of an explosive incident that occurred during a revival mission held on the occasion of an episcopal visitation to Hafford, Saskatchewan, early in July. Father Ludwig Boske, a Belgian priest of the Eastern Redemptorist rite, claimed in his sermon that those who sent their children to secular schools and supported or attended the *narishni domy* (community halls) promoted by the *Holos* were sinners and would be sentenced to eternal damnation. Declaring, "If someone buys or sells or contaminates the soul of a child in school — such a school may be a public school, a *bursa*, or an academy — he will go

to hell,"³⁶ The Belgian priest was challenged by the angry voice of Hryhory Worobec (a farmer visiting Hafford from another Saskatchewan village, Wakaw), who shouted, "That's a lie!" The outraged bishop took the matter to the local Justice of Peace, but Worobec retaliated by charging Budka and Boske with "treason against the state." It being wartime, the serious charge led to the immediate arrest of both ecclesiastics. At the trial, Worobec withdrew his charge of treason against the bishop, but insisted on proceeding against the priest. When the jury rejected his claims, Worobec was fined for causing a disturbance.³⁷ Although Catholic newspapers and the faithful rallied in defence of the bishop's honour, the whole affair was extremely humiliating for the hapless Greek Catholic prelate.

The *Rusyn* blamed the episode on what it described (17 July) as "the Saskatoon clique", that "brood of progressive and business-patriots" and "national parasites." It postulated that "when all these methods failed to frighten His Excellency, the Bishop, and he furthering his great cause kept going relentlessly ahead, then the gang of Saskatoon bandits [opryshky] seized on the last resort — to disgrace him publicly." Alleging that "For almost a year they have been organizing a gang to make a scandal", the *Rusyn* blamed not only Hryhory Worobec, but "the whole gang of the organized Saskatoon patriots." A week later, it published a copy of a letter written by Roman Kramar, editor of the Edmonton-based *Novyny* (*The News*), to Saskatchewan's attorney-general, in which Kramar accused those responsible for the arrest of Bishop Budka of being part of a pro-German conspiracy against Canada, declaring, "I do not hesitate to suggest to Your Department that if an investigation were made there would probably be uncovered a colossal conspiracy, which, I have no doubt, exists in this country in order to foment disorder among the so-called foreign element for obvious reasons." This was a very serious charge to make in the sensitive atmosphere of wartime Canada. What bearing it had on the attitude and policies of the Canadian government is open to debate; but a ban was imposed on all Ukrainian papers at the end of September, and when it was lifted in November one of the conditions stipulated that parallel columns with English translations had to be provided. The practice was continued until the end of March 1919.

From its side, the Mohyla Institute issued public statements denying any implication in the arrest of the bishop. Declarations affirming the innocence of the "Saskatoon clique" were made in the *Holos* by Sawchuk, Swystun and Julian W. Stechishin. In his "Open

36. Cited from the protocol of the court proceedings by Stechishin, 92.

37. See copy of the proceedings *Kanadyiskyi Rusyn*, 31 July 1918.

Letter to the Editor of the *Kanadiiskyi Rusyn'*. Swystun passionately denied the Church's charge of complicity: "In my own name and in the name of the Board of Directors of the Institute, I resolutely declare that not a single individual on the Board, nor I as a director of the Institute, in any way contributed to the arrest of the bishop." He then offered his interpretation of the affair:

In the very arrest of the bishop it was specifically the bishop who was to blame, as he first asked for the arrest of Worobec. The bishop absolutely does not reckon with the fact that people have certain dear feelings and convictions which cannot be flouted as the bishop and his priests are doing. The bishop thinks that a church exists so that in it he and his priests may speak inconceivable things, often wrapped in the greatest kind of lie against their opponents, who much stand in the church with closed mouths because the Church is the House of God and an ordinary mortal may not say anything there.

Let the bishop, however, with his priests be the first to show that the Church is the House of God; let him lecture Christian teachings in his church and not give sermons of hate and falsehood. Then he and his priests will convince the faithful to look upon the bishop and the church as the place of the word of God and not as a place for the bishop's politics and clerical agitations filled with contempt for everybody who does not want to accept such a system.

The whole Hafford affair proves the bishop's stupidity and arrogance. The bishop makes himself a national martyr because one of his priests corrosively and clumsily attacked the most important national institution and threatened with hell all those who support this institution.³⁸

Clearly, the conflict had developed to a point where no compromise was possible and none was offered. Bishop Budka was adamant in his stand against secular institutions, going so far as to withhold absolution for those who supported "Protestant" organizations. The violence of the rhetoric of both sides had polarized the issue and made the personal differences irreconcilable. The bishop regarded himself as a monarch and felt it was beneath his dignity to yield to an intelligentsia that consisted mainly of teachers and university students tainted with socialism, radical politics and "progressive" ideas. As the bishop's inherent hostility to any reform became increasingly apparent, those members of the intelligentsia who were Greek Catholic communicants realized their insistence of the secularization of education was fundamentally incompatible with the aims and character of the Church. Furthermore, most of the intellectuals never really felt a strong sense of attachment to the Church, and the bitter opposition that they encountered from the Greek Catholic

38. *Kanadiiskyi Rusyn'*, 28 August 1918.

establishment only served to alienate their affections even more. If the intelligentsia was truly interested in paying more than lip service to Christianity, it had to seek refuge in another denomination of the Christian church. By this time, they had already reached certain conclusions about a new church that would embody their ideals and aspirations and serve their needs.



Metropolitan Wasył Lyubkivsky



St. Sophia Cathedral in Ukraine



Metropolitan Germanos Shegedi



Archbishop Ivan Theodorovich



Archbishop Mstyslaw Skrypnyk



Metropolitan Ilarion Ohienko



Archpriest Semen W. Sawchuck



Archpriest Wasył Kudryk



Michael Stechishin



Julian W. Stechishin



Wasył Swystun



First Building of
St. Andrew's College in Winnipeg



St. Andrew's College on the Campus
of the University of Manitoba



Holy Trinity Cathedral, Saskatoon, Sask.



Holy Trinity Cathedral,
Winnipeg, Manitoba



St. Volodymyr Cathedral
Toronto, Ontario



St. John the Baptist Cathedral,
Edmonton, Alberta



St. Sophia Cathedral, Montréal, Québec.



The clergy who attended the Ninth Sobor of the UOOC in Saskatoon, 1946
Archbishop Ivan Theodorovich in center.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Founding of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada

As has already been shown, the idea of an independent church of the Byzantine rite that would embody the soul and look after the needs of the budding Ukrainian nation had existed among Galician and Bukovynian settlers since their arrival in Canada. The first effort that was made to realize this latent aspiration was the attempt to establish an independent Greek Catholic Church which recognized the principle of married clergy. This movement was decisively defeated with the coming of Bishop Budka (in 1912) and the voluntary incorporation of the last dissident stronghold — the Sts. Vladimir and Olga parish in Winnipeg — under the jurisdiction of the new prelate. The most popularly successful manifestation of this tendency was the short-lived Independent Greek Church piloted by the Reverend John Bodrug, but its ultimate fate was sealed the moment it began allowing encroachments on its autonomy and the Presbyterianization of its Orthodox character. Similarly, the Byzantine rite of the Russian Orthodox Church and its policy of recognizing the trustee ownership of property made it initially attractive, especially to Bukovynians; but the Russian-dominated institution soon lost its appeal when its Russophile orientation was expressed in anti-Ukrainian policies that alienated the increasingly nationalist Ukrainian intelligentsia.

In the light of these developments within the Ukrainian communities in Canada, and the growth and spread of a nationalist consciousness combined with democratic ideals — later to be reinforced by the establishment of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine — it is almost inevitable that an independent national Orthodox Church should arise among Ukrainians in Canada. We have already seen how the idea of a new church gradually took root in the struggle between the young intellectuals demanding reform and the intransigent Greek Catholic hierarchy represented by Bishop Budka. The creation of an identifiable Ukrainian state at the end of 1917 served to intensify the nationalism of the Ukrainians in

Canada and gave additional impetus to the movement for an independent national Church. It must be emphasized, however, that the autocephalous movement in Ukraine had no direct influence on the church movement in Canada, which was solely the product of local circumstances and forces.

The study of Ukrainian history, as presented and interpreted in the works of two Orthodox historians — Professor Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Mykola Arkas — induced many intellectuals to reassess their Greek Catholic upbringing and consider Orthodoxy as an alternative. Since the Greek Catholic Church was originally an Orthodox Church that had recognized the supremacy of the Pope in 1596 while retaining its unique rite and customs, it appeared logical to revert to Orthodoxy. While studying at the training schools (in Winnipeg, Brandon, Regina and Vegreville) the future teachers had learned Ukrainian history from Hrushevsky's and Arkas' books and often debated the pros and cons of the contentious church union of 1596. In these discussions the views opposing the union generally predominated.¹ For several months in 1913 and 1914 the *Holas* printed a series of articles describing Ukrainian church history under the heading, "The Course of Hundreds of Years" (*Protiakhom Sotok Lit*), in which Ukrainian Orthodoxy was presented in a favourable light and the negative aspects of the Greek Catholic Church in Ukraine were underlined.² It is also worth noting that the first teacher of Ukrainian history at the P. Mohyla Bursa in Saskatoon (1916) was Michael Stechishin, a graduate of the Ruthenian Training School at Brandon.

Although letters periodically appeared on the readers' page of the *Holas* advocating a return to Orthodoxy, it was the *Kanadiiskyi Farmer* — edited by a former teacher, O. H. Hykawy — that initiated the campaign promoting the formation of a "Ukrainian National Church." After publishing (in 12 October 1917) Michael Stechishin's landmark article criticizing the charters of the Greek Catholic Church, Hykawy's follow-up editorial (2 November) insisted that since Budka was only a titular bishop of a non-existing diocese, he possessed no real authority. Subsequently, from December 1917 to July 1918 (when the new church came into existence) a series of contributed articles signed "National Priest" (Narodnyi Svyashchenyk) presented a strategy for organizing a "Ukrainian National Church" that included proposals for its constitution and methods of operation.

The editor of the *Farmer* welcomed the possibility of forming a new church in a special editorial (21 December 1917) entitled, "The

1. Interview with Michael Stechishin, Wynard, Saskatchewan, 19 June 1953.

2. *Ukrainiskyi Holos*, 12 November 1913 to 14 January 1914.

Matter of Our Own National Church Organization." It was the opinion of the *Farmer* that the time was ripe for the creation of a church that would embody the popular will:

Some of our most distinguished individuals have been thinking about a Ukrainian National church in Canada for a number of years, but knowing that our people are not yet enlightened or cultured enough to accept this idea sympathetically, they have delayed presenting this matter to the people, awaiting the appropriate time. We, however, think that the appropriate time has arrived. The matter of a Ukrainian national church should be of general concern and not the matter of a few individuals...

If we truly want to preserve our national life in this Adopted Homeland we must fight on two fronts. We must defeat our enemies on both fronts: the foreigners' and our own. Our own, who work among us and for all outward appearances for us, are leading us along false paths to a goal that their bosses have designated for our destruction.

The "National Priest" argued in his article (21 December 1917) that the people should take matters into their own hands and become their own masters by following the example of the Ukrainian nation and its newly constituted state. The time had come to establish a Ukrainian National Church based on democratic principles. The bishop and clergy should be elected by the people and approved by a synod consisting of an equal number of priests and laymen.

In the discussion that ensued in the letters-to-the-editor section of the *Farmer*, the number of approving opinions steadily increased. The "National Priest" answered some of the questions and practical problems posed by the readers. In reply to a query as to how such a church could be established, he answered (8 February 1918), "When there would be a sufficient number of members who could maintain a bishop and priests (or rather preachers of the word of God), then there would be held a convention, which would decide the matter of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Church of Canada." The problem of securing priests to serve in the proposed church was rather neatly resolved with the assertion (1 March 1918) that, "There are already now and will be in the future priests who would join the Ukrainian National Church. They are among Budka's priests and among the Orthodox clergy." The "National Priest" took the opportunity to add that "The priests of the future church would be only Ukrainian nationalists. Their work would be not only in church but also beyond the church. They would have to be married and not celibate."

In the next issue of the *Farmer* Wasyl Swystun and Michael Stechishin suggested that a national church convention be called on the initiative of at least three church congregations to discuss the

bishop's charter. To help clarify matters and lay the groundwork for discussion, the "National Priest" followed (12 April) with proposals for the constitution, urging interested communities, in his introduction to hold preparatory meetings and make a list of potential members. Parishes that were sympathetic to the idea of launching a new church were to send delegates to a convention that would be held in July of that year in Saskatoon because of its central location. He hoped the convention would adopt the proposed constitution and found the new church.

The draft version of the constitution of the Ukrainian National Church (UNC) merits examination because most of it was adopted by the new church when it was formally constituted in July. Of the fifty-nine articles in the original, the following characterized the church:

THE CHURCH

2. The supreme organ of the UNC will be the Synod consisting of 12 persons: six priests and 6 laymen.
3. Churches, separate schools (parochial) and cemeteries must be assigned to the ownership of the UNC.
6. The owners of the UN Church and its property are the people.
7. All contracts of church property must be in the hands of the local trustees.
8. A church under the charter of the UNC in Canada may not accept priests of other denominations.
11. The bishop and his successors must be chosen by the people themselves.
12. The bishop and his successors must be sincere Ukrainians.
13. The bishop and his successors must either be married according to the Holy Scriptures (Tim. 3: 1-7.), widowers or single but in mature years.
17. The bishop may not accept any priests other than Ukrainians.
18. The bishop has the full authority to consummate the sacrament of priesthood with the assistance of 2 priests and 2 lay members of the Synod.

PRIESTS

23. Priests must be married, or single, mature men.
24. Priests must serve not only in church but also give leadership in various educational societies (only those that benefit the people).

MEMBERS

33. A majority of members decide any matter. Members have the right to request another priest if the present one does not satisfy the needs according to the wishes of the people (parish).

RITE

45. The Ukrainian National Church must adhere to the Eastern rite and this may never change.
46. Everything Roman in our rite must be removed (see Reforms).
47. Churches must be built in the ancient style of our churches on the exterior and in the interior.
48. Priests may wear beards or be shaven.

REFORMS

51. a) Rosaries, b) pictures with the heart over the chest, c) pictures with crowns: Jesus, Mary, and others, d) tin figures representing Christ on the cross, and e) plaster-cast figures must be removed from the churches, as these contradict the Holy Scriptures.
52. There must only be pictures painted on paper, cloth, boards or the cross.
45. General confession, twice a year, is to be read by the priest. Note: however, if anyone, such as a sick person, at any time requests confession, then the confession may be held according to the old system, auricularly.

The publication of these articles delineating the nature of the proposed church brought in several letters of approval; some however, questioned the very existence of the "National Priest." In reply, the following biographical details were provided by the editors: formerly a Protestant preacher, the "National Priest" had been ordained in 1916 by a Latin bishop of the National Apostolic Church to serve among Ukrainians.³ A second clergyman, identifying himself as "A Ukrainian Orthodox Priest" subsequently made the following declaration in support of the new church being advanced by the reform-minded group:

I am for a national church, but not for a national faith, as there is no such faith and cannot be. Christ established one faith for all nations.

In regard to the Ukrainian National Church, I agree that church property should belong to the people, for the church will be the same as the people... Our Greek Orthodox faith is the best, for such was accepted by our forefathers from the Greeks. It was for this faith that our glorious Cossacks fought....⁴

Significantly, it was later revealed that these two nationally-conscious priests (along with another, Father Dmytro Drapaka) had been ordained by one Bishop Paul Markiewicz to the National Apostolic Catholic Church, an independent Polish Catholic sect formed in Winnipeg in 1913 around the fact that it had repudiated the

3. *Kanadyjskyi Farmer*, 3 May 1918.

4. *Ibid.*, 31 May 1918.

supremacy of the Pope.⁵ Combined, the three Ukrainian clergymen served a total of nine formerly Greek Catholic parishes; if they could add at least eleven more to this number, Bishop Markiewicz promised to try to obtain an Orthodox bishop for them.⁶ Father John Kusy — the mysterious "National Priest" — served four congregations in Manitoba: East Selkirk, St. Norbert, Portage la Prairie and Poplar Park, all in the vicinity of Winnipeg. Father John Kokolsky — "A Ukrainian Orthodox Priest" — had two Saskatchewan congregations to look after — one at Mikado and the other at Calder, near Yorkton. And Father Drapaka had three parishes to administer in the Whitkow district, not far from North Battleford, Saskatchewan. Whether or not Bishop Markiewicz sincerely hoped to obtain a separate bishop or simply intended to be consecrated at a later date as an Orthodox prelate will never be known, for his plans regarding Ukrainians never had the chance to mature. The three Ukrainian priests under him essentially worked independently after their ordination, proceeding to play a major role in the founding of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada.

Confronted on one side with the hostile attitude of Bishop Budka and the non-Ukrainian priests in the Greek Catholic Church, and prodded on the other by the challenge posed by the "National Priest", Principal Wasyl Swystun of the P. Mohyla Ukrainian Institute called a confidential meeting of leading Ukrainians. About 320 printed invitations were sent out, including one to Bishop Budka.⁷

The invitation, dated 26 June 1918, explained that the meeting was necessary for the purpose of "discussing church and national affairs." It argued that, although the Greek Catholic Church had a Ukrainian bishop, it had departed from its traditions and operated "according to the wishes and under the rigid control of the French Roman Catholic Church, in contradiction to our [i.e., Ukrainian] national interests." It also claimed that Bishop Budka wanted to secure "clerical control over the national institutions and all of the national work", noting that he was not above resorting to the "medieval methods" of interdicting his opponents and "threatening the leaders of the national institutions, and all the people organized in those institutions, with anathema." Furthermore, it pressed forward the need to satisfactorily resolve some of the chronic problems hampering the church, urging an end to celibacy restrictions, the

5. Bishop Markiewicz (d. 1949) had been consecrated by Bishop Francis Hodur, the head of the Polish National Catholic Church of America (anti-papal) that was associated with the Old Catholic Church in Holland. Bishop Markiewicz broke away from the jurisdiction of Bishop Hodur in 1913.

6. Rev. Panteleimon Bozyk, *Tserkov Ukraintsiv v Kanadi*, 95-7.

7. Michael Stechishin, correspondence.

liberation of the church from the divisive influence of French and Belgian priests, safeguards protecting community ownership of church property and guarantees that the Ukrainian character of the bishops and priests would be maintained.⁸

This invitation was endorsed by a "National Committee" consisting of thirty prominent community leaders from the three Prairie provinces. As this historic group subsequently became the nucleus of the new church — the names of its members were recorded on the leaflet — it is worth noting its composition:

From Manitoba: W. Kudryk, editor; O. H. Hykawy, editor; J. W. Arsenych, lawyer; T. D. Ferley, MLA; D. Yakimischak, law-student; John Petrushevich, secretary-treasurer (municipal); W. Mihaychuk, reeve; Paul Hykawy, farmer; W. Romanchych, farmer.

From Saskatchewan: F. Hawryliuk, E.A., teacher; Joseph Bohonos, teacher; Stephen Sawchuk, secretary treasurer; A. Worobec, store-keeper; Michael Stechishin, law-student; A. Bodnarchuk, farmer; Wasyl Mychayliuk, farmer; P. Shwydsky, farmer; B. M. Sawiak, secretary-treasurer; D. J. Stratyshuk, banker; T. Stadnyk, farmer; A. Markowsky, farmer; P. Mamchur, farmer; Michael Chorneyko, teacher; John Kulczycki, buyer.

From Alberta: Tymko Goshko, farmer; J. J. Ruryk, teacher; A. T. Kibzey, medical-student; S. B. Mykytiuk, teacher; Peter Svarich, farmer; M. Sutkowsky, farmer.

Conspicuous by their absence from the committee were Wasyl Swystun, who did not want to openly involve the already beleaguered Mohyla Institute, and Fathers Kusy and Kokolsky, who supported the initiative but preferred to remain in the background because of their affiliation with another church.

The closed meeting was held in the recently completed Ukrainian community hall in Saskatoon on 18-19 July 1918, and was attended by 154 people.⁹ A detailed report of the proceedings was later published in the *Holos* and the *Farmer*, whose editors had participated.¹⁰ Three speakers addressed the exclusive gathering, which opened with a declaration by Wasyl Swystun that publicly renounced Mohyla Institute involvement in convening the meeting. Michael Stechishin launched the discussions with his analysis of the episcopal charter, pointing out its inadequacies before advising that it be invalidated and that a new one, conforming with democratic principles, be drawn up to take its place. Wasyl Swystun then outlined the shortcomings of the Greek Catholic Church in Canada and presented a

8. The author has a photostat copy of the invitations, supplied by Michael Stechishin.

9. Michael Stechishin, correspondence.

10. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 7 August 1918, and *Kanadyiskyi Farmer*, 9 August 1918.

critical account of the controversial Union of Brest in 1596. He argued that by means of it Rome had hoped to gain control over the Eastern Church, but when plans for a swift takeover were thwarted by stubborn resistance, a less antagonistic policy of Latinizing the Greek Catholic Church was pursued, instead. Bishop Budka was merely a "blind tool" of this policy. Swystun encouraged intellectuals "to take church affairs into their own hands" and either find a compromise with Bishop Budka or choose an independent course of action. Finally, Jaroslaw W. Arsenych denounced Latinizing encroachments on the Greek Catholic Church, claiming that the hierarchical church structure contradicted both the democratic system of government in Canada and the democratic spirit of the Ukrainian people. He concluded with a proposal calling for the establishment of a new Ukrainian church that would follow the Eastern rite and be democratically structured. The majority of the participants favoured Arsenych's recommendation.

A decisive first step was taken when the assembly decided to bring into existence a Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood, reminiscent of the brotherhoods that supported and defended the Orthodox Church in Ukraine during the Renaissance. Its function was "to conduct all the church activities until the time when there will be a legally elected and consecrated bishop, in conformity with the Eastern Orthodox Church."¹¹ All those in attendance could join the newly-constituted brotherhood by paying a membership fee of five dollars. The following were then elected to the presidium: Wasyl Hawrysh, Michael Stechishin and Peter Shwydky for Saskatchewan; Tymko Goshko, Peter Svarich and Andrew Shandro for Alberta; and Alexander Sylych, J. W. Arsenych and W. Mihaychuk for Manitoba.

Introduced by an eleven point condemnation of Bishop Budka and specific tendencies in the Greek Catholic Church, the first resolution adopted by the meeting breathed life into a Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada. It was to be guided by the following principles:

1. This church is in communion with other Eastern Orthodox churches and accepts the same dogmas and the same rite.
2. Priests must be married.
3. The property of the congregations must be in the ownership of the congregations and the church congregations must manage it.
4. All bishops must be elected by a general sobor of clergy and delegates of church congregations and brotherhoods.
5. Church congregations have the right to accept and discharge priests.

11. *Ibid.*

Another resolution approved the establishment of a theological seminary to be opened in Saskatoon by October of that year. Over two thousand dollars was collected in donations for that purpose at the meeting.

The published account of the landmark proceedings was followed by "An Appeal to the Ukrainian People in Canada." In it, the brotherhood recapitulated its familiar list of grievances against the bishop and summarized once again the defects of "our church." The causes that were responsible for the "very ungratifying situation" and the measures proposed to deal with it were outlined as follows:

Knowing from history, that many of the present shortcomings in our church are the consequences of the church union with Rome — which was forced on our people by several of our bishops, who by means of the union wished to make themselves autocratic ecclesiastical masters and thus gain aristocratic privileges from the Poles; the union, which was fabricated by the Poles and calculated to become a bridge for the Latinization and Polonization of our people; the union, which all the while, particularly here in America and Canada, trampled over the rights of our church and was destroying our rite; the union, which allowed foreigners in the management of our church; the union which made our bishop a blind tool in the hand of foreign people — You, the people, must make an effort to stop the existence of this union which is destroying our church.

In that direction You have already made a magnificent beginning through Your individuals attending the confidential meeting in Saskatoon on July 18 and 19, where the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church was established, the Church of our grandfathers and forefathers, the Church of nine-tenths of the Ukrainian Nation.

You, the People, must support these first steps of Your most enlightened sons and advance the cause of an independent church organization.

It is time already and urgent to obtain a genuine Ukrainian make our church a great institution, which must look after the religious, moral and educational elevation of the people.

IT IS TIME ALREADY AND URGENT TO FREE OURSELVES FROM THE UNINVITED FOREIGN GUARDIANS.

IT IS TIME ALREADY AND URGENT TO REMOVE FROM OUR CHURCH CELIBACY, WHICH IS DEMORALIZING OUR CLERGY AND PEOPLE.

IT IS TIME ALREADY AND URGENT TO SEND THE FRENCH-BELGIAN MISSIONARIES TO PREACH THE ROMAN FAITH AMONG THEIR OWN PEOPLE OR AMONG THE HEATHEN, BUT NOT AMONG US.

It is time already and urgent to obtain a genuine ukrainian BISHOP, WHO WOULD NOT BE A HIRELING OF THE FRENCH AND ROME, BUT A SERVANT OF HIS OWN CHURCH AND PEOPLE.

That is why it is the sacred duty of every Ukrainian to work sincerely for the organization of an independent Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church.

That is why it is the sacred duty of every Ukrainian to become a member of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood, which took upon itself the matter of organizing the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church....

When this will be achieved, then, with the help of God and through the work of all of us, the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church will become a true democratic institution which will be working for the glory of God and the welfare of the people.¹²

In a second appeal, issued a week later, the brotherhood declared its intentions to open a Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Theological Seminary in Saskatoon in two months time.¹³ Calling for the support of the people, patrons of the new church pleaded that "When we are returning to Orthodoxy we are safeguarding married priests who will truly be able to fulfill their duties with respect to their people.... Make this seminary, alongside the *bursa* and institutes, carry on the great educational-cultural work among our people in Canada." An announcement that twenty-five to thirty candidates with at least junior matriculation would be accepted for training in the priesthood indicated that the foundations of the church were being laid.

As could be expected, Greek Catholic circles reacted to this turn of events with undisguised contempt and unmitigated animosity. Prior to the confidential meeting in Saskatoon, the editor of the *Rusyn*, in a column entitled "Sparks" (10 July), jeered at the dissident faction: "Messrs. Swystun and Stechishin! Why are you sitting? You began the affair of a national church, now lead on!" When news of the formation of the new church appeared in the Canadian press,¹⁴ the Greek Catholic organ carried a full-page article headlined "A Godless Church for Ukrainians" (24 July). It concluded with the following diatribe:

For whoever, at this grave time, begins church subservion and church confusion among the people, which could lead to a great and serious fratricidal feud, far from the native land; whoever at this extremely important and historical time for Ukrainians, when the greatest harmony, unity and single-minded work is necessary to help the resurrecting country of Ukraine to become free and independent; whoever at this time throws among the Ukrainian people bones of contention; whoever at present starts confusion, particularly in the realm of church affairs (which always and everywhere was the most terrible

12. *Ibid.*

13. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 14 August 1918, and *Kanadyskyi Farmer*, 16 August 1918.

14. *Winnipeg Free Press*, 17, 18 and 20 July 1918; *Winnipeg Tribune*, 19 July 1918.

fratricidal confusion); such a person is a betrayer not only of our Faith and Church, but a betrayer of all the Ukrainian people! Such a person is an enemy of the resurrecting fatherland, Ukraine, which needs our assistance!

Henceforth, every issue of the *Rusyn*, until the government ban on Ukrainian papers, contained editorials, articles and letters from the readers that constantly attacked the leaders of the new church. A quick glance at the titles of some of the articles is all that is needed to get an indication of their tone and content: "The Ukrainian National Church Supported by English Protestant Finances" (31 July); "The Black Hand of the Saskatoon Clique" and "Warning" (7 August); "The Ukrainian Church or Foreign Protestantism" (14 August); "The Ukrainian Church or Foreign Protestantism" (14 August); "Business and Blasphemy" (28 August); "The Saskatoon God-Fighters", "Several Words in Reply to the Falsifiers of History" and "A Church in an Elevator or an Elevator in a Church" (4 September); "More Light on a Black Affair" (11 September) and finally in the last issue before the ban "An Unprecedented Recognition for an Elevator Church" (18 September).

The "Warning" perhaps best illustrates how the offended Catholic hierarchy damned its new rival with insinuations that it was a facade for Protestantism: "The word Presbyterian frightens our people. That is why the Presbyterian mission is trying its luck with Petrushevichs and Swystuns and masks its Presbyterianism with the name National Church.... But a church is not an elevator, nor an academy, nor a Community Hall.... The business men who gathered in Saskatoon have pushed too far.... There can be no doubt that the whole affair will end in a humiliating defeat and the bad careers of the Saskatoon gentlemen will be consummated in disgrace." The reference to elevators alluded to the fact that a co-operative enterprise, the Ruthenian Farmers' Elevator Company, had been launched in 1917 by Swystun, Ferley, Arsenych, and others who actively supported the new church.

The leaders of the breakaway group did not let the accusations go unanswered; and often their rebuttals were made in the same bitter tone that characterized the attacks of their adversaries. The following reply, "The Ravings of the *Kanadiyski Rusyn*," in the *Farmer* (23 August) was signed by Michael Stechishin in his capacity as the secretary of the brotherhood:

....the bishop and the *KR*[*Kanadiyski Rusyn*-Canadian Ruthenian] release among the people the shameful lie that the convention was to organize a National Church subsidized by Protestant finances. In the article by some kind of a Yakhymovych it was written that "there were sent invitations and free railroad tickets." Such a brazen, shameful lie

could not have been invented by anyone except the devil, or the bishop together with the *KR*....

But this does not still conclude all the baseness of the *KR* and its patron. From their circle originated the news item in the English press about the organization of the nationalist church; the church which is to serve separatist purposes: the church which is to create an insurmountable wall between Ukrainians and other peoples in Canada; the church which is to make the Ukrainians disloyal to Canada, as "loyalty" is understood by the English.

So they frighten our people with Protestantism and the English with separatism.... This was to be the two-edged sword that would destroy the new democratic movement in the church domain.... All the while they speak about the National Church subsidized by Protestant money, without mentioning a word that it is not the National Church but the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church that was founded at the convention.

Stechishin climaxed his defence with a demand that the *Rusyn* supply the evidence to back its allegations.

The most immediate obstacle facing the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church was the need to win recognition of an existing Orthodox Church. Such recognition would allow the new church to claim apostolic succession, this being necessary to establish the authority of its priests and effectively put a damper on some of the criticism emanating from loyalist circles. Shortly after its creation the brotherhood had telegraphed Archbishop Alexander Nemilovsky of the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States, requesting that he take the neophyte denomination temporarily under his patronage and permit Ukrainian priests in his service to minister to the congregations of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church.¹⁵ Some time passed before his cabled reply (in Russian) brought encouraging news to the founders of the new church: "I accept the new Orthodox infants under my omophorium, Archbishop Alexander."¹⁶ But follow-up letters that attempted to establish a more formal administrative relationship brought no reply, leaving the brotherhood bewildered as to what to do next. From a priest of the Russian Orthodox Church sympathetic to them because of the original telegram, the brotherhood learned that the archbishop could not act very decisively because other bishops and most of the priests in the Russian Orthodox Church were anti-Ukrainian. The priest advised that a delegation be sent to meet the archbishop, who was expected to visit Winnipeg in December. A delegation consisting of Wasyl Swystun, Michael

15. Wasyl Swystun, *Kryzys v Ukrainskii Pravoslavnyi (avtorokafalni) Tserkvi*, 81.

16. Michael Stechishin, correspondence.

Stechishin and Peter Shwydsky travelled from Saskatoon to Winnipeg only to find that Archbishop Alexander had failed to arrive.¹⁷

The brotherhood tried to cover up the embarrassing incident by announcing that Archbishop Alexander would give an address at the first sobor of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Saskatoon on 28 December 1918.¹⁸ A large attendance was assured as the sobor was scheduled to take place immediately after the Third Ukrainian National Convention — a two-day affair that drew over 500 participants.¹⁹ Four priests of the Russian Orthodox Church were attracted to this sobor by the announcement of their archbishop's attendance. Swystun, using the alibi that the prelate was unable to come because of illness, skilfully took advantage of the presence of the Russian priests by having them swear allegiance to the new church.²⁰ Fathers Iwakhniuk, Showhaniuk, Kolodniuk and Kizun publicly repeated the following oath: "I, and each of us separately, swear before God that I shall be faithful to the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada and vow to serve her faithfully and sincerely hereafter. So Help Me God."²¹ The priests were assigned parishes in St. Julien, Sheho and Goodeve, in Saskatchewan, but broke with the new church upon realizing that they had been duped. The brotherhood then found itself in a desperate situation, without priests and without official Orthodox sanction.

Fortunately, there was a timely change in the hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States. Metropolitan Platon Rozhdestvenskii of Odessa, Metropolitan of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine (not to be confused with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church), which recognized the authority of the Russian Church's newly elected Patriarch Tikhon — had left Ukraine because of the unsettled political climate there and because of the hostile attitude that nationally-conscious Ukrainians took toward his Church. Arriving in New York in June 1919, he decided to try to win the support of Ukrainians in the New World. With Archbishop Alexander's assistance, Platon contacted the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood in Canada and invited them to send a representative to discuss matters of mutual concern. His telegram brought Wasyl Swystun to the United States to confer with the metropolitan and the archbishop.

17. *Ibid.*

18. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 18 December 1918, and *Kanadyiskyi Farmer*, 20 December 1918.

19. Julian W. Stencusans, *Istoriia Ukrainskoho Instytutu im. Petra Mohyly v Saskatuni*, 98.

20. Michael Stechishin, correspondence.

21. *Ibid.*; for a report see *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 19 February 1919.

The successful negotiations led to a joint agreement on 16-17 July 1919. This document granted recognition to the new church. Of the nineteen clauses the following nine are of particular interest:

1. His Excellency Metropolitan Platon, in his capacity as President of the Holy Sobor of Bishops of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autonomous Church,* and his Excellency Archbishop Alexander, as the Governing Bishop of the Greek Orthodox Church in America, give recognition to the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada, which is being organized by the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood in Canada, as the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church with the right to separate Dominion and Provincial Corporations of this Church in Canada.
2. The basis of the organization of this Church is the following: the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada has the right to have a separate bishop of the Ukrainian nationality, resident in Canada.
3. The bishop to this church must possess all rights concomitant with his title of episcopal authority in his diocese, i.e., he must have full episcopal jurisdiction within the boundaries of his diocese.
4. The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada is a section of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine and recognizes the same dogmas and the same rites as in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine.
5. The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada is in communion with other Orthodox churches in America through the Supreme Administration that includes them as an equivalent church unit.
7. Only persons of the Ukrainian nationality may be priests of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada.
8. The bishop of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada is elected by a Sobor consisting of the priests of this Church, delegates of parishes and representatives of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood in Canada; and this newly elected Bishop becomes a rightful bishop after confirmation by the Supreme Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine and the Patriarch under whose jurisdiction the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church falls.
14. The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood in Canada continues to remain the chief organizational body of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada, which conducts its work in understanding with His Excellency the Archbishop; and after the eventual organization of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church the Brotherhood continues its activities and conducts work

* Apparently Metropolitan Platon misrepresented his position in the Holy Sobor, of which he was a member and not president. The sobor in Ukraine at the time was headed by Metropolitan Antonii Khrapovitskii of Kiev. "Autonomous" was not in the name of the Church in Ukraine. See *supra*.

similar to the activities of the Ukrainian Orthodox Brotherhoods in Ukraine during the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries.

15. Their Excellencies Metropolitan Platon and Archbishop Alexander will take immediate steps in the matter of the establishment of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Seminary in Canada.²²

The accord was signed by Wasył Swystun on behalf of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood. The bishops gave their written approval in a separate letter, dated 4 July (O.S.) and signed by Archbishop Alexander. The complete text read as follows:

His Excellency Metropolitan Platon read the main clauses of the Regulations of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada, as drafted by Mr. Wasył Swystun, and gives general consent to them; the details will be worked out at the future sobor in which His Excellency Metropolitan Platon has agreed to participate.²³

The signing of this agreement was a signal victory for the struggling brotherhood, since it gave the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada the recognition of the head bishops of both the Russian Orthodox Church in America and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine. As these churches were under the jurisdiction of the Russian Patriarch, Tikhon, the Canadian denomination automatically became heir to "apostolic succession." By the terms of the agreement the Canadian Church became a section of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine and as such was bound to accept its dogmas and rite and to submit elected bishops to the mother church for confirmation. It should be noted that the Canadian Church and its bishops were granted full autonomy. They could conduct its business according to the decisions of a democratic sobor and a consistory made up of an equal number of lay people and clergymen, who participated on equal terms. In this respect the Canadian Church departed from the contemporary practice of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine and revived the conciliar principles that guided the Ukrainian Church during the Cossack era, before it fell under the jurisdiction of the Russian Patriarch in 1686. Thus the accord satisfied not only the form of religion desired by the founders of the new church, but also their nationalist and democratic sentiments.

The joy which the agreement brought to pro-Orthodox circles in Canada proved, however, to be short-lived. In the opinion of one Russian Orthodox clergyman, who was well-informed about the details of the negotiations, it had been part of the understanding reached by the three parties that Swystun was to keep the arrange-

22. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 5 November 1919, and *Kanadyiskyi Farmer*, 7 November 1919.

23. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, April 1925; *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 31 July 1919.

ment in confidence until the sobor that autumn. Also the brotherhood was to recruit members for its church among Greek Catholics who might convert.²⁴ Swystun, however, announced Metropolitan Platon's sanction of the brotherhood in the *Holos* (30 July 1919) shortly after his return to Saskatoon. At the same time he made the claim that Metropolitan Platon — in his capacity as the spiritual leader of the Orthodox faithful in North America — would personally attend the church sobor to be convened by the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood in Winnipeg that fall.

Swystun's statement triggered an outburst of criticism in the Russian newspapers in the United States and Canada. The stand of the *Sviet* [Light], *Pravda* [Truth], *Novaya Rus'* [New Russia], *Liubov* (Love) and *Golos Naroda* [The People's Voice] was that Metropolitan Platon's sanction of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood essentially recognized Ukrainians as a separate nationality and that this was contrary to the interests of the Russian nation and the Russian Church. This, they argued, would eventually lead to the disintegration of both the Russian nation and its Orthodox Church.²⁵ *Russkii Narod* (*The Russian People*), the official organ of the Russian Orthodox Church in Canada — edited by Archimandrite Adam Filipovsky, an extreme Galician Russophile — also voiced its disapproval of Metropolitan Platon's manoeuvre and used the occasion to reiterate its anti-Ukrainian policy.²⁶ As a result both Metropolitan Platon and Archbishop Alexander were bombarded with protests from within the Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical community.

The torrent of criticism eventually forced Archbishop Alexander Nemylovsky to issue a special pastoral letter to the faithful, dated 10 September 1919 (O.S.).²⁷ The prelate, who was of Ukrainian origin and had strong sympathies towards his fellow Ukrainians, reluctantly signed the letter prepared by the consistory.²⁸ It reflected the reactionary Russian tsarist attitude toward Ukrainians despite the fact that in 1905 the St. Petersburg Imperial Academy of Sciences had issued a decree recognizing the distinctiveness of the Ukrainian language.²⁹ Moreover, the letter completely disregarded the creation of a Ukrainian state two years earlier, in 1917: particularly telling as Metropolitan Platon had only recently fled the new state of affairs in Ukraine. The introduction of the letter indicates the position of the Ukrainian Church, i.e.,

24. БУЗЬК, *Ivorkiv Ukrainiv*, 176.

25. *Ibid.*, 177.

26. *Ibid.*

27. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, May 1925, and *Kanadyivskyi Ukrainets*, 25 October 1919.

28. БУЗЬК, *Ivorkiv Ukrainiv*, 178.

29. J. S. ROUNCE, ed., *Slavonic Encyclopedia* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1949), 623.

With the blessing of the All-Russian Sobor and the holiest patriarch, Tikhon, there is in Little Russia [sic] an autonomous Ukrainian Orthodox Church; the elected president of its Holy Synod is His Supreme Excellency, our Metropolitan Platon....

....there is nothing frightening in the establishment of an autonomous Ukrainian Orthodox Church and once that autonomy is recognized, approved and legalized by the All-Russian Sobor and the Holiest Patriarch, we, the faithful children of the Russian Orthodox Church, are duty-bound to abide by the decisions of the Highest Church Authority. Here, there can be no place for any kind of controversy or any kind of polemics.

This was followed by the absurd statement, in the tradition of the notorious Russian Minister of the Interior, Valuyev (1863), that "it is understood that each of us as faithful sons of Holy Rus[sia] has thought, does think and cannot think otherwise than that the Ukrainians are not a separate people nor a nation but only one of the Russian political parties."³⁰

Finally, the archbishop censured the brotherhood for "commencing the organization of Ukrainian parishes, not among the Uniates but among our Orthodox." The Ukrainians were accused of trying to destroy the Russian Orthodox Church by ousting Orthodox priests who recognized the jurisdiction of the Russian mission and replacing them with their own sympathizers. In effect the pastoral letter appeared to rescind the mutual agreement signed on 16 July.

The public declaration of Archbishop Alexander was understood to be a severe setback to the movement for a Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada. No one seemed to notice that the pastoral letter virtually confirmed the autonomous character of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine and did not formally invalidate the initial agreement negotiated with Swystun. The Canadian Church was in theory a section of the canonical Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine. This technicality, the conferring of apostolic succession, was completely overlooked because feelings of insult and outrage blinded the leaders of the brotherhood to the options that were open to them. Considering that nationalist sentiments were at a feverish pitch at the time, being fed by developments in Ukraine, their over-reaction to the Russian dismissal of Ukrainian nationalism seems quite natural.

The leaders of the new church did not even bother to send an official reply to Archbishop Alexander.³¹ Their national pride had been stung to the core and they preferred simply to dissociate them-

30. See Note 27 *supra*.

31. SWYSTUN, *Kryza i Tserkvi*, 89-90.

selves from the Russian Orthodox Church, especially as the Greek Catholic press was making the most of the fiasco to press home its claim that the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada was a Russian device to keep Ukrainians subjected to the Muscovite yoke.³² Denounced as traitors, the embarrassed brotherhood leadership decided to let the matter drop, especially as another alternative had already presented itself to them at the time.

32. See *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets*, 22 October 1919. *Kanadyiskyi Rusyn* became *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets* in April 1919.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Formation of the Hierarchy and the First Parishes

Forging a new church out of the diverse elements — the discontented faction of the Greek Catholic Church, the Ukrainian congregations under Russian Orthodox and Polish Apostolic Catholic jurisdiction, as well as numerous independent undeclared parishes — was not an easy task. It required the utmost in diplomatic acumen and organizational skill. But the youthful leaders of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood had already acquired a great deal of experience as community activists. Not only had they established *bursy* in three western centres, they had organized the "Ukrainian National Convention" (which was well attended and drew the support of the intelligentsia), were active in the operation of a successful newspaper, ran an expanding enterprise, the Ruthenian Farmers' Elevator Company, and launched several co-operative stores. They even found time to direct the political campaigns of various Ukrainian candidates bidding for Canadian office.

The conspicuous activities of these energetic and talented community organizers led many of their opponents to denounce them bitterly. In the eyes of their fellow workers and supporters, however, they were committed men with lofty ambitions and noble characters. One leading clergyman who knew them well described them in glowing terms:

....there was no one among them who could be regarded as an authority in church and dogmatical-canonical affairs. Despite this shortcoming, all of them were people of faith and religion — and in addition enlightened Ukrainians who well understood the value and importance of the Church for both individuals and for the entire nation. Although they did not measure up with regard to theological knowledge, no one could doubt their faith and holy fervour. They all had a vision of the kind of Church that should and could exist, for they had been convinced of the need in their own lives.¹

1. Semen V. Sawchuk, *Osnovni Zaslady Ukrainiskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi*, 3.

The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood announced that a church sobor would be held in Winnipeg on 27 August 1919.² It was widely publicized that Metropolitan Platon and Archbishop Alexander would participate in the historic assembly of the new church. Lack of foresight, however, forced the delay of this sobor, as its timing coincided with the harvest.³ An appeal for candidates to attend the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Clerical Seminary followed. It had failed to materialize the previous year, but was definitely slated for Saskatoon in the fall.⁴ Reverend Dr. Lazar German⁵ of New York, assisted by two Ukrainian Orthodox priests from the United States, would be its rector. Three other American priests would follow. An appeal was also made for donations to the Religious Fund, which would be used to establish a semi-monthly paper, the *Narodnyi Vistnyk* (National Herald).

Father German — a Romanian from Bukovyna who spoke some Ukrainian — had come to the United States in 1916 to join the consistory of the Russian Orthodox Church under Archbishop Evdokhim Meshchersky. The Russian archbishop had plans to establish a separate patriarchate for America, but they fell through when the Holy Synod at Petrograd failed to provide the necessary funds.⁶ Frustrated, Father German came to Canada, where he tried to unite and bring the Romanian parishes under the jurisdiction of the Romanian patriarchate in Bucharest. In this he was not very successful. For a brief period he recognized the jurisdiction of Bishop Stephen Dzubay, originally consecrated by the Russian Orthodox Church to serve and recruit Carpatho-Ruthenian Uniate converts in America, but who after being slighted, attempted to organize a rival Orthodox Church.⁷ At the time of his appointment to the rectorship of the Saskatoon seminary, Father German had ties with Metropolitan Germanos Shegedi, a Syrian Orthodox prelate formerly under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch. A clash between Shehegi and the Russian Orthodox hierarchy in the United States had prompted the metropolitan to form an independent Orthodox diocese, resulting in his suspension by the Russian mission in New York.⁸ Clearly a priest with limited alternatives, the educated Father Germanos must have seen the potential in the young Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brother-

2. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 13 August 1919.

3. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 20 August 1919.

4. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 17 September 1919.

5. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 24 September 1919, and *Kanadyskyi Farmer*, 26 September 1919.

6. Rev. Panteleimon Boryk, *Tsvetkov Ukrainiv v Kanadi*, 182-3.

7. *Ibid.*, 144-7.

8. *Ibid.*, 134-6.

hood, which he now joined in the hope that at least some of his career aspirations might be realized.

Despite the fact that Archbishop Alexander had published his pastoral letter on September 10 (O.S.), making public the Russian hierarchy's opinion that Ukrainians were not a nation but simply a Russian political party, the executive announced that the second church sobor — to be held consecutively in Winnipeg, Saskatoon and Edmonton — would meet under the patronage of Metropolitan Platon, Archbishop Alexander and Bishop Stephen (Dzubay).⁹ To ensure a large attendance, the sobor's sessions were to follow the fourth national convention, organized by the P. Mohyla Ukrainian Institute, the Ukrainian Canadian Citizens' Committee, the Ukrainian Narodnyi Dim in Winnipeg and the recently established M. Hrushevsky Ukrainian Institute in Edmonton (modelled after the one in Saskatoon). Archbishop Alexander's visit to Winnipeg on 19 October complicated matters for the organizers. When he denied any connection with the sobor, denounced its sponsors and reaffirmed his Russian loyalty, they had to withdraw their claims that the gathering would meet with the blessings of the Russian bishop.¹⁰ Instead, the programme was revised to include a very obscure reference to "The address by His Excellency, the Prelate [*Vladyka*]".¹¹

At the same time, the brotherhood released the full text of the agreement with the Russian bishops, which "was to have been read and approved in detail at the sobor", but which the brotherhood had now released to counter the public declaration of Archbishop Alexander and his pastoral letter and the conclusions of the *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets*, the new name of *Rusyn*.¹² The introduction defined the nature of the new church in four concise articles and explained the motivation behind its formation:

1. The Brotherhood is organizing the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church as a national, independent church for Ukrainians and under the administration of Ukrainians.
2. This church is to have its own Ukrainian bishop and only Ukrainians may be its priests.
3. In matters of dogma, this church is related to all Orthodox churches, and not only to the Russian Church.
4. In a word, the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church is a restoration of the ancient Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Cossack times.

The causes behind the restoration of this ancestral Church were the Canadian Church situation and the rebirth of the Ukrainian Orthodox

9. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 1 October 1919, and *Kanadyiskyi Farmer*, 3 October 1919.

10. *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets*, 22 October 1919.

11. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 5 November 1919, and *Kanadyiskyi Farmer*, 7 November 1919.

12. *Ibid.*

Church in Ukraine, which had been recognized by the Muscovite patriarch.¹³

In the meantime, Bishop Budka's newspaper launched a campaign to persuade the public that the agreement reached by the brotherhood and the Russian prelates was just a stratagem to maintain Russian hegemony over Ukrainians. The announcement of the agreement's signing led the *Ukrainets* to declare (29 July 1919) that "The apostates of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church are establishing with the blessing of the Russian bishop, Alexander (also a Little Russian), the so-called Orthodox brotherhood and are entering into direct relations with the Muscovite Orthodox hierarchy." Such a policy, it charged, was treachery from the Ukrainian viewpoint as it supported "a united and indivisible Mother Russia." A second editorial (17 September), entitled "A New Muscovite Noose", quoted politically damning extracts from Archbishop Alexander's February communique, issued upon his election to the leadership of the Russian Church. Only four months prior to the negotiations with Swystun, Archbishop Alexander was purported to have said that "Ukrainians are an inseparable, undetachable people — they are the sons of the same 'Holy Rus'. Ukrainians are a political party.... There are evil people who say that we have given recognition to Ukraine. No!" To support these allegations the *Ukrainets* reported (22 October) on the anti-Ukrainian sermon the archbishop delivered during his October visit to the Winnipeg Holy Trinity Russian Church, then drove its point home by publishing (in Ukrainian translation) Alexander's fateful pastoral letter and a critical commentary on its meaning and significance.¹⁴

The editor of the *Farmer* (10 October) came to the defence of the new Ukrainian Church. To prove that Archbishop Alexander would not cut off the supply of Orthodox priests, the statement was reprinted from *Holos Tserkvy* (*Voice of the Church*) published by the League of Clergy of the Orthodoxy Eparchy in North America: "There is a Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church already. It is recognized by His Holiness, the All-Russian Patriarch, by the Prelate, Metropolitan Platon, and by all our Orthodox hierarchies. It is also recognized by His Excellency Bishop Stephen. The latter already ordained several priests... for the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church."

The *Ukrainets* retorted (15 October) that the Russians were supplying the Ukrainian Church with priests provided by a Greek Catholic renegade, Bishop Stephen Dzubay, noting that this was a case of "obvious betrayal." "If the concern is about Orthodoxy only,

13. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 1 October 1919, and *Kanadyskyi Ukrainets*, 3 October 1919.

14. *Kanadyskyi Ukrainets*, 20 and 22 October; 1 November 1919.

then why not accept it from the patriarch of Constantinople, Jerusalem or any Eastern Orthodox one, who also have their missions, their metropolitans and archbishops in the United States?"

To prepare public opinion and win support for the forthcoming sobor, an article under a pseudonym appeared in the *Holos* (29 October), entitled "The Situation of the Orthodox Church in Canada." It revealed that out of approximately 107 Orthodox parishes in the Dominion, twenty were in urban centres, the rest being rural. Between forty and fifty priests served them, half being Russophil Galicians and the rest "Little Russians", both spitefully anti-Ukrainian. Only two of the priests, from Bukovyna, were truly Ukrainian. The Orthodox population attending these churches was almost completely Ukrainian, with 65 per cent coming from Bukovyna, 20 per cent from Galicia and 12 per cent from Russian Ukraine. The Muscovite (Russian) membership amounted to about 3 per cent of the total. It was noted that the most recent congress of the Russian Orthodox Church,¹⁵ held in Cleveland, Ohio, on 12-15 February 1919, approved in principle the possibility of the existence of a Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The author admitted, however, that the administrator of the Russian Orthodox Church in Canada — Archimandrite Adam Filipovsky — was rabidly anti-Ukrainian. The article concluded with a statement that Ukrainians in Canada should not tolerate Russian abuse, but should rejoice that the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church has been established.

Subsequently, a sensational series of articles appeared irregularly on the editorial page of the *Holos* (12 November 1919 to 25 April 1920), indignantly entitled, "And What Would You Call This." The subject of the exposé was the "secret" "Regulations of the Ruthenian Catholic Church in Canada"¹⁶, a set of detailed instructions published in 1915 for the exclusive guidance of priests. The editor of the *Holos*, Wasył Kudryk, with frequent quotes from the original, carefully analyzed various sections of the document to show that the Greek Catholic Church was a tool of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and that the bishop and clergy were consciously promoting a policy of gradual Latinization. As this was definitely contrary to the interests of Ukrainians, Kudryk argued that one could only conclude that Ukrainians needed an ancestral church that was free from foreign interference, and where Ukrainians could retain their identity.

15. For an account of this congress see BHOYK, *Thouekov Ukrainiv*, 178-82.

16. A discussion of the "Regulations" and their controversial aspects may be found in the M. A. thesis of Paul YUZYK, "The History of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic (Uniate) Church in Canada", chap. 8.

The promoters of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church were aware that it was not enough to admit to the failings of the Russian Orthodox Church and reveal the inadequacies of the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church. If their cause was to advance and win popular support they would have to back their arguments with positive action. Thus, even before the sobor was held, they announced that a seminary for training priests had opened in Saskatoon on November 15, with the Reverend Dr. Lazar German as rector.¹⁷

The second sobor assembled in Winnipeg on 27 November, immediately after the fourth Ukrainian national convention. The convention, a two-day affair held in the Queen's Theatre, was attended by some three hundred delegates and guests, most of whom remained for the church meeting. Mass was celebrated the first morning of the sobor at St. Peter's Anglican Church. Much to the surprise of the participants, Archbishop Alexander was not at the altar. Instead, Metropolitan Germanos Shgedi officiated with the assistance of two Syrian priests and the following clergy until recently under the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church headed by Bishop Stephen Dzubyay: the Reverend Dr. Lazar German, Father Dmytro Kyrstiuk, and deacons Volodymyr Kaskiw, Lev Kushnir and Peter Dmytryk.¹⁸ Theodore Fedyk, who had gained fame as a "people's poet", served as the cantor (diak), and requiem was sung for the Ukrainian heroes who had fallen in battle for the freedom of Ukraine.

In all there were twenty-seven delegates,¹⁹ mostly from parishes administered by the Russian Orthodox Church — many having come because they expected Archbishop Alexander to be present. The five Ukrainian parishes in the Winnipeg area ministered by Father John Kusy, the initiator of the campaign of the Ukrainian national church, also sent representatives. In addition to the priests who assisted the Metropolitan at mass, Father Kusy and Father John Palij, the latter having been ordained by Bishop Stephen Dzubyay, also participated in the sobor; four priests from the Russian Orthodox Church — Fathers Panteleymon Bozyk, Vladimir Kozorizow, Cyril Bilych and Artemiy Dudko — came as observers. The most active delegates were Wasyl Swystun, Michael Stechishin, Taras Ferley, Jaroslaw Arsenych, Wasyl Kudryk, Nicholas Bachynski and Theodore Humeniuk. Swystun chaired the sessions of the sobor in all three cities.

The central issue and therefore the focal point of much lively discussion was the approval of the jurisdiction of Metropolitan

17. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 19 November 1919.

18. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 31 December 1919.

19. *Boz'yr*, *Tserkov Ukrainstiv*, 188; and *Kanadyskyi Ukrainets*, 3 January 1920.

Germanos over the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada.²⁰ Swystun explained that Archbishop Alexander's pastoral letter (denying the uniqueness of the Ukrainian nation) was sufficient evidence that the Ukrainians could not submit to the authority of the Russian Orthodox Church. The brotherhood therefore felt it was necessary to break with the Russian mission, despite the favourable terms of the original agreement. It was regarded as fortunate that the brotherhood was unable — with the kind assistance of Father German — to make suitable alternate arrangements with Metropolitan Germanos Shegedi (from Seleucia, Syria) of the Eastern Orthodox Church, under the Patriarch of Antioch, Gregory IV. The metropolitan, it was noted, had agreed to come to the sobor in person.

Father Panteleymon Bozyk of the Russian Orthodox Church, who was to have addressed the assembly on "The Union of Ukraine", came to the defence of his archbishop,²¹ claiming that Archbishop Alexander's sympathy toward Ukrainians had been clearly revealed at the Orthodox congress held in Cleveland the previous February. The Russian Orthodox prelate was unable to make a public stand in support of Ukrainians only because his consistory and other bishops prevented it. Bozyk urged the sobor to maintain ties with the Metropolitan of Kiev and the Church of Ukraine, rather than the Syrian metropolitan, who was foreign to Ukrainians and who, moreover, possessed no authority in North America, having in fact been excommunicated by the Russian Orthodox Church, which had the monopoly on Orthodox jurisdiction on the continent.

The case for Metropolitan Germanos was presented by Father German.²² He read the anti-Ukrainian pastoral letter of Archbishop Alexander and argued that it was irrefutable evidence that the Russian Orthodox Church completely disregarded the most basic rights of the Ukrainian people. It was impossible to have ties with the Metropolitan of Kiev while war raged throughout Ukraine; besides, the metropolitan and the bishops of the Ukrainian Church were Russians with an anti-Ukrainian attitude, and this could only prove to be detrimental to the new church in Canada. Father German then produced documents to establish that Metropolitan Germanos was indeed a legal bishop. He explained that the metropolitan's jurisdiction over the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church was the single realistic alternative available at the time, and that it would be of a nominal charac-

20. BOZYK, *Tsirkon Ukrainetsiv*, 190-1; and *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 30 and 31 December 1919.

21. BOZYK, *Tsirkon Ukrainetsiv*, 190; and *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 31 December 1919; and *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets*, 10 December 1919.

22. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 31 December 1919, and *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets*, 17 December 1919.

ter only, confined to supervision over doctrinal matters, ecclesiastical discipline and maintenance of the Byzantine rite. The administration would be left in the hands of the brotherhood and the priests. Near the conclusion of the sobor, Metropolitan Germanos made a personal appearance to confirm the terms of his proposed agreement as outlined by Father German. He also made the following remark, which greatly pleased the delegates: "I want your church to be a democratic that an undemocratic person would not be able to have a place in it."²³

The policy of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church was set out in sixteen resolutions.²⁴ Relations with the Russian Orthodox mission were severed and formal approval was given to the temporary spiritual jurisdiction of Metropolitan Germanos Shegedi, "until the time of the election of a Ukrainian bishop ordained according to the canonical rites of the Orthodox Church." The sobor "resolved to accept into the bosom of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada, parishes in the United States together with the priests"; these later formed the nucleus of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in America. A consistory of three clergymen and four laymen was to conduct the administrative affairs of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church, and a committee was to be appointed to prepare a draft constitution for the newest Orthodox denomination in Canada.

The delegates of the sobor were anxious to have ties with the Orthodox Church in Ukraine. The following resolution was passed to clarify the conditions under which they would be willing to enter into relations with it:

The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada and the United States considers itself part of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Ukraine, but will unite with it only when it will be autocephalous and when the administrative authority will be in the hands of Ukrainians; and the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada and the United States will endeavour with all its power to make the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Ukraine autocephalous as soon as possible and to put the administrative authority into the hands of Ukrainians.²⁵

Sessions of the same sobor were also convened in Edmonton on 4 December and in Saskatoon on 10 December, once again following

23. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 3 December 1919, and *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets*, 17 December 1919.

24. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 3 December 1919, and *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets*, 3 December 1919.

25. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 31 December 1919.

sessions of the fourth Ukrainian national convention. Although the number of delegates were few, a substantial number of guests remained from the preceding conventions. Metropolitan Germanos, did not attend, having returned to the United States. The resolutions adopted in Winnipeg were approved in Edmonton and Saskatoon under the able chairmanship of Wasył Swystun. The following individuals were elected to the first consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church: Father German, Father Dmytryk, Wasył Kudryk (Manitoba), Michael Stechishin (Saskatchewan), Peter Svarich (Alberta), Semen W. Sawchuk and F. Hawryliuk.

Metropolitan Germanos ratified his agreement with the new church in a pastoral letter dated 29 November 1919. Of interest are two passages elaborating on the arrangement:

We convey to you our pure, sincere and heart-felt thanks for your confidence, which you demonstrated in requesting our protectorship over your ancient Orthodox Church up to the time when your church of its own free will will elect, from among yourselves and through yourselves, its own spiritual head, your own bishop, in order that he may supervise and look after the congregations of your faithful and represent their religious interests in accordance with the rite and the teachings of the Orthodox Church...

O, may your hearts rejoice that your wishes have been fulfilled in the organization of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada and the United States, which spiritually is to be founded upon the rites, dogmas and discipline of the Ancient Orthodox Holy Church and in its practical administration is founded upon democratic principles, which upon your own request is recognized by our agreement, which we grant you in the name of the Lord God for the good of the Ancient Holy Orthodox Church....²⁶

The acceptance of Metropolitan Germanos as the nominal head of the Church required a public statement, for the Ukrainians in Canada had virtually no knowledge of the patriarchs outside of Europe. The acknowledgement of a formal relationship with the Patriarch of Antioch (through Metropolitan Germanos) was also intended to dispel any doubts concerning the apostolic succession of the new church. The explanation was worded in the following manner:

There are several eastern Orthodox patriarchs and each of them considers the other to be proper and legitimate and therefore there is no difference whether someone comes under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch, Jerusalem, Russia, or any other primate.... Thus, today, the spiritual jurisdiction of Metropolitan Germanos over the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church is only a restoration of the bond

26. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 24 December 1919; 4 and 18 February 1920.

which the Ukrainian Orthodox Church once had with the Orthodox patriarchates of the East.²⁷

It was also necessary to explain that Archbishop Alexander had been rejected because of his unpardonable anti-Ukrainian pastoral letter and because his training and environment prevented him from being a suitable head for a Ukrainian Church. By comparison, Metropolitan Germanos was head and shoulders above his Russian counterpart:

It is only today that the real difference between Archbishop Alexander and Metropolitan Germanos becomes evident. The first is a pupil of the Muscovite-tsarist school and for many years has been in the service of the Russian state. That is why he does not understand what the oppression of one nation by another means and what suffering and slavery are. The other is a son of a nation which suffered many centuries and that is why he understands oppression and slavery, truth and injustice. This is the only way that his sympathy for democracy can be explained.²⁸

The task of placing the first priests in parishes was apparently accomplished without much difficulty.²⁹ Most were located among Bukovynian Ukrainians who had grown increasingly dissatisfied with their Russian Orthodox priests, especially once Ukrainian nationalist ideas began to penetrate their communities. Disenchanted Greek Catholic congregations also welcomed clergymen of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church, local opinion often being prepared by the educational and national work done by Ukrainian teachers who were sympathetic to the new Church. Fathers Lev Kushnir and John Paliy were assigned to the Vita-Stuarthburn district of southeastern Manitoba; Father Dmytro Kyrstiuk, having deserted the Russian Church, went to the Insinger-Sheho district west of Yorkton, Saskatchewan; Father Peter Dmytryk took charge of the parishes at St. Julien and Meacham, to the northeast of Saskatoon; and Father Volodymyr Kaskiw for a brief period served in the Vegreville area, east of Edmonton, not far from the former Russian Orthodox parishes of Andrew and Boyany, which were taken over by Father German. Although Fathers Kusy and Kokolsky and their parishes were sympathetic to the new Church, they delayed becoming an integral part of it. Subjected to the ridicule and hostility of other denominations, the trail-blazing priests made headway slowly in the face of marked opposition.

27. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 10 December 1919, and *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainer*, 12 December 1919.

28. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 10 December 1919.

29. *Ibid.*

The most concerned was the Russian Orthodox Church. The Russian hierarchy was painfully aware that in the new church all the priests but two had been ordained by a Russian Orthodox Bishop, Stephen Dzubay. The exceptions were Father Kyrstiuk, ordained by Archbishop Alexander in 1916, and Father German, who had come as a priest from Romania. Moreover, Metropolitan Germanos, upon arrival in the United States, had received the sanction of the Russian mission. Furthermore, most of the parishes being won over by the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox priests had initially also been under Russian jurisdiction. Not surprisingly, in December 1919 Archbishop Alexander came to Winnipeg to confer with his priests and devise strategy to thwart the further spread of Ukrainian Orthodoxy.³⁰ He visited several parishes and on 19 December published a pastoral letter, in leaflet form, exhorting the faithful to remain loyal to the Orthodox Church under the Russian bishops. He dubbed the rival movement the "Swystunite sect" and labelled its supporters "Swystunivtsi."³¹ The pastoral letter concluded with the rhetorical question, "Are you not ashamed of belonging to a church which finds itself under the helm of persons who do not believe in God?"

The consistory of the new Church published an "Open Letter to Archbishop Alexander", declaring the church's primary objective to be the "redemption of the soul... to free You from spiritual bondage according to the words 'And truth shall make you free' (John 3:32)." The consistory recognized "every Orthodox bishop in its proper canonical relations with his highest head", noting that, since Metropolitan Germanos was directly under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch (Gregory IV), the Russian mission had no right to suspend him. Bishop Stephen Dzubay, too, was within his rights in choosing to continue good relations with Metropolitan Germanos: after all, the former had never formally broken with the latter. Similarly, the consistory felt that there was no justification for the archbishop to call the priest of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church — ordained by Bishop Stephen and by Alexander himself — "unconscientious people", "wolves in sheep's clothing" and "trouble-makers." Chiding the bishop for his actions, it reminded him that the prime duty of every priest was "to serve the church of his people", without regard to the conflicts of particular bishops.

The "Open Letter" took a more serious turn when it claimed that Archbishop Alexander had violated the laws of God and human rights. Whatever the Russian and Polish nations were entitled to, the Ukrainians were also justified in claiming: "According to the

30. BOBYK, *Fiiden Ukrainin*, 193.

31. *Ibid.*, 192.

teachings of the Orthodox faith, it is a grave sin to view the Ukrainian nation only as material for building, for example, the Polish or the Russian state and church." Outside of Montreal, "it is difficult to find another locality where there would in reality be a Russian colony." Alexander was guilty of "making the Ukrainians, Russians", as the Russified Ukrainian priests under his leadership — "in contradiction to God Himself" and "those whom God had had born as Ukrainians" — were trying to become Russians, thus becoming "apostates." The bishop was warned that the time would come when these misguided priests would see the error and reject the authority of the Russian Church. Furthermore, the members of the consistory defiantly proclaimed that they were not afraid of what might happen at the coming sobor; on the contrary, they welcomed it, "for in this way all the prodigal sons, the apostates of our nation, will be separated and will gather together; and we shall see them and know of whom we should beware."³²

Whereas the leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church in America dealt with the new Orthodox movement as a subversive faction within their ranks, the Greek Catholic hierarchy fought it as an outright enemy. Typically, a lengthy report on the second sobor, published in the *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets* (3 December 1919-18 February 1920) over the signature of Peter Ruta, was insinuatingly captioned "The First Shed of the Swystunite Seraphimism", in order to suggest that the new church was flimsy and fraudulent. Although the paper had acknowledged the need for a genuine Ukrainian Orthodox Church as far aback as 4 November 1914 and had even suggested (10 October 1919) prior to the sobor that a non-Russian patriarch might prove to be a suitable alternative to the chauvinist Russian Orthodox prelate, the Greek Catholic leadership must have been somewhat surprised by the swiftness with which Archbishop Alexander was replaced by Metropolitan Germanos. It continued to brand the opposing movement as "Seraphimist", while conceding that the action of the brotherhood was sound. A column (14 January 1920) entitled "On the Topic of the Day" illustrates this contradictory tendency: "There is no danger from Germanos. The Saskatoonians have already written to Gregory, the Syrian patriarch. Consequently, the matter has been placed on sound principles, and not as the old Seraphimism. The seminary in Saskatoon will shortly provide priests...."

By this time, training at the clerical seminary had begun in earnest. Archbishop Alexander had delayed the opening of the insti-

32. The Greek Catholic organ was the first to describe this movement as "Swystunite" (Swystunivtsi) and coined the term "Swystunism." See *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets*, 29 January 1919.

tute when he neglected to provide professors of theology;³³ prompting the brotherhood to secure Father German as the first rector. He taught all of the theological subjects; church singing was conducted by Father Dmytryk; and courses in Ukrainian language, literature and history were given by Swystun and Julian W. Stechishin of the P. Molyly Institute. The curriculum in theology is impressive in terms of its range, emphasis and depth:

1. Sunday Gospels and the Apostles of the New Testament.
2. General History of the Christian Church.
3. History of the Ukrainian Church.
4. General and Special Theology of Morals.
5. General Dogmatics and Apologetics and Special Dogmatics.
6. Church Law in the Eastern Church and in the Ukrainian Church.
7. Catechetics.
8. Church Rhetoric.
9. Liturgics.
10. Pastoral.
11. Life of Jesus Christ.
12. Protestant Sects in America.
13. Church Singing According to Ukrainian Style.
14. Course on Original Literary Theological Work.³⁴

In March 1920 the first priests graduated from the new seminary: Father Semen W. Sawchuk, Dmytro F. Stratyckuk and Peter Sametz.³⁵ Each had come to Canada in his boyhood and had taught public school before entering the priesthood. They were ordained by Metropolitan Germanos in the Syrian church in St. Paul, Minnesota, and then assigned separate provinces for their missionary work: Stratyckuk in Alberta, Sawchuk in Saskatchewan, and Sametz in Manitoba. To assist the young priests in their work the consistory started a school for cantors in Saskatoon. Classes were held from 1 March to 31 May with Father Dmytryk teaching the ritual chants and giving lessons in church choral music.³⁶ The three inexperienced "Ukrainian Canadian" priests — the first to be trained and ordained by the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada — joined two others in the task of building the new church: Father Dmytro Kyrstiuk, who had been accepted by the second sobor and remained in Canada after some other priests had elected to return to the United States; and Father John Kusy, who upon being re-ordained by Archbishop Alexander in December 1919, deserted the Russian Church immediately to serve his fellow-countrymen in the Ukrainian Church.

33. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 28 January 1920.

34. "A Brief Historical Survey of the Church Movement Among the Canadian Ukrainians", in *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 14 January 1920.

35. *Ibid.*

36. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, August 1925.

Some of the problems encountered in establishing Orthodox parishes in communities of disenchanted Greek Catholics are illustrated by the experience of the congregation at Vita, in southeastern Manitoba.³⁷ A Greek Catholic church, built in 1905, had been visited irregularly by priests of Ukrainian and French origin. In 1914 Bishop Budka demanded that the church be incorporated under the recently constituted episcopal charter and sent Father M. Irkha to the parish for this purpose. A meeting on 28 May, however, declared local opposition to the incorporation as well as the papal decree forbidding married priests in Canada. In 1916 Father Emilian Andruchowicz called a second meeting to resolve the issue, but the congregation remained adamant. Bishop Budka then forbade any Catholic priests — Ukrainian or otherwise — to serve the rebellious parishioners, who turned to the Russian Orthodox priests for marriages and christenings. For almost three years the parish was without a priest, and some members were beginning to favour incorporation. In April 1919 another meeting was called, attended by Father J. Shumsky, the bishop's personal secretary, and Father Andruchowicz, and once again incorporation was turned down. On 9 June the congregation decided to seek contact "with representatives of other church parishes" and elected a committee to find "a married priest who would have no connection with Rome." In September the committee secured the services of Father Lev Kushnir, who had recently been ordained by the Orthodox bishop, Stephen Dzubay, in accordance with arrangements that had been made by the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood. A meeting on 22 September finally approved the change of name to "Ukrainian Orthodox Church."

Bishop Budka, however, was determined to prevent the change and visited the locality to personally organize resistance to the Orthodox takeover. As a result, on 16 November four women who tried to present Father Kushnir from entering the church, were forcibly removed. During the scuffle, however, one of the women got to the altar, which caused the church executive to lock the building. Father Kushnir returned to the United States and the Orthodox congregation withdrew from the church, which was subsequently pilfered of its clerical vestments, the chalice, the Holy Scriptures and other church accessories. Bishop Budka held yet another meeting in December but failed to win over the dissident faction, and on 19 December a Ukrainian Greek Orthodox parish was formally established with 52 men as signed members. A mutual jury of representatives from both sides then decided that the weaker party should be refunded the value of the church property proportionate to the amount of the member-

37. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 18 February 1920.

ship fee originally paid by each member. Thus the Greek Catholics were paid off and the church property and building became the possession of the new Orthodox congregation. In April 1920 Father Peter Sametz arrived to take charge of the congregation, which he served very effectively. The church building, which was two miles from the village was moved to Vita. Later, in 1930 a larger church was built, as Vita became one of the more active parishes in the Orthodox diocese.

Perhaps the stiffest opposition from the Russian Orthodox Church was faced by Father John Kusy.³⁸ Toward the end of 1920 he was transferred from his parishes in Manitoba — composed of former Greek Catholics from Galicia — to a district in Alberta where the predominantly Bukovynian Orthodox faithful had been served by the Russian Church. Father Stratyshuk had "plowed the first furrow of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church"³⁹ when he conducted a Ukrainian service the previous spring at Suchawa, near Andrew, northwest of Vegreville. Upon arrival, Father Kusy plunged into community work, organizing a Ukrainian school, concerts and drama and literary evenings, all in the new Ukrainian community hall, which he helped to erect. His growing popularity greatly annoyed the priests of the Russian Orthodox Church, who were mostly "Little Russians" (i.e., Ukrainians) with Russophile convictions. Father Kusy was soon warned that nine of the Russophile priests were gathering to throw him out of the Suchawa church.

When the confrontation finally took place on 6 May 1921, the drama was played out before a large crowd of onlookers that overflowed the church into the yard. Toward the middle of the mass three "*batinshkas*" (a derogatory term applied to the Russian priests), Fathers Kiziuk, Zubach and Dovheyko, marched into the building and took up conspicuous places among the worshippers. Moments later, a cantor from a nearby Russian church ran in with a valise and stationed himself, trembling all the while, by the portals of the iconostasis, in front of the altar. There was commotion. A trustee of the church ordered the intruder to leave, threatening to beat him if he did not depart immediately. The terrified interloper fled the building and after shedding tears uncontrollably joined Father Kusy's cantor and sang in the church choir. The "*katsap*" priests, as the Ukrainians mockingly called the Russians, "blushed like a cooked lobster and stood with their eyes downcast."⁴⁰ In his sermon, Father Kusy gently upbraided the offending priests and asked the people to treat the guests with politeness and Christian consideration. In the end the embarrassed clergymen "disappeared like camphor."

38. See *Velyki Ruskovyzy*, 147-54.

39. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 25 May 1921.

40. *Velyki Ruskovyzy*, 81-4.

To procure funds for the work of the church, Father Lazar German introduced the idea of churchwardenship (*krytorstvo*).⁴¹ Accordingly, in 1920 the consistory announced two classes of founders. A major founder was any person who donated one thousand dollars or more. He had the right to have his name and that of his whole family mentioned during each mass in every church, and the honour of having a portrait of himself and his wife permanently displayed in the cathedral of the diocese. A minor founder was any member who donated five hundred dollars. He had the right to have only his name mentioned during mass and his portrait to be displayed in the cathedral. The first couple to become major founders were Iwan and Paraskewia Kantymir, of Bukovynian origin, who had settled near Runnymede, Saskatchewan. Next were Isydore and Maria Nowosad, who were Galicians living near Meacham, Saskatchewan. They were followed by Nicholas and Maria Bochonecky, Andrew, Alberta, and Kost and Pelagia Pylat, Fernwood, Saskatchewan.⁴² These and smaller donations in 1920 were collected for the most part by Father German, who conducted missions assisted by other priests throughout the Ukrainian settlements on the Prairies.⁴³

The consistory and brotherhood attempted to remedy the dire lack of priests by bringing in Ukrainian Orthodox clergymen from Europe. At the end of June 1920, the Reverend Dr Mykola Kopachuk arrived in Canada to assume the duties of administrator of the church.⁴⁴ A prominent national leader, he had been a former lecturer on religion at the teachers' seminary in Chernivtsi (Czernowcy in Polish, Cerneuti in Romanian), the capital city of Bukovyna, and was an official in the ministries of war and agriculture during the short-lived Western Ukrainian National Republic.⁴⁵ It was soon obvious, however, that Father Kopachuk had an inadequate understanding of the problem facing the Church, and was unable to cope with the unfamiliar and complex situation.⁴⁶ As a result, he was assigned to do missionary work in Saskatchewan (touring the vast settlements around Yorkton) and Manitoba, where he made an especially favourable impression upon his Bukovynian countrymen, although himself dissatisfied with such a minor task. During the summer and fall of the same year, Father German conducted similar missions in

41. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 25 May 1921.

42. Rev. Semen V. Sawchuk, "Jak povstala Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva v Kanadi" [How the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada was Founded], in *Pravoslavnyi Vistyk*, August 1925.

43. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 21 January, 25 April, 11 and 18 August 1920.

44. *Velyki Rokovyny*, 221-2.

45. *Kanadyiskyi Farmer*, 9 July 1920.

46. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 1 September 1920 and *Kanadyiskyi Farmer*, 3 September 1920.

Alberta and taught theological subjects to candidates for the priesthood who had transferred to Andrew from Saskatoon.

The third sobor of the Church was held in conjunction with the fifth national convention, which met in Winnipeg on 11 November, Saskatoon on 18 November and Edmonton on 25 November, 1920. It was relatively poorly attended, partly because the economic recession was beginning to affect farmers. As a result, the *Holos* carried no report of the proceedings, while the *Ukrainets* took advantage of the apparent setback to caption its account (17 November 1920), "From a Large Cloud a Scanty Rain." Nevertheless, the sobor had its encouraging aspects. It was the first to witness the participation of priests who had been trained by the Church and ordained by its bishop. The fact was symbolically expressed when Stratyshuk and Sametz celebrated mass jointly with Fathers German and Kopachuk. Moreover, the reports of the delegates and priests indicated that the Church was growing and required more clergymen to meet the increased demands.⁴⁷ It was noted that the lack of an official publication handicapped the promoters of the new Church in their efforts to publicize its ideals, and a resolution therefore approved the establishment of a monthly paper as soon as it was deemed possible. A most important step was taken when the sobor voted to unite with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine. The resolution requested "the Brotherhood and the Consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada to enter into an organic union with the Kievan metropolitanate just as soon as communication contacts permit."⁴⁸

The sobor's decision to empower the brotherhood and consistory to select the Church's administrator greatly disappointed Father Kopachuk, for a joint meeting decided not to fill the position immediately. During the winter of 1920-1, Kopachuk had performed the duties of an ordinary priest in the Bukovynian parish at Calder, Saskatchewan (near Yorkton), which he had successfully weaned away from the Russian Orthodox Church.⁴⁹ When a representative of the American Church, Father Deacon Volodymyr Kashiw, approached Kopachuk to administer the American counterpart of the Canadian Church, the slighted priest seized the opportunity, requesting, prior to departure that he be made at least a nominal administrator of the Canadian Church to preserve some sense of Ukrainian Orthodox Church unity in North America. A joint meeting of the consistory and the brotherhood in Saskatoon on 9-10 March 1921,

47. Sawchuk, "Iak Povstala Tserkva."

48. *Ibid.*

49. *Ibid.*

agreed and appointed him administrator of the Church until the next sobor.⁵⁰ He failed, however, to fulfill the stipulation attached to the appointment, and left for the United States,⁵¹ never to return to Canada.⁵²

It was at this time that the consistory first communicated with Dr. Ivan Ohienko, Minister of Religious Affairs in the exiled government of the Ukrainian National Republic, then situated in Tarnow, Poland. The minister was requested to provide several suitable priests for the Canadian Church and to recommend an appropriate candidate to serve as its head. In reply, Dr. Ohienko sent a list of ten priests who were willing to come to Canada, along with a suggestion that two bishops accompany them, one of whom after visiting the parishes would return to Europe and the other remain as the bishop of the Canadian Church.⁵³ Unfortunately, the proposition was regarded as financially impracticable. A joint meeting of the consistory and brotherhood on 24-25 December asked the minister of Religious Affairs to send only three priests and a Ukrainian bishop. An attached proviso stipulated that the American section of the Church would have to agree to a common bishop and share the costs of his journey to Canada.⁵⁴

Subsequently, the Reverend Dr. Kopachuk, as the new administrator of the Church in the United States, advised that the matter be referred to the forthcoming American sobor. Father Sawchuk was delegated to attend its session at Chicago and Pittsburgh on 12 and 19 March 1922 respectively, but was not given the authority to conclude any agreements. The sobor was of the opinion that the American Ukrainian Orthodox Church should be completely independent and passed the following resolution: "The Sobor authorizes the Reverend Administrator and the future National Church Council to make every effort to consummate as soon as possible the procuring of our own prelate [*vladyka*], a Ukrainian, for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in America."⁵⁵ It was evident that plans for co-operation were futile.

The leaders of the Church in Canada were now faced with a serious dilemma. They no longer had any confidence in Father Kopachuk's ability to act as a mediator, for they had reason to believe that he was no longer interested in a bishop who would reduce

50. BOBYK, *Tserkva Ukrainiv*, 185.

51. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 20 April 1921.

52. SAWCHUK, "Jak Povstala Tserkva", in *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, September 1925.

53. Father Kopachuk defected to the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in the United States in 1928; he served as a parish priest there until his death in 1940.

54. Sawchuk, "Jak Povstala Tserkva," in *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, September 1925.

55. *Ibid.*

his own authority.⁵⁶ Yet the financial resources of the Church were too inadequate to pay the costs of importing priests and a bishop from Europe. Moreover, recent experience had shown that some newly arrived members of the intelligentsia did not understand the needs of Ukrainians in Canada and were unable to adjust to the situation.⁵⁷ For a time the stymied leaders considered the possibility of sending for Dr. Ivan Ohienko and having him instruct at the clerical seminary to obtain the type of priests that the Church in Canada required without gambling on unknown clergy. The selection of a Ukrainian bishop, however, would thereby be also postponed, and for half a year the leaders of the Church wrestled with their indecision.

Finally, on 11 October 1922 a combined meeting (*soborchyk*) in Yorkton of the consistory, brotherhood and clergy made two important decisions. Father Kopachuk was formally dismissed and in his place Father Sawchuk was elected administrator of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada. The new administrator was then authorized to visit Europe and to negotiate with Orthodox bishops for the consecration of a candidate to head the Canadian Church, provided such ordination did not involve the jurisdictional subordination of the bishop or his diocese in Canada.⁵⁸ This provision was important to avoid any potential obstacles that might interfere with the Church's commitment to union with the Kievan metropolitanate when circumstances permitted. The leaders of the Canadian Church firmly believed that if they succeeded in obtaining a bishop for Canada, even if done unilaterally, the American Church would also be compelled to recognize him as its bishop.

Father Sawchuk left for Europe on 8 November. In Poland he immediately set about making arrangements for a visa that would allow him to visit Kiev, where he would contact the leaders of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church — headed by Metropolitan Wasyl Lypkivsky — and negotiate for a bishop and church union. As the situation under the Bolshevik regime was extremely unstable, Father Sawchuk was unable to gain access to Ukraine. With the help of Dr. Ohienko, he held conferences in Galicia and Volyn with leaders of the Orthodox Church, who assured him that a suitable bishop for the Canadian Church would be found. During his stay of almost four months in Poland, Father Sawchuk celebrated mass with Archbishop Dionysius Valedynsky in the Orthodox cathedral at Kremenetz in Volyn.⁵⁹

56. *Ukrainskii Rohos*, 31 May 22.

57. SAWCHUK, "Jak Povstala Tserkva," in *Pravoslavnyi Vistnik*, September 1925.

58. *Ibid.*

59. *Ibid.*

Upon Sawchuk's return, the consistory issued a communique⁶⁰ which termed his trip successful and contained a copy of Professor Ohienko's letter indicating that a bishop would be sent as soon as the necessary preparations for his reception and installation could be made in Canada and the United States to ensure a United Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The minister's letter also mentioned that Archbishop Dionysius had presented him with a violet velvet calotte (*Kamylavka*) — a symbol of recognition of ecclesiastical status — and a confirming certificate to Father Sawchuk on 28 January 1923.⁶¹ This gesture was evidence of the cordial relations between the Orthodox Church in Poland and the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada, and appeared to symbolize recognition.

In preparation for the coming of a Ukrainian bishop, the consistory and the brotherhood took steps to strengthen the foundations of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church. A very significant gain was made when Wasył Kudryk was persuaded to join the priesthood; he was ordained, unmarried, in August of 1923 by Metropolitan Germanos.⁶² The new priest, who had edited the *Holos* since its inception in 1910, was widely experienced and vastly knowledgeable in church affairs. He was without a doubt the most vociferous promoter, founder and champion of the new Church. Known for his imaginative and scathing polemics in the *Holos*, he was a person modest, courteous, affable, and ready to help anyone at any time. With an intense and unwavering loyalty to the Ukrainian nation and an unshaken faith in the efficacy of democracy, he was willing to sacrifice everything that he had for the good of his people and his Church. It was therefore quite natural that he should join the ranks of the clergy of the Church which he had helped to launch.

The Church desperately needed a man of Kudryk's calibre. The third sobor in November 1920 had approved a church publication, which had to be delayed because of the lack of an experienced editor and the chronic shortage of funds. With Father Kudryk available, the consistory could finally launch a religious monthly. The paper, called *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk* (*The Orthodox Herald*), appeared in April 1924 with Kudryk as editor. The talented priest was to remain

60. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 14 March 1923.

61. The certificate states that Archbishop Dionysius blessed Father Sawchuk and authorized him to wear the calotte during church services in accordance with the following passage from the scriptures: "And take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints" (Ephesians 6:17, 18).

62. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 2 January 1924.

editor of the *Vistnyk* until late in his life, authoring several polemical books against the Greek Catholic Church.⁶³

By the end of the period of Metropolitan Germanos' jurisdiction, there were eleven priests in the service of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church.⁶⁴ Of these, six had been ordained by the acting bishop: Fathers S. W. Sawchuk, D. Stratyshuk, and P. Sametz (March 1920); S. Hrebeniuk (December 1923); W. Kudryk (August 1923); and P. Melnychuk (December 1923).⁶⁵ The five other clergy were Fathers D. Kyrstiuk, formerly of the Russian Orthodox Church (November 1919); J. Kusy, formerly of the National Apostolic Church but re-ordained by Archbishop Alexander in December 1920; N. Nowosad, previously with the Russian Orthodox Church and an immigrant to Canada from the United States in 1923; Kornilo Kyrstiuk, formerly of the Orthodox Church in Bukovyna, who entered the Canadian Church in February 1924; and D. Seneta, a former Greek Catholic priest from Galicia, who joined the Canadian Church in May 1924. As of June 1924, they were stationed at the following centres: Manitoba — Sawchuk (Winnipeg), Nowosad (Tolstoi); Saskatchewan — Sametz and Melnychuk (Canora), Stratyshuk (Hamton), Hrebeniuk (Goodeve), D. Kyrstiuk (Theodore), K. Kyrstiuk (Sheho) W. Kudryk (Saskatoon); Alberta — Kusy (Andrew), Seneta (Edmonton). They served from seventy to seventy-five congregations, in addition to several remote missions visited only occasionally.⁶⁶

From all outward appearances, the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada was steadily expanding in 1924. Although the number of priests was increasing, it was not keeping pace with the growing list of congregations and parishes. Of considerable impor-

63. His publications include: *Chuzha Ruka, Zhetvta Iovfata Kantsevycha, Istorychni Materialy, Malovidome z Istori Hreko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy*.

64. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, July 1924.

65. The following text is from a clergymen's certificate issued during this period:

Under the Patronage of the Syrian Orthodox Diocese of His Grace Metropolitan Germanos, Brooklyn, N.Y..

No. 13.

March 2nd & 15th, 1920

We, by the Grace of God, Germanos, Metropolitan of Selephkias and Haalbek, Syria, Acting Bishop of the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church in North America, and Acting Bishop of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada and the United States, do hereby certify that Reverend Father Samuel (Semen) Sawchuk is a duly ordained priest of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox in Canada and the United States and is appointed missionary priest in the above named Church in Canada with full rights to perform the Divine Liturgy and Sacraments in accordance with the dogmas, rites and directions of the aforesaid Church, and this authorization We certify with Our own hand and signature.

66. This information was supplied in a written statement by Father S. W. Sawchuk.

tance was the fact that the Church no longer had to depend upon the "hospitality and favours of the *Ukrayinskyi Holos* and other newspapers,"⁶⁷ for it now published its own official organ, the *Pravoslavnyi Visnyk*. The leaders were satisfied that the Church had grown to maturity and could now "stand on its own feet" in the often hostile environment of western Canada. The clergy consisted of eleven priests and the time had come to choose the twelfth, thereby completing the circle of Christ's disciples as in apostolic times. The twelfth was to be a bishop of their own nationality. The policies had been set, the contacts made, and the arrival of the bishop was solely a matter of time.

67. *Pravoslavnyi Visnyk*, April 1924.

CHAPTER SIX

The First Ukrainian Bishop and Acceptance of Autocephaly

The hopes and prayers that for years had been single-mindedly directed toward the goal of obtaining a Ukrainian bishop were soon to be realized. The founders, the leaders and the faithful of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church had been preparing for this great event since the first days of the institution. It was absolutely necessary that the bishop be Ukrainian — *nash* (ours) — as the Church was in part the result of strong nationalist sentiments not satisfied by existing denominations. The fact that the bishop was to come from the ancestral homeland, where a Ukrainian state had recently been established and had restored both in name and principle the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, intensified feelings of anticipation and heightened appreciation of the event. In their enthusiasm the members of the young Church could not have possibly foreseen the obstacles and complications that lay ahead and would convulsively frustrate their efforts.

Before Dr. Ivan Ohienko, as Minister of Religious Affairs in the exiled Ukrainian government, could comply with the request made by Father Sawchuk and recommend a suitable bishop for the Canadian Church, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States had contacted Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky, primate of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Kiev. The metropolitan and the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council then selected as their candidate for the American bishopric Archbishop Ivan (Ioann) Theodorovich¹ of Vynnytsia and Podillia, who had been consecrated, along with Metropolitan Vasyl, according to the controversial Alexandrian method, one which would later become a contentious issue in the Churches of North America. Born the son of a cantor, in the province of Volyn, in 1887, he had a distinguished record as a chaplain in the armies of the Ukrainian National Republic and the Ukrainian

1. For his biography see *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, September 1924.

Galician Army in the struggle for independence and statehood of Ukraine. He had narrowly escaped death after having been taken prisoner by the counter-revolutionary White Russian Army of General A. I. Denikin, who fought against both the Bolshevik Red Army and the Ukrainian state. Under the dynamic bishop's able leadership the diocese of Vynnytsia and Podillia had expanded from 18 to 247 parishes in a period of two years.

Leaving Ukraine on the third day of Christmas — 9 January 1924 — Archbishop Theodorovich arrived in New York on 13 February. His first task on foreign soil was to tour twenty-six of the larger parishes of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. On 12-13 June the sobor of the American Church at Newark, New Jersey, formally elected him bishop.

Upon news of the arrival of the archbishop in the United States, the consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada dispatched a letter of welcome.² Archbishop Theodorovich's reply was most encouraging:

With great joy I accept your greetings in the unshaken hope that Divine Providence will bless our people with the realization of union in the single Fold of the Christian Church. Your greetings are dear to me as one of the first heralds and as the illustrious guarantee that we are on the road to that union which is blessed by God. We shall all meet in our own Church and on our own path of unfaltering faith in order to lead our people to the higher kingdom of the Divine Teacher, to the kingdom of the beautiful illumination of the higher being, of love and beauty.³

Further correspondence between the two parties convinced the leaders of the Canadian Church that the archbishop possessed the qualities which they desired in a prelate.⁴ Accordingly, a *soborchyk* involving the consistory, brotherhood and clergy was called at Yorkton on 21-22 May to discuss the question of the legality of the candidate from a canonical viewpoint, the concern being apostolic succession. Nine priests attended. After consulting the works of such church authorities as Bulgakov, Pokrovsky, Spasky, Makariy, Barsov, Lebedev and Pisarev, the participants "became convinced that the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine is fully legal (canonical) and that in no way did it follow an arbitrary and irresponsible course."⁵

2. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, April 1924.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Ibid.*

5. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, October 1924.

6. *Ibid.*

A number of factors favourably influenced this assessment of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine. One was that the supreme representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church had not condemned it. Moreover, in taking steps towards reconciliation with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in 1922, a conference of the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine (under Patriarch Tikhon) had virtually undermined their previous charges against the U.A.O.C. Prominent bishops and their representatives from both Churches met only once to discuss the matter but found no compromise. Further negotiations were prevented by the Bolsheviks. The most convincing argument of all, however, was a written statement by Archbishop Theodorovich: "The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church recognizes itself as continuously dwelling in the bosom of the entire Orthodox Eastern Church. The dogmas of the entire Orthodox Church are an inviolable sanctity and our Church has never demonstrated any desire to violate even one of these dogmas."⁶ The *sobor*chuk was therefore satisfied as to the validity of the Ukrainian Church's claim and decided to convene a *sobor* to resolve the issue of episcopal leadership.

Subsequently, the administrator of the Canadian Church, Father Sawchuk, wrote an article outlining the possibilities.⁷ The forthcoming *sobor*, he explained, would have to approve one of three proposals:

1. To invite Archbishop Theodorovich to become the permanent bishop;
2. To invite the archbishop to become the head until another bishop could be found for the Canadian Church;
3. To continue to remain under the patronage of Metropolitan Germanos until a Ukrainian bishop for Canada could be elected.

The fourth *sobor* of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada met for two days at Yorkton on 16-17 July 1924. It was formally opened by a church service at which Archbishop Ivan Theodorovich was present in only a mantle, as he was not yet part of the Canadian Church. About three hundred persons attended, with some ninety delegates from church congregations present, the *sobor* being the most representative since the founding of the Church.

When Father Sawchuk called the afternoon's sessions to order, reports from the delegates provided details of the progress that was being made at the parish level and related some of the problems that were being experienced with the opponents of the young Church, who

6. *Ibid.*

7. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, June 1924.

were denounced as agents acting on behalf of foreign interests.⁸ Archbishop Theodorovich brought greetings from Metropolitan Wasył Lypkivsky and described the struggle that the Ukrainians had waged for independence.⁹ The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, he explained, was brought into being by the will of the people, who wanted their own Church. The archbishop criticized the Greek Catholic Church for being in the service of Ukraine's enemy, Poland. And he condemned the enslavement of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in 1686 by the Muscovite aggressors, who used deceit and cunning to achieve their ends. Ukrainians, he stated, had recently cast off such foreign shackles in a bloody but holy struggle for freedom. Ending on an optimistic note, he declared that by the grace of God the Ukrainian nation and its Church were steadily advancing toward a better future.

Archbishop Theodorovich's speech made a powerful impression upon the audience, as this account by the editor of *Vistnyk* testifies:

The first speech of the Bishop captivated the hearts of all with its sincerity. Most of the participants wept with joy for having lived to see their very own bishop and the revival of their own mighty Orthodox Church in Ukraine; they also wept with sorrow upon learning of the great sacrifices that Ukrainians had made in the struggle for independence — independence that still has to be regained. The stirring salutary speech of his Excellency made a very favourable impression upon the entire Sobor with respect to the personality of the Bishop, so that it was soon possible to predict boldly that the Sobor would unanimously support the invitation that he also assume leadership of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada.¹⁰

Clearly, the prelate had won the hearts and minds of all those in attendance. The first afternoon's session also featured presentations by two clergymen.¹¹ Father Kornylo Kyrstiuk spoke first on the origin of sobors and their development in Ukrainian church life. Originally meaning a "gathering", the sobor, he observed, had evolved into something akin to a Christian parliament where both the clergy and the laity could participate on equal terms and according to democratic principles. Father Semen Sawchuk then reviewed the important events in the history of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada and introduced the problem of securing a suitable bishop.

The keynote address of the sobor was delivered by Archbishop Theodorovich, who summarized the details regarding the revival of

8. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, October 1924.

9. *Ibid.*

10. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, July 1924.

11. See *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, November 1924, for a complete summary of this sobor.

the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and explained the fundamental principles that determined the policy guiding the new church movement. The address convinced the delegates to support the union with the autocephalous movement in Ukraine, a decision which was to have profound repercussions on future developments in the Canadian Church.

The archbishop had lived through a revolution of international significance, one which changed not only governments but the attitudes and outlooks of people. The birth of the new Church coincided with the revolution, which released a great deal of initiative and idealism. In its efforts to build its own state, the Ukrainian nation had also striven to establish its own Church. But states could change, whereas the Church continued because it had eternal aims — to bring the human spirit closer to the divine spirit.

Before the revolution, the archbishop said, the Church had ceased to be a living organism, for it failed to fulfill its duties on earth. The priests had become mere government officials, without any opinions of their own, while the Church had concerned itself with the needs of the stomach instead of tending to the needs of the soul. Thus it began to fall, departing from the two great commandments of the Son of God. The first was that leaders must also be servants. The neglect of this commandment brought compulsion and oppression, which were contrary to the basic tenets of the Christian faith. Casting aside Christ and God's word, the bishops began to worship power and resort to coercion in their obsession to become temporal lords. The Jesuits, in particular, were guilty of this offense. When the rulers of Russia and the Byzantine Empire forced the Church to serve their political ends, they did so at the expense of the people. Ukrainians, because they opposed this oppression, suffered from the knouts of the tsar.

The second great commandment that had been violated through the years exhorted man to strive for perfection, just as the heavenly Father was perfection. Christ urged man to please the heavenly ruler, and not to dote on earthly rulers. Therefore, a truly Christian Church had to be free. Decisions affecting it were not to be made by tsars, but by sobors and the people, who were the living church of the Son of God. From this it followed that the clergy were to be elective, and the government of the Church was to be democratic. Only under such a system could the commandments of Christ be adapted to life.

The Ukrainian Orthodox movement to revive the Christian Church was started during the revolution by a small group of individuals. They had attempted to reach an agreement with the Russian bishops but were rebuffed by the antagonistic hierarchy. Frustrated, the group appealed directly to the people, who decided to

make their Church independent of foreigners. When the Russian patriarch and Metropolitan Platon (of the Russian Church) refused to approve the use of Ukrainian in the liturgy, an All-Ukrainian Church Sobor was convened only to be sabotaged by the obstinancy of the Russian hierarchy, which refused to recognize the demands of Ukrainians.¹² The Bolshevik occupation of Kiev ironically provided the opportunity for Ukrainians to celebrate their first mass in their native tongue at the St. Nicholas Cathedral; at the same time they also succeeded in gaining control of the St. Sophia Cathedral, the most famous Kievan shrine. An All-Ukrainian Church Council was then formed, but once again the Russian hierarchy refused to grant any concessions. This struggle for the use of the Ukrainian language, the archbishop observed, was in keeping with the practice of the apostles, who had received the gift of tongues from the Holy Spirit to aid them in their work. Similarly, Sts. Cyril and Methodius had translated the Holy Scriptures from Greek into a written version of Old Slavic — the language spoken by the common people — to facilitate the spread of the Word of God. Yet the Russian bishops continued to defy the works of the Holy Spirit and obstructed the religious enlightenment of the people by preventing communication in a language they understood.

At this point, continued the archbishop, Ukrainians turned to autocephaly and a tradition of self-government in their Church that extended to its inception. It was noted that the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople over the Ukrainian Church had been nominal, as he only confirmed the metropolitan, who was free to direct the Church without foreign interference through the vehicle of the sobors. But the Russian rulers would not tolerate this state of affairs or permit ecclesiastical autonomy. They finally managed to subordinate the Ukrainian Church to the Muscovite Patriarch in 1686 by cynically bribing the Turkish vizier with 300 *cherwonets*¹³ and 120 sable skins.¹³

The archbishop then refuted the accusation that the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was nothing more than a political institution. Politics, he argued, concerned party matters; the question of national identity was something different. People were Ukrainians because they were born into a tradition and inherited a language, not because they chose to be Ukrainian. A German was a German even without politics. It was the will of God that brought separate nations into existence. The preservation of national traits in a church therefore conformed with God's divine plan. And the Church, as the soul of the nation and its most lofty undertaking, was bound to lead the nation

12. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, December 1924.

13. *Ibid.*

and fight any evil that threatened to undermine it. Politics was transitory, but the Church was eternal. Its job was to care for the spiritual welfare of man, a task of paramount importance because a spiritual transformation was the only way a new and truly just order could be established in the world. The power of the Church surpassed military might because it was rooted in the very depths of human hearts and founded upon the eternal word of the Son of God.

During the question period that followed, Nicholas V. Bachynsky, a member of the Manitoba legislative assembly, asked the church leader to clarify two points: whether the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church considered itself part of the Universal Orthodox Church, and whether it could exist without recognition by the supreme authorities of the Mother Church. In reply, Theodorovich declared:

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church did not take even one step which was contrary to the principles of the Universal Orthodox Church. The Russian church itself negotiated with the Autocephalous Church on the assumption that it was a legitimate formation, and even recently requested the conditions for an agreement. In such a way it recognized the legality of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church.

Furthermore, I am in communication with the patriarchs of the East. But we must remember that the value of a church is based not on recognition but on its work. When we shall be strong in work then everyone will recognize us. (Applause). It is therefore necessary that we first recognize ourselves. When the work is evident recognition will be given. Does it ever happen that someone builds a house and then goes to the neighbour to seek recognition for the fact that it is his house? (Applause). So far, an Ecumenical Council has not been called and consequently nothing has been said about us.¹⁴

When Mr. Bachynsky maintained that "our church has received no recognition", it was revealed in the discussion that the "Czech Church" had given formal recognition. Bachynsky then questioned the legality of the denomination and Michael Stechishin, the secretary of the brotherhood, indicated that the "Czech Church" was recognized by the Serbian Orthodox Patriarch. Moreover, Metropolitan Germanos had already formally turned over the administration of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church to Archbishop Theodorovich, thereby tacitly bestowing recognition. Ukrainians, Stechishin concluded, had every right to determine their own religious life, for Moscow had subjugated their national Church by using devious means that violated the laws of God.

The evening session of the first day of the sobor was devoted to a discussion of the election of Archbishop Theodorovich as bishop

14. *Pravoslavnyi Visnyk*, January 1925.

of the Canadian Church. The case in his favour was presented by the ubiquitous Father Sawchuk, who stated that the May meeting of the consistory, brotherhood and clergy had debated the question and unanimously concluded "that the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church has nothing uncanonical about it." The elevation of Metropolitan Lypkivsky had out of necessity followed the ancient method of consecration employed in the Alexandrian Church up to — and for a time beyond — the First Ecumenical Council in Niceae in 325. This explanation satisfied the delegates and they unanimously voted to bring the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada under the jurisdiction of Archbishop Ioann Theodorovich, "on terms similar to those made with Metropolitan Germanos, with both parties maintaining their independence." When the archbishop appeared about midnight he was welcomed enthusiastically and publicly accepted the arrangement in a lengthy speech. The majestic episcopal service held next morning was the first to replace Old Slavic with the Ukrainian language in Canada. During the service Fathers Sawchuk and Wasył Kudryk were elevated to the rank of arch-priests.

The last session of the sobor dealt with methods of intensifying and expanding the work of the Church and its congregations. The role to be played by women in the sisterhoods was outlined by Sophia (Mrs. Michael) Stechishin and Olga (Mrs. Wasył) Swystun. The following individuals were then elected to the consistory: Fathers Sawchuk (chairman), Kudryk, K. Kyrstiuk and Sametz representing the clergy; and Michael Stechishin, Iwan Semeniuk and Fre Hawryliuk representing the laity. The new executive of the brotherhood consisted of Wasył Swystun (president), Isydore Nowosad (vice-president), Julian W. Stechishin (secretary), Joseph Kulachkowsky and S. Mychayliuk (members at large). The consistory and brotherhood publicly expressed gratitude to Metropolitan Germanos Shegedi for serving as the Ukrainian Church's first bishop.

The news of Archbishop Theodorovich's installation as the new head of the Canadian Church, was happily received in "autocephalous" circles in Ukraine. A report in a Kiev newspaper, indicated that thanksgiving services on the occasion of union were held by Metropolitan Vasyl in St. Sophia Cathedral.

The place of the Canadian Church in the Autocephalous Orthodox movement was more explicitly defined in the first Easter message of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council.¹⁵ In a section entitled "To the Children of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada," the relationship was enthusiastically described in the following words:

15. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, April 1925.

Lord! How joyful it is to greet with Easter felicitations our beloved and dear Brethren who are distant in body but near in soul. Great spaces and a wide ocean have divided us, but our holy Ukrainian Church now unites us...

With great attention we followed from Ukraine Your church activities. With great satisfaction and sacred joy we read the resolutions of Your Sobor. From them we learned how our Church as manifested in Your parishes consciously is paving new roads on the solid foundation of Canadian life. It is a difficult task, but carry on and do not lose spirit....

Instead of a *pysanka* (Easter egg) we send You the joyful news that our holy cause in Ukraine is blossoming and spreading. We already have on the territory of Ukraine over two thousand parishes in which 28 bishops toil. Ukrainians in Middle Asia and Kuban are uniting with us, and Galicia and other parts of Ukraine under Polish subjugation are turning their ears to us. Our Church is already entering into a legal status of existence in the Soviet Republic. The most difficult years have already been experienced and we can now look with greater hope to the future...¹⁶

The delegates at the fourth sobor, in deciding that union with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church would be desirable, had been influenced by the arguments of their Canadian Church leaders and won over by the personality of Archbishop Theodorovich, who had come from their native country and the golden-domed capital of Kiev. Although this decision was well-received in the Ukrainian Orthodox parishes scattered across the Canadian Prairies, it was still necessary to explain to all those who had not attended the sobor some of the details and complications that were involved in the move. In particular, the Church leaders had to inform the membership about the contentious issue of the Alexandrian method of ordination, on account of which the patriarchs of the Eastern Church were withholding recognition of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Kiev. The issue had been the subject of considerable debate at the sobor, where it was finally resolved to the satisfaction of the delegates and Father Nowosad was assigned to present the case to the public at large.

In an article in *Vistnyk* entitled "According to the Example from Apostolic Times", Father Nowosad explained how the apostles and their successors had been selected.

The disciples chose Matthew by lot when they made him the successor of Judas Iscariot. It was also significant that the first Christian deacons were appointed at a ceremony of prayer involving the laying of hands by the congregation. Barnabas and Saul were called to

16. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, August 1924.

become apostles by the Holy Ghost at the church at Antioch, which followed the ritual of fasting, praying and laying of hands (Acts 13:1-4). There was no mention in the Holy Scriptures of how bishops (spiritual overseers) and presbyters — meaning elders ranking higher than deacons but lower than bishops — were chosen. There did not exist definite historical evidence that the Church centred at Alexandria ordained its presbyters and bishops for several centuries by the laying of hands by members, according to the original method used to elevate St. Paul to apostleship.

That the ritual of ordination by individual presbyters was commonly practised and sometimes abused could be inferred from the exhortations of St. Paul to Timothy to "lay hands suddenly on no man" (1 Timothy 5:22). As a precaution against improper use of the office of priests, there developed the method that is still employed today: priests were ordained by bishops and bishops were ordained by at least two other properly consecrated prelates.

Although this method of ordination was initially devised to maintain certain standards and prevent abuses, it became a instrument of oppression itself through the course of many generations. By manipulating the practice, rulers could make it serve their own selfish interests. Thus it eventually gave birth to papism and caesaro-papism in the Western Church, the procedure being enlisted by various imperialist states bent on subjugating conquered or annexed nations.

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Father Nowosad continued, was an example of an institution victimized by this system. Although the Revolution of 1917 brought statehood to Ukraine and the demand for a separate Ukrainian Church, the Orthodox hierarchy there was hostile to both autonomous and autocephalous ideas because it had been long dominated by Russian or Russianized bishops. If these bishops had been true Christians they would have satisfied the aspirations of Ukrainians by ordaining bishops for their church and then withdrawing to Russia. As they refused to do this, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church — cut off from communication with the outside world by the Bolshevik regime — had to resort to the Alexandrian method of consecrating its bishops, which was also used in the Armenian Church. "What was proper and adequate for St. Paul was certainly proper and adequate for the head of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church."¹⁷

The priest then observed that no revolution had yet occurred in the Uniate or Greek Catholic Church. Uniates accepted Gregory Khomyshyn as the bishop of the Stanislaviv diocese, Josaphat Kotsylowsky for the Peremyshl diocese and Count Andrew Shepty-

17. *Ibid.*

tsky for the eparchy based in Lviv. But neither the Ukrainian faithful of Galicia nor the Uniate clergy there had been consulted in the selection of the bishops. Similarly, Bishops Soter Ortynsky in the United States and Nicetas Budka in Canada "were placed in their offices by the old Vienna sinner and profligate, Emperor Franz Joseph, or rather his minister of faiths, and were blessed by the Pope."¹⁸ These appointments were made for political reasons, Galicia having been incorporated by Poland. The selection of bishops for the Uniate Church was entirely in the hands of the Polish government, "the very same government which vowed to destroy the Ukrainian nation and its church."¹⁹ Inevitably, future bishops would be "Polish mannequins", especially since the Pope at the time had once been a former legate to Warsaw. What would eventually happen in the Uniate Church could be inferred from what was happening in the Orthodox Church in Volyn [Volynia] and Kholm [Cholm], territories that had recently come under Polish rule. There, anti-Ukrainians were already being appointed as Orthodox bishops. In all of these instances, the "canonically-approved" method of ordination was the procedure used.

Nowosad noted the irony implicit in the fact that Austrian bishops were selected through the medium of a Godless emperor and that Russian bishops were appointed by an impious tsar dominated by the deceitful and hypocritical monk, Rasputin. How often it seemed that bishops were chosen by "not only sinful people, whose hands were drenched with the blood of innocent, tortured, true ministers of the word of God..., but also people entirely unbelievers, declared heretics, prostitutes and infidels (for example, the Turks)."²⁰

The emotional tone of the article and perhaps its persuasiveness as well are captured in this excerpt from the conclusion:

....Is it not a sin to say that the Grace of God rests only on those bishops upon whom were laid the hands of the fawners of various tsars and emperors, who in addition were themselves often extreme sinners and unbelievers conducting a criminal, immoral, and profligate life, even stooping to simony and often to suicide? It could be concluded that thieves have taken God into a kind of captivity and compel Him to offer or withhold His Holy Grace according to their sinful command.... And to say now that they alone may transfer the apostolic authority to their successors, while people whose heads were not touched by their sinful hands do not have the Grace of God, is, to say the least, sinful.

18. *Ibid.*

19. *Ibid.*

20. *Ibid.*

The Grace of God is with all those who believe in Christ's teachings; it is with all Christians who have God in their hearts. It is stated that where two or three gather in the name of God, there God is with them.... When the Sobor of faithful Christians, communing in fasting and prayer, laid their hands on their selected candidate to make him the elder among them, then certainly the Grace of God would descend on him rather than on the one on whom two persons laid their hands and who have not God in their hearts....

....We see the hand of God in the fact that the Ukrainian nation came to the necessity of ordaining their metropolitan with the clean hands of the faithful and honest Orthodox clergy gathered at the Church sobor, and not with the dirty hands of tsarist hirelings. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Church was founded by the express will of God. The Ukrainian nation restored its Church through the will of God, taking the example from apostolic times.²¹

This defence of the actions of the autocephalous Church in Ukraine was important because it placed the issue of the Alexandrian method of ordination in an historical context. Whether or not the delegates at the fourth sobor really understood the implications of their decision to make Archbishop Theodorovich the head of the Canadian Church is in retrospect a moot point. An editorial in the *Ukrainets* (22 October 1924), however, attributed the unanimity of the vote to the fact that the archbishop was a skilful actor who had charmed the delegates, being fully aware that he was not a "genuine Orthodox bishop." Significantly, one looks in vain in the *Holos* and the *Vistnyk* for a discussion before the sobor of the certainly debatable canonical legality of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and its bishops. The *Farmer* maintained a neutral attitude and printed (28 February) only one relevant item on the subject before the convening of the sobor was even mentioned: an interview previously published by *Svoboda* in the United States that presented the views of Archbishop Theodorovich regarding his Church. Therefore, one could justifiably argue that the delegates lacked the necessary information to form a valid opinion and were not in a position to properly consider all of the ramifications of their eventual decision. Instead, they had to rely solely on the arguments put forth by the members of the consistory and the activists in the brotherhood. And though these leaders undoubtedly were familiar with the criticism expressed in the Greek Catholic *Ukrainets*, the majority of the rank-and-file membership was not.

The leaders of the Greek Catholic Church in Canada were consistent in their attitude toward the new Church in Ukraine. Two weeks after the interview with Archbishop Theodorovich had been

21. *Ibid.*

reprinted in the *Farmer*, and before any public mention had been made of the possibility of his becoming a Canadian bishop, the Catholic point of view was articulated in an editorial entitled "The Ukrainian Autocephalous Church" (which omitted capital letters in the article):

We now know that the u.o.a. church broke with the old orthodox church entirely and even went to the opposite extreme, retaining only the orthodox name.... Having stood on the opposite pole, it went so far that it is already impossible to push the concept of a church any further, and particularly on this point it is already impossible to recognize even the concept of an orthodox church in that gathering of people. And this [formation] cannot be recognized by any orthodox or catholic Christians because the hierarchy established from the bottom has only the name of a hierarchy and is not one according to the teachings of the gospel....

This rule by the people is conducted by meetings of soviets. This therefore looks like a soviet institution, similar to political state soviets, with only these differences: that the leaders are called bishops instead of commissars, and that their purpose is not politics and the administration of taxes, etc., but the enforcement of morality in behaviour. They place no emphasis on dogma and principles, but only on moral behaviour....

The impression one gets of this formation is that it is a great patriotic institution and not a church....²²

A public debate on the topic, "The Ukrainian Orthodox Church Is Not Necessary for the Ukrainian Nation" — held at the Queen's Theatre in Winnipeg on 23 March 1924 — was discussed at great length throughout the Ukrainian settlements in Canada and in the Ukrainian press.²³ The Greek Catholic position was presented by Dr. Emanuel Michaychuk, a dentist, and Simón Ozero, a law student. The defenders of the Orthodox Church were Wasyl Swystun and Nicholas Bachynsky, the MLA. Dogmatical and canonical aspects of the Church were avoided by mutual agreement, and there was no panel of judges to rule on a victor, the decision being left to the public and partisans on both sides. The *Holos* claimed that the Orthodox spokesmen had carried the day,²⁴ as did the *Farmer* (27 March). The Protestant *Ranok*, (25 March, 8 April) ruling on the basis of argumentation, reached a verdict in favour of the Greek Catholic side. The *Ukrainets* discussed the debate in several issues and contended that

22. *Kanadyskyi Ukrainets*, 12 March 1924. The name of the church is uncapitalized in the original, the editor, as a matter of policy in all future articles, obviously intended in such a manner to imply its insignificance.

23. An account of the debate is given in Rev. Panteleimon BOZYR, *Tsvetok Ukrainiv v Kanadi*, 230-3.

24. *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 2, 9, 16, 23 and 30 April 1924.

the Orthodox defence completely crumbled before the arguments of the Catholic side.²⁵

The first issue of the *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk* in April 1924, featuring the consistory's greetings to Archbishop Theodorovich, brought the following response from the *Ukrainets*:

To date, we have learned that Lypkivsky was ordained as metropolitan with the hands of priests, others say he was consecrated with the relics of deceased bishops; neither way has any juridical or canonical basis. This one [Lypkivsky] in turn ordained Theodorovich, who, on the basis of the illegality of his predecessor, is no more legitimate than his consecrator. If this is true, then neither possesses a genuine church experience and neither, therefore, is any kind of bishop. If such are to be church authorities, then the Saskatoon orthodox in substance is the very same as Seraphimism....

The orthodox church must have a legal episcopate if it wants to be an orthodox church.²⁶

Unlike other Ukrainian papers, the *Ukrainets* did not print any accounts of the Orthodox sobor at Yorkton, though criticism of the Church continued. The campaign was stepped up considerably when Archpriest Panteleimon Bozyk deserted the Russian Orthodox Church and was accepted into the Canadian hierarchy of the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church on 2 August 1924.²⁷ Following the lead of Bishop Stephen Dzuby and five other priests who had joined the Greek Catholic Church in the United States earlier that year,²⁸ Father Bozyk became a fierce opponent of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church. To the *Holos* (6 August 1924), Father Bozyk's defection was "no surprise", for it "was well known" that he had his paper, *Bukovyna* (1920-1), printed at the plant of the *Ukrainets*; that he had collaborated with the Greek Catholic Church; and that he had recently "been thrown out" of St. Michael's Greek Orthodox church. Some "wonder" was expressed how the fact that Father Bozyk had a wife and children would affect the situation in the Greek Catholic Church.

Not easily intimidated, Father Bozyk's first public statement as a Greek Catholic priest was directed at a familiar target:

Theodorovich does not have a legal episcopal ordination, for Vasyl Lypkivsky, who elevated him, was ordained by priests and not by bishops as is decreed in the Christian Church. In this fashion the Swystunite sect was created....

25. *Kanadyskyi Ukrainets*, 28 March; 2, 9, 16, 23 and 30 April; and 7 May 1924.

26. *Kanadyskyi Ukrainets*, 14 May 1924.

27. *Kanadyskyi Ukrainets*, 6 August 1924.

28. BOZYK, *Tsarkov Ukrainets* 261-2.

To save themselves they ostensibly adopted autocephaly, through which they lost the apostolic succession because they accepted in principle the clerical ordination of a bishop. In doing so, they are paving the way for the further splintering of national and religious forces, because two or three pastors, following the example of Lypkivsky, will elevate their own 'bishop' and will again form a new party at any time.

In the same issue (6 August 1924), the *Ukrainets* presented its views on the election of Theodorovich. The new Church, it claimed, was Presbyterian in character and obsessively nationalist in orientation — views repeated for several years until they were finally halted by court action. The following extract is typical:

Essentially this church is a more radical form of Protestantism, for, with the exception of rites it discards and negates almost everything but a single dogma of faith: nationalism....

...the sobor itself knew what it was doing and has documented with the election of Theodorovich that it has abandoned Orthodoxy.

An editorial in *Ranok* (19 August) added fuel to the fire when it quoted the Soviet Ukrainian newspaper *Visti (News)* of Kremenchuk, Ukraine, about a meeting between Archbishop Theodorovich and the Soviet consul, C. T. Rakovsky, in London, England, at which the archbishop allegedly said: "The U.A.C. is a child of the revolution and its sympathies as well as those of the great majority of the Ukrainian intelligentsia were on the side of the Soviet government.... The Ukrainian intelligentsia did not need Petliurism but rather Ukrainian culture, which at the present time is being built and revived by the soviet government."²⁹ The *Ukrainets* reprinted the statement in an editorial (3 September) and accused Archbishop Theodorovich of being a Bolshevik. The *Holos*, in defence as usual, explained (10 September) that the archbishop made no such statement and that Rakovsky's false report was released for propaganda purposes. In another piece, the *Holos* asked (29 October) hypothetically: How would a bishop be ordained by the contemporary method if something unprecedented and catastrophic happened and not a single bishop were left among the living?

The *Ukrainets*, unimpressed, continued to blast away at the "Swystunites" in each issue. It maintained (12 November) that the autocephalous method of ordination "possessed not even a shadow of similarity to... apostolic times. It was "worse than any Protestant

29. Simon Petliura was a nationalist Ukrainian leader who was the Head of the Directorate Government and Minister of War, as well as the President of the Ukrainian National Republic. He was assassinated in Paris in 1926 by a Bolshevik agent.

church" in being "ordinary seraphimism, known to us in Canada and calculated for dealers in faith and souls." And it categorically added, "We are at war with him [Theodorovich]." A week later, it argued that ideological differences were not at stake in the conflict. What was at stake was the fact that "the house is burning and it is necessary to ring all bells and shout loudly: 'The house is burning! Help! Catch the arsonists!'" Greek Catholic leaders respected "born Orthodox and Ukrainian autocephaly where they are in their place, but not in Galicia, in America or in Canada." At issue was Archbishop Theodorovich, who "was not legally consecrated according either to Catholic or 'Orthodox' canons and therefore possessed no apostolic mission."

The controversial archbishop took no part in the polemics. His article, "The Church and Politics", in the *Holos* (29 October, 5 November) was written in general terms which clearly separate one from the other. An addendum expressed his attitude toward his critics:

In the several sharp attacks directed against me by the *Kanadyskyi Ukrainets*, I see an attempt to provoke me into the same kind of polemics. This tactic is futile. I do not know how to conduct myself in such a way — either in word or in thought — and therefore I shall not reply to these insults. I only reserve the right to elucidate the ideology of the church when the situation demands it.

Despite its pro-Orthodox sympathies, the *Farmer* maintained a neutral position amidst the tirades. When it appeared that feelings on both sides were approaching a feverish pitch — with the language becoming increasingly inflammatory and the accusations potentially libellous — the *Farmer* intervened (13 November) to play the role of peacemaker.

It is high time that both church-religious camps dropped the fight among themselves, and in particular it is time for the Catholic camp to leave the Ukrainian Orthodox church in peace. Instead of dissipating their energy on overthrowing the Orthodox formation, Catholics should strengthen their own church. For as long as the Ukrainian Orthodox church is not hostile to the Ukrainian people, and as long as this church propagates and strengthens the Christian faith among our countrymen, the hostility of Catholic clergyman toward it — and their attempts to ridicule it and smear it with mud — will be without justification. There are many religious sects that are antagonistic to the Ukrainian people, which the Catholics and the Orthodox church should fight, but never each other.... Let us fight for our existence and not for our death.

Unfortunately the *Ukrainets* rejected (26 November) the plea for peace in an editorial entitled "It's a Warm Sheepskin Coat But Not Tailored For Me":

If there are any hostile sects among the Ukrainian people in Canada that must be fought, Catholics are already doing that. And since the neo-orthodox church is one of these hostile sects, Catholics are fighting it...

The religious controversy that engulfed the *Ukrainets* and the *Holos* was not reflected in the *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk* until the end of the year. An article signed W. N. (Father W. Nowosad) presented arguments which ended the dispute on the Orthodox side. Entitled "The Superiority of the Ukrainian Church", the piece (December 1924) furnished additional evidence in support of the Alexandrian method of consecration, "exploded" the myth of apostolic succession and quoted canons which were either outdated or disregarded by contemporary churches.

In the matter of episcopal ordination by two other bishops and apostolic succession, Nowosad argued that St. Paul was ordained by priests who were not apostles and in the two hundred years that the Alexandrian practice prevailed, "the legend of apostolic succession was shattered into debris. The apostles never dreamt of any kind of succession. The legend of succession arose later when episcopal offices were acquired by sinful people, who unable to extol their own good deeds, began to take cover behind the good deeds of their predecessors." The controversial matter was then approached from a different angle: If the accepted procedure was of such cardinal importance why had it not become one of the holy sacraments, together with baptism and matrimony? This rhetorical question was followed by a more daring challenge to traditional conceptions: had not the disciples ordained people who later proved to be enemies of Christianity? And had not Jesus chosen Judas Iscariot as one of His disciples? In this manner Reverend Nowosad attacked the claim that the approved method of ordination maintained legal standards regarding candidacy and provided a safeguard against abuse.

The next argument hinged on the legality of the church canons. If the canon dealing with the ordination of bishops was considered to be inviolable, Nowosad reasoned that all other canons must also be considered sacrosanct. A list of some ancient canons was provided to draw out the implications of such a position:

5. Every bishop, priest or deacon who renounces his wife must be dismissed from his ministerial office.
6. Every bishop, priest or deacon who accepts a secular occupation must be dismissed from his ministerial office.
17. Anyone who had a concubine may not be on the list of priests.
25. Every bishop, priest or deacon who resorts to immorality, the breaking of an oath or to theft must be dismissed from his ministerial office.

30. Any bishop who acquires his authority in the church through secular officials must be dismissed and expelled from the church.
34. The bishop of each people must recognize as head one from among themselves.
42. Every bishop, priest or deacon who engages in gambling or drunkenness must be dismissed from his ministerial office.
44. Every bishop, priest or deacon who takes usury from debtors must be dismissed from his ministerial rank.
47. Every bishop, priest or deacon who decides to christen a second time anyone who has already been christened, must be dismissed from his ministerial rank.
51. Any bishop, priest or deacon who avoids marriage because he abominates it, forgetting that God created man and, woman — thus despising the creation of God — must be dismissed from his ministerial office and expelled from the church.
57. Anyone who ridicules the maimed, the deaf or the blind must be expelled from the church.
64. Anyone who fasts on Sunday or Saturday, except pre-Easter Saturday, must be expelled from the church.

It was noted that the application of the thirtieth canon alone would have serious repercussions in modern times. After all, bishops in the Roman Empire had customarily been appointed by the emperor; in Russia this responsibility was in the hands of the tsar for hundreds of years. If this canon were strictly applied, every bishop ordained in violation of it should have been deposed and expelled from the Church, thereby breaking the line of succession that was purported to extend back through the ages to apostolic times.

It was thus apparent, the author concluded, that an ordinary Christian had more right to be in the Church than an expelled bishop. Every christened soul was a member of the Christian Church, but any bishop who had lost the Grace of God had also lost his right to membership. Nowosad closed with the assertion that "the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in respect to the legality of its bishops stands a whole sky higher than other churches.... A bishop ordained by the faithful gathered at a church sobor and chosen by them after prayer and fasting, like the Apostle Paul, has greater authority than a person ordained by those who, according to canons, have ceased to be members of the Christian church."

With this article the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church ended the polemical debate for several years, unequivocally committed to the autocephalous movement. The self-assurance of Orthodox supporters continued to grow, fed by embarrassing retractions in the Greek Catholic press and successful legal action. An article in the *Ukrainets*, "Trade, Trade" (Miniai, Miniai) (12 December 1923), contained slanderous allusions to Wasyl Swystun and his promotion

of the P. Mohyla Ukrainian Institute and the Orthodox Church. Court action was only avoided by the publication of an apology which admitted that twenty-five statements in the piece were fallacious. But the libellous rhetoric of the Greek Catholic organ did not abate. An editorial, "What It Is About" ("O Shchno Khodyt") (1 October 1924), after the election of Archbishop Theodorovich as the head of the Canadian Church, accused Orthodox leaders of being bankrupt businessmen who were using the Church which they had established to make money for themselves. Orthodox priests, in turn, were described as "uneducated ignoramuses, without the least knowledge of theology and rites" and denounced as imposters: "They deceive the people, for they present themselves as priests, which they are not. They are parasites on the organism of our people or 'quacks' who want to live by deceiving the people." Father Sawchuk challenged these allegations in the Court of King's Bench, which on 24-25 June 1925 found the *Ukrainets* guilty of libel and fined its publishers \$10,000. Although this amount was reduced to \$7,000 at the request of the defendant,³⁰ the fine was never paid, nor was the case reported, by the *Ukrainets*. The judgment, however, served to deter insulting remarks and doubtful or unfounded accusations for several years.

After the lawsuit, the West Canada Publishing Company ceased to publish the *Ukrainets*, which was immediately taken over by the Ukrainian People's Press Limited, a private company that also published the *Farmer*. Even under the new management, a defamatory article, "In the Service of Foreigners", somehow found its way into print on 9 May 1928. Quoting a news item in the *Catholic Register*, which had originally appeared in Toronto's *Daily Mail and Empire*, the Ukrainian paper self-righteously editorialized: "What we had written about several years ago is being fulfilled.... The props of the autocephalous church, together with their Theodorovich, have sold themselves to the protestants, and entered the road of a new evolution.... We further confirm that the autocephalous church, assisted by protestant money, works to harm Ukrainian immigration in Canada and as such is harmful and dangerous to Ukrainians in Canada."³¹

When Archbishop Theodorovich, Father Sawchuk and Wasył Swystun responded with a formal protest on behalf of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church and themselves, the publishers, to avoid a costly lawsuit, issued the following "Correction":

30. The proceedings were reported on in their entirety in *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 1 July 1925.

31. *Kanadyjskyi Ukrainets*, 9 May 1928.

We carefully examined all the charges that were contained in the said article, and without the least hesitation declare that all the allegations and remarks contained therein, are false.

It is a falsehood that the Protestants support the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in Canada. What we wrote several years ago was false and what we wrote in the aforementioned article is also false.

We wrote that the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in Canada was moving in the Protestant direction and gave reasons for such an allegation. What we wrote was false and the reasons were false.

It is not true that the leaders of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, together with their bishop, Theodorovich, sold themselves to the Protestants and have entered the road of the new evolution. Our predictions were false and what we predicted did not happen.

The history of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in Canada is honourable and pure. It was established at the spontaneous desire of the Ukrainian masses in Canada. Our comparison of this church with Seraphimism, Bodrugism and Makaryism, and the allegations that it was established 'to trim the wings of Bishop Budka' are false.

The ties of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada had with His Excellency Germanos, the Syrian metropolitan, and the present ties between the church and his Excellency Ivan Theodorovich, have been and continue to be honourable and worthy of respect; they are above any kind of suspicion.

It is not true that the associations which from the outset supported this church have publicly renounced it, or that respectful people from this church in the press as harmful to the Ukrainians in Canada, or that parishes are returning to the church of their fathers, or that autocephalous priests are joining other churches. The bishop, priests and leaders of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in Canada are worthy of respect, are fully devoted to their church and are giving their efforts with devotion to the expansion of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada; and in the interest of those who are attached to it, as in every other religious group, [they] serve the objectives desired among the Ukrainian settlers in Canada, because they endeavour to raise them to a higher level and to lofty ideals.

Our allegations that Protestant churches are financially aiding the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada are false and groundless.

The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada does not work to harm the Ukrainian immigration in Canada, but on the contrary serves good and noble objectives; and our allegations in the aforementioned article, ascribing lack of good will and veiled objectives to people associated with this church, were and are false; consequently, we sincerely apologize to His Excellency Archbishop Ivan Theodorovich, Father S. W. Sawchuk and Mr. W. Swystun and all other leaders, members and supporters of this church, expressing our sincere regrets for the injury caused by publishing defamatory allegations and allusions to them. In the future we shall exert every effort not to allow irresponsible persons to use the columns of our newspaper to make

defamatory attacks on the bishop, priests and leaders of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada.

The publishers of the *Canadian Ukrainian* and the *Canadian Farmer*.

The Ukrainian Peoples Press Ltd.

The National Press Ltd.³²

This recantation was a bitter pill for the leaders of the Greek Catholic Church to have to swallow. Essentially, it was an admission that accusations made over the years against the Greek Orthodox Church were unfounded. It meant that charges of Protestantism and Seraphimism could no longer appear in the Greek Catholic press. Even more important, the most formidable opponent of Ukrainian Orthodoxy in Canada was compelled to recognize the legitimacy of the movement; it was no longer possible to apply "shop", "elevator", or similar derogatory epithets to its rival. Effectively silenced, the *Ukrainets* ceased publication at the end of 1930.

It is difficult to overestimate the significance of this victory for the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church and its leaders. It is noteworthy that the term "Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in Canada" was chosen as the official designation, as if formally to acknowledge the allegiance of Ukrainian Orthodox Canadians to the Autocephalous Church in Ukraine. The use of the parallel name underlined the affiliation and character of the Canadian Church, and challenged the Greek Catholic leaders, in particular, to recognize that fact.

Despite Greek Catholic propagandists' former claims to the contrary, the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church was steadily making headway in the community.³³ The first two annual tours of Archbishop Theodorovich included visits to thirty-six different parishes in the three Prairie provinces, the total comprising about half the congregations within the church at the time.³⁴ The bishop's itinerary on these tours serves as a useful record of some of the more active early Orthodox communities:

1924

Aug. 2	Gardenton, Man.
" 3	Arbakka, Man.
" 10	Winnipeg, Man.
" 17	Tolstoi, Man.

1925

Aug. 9	Brandon, Man.
" 16	Winnipeg, Man.
" 19	Fenwood, Sask.
" 23	Goodeve, Sask.

32. *Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets*, 30 May 1928.

33. Father Sawchuk's estimate for the number of parishes in the Church at the close of 1924 — obtained through correspondence with the author — is 70-75, some of which were only served on an infrequent basis.

34. Taken from *Pravoslavnyi Vistyk*.

"	19	Senkiw, Man.	"	28	Canora, Sask.
"	22	Menzie, Man.	"	30	Theodore, Sask.
"	24	Sheho, Sask.	Sept.	6	Melville, Sask.
"	28	Meacham, Sask.	"	13	Radymno, Sask.
"	31	St. Julien, Sask.	"	20	Krydor, Sask.
Sept.	7	Shypenitz, Alta.	"	21	St. Julien, Sask.
"	11	Espas, Alta.	"	27	Slawa, Alta.
"	14	Mundare, Alta.	Oct.	4	Mundare, Alta.
"	21	Radway Centre, Alta.	"	6	Zawale, Alta.
"	27	Bufford, Alta.	"	11	Bruderheim, Alta.
"	28	Edmonton, Alta.	"	14	Wilno, Alta.
Oct.	3	Saskatoon, Sask.	"	18	Smoky Lake, Alta.
"	5	Goodeve, Sask.	"	25	Radway Centre, Alta.
"	12	Regina, Sask.	Nov.	1	Tolstoi, Man.
"	14	Hamton, Sask.	"	8	Fort William, Ont.
"	19	Keld, Man.			

To meet the growing demands of the Church, a theological seminary was directed in Regina, Saskatchewan, by Father Kornylo Kyrstiuk from the autumn of 1925 to the summer of 1926. The following were the first candidates to be ordained by Archbishop Theodorovich: Dmytro Leshchyshyn, Myroslaw Podolsky, John Mayba, Alexander Horbay and Peter Zaparaniuk.³⁵

The stirring oratory and dynamic personality of Archbishop Theodorovich; the fervour and unselfish dedication of Orthodox clergy and lay leaders; the energy of newly-ordained and youthful priests who took to their work with an undaunted zeal; and the spread of a passionately nationalist spirit, all contributed to a rapid increase in the number of Ukrainian Orthodox parishes. Among them were Greek Catholic congregations that had refused to come under the charter of Bishop Budka, but even more numerous were independent Bukovynian parishes originally served by priests of the eclipsed and swiftly declining Russian Orthodox Church.³⁶ Some in the Russian fold had to be acquired through lawsuits: St. Michael's Church in Winnipeg and Arbakka in Manitoba, Sheho and Edmore in Saskatchewan, and Andrew and Soda Lake in Alberta. The decisive evidence in the court cases proved to be the agreement of 16 July 1919, signed by Archbishop Alexander Nemykovsky and approved by Metropolitan Platon Rozhdestvensky.³⁷ Once the precedents were set, the transfer of Russian churches in such Saskatchewan communities as Saskatoon, Meacham, St. Julien, Canora, Insinger and

35. Borys, *Fourty Ukrainians*, 244.

36. *Ibid.*, 285-6.

37. The case involving the parish at Edmore, Saskatchewan, received extensive coverage in *Ukrainskyi Holos*, 11 February 1925.

Theodore, and in other centres across Canada, was simply a matter of obtaining majority approval. Numerous churches were also built during this period of expansion, a notable example being the Cathedral of St. Mary the Protectress in Winnipeg, begun in 1925. New parishes were also established for the first time in eastern Canada, initially in Toronto, then in Montreal (1926). By the end of 1928 the Church claimed to have 26,000 members, 38,000 communicants under pastoral care, 152 parishes and twenty-one priests.³⁸

It is clear the spiritual leadership provided by Archbishop Theodorovich in the first five years of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada played an important part in making the new Church a dynamic force in Ukrainian Canadian society. Standing firmly behind their elected bishop and the principles of Ukrainian autocephaly, as embodied in the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky, the laity of the young Church worked in close co-operation and harmony with the hierarchy. And though the future looked bright from the vantage point of those idealistic years, dark clouds were already beginning to appear on the horizon.

38. *Canadian Almanac*: 1929, 446.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Dissension Within the Church

The serenity of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church was broken by a violent internal explosion in 1935 which subsequently triggered a series of lawsuits in the Canadian courts. The issue at stake was a familiar one, revolving around the validity of claims to apostolic succession by the bishop of the Canadian Church, who was, it must be remembered, part of the hierarchy of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine and the head of the Church in America. The discord brought into focus once again the contentious principles behind the establishment of the Church in Ukraine, namely, the legitimacy of its sanctity — that is, its inheritance of Divine Grace — and the canonicity of the apostolic succession of its hierarchy. By this time the Church in Soviet Ukraine had been destroyed by the Bolshevik government, and seeds of dissension were gradually sown outside the homeland. The fertile soil in which the conflict took root was the American Church, the sister institution of the Canadian movement. Had the dispute not spilled over the national border, the Canadian Church would undoubtedly have continued along its path of peaceful progress.

The fifth and sixth sobors of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada — the first held in Saskatoon on 20-21 July 1927¹ and the second in Yorkton on 25-27 November 1930² — were routine affairs that featured reports on the steady growth of the Church. Two events, however, were noteworthy. In 1930, Wasył Swystun, the president of the brotherhood since its inception, withdrew from active leadership, declining to hold any executive position; and in 1929 a

1. See the report published in *Pravoslavnyi Vistyk*, August, September and November 1927.

2. See the report in *Vistyk*, 1 December 1930 to 15 April 1931. *Pravoslavnyi Vistyk* was formally abbreviated to *Vistyk* on 1 January 1928, when it began appearing on a bi-monthly basis.

Dominion charter was finally obtained³ having been drawn up by the following committee elected by delegates to the fifth sobor: Father S. W. Sawchuk, W. Swystun, Michael and Myroslaw Stechishin.

As part of the charter incorporating the Church took on added significance in the bitter struggle that rocked the Church in the mid-thirties, it merits close attention. Of particular interest is the article dealing with the basic tenets of the faith:

The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada hereby declares that its faith and dogma are the same as that of the various already existing Greek Orthodox Churches, and that it adheres to the faith and dogma adopted by the First Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Christian Church.

It should be noted that this statement — the only one in the document elaborating on the fundamental principles guiding the Church — is of a very general nature. There is no mention of canons or any reference to affiliation with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine, despite the fact that the Canadian bishop belonged and proclaimed allegiance to it, and despite the formal recognition that the fourth sobor bestowed upon the autocephalous formation. These conspicuous omissions can only suggest that the authors of the charter were already having misgivings about the character of the Church in Ukraine and therefore were deliberately vague when articulating the theological basis of the Ukraine Greek Orthodox Church of Canada. Obviously they wished to avoid complications that might arise sometime in the future. Could it be that they had a premonition of the coming crisis? Whatever the explanation, one thing is certain: the ambiguous clause was to haunt its authors. One cannot escape the irony that it was Wasyl Swystun — an active participant in the drafting and processing of the charter — who eventually precipitated the crisis in the Church.⁴

The controversial matter of the canonical legality of Archbishop Ivan Theodorovich's ordination was revived and brought to the fore by a rebellious group of former Greek Catholic priests who had rejected the jurisdiction of Bishop Constantine Bohachevsky and abandoned the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church in the United States. Dissatisfaction with Bishop Bohachevsky had come to a head at a congress of Greek Catholics meeting in Philadelphia on 29 December

3. "An Act to incorporate The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada", in *Statutes of Canada*, 1929, 19-20 George V, chap. 98, 83-88. Assented to on 1 May 1929.

4. The Senate files at Ottawa reveal that Wasyl Swystun, along with Father S. W. Sawchuk and J. Stechishin, was a signatory of the petition drawn up in Saskatoon and dated 9 January 1929.

1926. On that occasion, 130 delegates representing eighty-five parishes vigorously opposed the bishop's Ruthenianism and his complete subservience to Rome. The protest climaxed in an open revolt that ended with the dissidents refusing to recognize the bishop's authority.⁵ The consequences of this mutiny was that nine leaders of the opposition, including Dr. Luka Myshuha, editor of *Svoboda*, were excommunicated. On 27 February 1927 approximately thirty Greek Catholic priests held a convention in New York that agreed to request a papal recall of the offending bishop.⁶ Bohachevsky retaliated by suspending the instigator of the revolt — who happened to be his former professor of theology, the Reverend Dr. Joseph Zuk — and demanding that the disaffected clergymen recant their stand. Some of the priests duly apologized, but thirteen chose to leave the Church in 1927.⁷ Initially they formed an independent "Ukrainian Orthodox-Greek Catholic" Church, which soon was publishing its own paper, *Dzvin* (The Bell).⁸ Not easily intimidated by their difficult circumstances, the indomitable group of rebels slowly expanded their base of support and by 1931 had managed to secure the recognition of the Patriarch of Constantinople.⁹

From the very beginning this rebel band of former Uniate priests refused to join the American Orthodox Church led by Archbishop Theodorovich. Maintaining that his consecration was uncanonical, the disenchanted Greek Catholics insisted that the archbishop secure recognition from the Patriarch of Constantinople as a pre-condition to their acceptance of his jurisdiction. The "correction" could be made during the liturgical celebration that would sanctify the proposed union. Theodorovich was willing to satisfy this condition provided that it was sanctioned by the Church in Ukraine. He expressed his opinion on the matter in a letter to the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council in Kiev, which, however, resolved to take no action.¹⁰ The following excerpts reveal the bishop's thoughts concerning the proposal:

Our church... considers the act of union only as an act of joint participation in the Eucharist. One or another rite of ordination or consecration is only a matter of external form....

On these grounds, I feel that if the Ecumenical Church insists on a standard form of consecration, whose circumvention would be a

5. *Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk*, June 1927.

6. *Ibid.*

7. *Vistnyk*, 15 October 1928.

8. *Vistnyk*, 15 August 1931.

9. *Vistnyk*, 1 October 1931.

10. The letter was published in the official organ of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, *Tserkva i Zhittia* [The Church and Life] (Kiev) no. 2, 1928.

violation of church discipline, we have nothing against it and could agree to one such standard form. But this is only a question of discipline and not a question of grace [*blahodariu*].... If such an ecclesiastical discipline would require the supplementing of our consecration because of the character of its inadequacy, in the name of church peace, along with our expression of faith that God's grace was granted to us on the strength of our faith, I can see no difficulty in satisfying the demand, meaning the demand of that discipline.¹¹

This willingness on the part of Archbishop Theodorovich to supplement his consecration had tragic repercussions in that it opened a Pandora's box full of doubts upon the hierarchy of his Church in the United States. In 1930 a special meeting of the American consistory rejected the bishop's proposal that the church come under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople "for the price of the supplement of his consecration." The American position was at that time supported by a representative of the Canadian Church,¹² and therein began the unfortunate chain of events that would eventually rock both institutions.

Negotiations between the dissident Greek Catholics and Archbishop Theodorovich began in October 1930 and continued in March of the following year. Essentially, any potential agreement hinged on the archbishop's acceptance of the Patriarch of Constantinople, which would entail his supplementary consecration in conformity with the general canons followed by Orthodox Churches around the world.¹³ These negotiations proved to be disastrous to the autocephalous movement in the United States, for two of its leading priests, Father Ivan Hundyak, the editor of *Dnipro*, and Father Andrew Ivanyshyn, formerly the secretary to the American consistory — both of whom had originally been Uniate priests — left Archbishop Theodorovich on the grounds that his consecration was uncanonical. Their recruitment into the ranks of the Greek Catholic dissident movement immeasurably strengthened the breakaway faction, which adopted the name "Ukrainian Orthodox Church of North America" at a sobor held in New York in July 1931. The same sobor elected Reverend Zuk, who had finally defected from the Greek Catholic Church, to be the bishop of the new formation. He was consecrated under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople in the fall of that year. All of these developments served to weaken the Autocephalous Church and to undermine the prestige of Archbishop Theodorovich, who became increasingly anxious about the "inadequacy" of his consecration.

11. *Ibid.*

12. Wasyl Swystun, *Kryzo v Ukraïnskii Pravoslavnyi (avtokefálny) Tserkvi*, 36.

13. *Visnyk*, 15 August 1931.

The problem was exacerbated with the death of Bishop Zuk in the autumn of 1934. The leaders of the new Ukrainian Orthodox Church used the opportunity to once again approach Archbishop Theodorovich with a proposition of union on the same basis as that first made in 1930.¹⁴ This time Archbishop Theodorovich secured the sanction of the consistory of the American diocese of his Church. A forty-eight point agreement of union was secretly signed by the consistories of both Churches on 6 March 1935, the text of which was destined to become the subject of a fierce debate at the seventh sobor of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada during the summer of the same year.¹⁵ The public announcement of the proposed union was worded as follows:

The Most Venerable and Revered spiritual Fathers and all the faithful are hereby informed that with the help of God all misunderstandings and the struggle between the U.A.O.C. [Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church] of the U.S.A. and the U.O.C. [Ukrainian Orthodox Church] of North America have ended.

The consistories of both of the above mentioned Churches, in the month of December of the preceding year, had renewed negotiations which had begun in July 1930 and were interrupted.

The object of these negotiations was, in the past and is also in the present, an agreement between both Churches and their mutual cooperation; which must lead to their complete union in a single Regenerated Church of the Ukrainian Nation.¹⁶

Archbishop Thodorovich informed the consistory of the Canadian Church about the agreement of union in a letter dated 11 March 1935, but failed to provide a copy of the terms of the arrangement. Father S. W. Sawchuk's reply on 14 March indicates that Canadian Church leaders were shocked and angered by the move:

Your communications regarding the agreement with the Zukites caught us wholly unaware. We knew nothing about it and actually know nothing about it now, except that the agreement was made; but the terms and how it affects us in Canada are a mystery to us... [and therefore] we must protest against it most strenuously. The matter of rejecting the principles of autocephaly, and Your subordination to the patriarch, is not exclusively Your personal affair or a question that pertains only to the American Church without interest to the Canadian Church. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada is profoundly interested in this question, and justice itself as well as the welfare of the Ukrainian Church would demand that it be able to have its word

14. SWYSHUN, *Kryzys v Tserkvi*, 36.

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Dniipro*, 15 March 1935 and *Visnyk*, 1 April 1935.

before the consummation of the agreement and before the dispatching of the request to the patriarch.¹⁷

The head of the Canadian consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church demanded a full explanation of the actions of the archbishop and more details regarding the text of the document. His questions on behalf of the leaders of the Church, were intended to clarify the situation and were therefore quite specific:

5. Would You agree to a reconsecration if the patriarch demanded it? This refers even to the possibility that such a reconsecration would have to be "concealed" in the act of elevating You to the rank of metropolitan.
6. Was Your request "that the patriarch... be so gracious as to accept our Church under his guardianship" sent in the name of the American Church exclusively, or was it also made on behalf of the Canadian Church?
7. What are Your plans or alternatives should the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada at its Sobor reject the proposal to abandon autocephaly and to subordinate itself, together with You, to the patriarch — either with Your reconsecration or without it?
8. In the event that patriarchal blessing of the union is obtained along with an agreement from the U.G.O.C. of Canada to abandon autocephaly and to subordinate itself, together with You, to the patriarch what plans do You have regarding the establishment of a Ukrainian hierarchy in Canada and America; that is, from where will we get candidates for Ukrainian bishops, bearing in mind that the patriarch will not approve married candidates? Our clergy in Canada and America is married, and therefore we shall never have our own candidates for bishops if they must be unmarried. The same problem of finding candidates for bishops may be repeated as that which was experienced by the Zukites, and which eventually compelled them to approach You.¹⁸

The archbishop's answers in a letter written on 18 March were for the most part evasive.¹⁹ He claimed that he was unable to respond to many of the questions because it would be premature to release all the details of the arrangement. The accusation that he had launched the undertaking without consulting his Canadian diocese was countered with the argument that the Dominion charter, an equally important document in Theodorovich's opinion, was obtained without his episcopal counsel. "The only worker in the Church who does not have to be paid is the bishop." He reminded the Canadians that when he had suggested that a new bishop be installed by means of the Alexandrian method originally used by the Church in Ukraine the

17. SWESTUN, *Kryva v Turekii*, 37-8.

18. *Ibid.*, 38-9.

19. *Ibid.*, 39-41.

proposal was not well received. Not surprisingly, he rejected the consistory's suggestion that a candidate be elevated to the episcopacy in the traditional manner by two bishops of an European Orthodox Church that did not consider him to be a canonical bishop. Furthermore, Theodorovich claimed it was the delaying tactics of the Canadian church leaders that had finally driven him to seek relations with the Eastern patriarchate. The archbishop assured Reverend Sawchuk that several qualified candidates for the episcopacy would most certainly meet with the approval of the Patriarch. He declared unequivocally that he had made no commitments on behalf of the Canadian Church: "Concerning my letter to the Patriarch, I sent it from myself personally and this does not bind You." The remainder of his letter elaborated on the agreement to unite the two Orthodox groupings in the United States.

The consistory discussed the reply on 4 April, and Father Sawchuk communicated the results four days later. He explained that the position of the Canadian Church remained unchanged: "The Ukrainian Orthodox Church and its hierarchy always were and are Grace-bearing and that is precisely why we regarded and still regard as unnecessary and even improper to strive for patriarchal recognition."²⁰ It was noted that the Alexandrian method had been resorted to in Ukraine solely because of existing circumstances, and that future ordinations were in the accepted manner according to canons adopted by the autocephalous formation. Moreover, it was the opinion of the consistory that it would be proper to ordain a second North American bishop with the assistance of another Orthodox Church in Europe since the new bishop would immediately come under Archbishop Theodorovich's authority. Such a move virtually ensured continuing autocephaly, as it would be nearly impossible for the consecrating bishop to meddle in the affairs of the Canadian Church in the unlikely event that they should want to do so.

Father Sawchuk denounced the agreement of union on the grounds that it would ultimately humiliate the Church in the United States. "The Zukites", he warned, "still maintain that he [Theodorovich] is an uncanonical bishop and that patriarchal recognition is necessary", because their aim was to outwit the archbishop and "to liquidate the autocephalous church in America." Sawchuk expressed surprise that the archbishop would give his consent to such one-sided conditions. Furthermore, by informing the Canadian Church of his actions after an agreement had been reached, the prelate had left the sobor with but two unsatisfactory choices: "to state 'yes' or 'no' — and such a 'yes' or 'no' will decide for the Canadian church only

20. *Ibid.*, 42.

one of two diametrically opposed courses: either to manifest before the world that together with the Zukites we do not believe in the grace of the U.A.O.C. and go together with them under the patriarch, or — to part company with the American Church."²¹

The indignant tone of Father Sawchuk's letter was to some extent outward posturing, for there were already signs that the consistory was reconsidering its policy vis-à-vis the Autocephalous Church. The first indication that opinion was shifting was an editorial in the *Holos* on 6 March 1935, entitled "A Fish in Murky Water." Significantly, it was written by Myroslaw Stechishin, the editor and a member of the consistory. The article approved the recent action of the Greek Catholic bishop, Basīl Ladyka, who had suspended two of his priests, Fathers A. Sarmatiuk and N. Shumsky, for having married after ordination. Two statements in the article sparked a serious controversy within Orthodox circles. The first claimed that "Neither the Catholic nor the Orthodox church permits a priest to enter into wedlock after ordination." The second expanded on the relevant part of this assertion: "The Orthodox church... considers that if anyone of his own free will and after mature reflection decide to become ordained as a celibate then he must continue to live in that state unmarried and must not marry after ordination. Similarly, the Orthodox church forbids widowed priests to re-marry."

This position was immediately challenged by Wasył Swystun in the same issue:

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada is a separate or autocephalous church in matters of church administration and episcopacy, but at the same time in matters of dogma and canons it is part of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church which was revived in 1921 under the leadership of the Metropolitan of Kiev and all Ukraine, Vasył Lypkivsky. Having accepted Archbishop Ioann Theodorovich as its bishop and having united with the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada, in regard to dogma and canons, thus approved the policy of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in Ukraine.

Because of this, it was governed by canons that the Ukrainian Church had sanctioned at the first All-Ukrainian Church Sobor held in Kiev in 1921, which in the matter of marriage had declared, according to Swystun:

In other words, Canons resolve that in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church bishops may be married and also that the clergy, in the matter of wedlock, are subject to the general laws of the Orthodox Church which apply to the marital unions of all the faithful. The laws of the

21. *Ibid.*, 43.

Orthodox church permit not only a second marriage for widowers (and widows), but also a church divorce (or severance of wedlock). The clergy of the Ukrainian Church also have these very same rights.

Father Sawchuk's position in the next issue of the *Holos* was that Swystun's "assertions were not in conformity with reality" for the following reasons:

1. When the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada was established in 1918, it accepted the same faith and dogma as that of various already existing Greek Orthodox Churches; thus it adheres to the faith and dogma adopted by the First Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Christian Church (see paragraph 1 of the Charter of the U.G.O.C. of Canada), and up to the present by no resolution has it become part of any other church.... In matters about which it has not made special resolutions or decisions, it adheres to the canons and practices of the Ecumenical Orthodox Church.
2. The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada nowhere and never made a resolution to accept the canons of the Ukr[ainian] Autoceph[alous] Orthodox Church in Ukraine as its own....
3. In the matter of the marriage of priests the Ukr[ainian] Greek Orthodox Church of Canada adhered and still adheres to the canons of the Ecumenical Orthodox Church. Up to the present all candidates for priesthood in the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada were obligated to marry before ordination....

In conclusion, it is necessary to state that most of the canons of the Ukr[ainian] Autoceph[alous] Orthodox Church in Ukraine, approved by the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Sobor 14/30 October 1921 without the participation of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, are in general unacceptable in Canada.... The Ukr[ainian] Greek Orthodox Church of Canada may but does not have to accept any canons of the Ukr[ainian] Autoceph[alous] Orthodox Church in Ukraine which it considers beneficial and necessary in its activities and development, on the condition that such acceptance takes place formally, at a legal Sobor of the Ukr[ainian] Greek Orthodox Church of Canada.²²

Confronted with Sawchuk's contradictory "evidence", Swystun claimed that he "could not believe his eyes" and wondered "how the administrator of the Church and head of the consistory could write things which were completely at loggerheads with the facts." He immediately prepared a lengthy article, challenging Sawchuk's arguments but it was rejected by the editor of the *Holos* on the grounds that it was damaging to the Church and the administrator.²³ After

22. Wasyl SWYSTUN, *Dogmatychno-kanonichne Stanovyschne Ukrainiskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi*, 9.

23. *Ibid.*

consultation, the disputants agreed to place the matter before the forthcoming sobor, with Reverend Sawchuk consenting, in the meantime, to publish a declaration in the *Holos* that his article expressed personal views and was not the official opinion of the Church.²⁴ When the promised statement failed to materialize, Swystun decided that he had no other recourse but to publish his reply in a pamphlet, which appeared early in May 1935 as (translated) *The Dogmatical-Canonical Position of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada*. In it, he challenged the "party line" and offered documentary evidence to support the following five tenets:

1. The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada is a part of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine and therefore is bound by its dogmatical-canonical practices.
2. Spiritually, i.e., dogmatically and canonically, the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the U.S.A. and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine form one church, of which the Canadian and American churches form a single diocese under a single bishop. Juridically, all three churches are separate.
3. Therefore, in matters of marriage the Canadian Church cannot be bound by the canons of the Ecumenical Orthodox Church but must adhere to the canons of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine, which approve marriage of priests after ordination, as practiced in Ukraine and in the American church.
4. It is right that no canons were formally accepted, and consequently that nowhere and never did our Church accept the canons and practices of the Ecumenical Orthodox Church.
5. The acceptance of Archbishop Theodorovich as bishop of the Canadian church and the recognition of the canonicity of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church signifies that our Church also accepted all of its canons. The Fourth Sobor did not state that it accepted some of the canons and rejected others.

The remainder of the pamphlet was devoted to the "canonical union" that Archbishop Theodorovich had negotiated with the Patriarch of Constantinople. Swystun denounced the secrecy of the manoeuvre and described as a "shock and scandal for the Church" the pre-condition upon which the merger hinged — a correction in the consecration or a re-consecration of the bishop.²⁵ In accusing the archbishop of violating the canons of his Church, and in castigating him for seeking canonical union "with the Patriarch of Constantinople, who, according to the words of the very Archbishop Ivan uttered by him at the Fourth Sobor, sold our country to the Musco-

24. *Ibid.*, 9-10.

25. *Ibid.*, 28.

vite Patriarch for 120 sable skins and a small sum of money". Swystun virtually insinuated that the prelate was a traitor to the cause of his Church. It was Swystun's opinion that the planned "canonical union" with the Patriarch of Constantinople meant nothing less than "canonical disunion with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church."²⁶ He thought, moreover, that Archbishop Theodorovich had violated a fundamental principle of the Canadian Church, namely, the commitment to *subornopravnist* (conciliarism) on the primacy of the sobor — the democratic ideal as applied to religious affairs. The archbishop's first steps toward union had been taken with the approval and co-operation of the American consistory, but "without the participation of the whole Church represented at a Sobor and without the knowledge of the Church in Canada."²⁷ Roundly censuring Theodorovich for his "irresponsibility", Swystun declared that the course of events had brought him to an inevitable conclusion:

In my opinion, he [Theodorovich] took a step which puts him outside the realm of the Ukr[ainian] Autocephalous Orthodox Church. It seems to me that the coming Sobor of the Ukr[ainian] Orth[odox] Church in Canada will have no other alternative but to condemn the step of Archbishop Ivan Theodorovich and find a way of ordaining another bishop for our Church in Canada.²⁸

The new bishop, Swystun suggested, could be consecrated by the Alexandrian method used in 1921 by the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine.

With Swystun's dissatisfaction virtually a call for open revolt, Archbishop Theodorovich was forced to defend his position as the head of the Canadian Church in a pamphlet from Philadelphia entitled (translated) *The Present State of the Native Church and Our Problems*, dated 23 May 1935. He had hoped to leave the matter for the sobor to decide, but was compelled to act sooner because of Swystun's "energetic efforts to give his pamphlet the widest possible circulation."²⁹ Theodorovich first reprimanded Swystun for making categorical statements "which he had no right to make and which decisively do not correspond with the truth."³⁰ By not consulting with the bishop before making his dissent public, Swystun had shown himself to be a "wrecker of the Church who chooses the best way of destroying the authority of the Church and then destroying the

26. *Ibid.*, cit.

27. *Ibid.*, cit.

28. *Ibid.*, 29.

29. Ivan THEODOROVICH, *Teperishnyi Stan Ridnoi Tserkvy i Nashi problemy*, 1.

30. *Ibid.*, 8.

Church itself."³¹ Theodorovich pointedly reminded the discontented lawyer that, although the Church was democratically structured, this did not mean that any individual could attack the bishop at will and without foundation: "A private person may express his opinion and criticism only when he acquires definite credentials from the Church and then only at a Sobor."³²

In his defence, the archbishop declared that he did not surreptitiously meet with the breakaway Orthodox formation in the United States, but did so with the approval obtained at a conference of his American clergymen held in December 1934. He had also written a letter to the consistory of the Canadian Church on 18 March 1935; notifying it of the proposed union and of the memorandum which he was about to send to the Patriarch of Constantinople. The memo was duly delivered to Archbishop Athenagoras on 30 March. Theodorovich quoted a passage from his letter to the Canadian consistory absolving him of the charge that he had acted irresponsibly: "The time for a definite decision will come after receiving a reply from the Patriarch. Then, you can be sure I shall come to an understanding with You beforehand."³³ Clearly, the bishop intended to work out all the details of an arrangement before presenting the matter to his North American dioceses for approval.

In establishing contact with the Patriarch of Constantinople, Theodorovich claimed that he was acting on behalf of all parts of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, including the Canadian and American Churches under his personal jurisdiction. He supported the claim with a letter from the All-Ukrainian Church Council in Kiev, dated 7 August 1925, which empowered him to represent the autocephalous movement in religious and institutional affairs involving relations with churches outside the Soviet Union.³⁴ But the situation was complicated by the fact that the Church in Ukraine had been essentially destroyed by the Bolsheviks, who designated a sycophant named Ivan Pavlovsky as metropolitan. Theodorovich described the problem as follows: "We would like to be in spiritual-canonical union with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in Ukraine, but we do not have such a union, because there exists no Church there which we could recognize."³⁵ Regarding the status and authority of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky and Mykola Boretsky, the archbishop noted that, although they were mentioned in the liturgy, they were not technically members of a canonically organized church

31. *Loc. cit.*

32. *Ibid.*, 9.

33. *Ibid.*, 4.

34. *Ibid.*, 17-8.

35. *Ibid.*, 6.

body.³⁶ And in this manner the independent-minded prelate painted a tragic picture of the Canadian and American Churches, describing them as fragments dissociated from the body of the Mother Church.

Theodorovich chided Swystun for censuring all the patriarchs of Constantinople for the indiscretion of one who succumbed to devious manipulation and allowed the Ukrainian Church to pass under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Moscow in 1686. To show the superficiality of such an attitude, he cited several instances when Greek patriarchs were benefactors of the Ukrainian Church. Theodorovich then categorically rejected Swystun's contention that canonical union with the Patriarchate of Constantinople meant canonical disunion with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. The sobor of 1921, he observed, not only confirmed the faith, dogma and canons adopted by the Seven Ecumenical Councils, but also declared that the new formation remained "in inviolable fraternal unity with all Orthodox Churches." Therefore, the objections to a possible union with the Patriarchate of Constantinople were groundless. How could it mean disunion with the Mother Church when the new formation was committed to fraternal union with all Orthodox churches?³⁷

Regarding the method of episcopal ordination used in post-revolutionary Ukraine, the archbishop was most emphatic in stating that the Alexandrian technique had been used as a last resort in desperate circumstances. He underlined the fact that "once and for all time forbade the repetition of this act" after the consecration of the first two bishops.³⁸ To Theodorovich, this indicated that the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church did not desire to break away from the unity of the Church, which he described as the "living and most sacred Body of Christ on the earth." From here the prelate argued that since the North American dioceses "are dissociated from the Native Church, we may seek the temporary guardianship of the Ecumenical Church Authority."³⁹ Theodorovich revealed that his memorandum to the Patriarch, which would be read at the pending Sobor, suggested that "in the interests of Ecumenical Orthodoxy it would be proper if the Patriarch decided to accept our Church outside the boundaries of Ukraine under his guardianship and for this purpose to find a worthy and painless process."⁴⁰ Furthermore, Theodorovich claimed that he had informed the patriarch's representative, Archbishop Athenagoras "that if the Patriarch insisted on demanding a new consecration, I shall be in no position to fulfill this demand."⁴¹

36. *Ibid.*, 7.

37. *Ibid.*, 14.

38. *Ibid.*, 20.

39. *Ibid.*, 21.

40. *Ibid.*, 23.

41. *Loc. cit.*

The growing controversy spurred another pamphlet entitled (translated) *Concerning the Dogmas, Canons and the Legal Position of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada* by Michael Stechishin, Swystun's colleague and co-founder with him of the Orthodox Church, who now tried to persuade Swystun that he was in error. Prophetically, Stechishin speculated that "personal irritations which impelled Mr. Swystun to write, publish and circulate his brochure, threw him off balance and drove him not only to the most drastic, but really to the tragic step of his life."⁴² He chastised his fellow activist for not waiting until the sobor to raise his objection and make his accusations, arguing that pamphleteering was not conducive to constructive debate. Stechishin encouraged his old comrade to take his "normal place" alongside his "faithful and sincere friends, who, just the same as he, have heads on their shoulders." Swystun, in short, "must stop regarding himself an Atlas, who carries the world on his back."⁴³ In intervening, Stechishin elaborated on his conceptions of "dogma" and "canonical law", citing historical precedents when then chain of apostolic succession was broken and concluding that "canonicity" was a fiction.⁴⁴ He proclaimed his support for the idea of the unity of Ukrainian Orthodox Churches, making it known that he saw nothing wrong with Archbishop Theodorovich's efforts to bring this about. In Stechishin's opinion, "Mr. Swystun had no right to accuse the archbishop of betrayal and to issue a censure against him before the archbishop related what he actually wrote to the patriarch and what the latter replied."⁴⁵

Stechishin then described Swystun's role in the fourth sobor at Yorkton in 1924 in the following matter:

After the election of the bishop there took place a discussion of our relations with the Church in Ukraine. Mr. Swystun maintained that we should keep our full autonomy in Canada; that we leave ourselves a free hand; that our union should not bind us with the Bolshevik government in Ukraine. Mr. Swystun's advice was followed and the matter was thus decided. We united with the U.A.O.C. only in FAITH and spiritually. As an organization, we kept our full autonomy. Mr. Swystun will not contradict these facts because there are hundreds of people who remember these things. Mr. Swystun did not contradict this fact in December of the very same year, 5 months after the Sobor at the lawsuit in Yorkton for the church of Edmore. Then, under oath, he confirmed several times that our church, with our canons, is in-

42. Michael STECHISHIN, *Pro Dogmy, Kanony i Pravne Stanovishche Ukrainskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy Kanadi*, 3.

43. *Ibid.*, 14-5.

44. *Ibid.*, 7.

45. *Ibid.*, 10.

dependent of the U.A.O.C. in Ukraine. Perhaps after 10 years Mr. Swystun had forgotten this, but a copy of the court protocols, which I took out from the court during the incorporation of the Church, states the same thing very precisely.⁴⁶

He also reminded Swystun of the details worked out in processing the Church's charter in 1929, details that safeguarded the full autonomy of the Canadian Church. At that time it was specified that ties with the Autocephalous Church in Ukraine were spiritual only, amounting to little more than a profession of the same faith. Stechishin pointed out that Swystun had agreed to the particulars, and in fact had helped to formulate the articles in the charter. He wondered why his legal colleague had not protested then, and what prompted his dissatisfaction now. Stechishin sided with the opinions expressed by Father Sawchuk in the *Holos*, repudiating Swystun's charges that Sawchuk was a traitor by insisting that spiritual union with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church had not been severed, even though a church could no longer be said to exist in Ukraine.

Swystun, however, did not accept the account and rebuttal of Archbishop Theodorovich and late in June issued a lengthy reply in another pamphlet (in translation), *Autocephaly — Or Dependence Upon Foreigners*. He countered that the destruction of the Church in Ukraine did not mean that no church existed. The hierarchy, he argued, may have been destroyed, but "the Ukrainian Church has existed uninterruptedly from the time of St. Volodymyr to the present day."⁴⁷ He contended that the Churches in Canada and the United States could still maintain ties with Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky*; after all, "his [Lypkivsky's] forcible removal from official office has never been recognized by us." Furthermore, the fact that Archbishop Theodorovich and other priests still corresponded with the exiled Church leader was proof that an unbroken link to the Mother Church — which, emphasized, was "spiritual-canonical" — continued to exist.⁴⁸ Swystun acknowledged that the autocephalous Church in Ukraine possessed unity of faith and dogma with other Orthodox Churches, but stressed that this did not apply to canonical matters. The first canon of the sobor of 1921 pertained only to unity of faith; no mention was made of canons because the sobor adopted its own church laws and they did not conform to those of the Ecumenical formation. Swystun summed up this position with an assertion that "on the basis of the canons of the Ukrainian Church, whose jurisdic-

46. *Ibid.*, 13.

47. Wasył SWYSTUN, *Autokefalia — Czy Zależność від Chudykh*, 9.

* Lypkivsky was arrested by the Soviet government in 1930 and disappeared without trace.

48. *Ibid.*, 11.

tion we recognize, we are not allowed to go under the subordination or guardianship of other Churches... or patriarchs because our Church safeguards for itself full independence or autocephaly."⁴⁹

Swystun's skillful presentation of his case is illustrated by the following passage:

From the assertions of the Archbishop it appears that other Orthodox Churches and the patriarch are in canonical union with our Church in Ukraine. So, if the patriarch is in canonical union with the Church in Ukraine, then he is in canonical union with our Church in America and Canada, for these Churches, as the Archbishop properly declares — in contradiction to the incorrect assertion of Father Sawchuk — are integral parts of our Church in Ukraine (p. 19).

Then why should he go under the patronage of the patriarch? This step is not only unnecessary but also illogical and unwise. Furthermore, this move contradicts the fundamental canons of our Church.⁵⁰

Besides exposing the contradictions in the arguments against him, Swystun produced more evidence to show that the archbishop was willing to undergo reconsecration as early as 1927. He quoted letters written by a member of the American consistory, and by a priest in the American church; one was from Metropolitan Lypkivsky himself, dated 10 April 1934; all of the correspondence confirmed that Archbishop Theodorovich wished to secure a canonical consecration from the Patriarch of Constantinople.⁵¹ Swystun repeated his suggestion that the Canadian Church consecrate its own bishop by the Alexandrian method, this time drawing attention to the fact that the eighth canon merely stated that future ordination of bishops would take place with the participation of two or more bishops, but did not expressly forbid reverting to the controversial Alexandrian practice. As Swystun pointed out, Metropolitan Lypkivsky had, in a number of letters of a priest in Canada, recommended precisely this course of action.⁵²

Michael Stechishin's pamphlet was also discussed by the dissident lawyer. Although he agreed with most of Stechishin's interpretation of the dogma, canons and legal standing of the Canadian Church, he firmly denied the allegation that he had stated under oath — in the court case over the church in Edmore — that "our Church with its canons is independent of the U.A.C.C. in Ukraine." On the contrary, his stand on that occasion had been that "our Church

49. *Ibid.*, 20.

50. *Ibid.*, 22.

51. *Ibid.*, 33-5.

52. *Ibid.*, 37.

does not differ from other Orthodox Churches in dogma, although it had different canons regarding the erection of the hierarchy by the Alexandrian method."⁵³ Swystun described Stechishin as being "Solomonian" in his approach, for he agreed with both sides of the dispute when, in reality, they were irreconcilable. Swystun explained that he could not heed Stechishin's call to return to the fold of his former friends because "loyalty to an idea, organization, community and the Church is higher and more important than loyalty to persons."⁵⁴

The polemics and pamphleteering created a tense atmosphere throughout the parishes, prompting the largest turn-out of delegates in the seventeen-year history of the Church. The seventh sobor of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, held in Saskatoon from 30 June to 3 July 1935, was attended by eighty-eight lay delegates and twenty-four clergy (including the bishop) representing 61 of the 181 parishes. Only two priests failed to attend the event.⁵⁵ The significance of this particular session of the Church "parliament" is reflected in the fact that this is the only sobor in the history of the Church which had its proceedings published in booklet form. It is possible therefore to obtain a fairly detailed and accurate impression of the nature and tone of the discussions.

The sobor opened rather ominously with the accusation by Archbishop Theodorovich that Swystun's recent action had violated the discipline and constitution of the Church. The judicial committee consisting of Father Peter Sametz, Father Volodymyr Sluzar and Peter Svarich, after carefully considering all the evidence on 29 June, ruled that Swystun "had acted in an improper manner" by not referring the matter to the judicial committee. His behaviour was subsequently condemned as "detrimental" and deserving of "public reprimand before the Sobor."⁵⁶

The defendant charged that the judicial committee was not competent to try him and claimed his actions had not violated the constitution.⁵⁷ To Swystun, it was Myroslaw Stechishin who deserved to be tried, for he had initiated the whole affair by making it public through the medium of the *Holos*. In his defence, Swystun stated that he allowed his pamphlet to circulate publicly only after he heard that a conference in Saskatoon had authorized Michael Stechishin to write one in reply. As background, he recalled how church leaders in Win-

53. *Ibid.*, 43.

54. *Ibid.*, 44.

55. *Protokol Semsho Soboru Ukrainskoi Greko-Katoličnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi*, 63, 70.

56. *Ibid.*, 5.

57. *Ibid.*, 7-11.

nipeg had just agreed that efforts should be made to win over two suspended Uniate priests — Fathers Sarmatiuk and Shumsky — when suddenly Myroslaw Stechishin's editorial contradicting this decision appeared in the *Holos*. Swystun challenged the stand taken by the editor of the *Holos* in an article published a week later, but when Father Sawchuk supported Myroslaw Stechishin's position — in another article appearing in the *Holos* — and then refused to identify his statements as an expression of personal opinion, Swystun's hand was forced and the public pamphlet was the result. Swystun revealed that he had not been invited to defend his position before the members of the judicial committee when they met to discuss his behaviour, and argued that the gravity of his accusations against the archbishop and the administrator demanded that they be heard by the only body capable of passing judgement on the matter — the sobor itself. In addition, he asserted that the judicial committee was not constitutionally empowered to decide on the unprecedented dispute and threatened to go to the Canadian courts to enforce the constitution.

The second session was a closed affair. Editor Stechishin explained that he was opposed to the idea of the Church acquiring Sarmatiuk and Shumsky, not only because both had married after ordination, but also because both had been united with the "Zukites" before their suspension. He claimed that Swystun wanted them in the Church for the simple reason that they were Ukrainian patriots who had aided the cause of the establishment of the P. Mohyla Institute, and alleged that the campaign to defend the canons of the Autocephalous Church was merely being used to attain this objective. Stechishin further accused Swystun of seeking any possible pretext to remove Father Sawchuk from the leadership of the Church.⁵⁸ Father Wasyl Kudryk, editor of *Visnyk*, then testified that when word reached Saskatoon that Swystun was publishing a pamphlet, an immediate letter advised him to desist. Furthermore, Kudryk argued that the controversial canons were the product of hostile conditions and "that is why we cannot entirely accept them"; thus, in his opinion Father Sawchuk's article expressed the official policy of the Church.⁵⁹ In his declaration, Archbishop Theodorovich affirmed that even though Swystun had called him a traitor, he initially had hoped to resolve the differences peacefully. But only when he had arrived in Canada and found Swystun's second pamphlet addressed to him did he decide that the lawyer had gone too far and lodged his charge with the judicial committee.

58. *Ibid.*, 15.

59. *Ibid.*, 16.

Swystun did not bother to reply and declared simply, "I shall leave this matter to the decision of the Sobor; I shall adapt myself to the decision of the majority.... I would prefer that a decision be taken first in regard to the substance rather than the form."⁶⁰ In the discussion that followed, however, the overriding concern was the manner of Swystun's protest. The dominant feeling was that discipline was more important and had to be maintained if similar incidents were to be prevented. A vote of sixty-two to six upheld the verdict of the judicial committee.⁶¹

The tone of the third session was established the moment Swystun walked in with a pack of papers under his arm, which were then handed out with accompanying shouts of "This is an act of accusation against the Archbishop!" The accused prelate protested that the distribution of the "theses" was a shameful trick. Swystun retorted that the delegates had a right to know the terms of the union of the two Ukrainian Orthodox Churches in the United States, the details of which were only made available to the clergy in North America. The archbishop replied that the move had caught him unawares, the theses being a "church document for the use of the consistories of both American churches and the priests, and later the whole Church."⁶² He wanted to know how Swystun obtained his copy of the document, and proclaimed that it "was no kind of agreement but a search for ways to an agreement."

Undaunted, Swystun countered that what he was handing out was not a draft proposal but "a document of agreement between the 'Zukites' and our Church in America." He charged Archbishop Theodorovich with betrayal of the Church and challenged his episcopal status: "I do not regard the archbishop to be a bishop because the archbishop does not regard himself to be a bishop.... and he himself said he was uncanonical."⁶³ Swystun then reiterated some of the main points covered in his pamphlets to prove that Archbishop Theodorovich had already agreed to a reconsecration and was abandoning the democratic feature of the church sobor.

The new evidence presented by Swysun, in Ukrainian, were "Theses for Discussion." They had been approved by the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of North America and were being circulated among the clergy of Theodorovich's Church for comments and observations. The plan was to have them accepted by the clergy by 15 July and at a future joint convention of the priests of both dioceses. Swys-

60. *Ibid.*, 18-9.

61. *Ibid.*, 20.

62. *Ibid.*, 22.

63. *Ibid.*, 24.

can read only the most controversial and important articles and these are reproduced below:

1. On the day that these conditions are accepted in writing by the Consistories of both above-mentioned Churches, both Churches will halt all antagonism in spoken, written and printed language and will announce this in their official organs, explaining that they are on the road to complete union.
2. Complete union of the two Churches referred to above will follow after the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople gives his approval and blessing to the formulation of the episcopacy of His Excellency Archbishop Ioann Theodorovich as the Arch-pastor of the united Church; the act of complete union will be announced solemnly in the way that the Consistories of both above-mentioned Churches will decide — after further negotiations and consultations — to be the best for the Church and its Arch-pastor.
4. The Clerical Consistory of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of North America, together with the clergy of the faithful, pledges to beseech the Holy Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and his representative in America, His Excellency Archbishop Athanagoras, to recognize His Excellency Archbishop Ioann Theodorovich as a canonical Orthodox bishop in union with the Holy Ecumenical Orthodox Church in the way that the Holy Patriarch will regard as the most proper and worthy. The assessment of the rank of episcopal dignity is left to the final decision of the Holy Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople.
5. Both Consistories of the above-mentioned Churches, with the consent given solemnly in their presence by His Excellency Archbishop Ioann Theodorovich, now pledge that immediately after the complete union of both Churches — as discussed in the second article — the united Church will endeavour at the earliest possible moment and no later than a year, to secure another Bishop, or rather a candidate for bishop suffragan, thereby to safeguard the Church in the event of the illness, abness or death of its first Arch-pastor.
10. A layman may not be a member of the Consistory.
15. The Arch-pastor, on the basis of a unanimous decision of the Consistory, may appoint new members of the Consistory in the event of death or resignation, and may dismiss members of the Consistory for significant reasons.
45. In the event of the collapse of further negotiations — a possibility that would occur only if the Holy Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople took a negative attitude toward the canonical formulation of the episcopate of His Excellency Archbishop Ioann Theodorovich — these terms will never be divulged in any manner, and in such a case both Churches will not quarrel with each other but will seek all possible ways to facilitate their complete union.

46. All of the above terms will be ratified by Sobors of the two above-mentioned Churches. The time, place and method of conducting such Sobors will be determined by the Consistories of both Churches in future joint sessions.
47. After the terms stated above have been ratified by the Sobors or Sobors of clergy of both above-mentioned Churches, thereby making them binding, if it is the will of the Arch-pastor and the Consistory they may be submitted for the ratification of a general Sobor of the Church, already united, consisting of clergy and representatives of parishes.⁶⁴

Swystun concluded his presentation of these articles with the following resolution:

In view of the fact that the conduct of our present Archbishop, Father Ioann Theodorovich, in connection with the request to the Patriarch of Constantinople and in connection with the negotiations and terms with the so-called Zukite church in America — acting in his capacity as Arch-pastor of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in America, which like ours is under his jurisdiction at the present time — stooped to violate canon 6 of Section II of the All-Ukrainian Sobor of 1921 in Kiev, he thereby lost his right to be Archbishop of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada.

This Sobor decisively opposes any kind of union with the Patriarch of Constantinople and the so-called 'Zukite church'.⁶⁵

After reflection during the lunch break, Swystun reintroduced the resolution in revised form, having moderated its intent.

1. In view of the fact that our present Archbishop, Father Ioann Theodorovich, with his conduct in connection with the request to the Patriarch of Constantinople and in connection with the negotiations and terms with the Zukites — acting in the name of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church in America... which finds itself, together with the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada, under his jurisdiction — took steps that:
 - i) Cast doubt on the canonicity of the hierarchy of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine, thereby also casting doubts on the canonicity of his office as bishop of our Church in Canada; at the same time, in conjunction with the request to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and in connection with the negotiations with the Zukites,
 - ii) Disregard the conciliar principle of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church in America and thereby placed under great threat the principle of conciliarism (sobornopravnist) in our Church in Canada; and also in view of the fact that these steps and espe-

64. *Ibid.*, 28-31.

65. *Ibid.*, 33-4.

cially the steps in connection with the request to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

iii) Were taken without any consultation with our Church in Canada, of which he is also Arch-pastor.

This Sobor hereby resolves that the above steps of his brought detriment to the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada.

2. This Sobor regards the union with the Zukites and the Patriarch of Constantinople and the canonical recognition of our Archbishop and Church, as unnecessary and undesirable, because our church professes that the hierarchy of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church is [already] fully canonical and that our church is also a fully canonical Orthodox Church in fraternal unity with all other Orthodox Churches.⁶⁶

Replying in his own defence, Archbishop Theodorovich suddenly turned the tables on his accuser. He categorically denied that he had any intention of accepting reconsecration secretly. With the liquidation of the Church in Ukraine, he declared, the two Churches in North America were placed in a precarious situation and that is why he sought ties, not union, with the Patriarch of Constantinople. Recognition, he insisted, was an absolute necessity, for the Bolsheviks had not only deprived Metropolitan Lypkivsky of his jurisdictional authority, but would arrest him if he tried to conduct official correspondence in church affairs. The North American dioceses were thus virtually alone in the world. The archbishop maintained that he had demonstrated his respect for conciliarism by referring all important matters to the sobor, while Swystun took issues into his own hands and published pamphlets. The prelate described his adversary's behaviour as "unworthy and un-Christian." The "theses", he countered, were not an act of union but only propositions for "relations with the patriarch", for which "a whole group of people are responsible and not I alone."⁶⁷ Theodorovich then turned his attention to the priest who had corresponded with Metropolitan Lypkivsky and had given the letters to Swystun rather than the bishop. He denounced these actions as "a conspiracy of the priest together with Mr. Swystun to draw the Metropolitan into a filthy intrigue against the Bishop."⁶⁸ He climaxed his rebuttal with a surprise accusation: Swystun and his circle denounced unity with other Orthodox Churches, but "behind my back and behind the back of the Consistory communicates with the Orthodox church in Poland."⁶⁹

66. *Ibid.*, 33.

67. *Ibid.*, 45.

68. *Ibid.*, 43.

69. *Ibid.*, 45-6.

When Swystun shouted out "A lie!", the archbishop asked Father D. Leshchyshyn to produce the evidence. The priest read a copy of Professor Ivan Ohienko's letter to Father Peter Mayewsky, the pastor of the cathedral in Winnipeg. Dated 31 March 1933 and marked "Strictly Confidential", the letter⁷⁰ revealed that Metropolitan Dionysius of the Orthodox Church in Poland had agreed to consecrate a Ukrainian bishop for the Church in Canada, but that the arrangement had to be kept in complete secrecy until the appropriate time. The matter was to be discussed with Father Sawchuk and preferably with the consistory. Subsequently, Father Leshchyshyn read a second letter,⁷¹ which he had received from Professor Ohienko in reply to some enquiries which he had made. In it, the Minister of Religious Affairs in the Ukrainian government-in-exile had stated that the bishop to be consecrated by Metropolitan Dionysius would not be under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan, but would come under the authority of Archbishop Theodorovich. After Archbishop Theodorovich's act of 6 March, however, this matter had to be dropped. The correspondent approved the steps that the American archbishop had taken to obtain recognition from the patriarch of Constantinople, and expressed the opinion that reconsecration of the bishop would be in accordance with the "present (non-revolutionary) circumstances and customs." These letters caused a commotion on the convention floor and shouts of indignation were heard.

In his hearing Father Peter Mayewsky swore that he had acted in good faith, noting that the Clerical Conference held two years earlier had requested him to find a bishop for the Canadian Church. With that objective in mind, he had written to Metropolitan Lypkivsky — a personal friend — in an unofficial capacity. The metropolitan replied that since the Bolshevik government would not allow any of his bishops to leave the country, Bishop Polikarp Sikorsky of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church of Poland — one of the founders of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the first treasurer of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council — should be given consideration as a possible candidate. This prompted Father Mayewsky to write to Professor Ohienko, who discouraged the choice of Bishop Sikorsky and suggested that a new candidate be elevated to the position — as was revealed in the letter read by Father Leshchyshyn. Father Mayewsky then read a letter which he had received from Bishop Sikorsky, who, after explaining that circumstances would not permit him to come to Canada, offered to recommend a worthy nominee. At this point the priest revealed that although he

70. *Ibid.*, cit.

71. *Ibid.*, 35.

supported Swystun on most issues, he did not agree with his advocacy of the Alexandrian method of episcopal ordination, thereby also parting ways with Metropolitan Lypkivsky on the matter.⁷² Mayewsky made it clear that his attitude toward Archbishop Theodorovich was antagonistic because of the latter's efforts to conciliate the Patriarch of Constantinople. And he was firm in his belief that his defence of the original principles of autocephaly did not constitute a conspiracy.

After Mayewsky had been cross-examined by Michael Stechishin and several opposing opinions were heard in a heated debate, Swystun asked the sobor to define its position regarding "autocephaly, conciliarism and consecration" and withdrew his resolution, knowing in advance that it would not pass.⁷³ Archbishop Theodorovich then asked for a resolution to approve his efforts to secure recognition from the Patriarch of Constantinople and to seek union with the other Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States. Swystun followed suit by revoking his charge against Father Sawchuk and accepting as punishment "a rebuke and reprimand by the Sobor."⁷⁴

The following resolution, dealing with Swystun's behaviour, was passed unanimously:

The Seventh Sobor of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada rules that the charges made by Mr. W. Swystun — in writing and orally before and during the Sobor — against His Excellency Archbishop Ioann Theodorovich, are unfounded and unworthy.

The Sobor further affirms that Mr. Swystun, after a lengthy discussion during the Sobor, withdrew, without reservations, his charges against His Excellency the Archbishop, and promised in this matter to accept the decision of the Sobor and in the future to conform to the requirements of the discipline of the church organization.

For this reason the Sobor accepts the declaration of Mr. Swystun in good faith and confines itself only to reprimanding him.⁷⁵

The climax of the drama was reached. Archbishop Theodorovich graciously forgave Father Mayewsky and asked the sobor not to pass judgement upon the priest or to punish him. The gesture brought a flood of tears to Mayewsky's eyes. Swystun then rose and stated that he had been advised by a member of the resolutions committee to withdraw from the sobor. With the terse pronouncement, "I accept this. I consider that for me further participation in the life of the Church is unthinkable. I must also withdraw from national work"⁷⁶,

72. *Ibid.*, 60.

73. *Ibid.*, 62.

74. *Ibid.*, 63.

75. *Ibid.*, 65.

76. *Ibid.*, 66.

he, too, burst into tears and made a dramatic exit. A discussion followed but a resolution to invite him back to the sobor was defeated forty-four to twenty-two.⁷⁷ Obviously the majority of delegates doubted his sincerity. Those doubts were confirmed subsequently when it was reported that Swystun had called Father Leshchyslyn a *provocateur*, a charge that did not surprise the priest.⁷⁸

The central issue of the sobor was eventually resolved by a unanimous vote supporting the following declaration:

The Seventh Sobor of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada acknowledges the initiative of Archbishop Ioann in commencing spiritual relations with the Patriarch of Constantinople; furthermore, this Sobor establishes the fact that this matter is not a matter of the Archbishop of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of U.S.A. alone, but is also a matter of common concern and import to both churches, and that therefore this Sobor insists that further action in this matter be conducted in consultation with the Consistory of our Church in Canada. The Sobor nevertheless safeguards for itself the full right to a final decision in this matter, in which it will be guided by the following principles:

1. Inviolability of conciliarism and the independence of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada.
2. Inviolability of the present rank of the clergymen of our Church.
3. Establishment in due time of our own hierarchy, maintaining the autocephaly of our Church.
4. The right to a spiritual union with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine when it will be restored according to the will of the Ukrainian nation and independently of foreign influences.⁷⁹

The sobor constitutes the fact that the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada upheld and upholds, regarding canons, the very same position as all other Orthodox churches, and in practical matters conducts itself according to its own constitution and charter as a independent church organization; when a special canonical question will emerge in concrete form it will be decided by special studies of experts engaged for these purposes by the church authorities.

The Sobor further adjudges that the article by the Administrator, Father S. Sawchuk, printed in *Ukrainskyi Holos* on 20 March 1933, correctly defines the view point of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada on the issue under dispute.⁸⁰

Finally, a unanimous vote re-elected all of the former members of the consistory to the following positions: Father S. W. Sawchuk (pre-

77. *Ibid.*, 76-7.

78. *Ibid.*, 73.

79. *Loc. cit.*

80. *Ibid.*, 78.

sident and administrator); Father W. Kudryk (vice-president); Father D. F. Stratyчук (secretary); Myroslaw Stechishin (vice-secretary); and Joseph Bohonos (treasurer).

The tempestuous seventh sobor had ended. It concluded with an impressive demonstration of loyalty to the bishop and a vote of confidence in the leadership provided by the consistory. Swystun and Father Mayewsky were ignominiously defeated. But despite the fact that many contentious resolutions had been passed, the issues were far from settled. There was much serious trouble ahead.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Further Difficulties and Lawsuits

Wasył Swystun was not the kind of a man to give up easily. In the face of overwhelming opposition, he considered it wise to retreat until he was in a better position to resume the offensive. Extremely ambitious, envious and occasionally spiteful, imbued with idealism, he considered himself to be a natural leader of the Ukrainian people. To champion a cause, he was prepared to sacrifice his time, money, and even his friends. Without any hesitation, and at the expense of his legal practice, he devoted much energy to community work. In a word, Swystun was a crusader.

At the seventh sobor of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, Swystun had called off his frontal attack on Archbishop Theodorovich because his parish priest and political ally found himself in a serious predicament with the archbishop. Swystun had to "rescue" Father Mayewsky, "who was threatened with suspension from the church."¹ But the crusader's silence was short-lived. The convention of the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League — comprised predominantly of church members and sympathizers of the Church and held immediately after the sobor, gave him cause for hope. Private discussions convinced him that the "opinion of the preponderant majority of the participants of the convention was against the decisions of the sobor";² he claimed many people asked him to continue his defence of the basic principles of the Church.

As a result, Swystun's opposition surfaced again at a meeting of the cathedral parish of St. Mary the Protectress in Winnipeg on 14 July 1935. The delegates who had attended the Saskatoon sobor — Father P. Mayewsky, Joseph Boyaniwsky and Wasył Swystun — reported critically on the proceedings. In denouncing the sobor, Swystun allegedly stated that it was "illegal, irregular and invalid."³ Several resolutions were passed voting confidence in the stance that

1. Wasył SWYSTUN, *Artolektajna — Chy Zalezhnist vid Chuzhykh*, 47.

2. *Ibid.*, 49.

3. *Visnyk*, 1 August 1935.

Swystun had taken in the pamphlets published before the sobor. The publication of an irregular bulletin called *Ridna Tserkva* (Native Church), was approved, and several issues appeared during the next five years. An organization, "Bratstvo Oborony Ridnoi Tserkvy" (Brotherhood for the Defence of the Native [Ukrainian] Church) was founded, the official name in English being "Ukrainian Church Defence Brotherhood." The following constituted the executive: W. Swystun (president), Nicholas Kinash (vice-president), Joseph Boyaniwsky (secretary), John Riy (treasurer), Fred Cyhaverich (member-at-large); Gregory Blok, Gregory Uhryniuk, Alexander Klymkiw (auditors).⁴

The first issue of *Ridna Tserkva*, a 14-page tabloid featured a full-scale assault on the Saskatoon sobor. In a "Public Declarations"⁵ that the *Holos* had rejected, Swystun asserted that the resolutions of the sobor made a "mockery of our Church and the faithful of the Church" in that "they basically alter the position of our Church and cancel out eleven centuries of the work of the Church in union with Kiev." Consequently, the seventh sobor was "illegal, irregular and invalid." He called for an "Extraordinary Sobor", free of "coercion, intrigues, and 'schemes'" and "conducted without 'bombs', 'stampedes' and 'panic'." An article by Father Mayewsky cited letters to prove that his communications with Metropolitan Lypkivsky and Professor Ohienko were not "intrigues", as Theodorovich had claimed, but had been approved at the sobor in Alberta (1932) and at the conference of clergy in Saskatoon in 1933.⁶ In addition, the inaugural issue contained Archbishop Theodorovich's "Theses" — under the title, "The Terms of the Union" — explaining that the union with the Patriarchate of Constantinople had been consummated without reference to the faithful of the American or Canadian Churches. It was argued that the resolutions of the seventh sobor had virtually approved Theodorovich's initiatives in the direction of union. Finally, the eight resolutions of the new brotherhood condemning the seventh sobor, were printed with a call for an extraordinary sobor within a year.⁷

The second issue of *Ridna Tserkva*, expanded to sixteen pages, continued the discussion of topics made prominent in the first. A long article by Swystun, "The Canons, Charter and Constitution of the Church"⁸, explained his relations with Father Sawchuk, who since 1929 had been "very cautiously preparing the ground in our Church...

4. Swystun, *Avtokefalia*, 49; *Ridna Tserkva*, August 1935.

5. *Ridna Tserkva*, August 1935.

6. *Ibid.*, *cit.*

7. *Ibid.*, August 1935.

8. *Ibid.*, September 1935.

so that at an appropriate time he could say that our Church in Canada does not have and did not have anything in common with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine." Swystun alleged that the "falsification of the canonical position of our church" at the seventh sobor was Sawchuk's work, who, to achieve his end, had Swystun ousted from the leadership in 1930. Much of the issue was devoted to a reader's forum with opinions from various parts of Canada supporting the position taken by the new brotherhood. Of greater significance, however, was the fact that the following parishes approved the 14 July resolutions of the cathedral parish in Winnipeg: Meacham, Redfield and Glaslyn in Saskatchewan, Smoky Lake in Alberta and the Holy Trinity Church in Chicago.*

During the months of October and November, the activity of the Ukrainian Church Defence Brotherhood gained momentum, as Swystun visited the following centres to turn criticism into open rebellion: Saskatoon, Whitkow, Hafford, Canora, Arran, Meacham, St. Julien and Yellow Creek in Saskatchewan; and Pine River, Gilbert Plains, Vita and Gardentown in Manitoba. He reported in *Ridna Tserkva* (October-December 1935) that many representatives from neighbouring parishes took an active part in the meetings and sanctioned the resolutions of the new brotherhood, which gained more than two hundred new members.

In the meantime, the consistory of the Church staunchly defended its own position. In a *Visnyk* editorial, "Union with Kiev (1 September), it was argued that "There is no Native Church Centre in Kiev. Since 1929 there has been neither an All-Ukrainian Church Council, nor a Metropolitan nor Bishops; in general, there has been no body which could represent the U.A.O.C.... The U.G.O.C. does not now speak about its union with Kiev. When there is no union, there can be no disruption of union." A subsequent editorial (1 November) elaborated on the matter of the "Kievan Canons":

The constitution of the U.G.O.C. of Canada is its law. When church laws are called canons in church language, then the constitution of the U.G.O.C. of Canada may be regarded as its canons.

...it is impossible to use in Canada the constitution of the U.A.O.C. approved in Kiev and adapted only to life in Ukraine under the Bolshevik government and not adapted to life in Canada. And that is why the idea that the U.G.O.C. is bound by the constitution, or canons, or rather the "Proceedings" approved in 1921 in Kiev is the greatest nonsense that could be contrived by anyone....

We said and say that the Kievan canons, or rather the "Proceedings", did not and do not obligate us in Canada, because we never accepted them and most of them in general are not applicable in

9. *Loc. cit.*

Canada. The U.G.O.C. of Canada may, but does not have to, accept some of them; it may accept them only when, after discussing them at its own Sobor, it will regard them as beneficial and necessary for its own activities and development. Up to the present, it has not done so.

The increased activity of the Ukrainian Church Defence Brotherhood and, in particular, Swystun's tour through Saskatchewan and Manitoba began to alarm the members of the consistory. The church leadership thought that it was necessary to clarify its position in the *Visnyk* (15 November) under the title "Warning":

1. Absolutely no changes have been made in the position of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada at the Seventh Sobor; and the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada remains to the smallest details in the same position that it has held since 1924.
2. The Seventh Sobor did not consider nor did it resolve to recognize the supremacy of the Patriarch of Constantinople, or any other patriarch, over the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, nor to subordinate our Church to any other foreign Church or church authority; and no participant of the Sobor introduced or expressed such an idea at the Sobor.
3. Likewise, no one at the Sobor proposed the unification of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada with the so-called Zakite Church and therefore, concerning this, at the Sobor there was not nor could there have been any discussion or resolution.
4. In particular, at the Seventh Sobor there was no change in the principle of the conciliarism of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada nor in the principle of its Ukrainian leadership. The principle of conciliarism and the independence of our Church from foreign churches and overlords can never even be placed on the daily agenda of the Sobor, for this would contradict the charter of our Church, and every resolution contrary to the charter must be regarded not only as illegal but also as non-existent.
5. Finally, the Seventh Sobor did not grant the Consistory any authority to make changes in the structure or the position of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, and the Consistory is conscious that if it wanted to make, independently, any kind of changes in that direction it would transgress its right and would thus place itself outside the framework of the church organization.

...If any church congregation unites with the enemies of the church, it leaves itself open to expulsion from membership in the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada.

This threat was not enforced. Instead negotiations in Saskatoon on 27 December 1935 resulted in the signing of a mutual agreement reconciling the church leadership with the dissident faction.¹⁰ The

10. SWYSTUN, *Archiepiskop*, 49-50.

declaration was post-dated 3 January 1936 and published in the *Visnyk* (1 January):

1. The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada upholds the following canonical principles, which are in conformity with the canonical position of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church adopted at the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Sobor in 1921 in Kiev:
 - i) National conciliar structure
 - ii) Canonicity of the hierarchy of the U.A.O.C.
 - iii) The right of the Church to establish new canons at a Sobor of the Church in accordance with the demands of the life of the Church, and to exclude the use of canons which have ceased to be in accordance with the demands of the life of the church.
 - iv) Use of the native language in mass.
 - v) Prevention of the subordination of the U.G.O.C. in Canada to foreign churches or foreign church authorities.
2. The Consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada regards the "Theses for Discussion" as a document which does not express the viewpoint of the U.G.O.C. of Canada, and regards the terms of these "Theses for Discussion" as unacceptable for the U.G.O.C., because they are contrary to the basic principles of the U.G.O.C. of Canada.

This statement marked a signal victory for Swystun and the supporters of his movement. *Ridna Tserkva* suspended publication and the Ukrainian Church Defence Brotherhood was dissolved by mutual consent. The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood, which had not been active since 1930, was revived and once again became a functioning body. Peace was formally declared in a public announcement in *Visnyk* (15 January) by the leaders of the Ukrainian Church Defence Brotherhood:

In the previous number of the *Visnyk*, the Consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada published a declaration regarding the canonical position of the U.G.O.C. of Canada. In view of the fact that the declaration referred to clearly and unequivocally defines the present canonical position of the U.G.O.C. of Canada, the Ukrainian Church Defence Brotherhood considers the previous misunderstanding in this matter as ended; consequently, the Ukrainian Church Defence Brotherhood is dissolved and together with Mr. W. Swystun terminates the activities it formerly conducted in this matter, including the publications of *Ridna Tserkva*. The Ukrainian Church Defence Brotherhood appeals to its members to work jointly with all other members of the U.G.O.C. of Canada for the welfare of the church and the glory of God.

On the surface, peace reigned in 1936, and another major development brought great satisfaction to Swystun and his sympa-

thizers. The fifth sobor of the sister American Orthodox Church, held 7-9 June in New York, rejected Archbishop Theodorovich's "Theses for Discussion" and reaffirmed its commitment to the principles of autocephaly (established in Kiev in 1921) with the declaration that "our Church is in daughterly union with the whole Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in Ukraine."¹¹ The proposed union with the breakaway Zukite Church was disapproved "while it remained under an administration foreign to the U[krainian] O[rthodox] C[hurch] and its people." Father Sawchuk, who was the Canadian representative at this sobor, editorialized upon his return that only the structure of the consistory of the American Church distinguished it from its Canadian counterpart: "in questions of autocephaly, church canons and relations with the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine, there are no differences."¹² The resolutions of the American Church and this statement by Father Sawchuk naturally pleased the Swystunite faction — who felt vindicated in their stand — and seemingly ensured that further misunderstandings would be avoided.¹³

To symbolically cement the new-found harmony in the Church, the congregation of St. Mary the Protectress decided it would be an appropriate time to invite Archbishop Theodorovich to their cathedral. Accordingly, that summer Swystun travelled to Tolstoi, where the bishop was on visitation and the exchange of views ended in a reconciliation, followed by an invitation on behalf of the parish and its rector, Father Peter Mayewsky.¹⁴ Instead of being cheered by the visitation, the congregation was stung by a bitter reproach, from which it took a long time to recover.

At a meeting of the consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada on 26 October 1936, Archbishop Theodorovich charged Father Mayewsky with violating the discipline of the Church.¹⁵ The priest was accused of insubordination, undermining hierarchical authority and conspiracy in respect to his correspondence with Metropolitan Lypkivsky and his efforts to obtain a bishop outside the hierarchy of the U.A.O.C. In sum, these charges reiterated the accusations that Theodorovich had made and then withdrawn after the repentance of Father Mayewsky at the seventh sobor of the Church. The case was referred to the Church Judiciary Commission which was to meet early in the new year, in order to give the priest "time to rectify his uncanonical attitude to His Excellency Arch-

11. *Visnyk*, 1 July 1936.

12. *Visnyk*, 1 August 1936.

13. Swystun, *Autokefalia*, 52.

14. *Ibid.* *cit.*

15. From a copy of the archbishop's letter, dated 26 October 1936, confirmed by Father S. W. Sawchuk.

bishop Ioann and to the leadership of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada."¹⁶ It was hoped that the tactic would avoid a confrontation and thus prevent the action from being carried out.

The pretext used to bring Father Mayewsky's case to a head was a radio broadcast made from his church in defiance of the consistory. For several years, the cathedral had been broadcasting mass over the radio on various holy days and festive occasions. In December 1935 a conference of clergy in Saskatoon decided that only part of the church service could be broadcast, and then only with prior approval of the consistory. Furthermore, broadcasts of the mass on Easter, Christmas and on the Green Holidays (Pentecost) were entirely forbidden.¹⁷ The official notice of this regulation was published in the 15 February 1936 issue of *Visnyk*, only to be ignored ten months later by the independent-minded parishioners of the Winnipeg Cathedral of St. Mary the Protectress — where Wasyl Swystun conducted the choir. In the 30 December 1936 issue of the *Holos*, they announced that mass would be broadcast from the cathedral on 10 January, immediately after the Christmas celebrations. The consistory quickly despatched a letter to Father Mayewsky warning him not to make the broadcast, as it contravened the regulations. Neither the priest nor his congregation heeded the warning and the radio broadcast was transmitted in its entirety on the specified date. Adding to the gravity of the offence was Father Mayewsky's "overly tendentious and provocative" sermon.¹⁸ Clearly, the rebellious gesture openly defied the consistory's authority.

Informed by the consistory of Father Mayewsky's action, Archbishop Theodorovich, in a letter¹⁹ dated 20 January 1937, ordered the immediate suspension of the priest and demanded that his antimension — a consecrated linen containing relics of a saint, used in ministering the sacraments — be returned to the consistory. He further charged Father Mayewsky with eleven violations of church authority, some of the accusations having previously appeared in the indictment of 28 October 1936. The priest was accused of

1. Defying the instruction of the consistory regarding the radio broadcast on 10 January.
2. Breaking the pledge made at the seventh sobor to terminate the covert struggle against the archbishop.
3. Having an unbrotherly attitude toward the archbishop.
4. Causing divided authority in the church.

16. Consistory communique to the Church Judiciary Commission, dated 8 February 1937.

17. Taken from the minutes and confirmed by Father S. W. Sawchuk.

18. Consistory communique, 8 February 1937.

19. Copy of the letter, confirmed by Father S. W. Sawchuk.

5. Usurping the rights that exclusively belonged to the canonical leadership of the church.
6. Conspiring to seek a bishop for the Canadian church outside the hierarchy of the U.A.O.C.
7. Ignoring decisions made by the church and adopted canonically and constitutionally.
8. Engaging in activities beyond the realm of the church.
9. Conducting correspondence concerning church matters with persons wholly foreign to the church, without the authorization and knowledge of the archbishop and the consistory.
10. Conducting correspondence with Metropolitan Lypkivsky, who had been removed from the church leadership.
11. Using the above metropolitan's letters to create a rift in the U.G.O.C. of Canada and to undermine the authority of its recognized head [Theodorovich].

These charges, with a notice of suspension, were delivered on 28 January by two persons to Father Mayewsky, with copies to the president of the parish of St. Mary the Protectress, Joseph Boyaniwsky. The priest, however, refused to return the antimension and continued with his pastoral activities. At the annual meeting of the parish, on 31 January, he declared the suspension to be invalid.²⁰

The Church Judiciary Commission consisting of Fathers W. Slusar and Peter Sametz, met in Winnipeg on 17 March, but Father Mayewsky, though summoned, refused to appear. Not surprisingly, the verdict sustained the bishop's charges, and on 1 April an official announcement in the *Visnyk*, over the signature of Archbishop Theodorovich, "expelled" Father Peter Mayewsky from the ranks of the clergy and membership in the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada. Considering that the priest was convicted of neither heresy nor immorality, the excommunication was a very serious step.

The consistory's action was immediately challenged at a special meeting in the cathedral on 22 March, at which Swystun was the principal speaker. The twelve resolutions that he moved were passed, and expressed the following sentiments and arguments:

1. The consistory's ban on the radio broadcast was uncanonical.
2. Father Mayewsky acted correctly.
3. The suspension, charges and trial were uncanonical and unjust.
4. Father S. W. Sawchuk and other members of the consistory were at fault for the entire affair while Archbishop Theodorovich was wrong in announcing the suspension without investigating the matter personally and giving Father Mayewsky a hearing.
5. The chief cause of the suspension was Father Sawchuk's personal antagonism to Father Mayewsky, who had the affections of this parishioners.

20. Consistory communique, 8 February 1937.

6. The consistory, and especially Father Sawchuk, had excluded the parish from the church's formal activities during the preceding two-year period.
7. The root of the problem was the unfortunate attempts of Archbishop Theodorovich to seek union with the Zukite church. Responsibility for the failed reconciliation of 21 December 1935 lay with the consistory, and especially Father Sawchuk. In requiring parishes to transfer their property to the Dominion corporation of the church, the consistory had violated the constitution. Having thus lost the confidence of the faithful, the consistory members should resign immediately.
8. Instructions of the church leadership were valid only when they conformed with the canonical principles of the First All-Ukrainian Church Sobor in Kiev in 1921, and with the basic principles of the constitution.
9. The charter incorporating the church did not represent the church in its most complete sense, i.e., as a spiritual union of parishes, but only applied to property and other temporal matters.
10. Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky should be invited to help Archbishop Theodorovich to iron out the misunderstandings and restore peace in the church. Since the Seventh Sobor was only a sobor of the corporation and not of the church, the archbishop should convoke an extraordinary sobor of the whole church as soon as possible.
11. In the event that the archbishop refused to act, steps would be taken with other church congregations that approved the canonical principles of the First All-Ukrainian Church Sobor in Kiev and upheld the constitutional principles of the church of Canada to bring about peace and unity in the church.
12. In the meantime, the activities of the Ukrainian Church Defence Brotherhood and the publication of *Ridna Tserkva* would be resumed.²¹

With show of solidarity on the part of Father Mayewsky's parishioners, the consistory decided to take legal action. On 8 May 1937, a suit was filed with the King's Bench requesting the following: a perpetual injunction restraining the priest from officiating in the cathedral; a perpetual injunction restraining the parish from retaining the services of Father Mayewsky; an order securing the return of the antimimension to the consistory.²² On 1 June the defendants filed counterclaim maintaining that Father Mayewsky was a priest of the Church in good standing; that his suspension was illegal and therefore null and void, as the present leaders of the Church had "seceded and departed from the faith, rites, canons, discipline and practices of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada and [were] no

21. *Ridna Tserkva*, May 1937; also to be found in the files of the Consistory.

22. Taken from a copy issued by A. J. Christie, prothonotary.

longer members thereof"; that the office of bishop, members of the consistory and members of the Church Judiciary Commission were vacant; and that Father Mayewsky and "those associating and acting with him constitute The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada." An injunction was therefore requested restraining the present leaders of the Church from interfering with the pastoral duties of Father Mayewsky and requiring them to pay \$50,000 damages to the claimants.²³ It took the court almost a year and a half to unravel the complicated case.

In the meantime, both sides busily conducted campaigns to win the favour of the faithful. Swystun, Father Mayewsky and their supporters revived the Ukrainian Church Defence Brotherhood and its organ the *Ridna Tserkva* and organized meetings in various parts of the country. The leaders of the Church, in turn, mobilized the clergy, the *Visnyk* and the *Holos* — edited by a consistory member Myroslaw Stechishin — in their campaign to defend the status quo.

To contradict the claims of the "cathedralites" (*soborivtsi*) that support was growing among dissatisfied church members, the consistory published a declaration in the *Visnyk* (15 July 1937), signed by twenty-four priests at a conference of the clergy held in Saskatoon, 29 June to 1 July 1937, which stated that none of the signatories sympathized with "the work of Messrs. Wasyl Swystun and Peter Mayewsky" and described rumours to the contrary as false and insulting. Another article in the same paper (15 September) carried the list of new parishes that had joined the Church between 1934 and 1937. In all, thirty six new congregations had been accepted from the following provinces: Alberta-12, Saskatchewan-10, Manitoba-9, British Columbia-3 and Ontario-2. The distribution of new church buildings erected during this period was also noted by the consistory: Saskatchewan-8, Alberta-3, Manitoba-3 and Ontario-1.

At the trial before the King's Bench on 8-9 and 14 November 1938, the judge granted the injunction restraining Father Mayewsky from officiating in the cathedral and the trustees from keeping him in their employ. The priest was also ordered to return the antimension to the corporation, as the consecrated linens were the property of the Church.²⁴ The counterclaim was dismissed, and the victory of the consistory was complete. Celebrations, however, were short-lived, as the losing party appealed the verdict.

The case was argued in Manitoba's Court of Appeal on 31 January and 1 February 1939, and on 13 March²⁵; the four judges

23. Taken from a copy by the receiving officer.

24. *Manitoba Reports*, 47: 63; *Visnyk*, 15 November 1938; *Ridna Tserkva*, December 1938.

25. *Manitoba Reports*, 47: 64-112.

reversed part of the decision of the lower court. The corporation of the Church was not granted the right to enforce the previous injunction, which was judged invalid because the corporation possessed only temporal rights and no spiritual jurisdiction over the parish. The decision also noted that Father Mayewsky claimed to be a member of the unincorporated Church. The court advised that the antimimension be returned, but would issue no injunction as the antimimension possessed only symbolic value and had little monetary worth.

The decision satisfied neither party and both filed separate appeals with the Supreme Court of Canada, which handed down the final judgment on 29 June 1940.²⁸ The verdict upheld the Court of Appeal, with the five judges unanimous in dismissing the appeals of the corporation and the cathedral congregation. An addendum then restricted the court's interpretation by noting that it was "not to be deemed an adjudication of issues raised thereby other than those adjudicated upon in the main action." Two judges dissented, maintaining that Father Mayewsky should be ordered to return the antimimension to the corporation. The majority, however, argued that the corporation was vested with authority in property matters only and had no legal right "to enforce spiritual discipline over priests or to disqualify them or to restrain any particular priest from officiating or any congregation from accepting his ministrations." The validity of the decree of excommunication was considered to be beyond the competence of the courts.

In its issue of 15 July, the *Visnyk* translated the ruling into black and white terms. The Church lost the cathedral building and the antimimension and it had to pay the costs of the lawsuits. On the other hand, it did rid itself of the mutinous elements, established the inviolability of the judiciary's decisions and obtained judicial comments which could be useful in the future. In winning the right to continue functioning as a parish the congregation of St. Mary the Protectress had to face the fact that the overwhelming majority of the organized Ukrainian Orthodox community was solidly behind the consistory and the leaders of the Church. In fact, Swystun, Father Mayewsky and the cathedral parishioners soon found themselves completely ostracized — a sad end to a tragic episode in the Church's history. It was a Pyrrhic victory for Swystun and the supporters of his movement; the last battle was won but the war was lost.

Throughout this period of fratricidal struggle, the great bulwark of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada was the secular organization *Soiuz Ukrainiv Samostiinykiv*, officially designated in English as the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League. The latter was

28. *Canada Law Reports* 1940, 586-616.

established at the eleventh Ukrainian national convention, in Saskatoon on 28-30 December 1927.²⁷ The participants at the historic meeting were all members of the P. Mohyla Ukrainian Institute. Wasył Swystun was one of the league's founders, and served as its first president until 1931. The ideology of SUS (its Ukrainian acronym) has been centred in the word "Samostiinist", which means independence and connotes self-reliance. Its three goals have been: 1. independence of the individual, the organization and the nation, 2. independence of thought and action, and 3. independence in political, economic and religious affairs. The league "recognizes the great importance of the church and the work of the church and supports that church which works for its [the nation's] welfare, and is under its own, rather than foreign, control and is not a tool for foreign purposes."²⁸ The leaders of the organization have regarded the history of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the history of the Ukrainian nation and the history of the Ukrainian culture to be one, indivisible reality. On that basis they have propagated the view that "An Orthodox is Ukrainian, a non-Orthodox is a non-Ukrainian."²⁹ This compound of nationalism and religion was the formula selected by the founders as the best possible safeguard of the Ukrainian identity in Canada. The league's official organ is the *Holos*, long a partisan supporter of Ukrainian Orthodoxy. And the activities of the organization are conducted in the community halls known as *Ukrainski Narodni Domy* (Ukrainian National Homes — familiar landmarks in many Ukrainian settlements on the Canadian Prairies) — and in the parish facilities of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada.

The birth of the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League was followed by the creation of two affiliates. *Sotuz Ukrainok Kanady* (Alliance of Ukrainian Women of Canada), known in English as the Ukrainian Women's Association,³⁰ outpaced the growth of the league itself by forming its branches almost exclusively in parishes of the Church and coupling cultural work with activities connected with the Church. And the *Sotuz Ukrainskoi Molodi Kanady* (Alliance of Ukrainian Youth of Canada) — officially known as the Canadian Ukrainian Youth Association — soon was recruiting young Ukrainians into its ranks under the energetic leadership of its talented organizer, Harry Tyzuk.³¹ The activities of both organizations were directed by the

27. Julian W. Stechishin, *Istoriia Ukrainskoho Instrytatu im. Petra Mohyla v Saskatuni*, 192-201.

28. Julian W. Stechishin, *Mich Ukrainstoinny v Kanadi*, 30.

29. *Ibid.*, 31.

30. A detailed, illustrated history of the organization is given in Natalya L. Kostuska, *Chyvert Stofitna na Hromadskii Niv, 1928-1951*.

31. *Naryi Shliakh*, 29 March 1938.

Ukrainian Self-Reliance League, thereby giving the leaders a great deal of influence at the grass-roots level of most parishes.

Branches of each of the three organizations were very active at the Cathedral of St. Mary the Protectress in Winnipeg. When Swystun began his campaign in 1935 against the alleged deviations of the consistory, these branches sided with him and subsequently gave support to Father Mayewsky. But the national executive of the league, in supporting the policy of the consistory, waged a silent boycott against the branches at the cathedral. This provoked the Canadian Ukrainian Youth Association chapter to retaliate on 14 March 1938 — with the cathedral leaders' approval — by making a public declaration of co-operation with the Ukrainian National Youth Federation based in Saskatoon.³² A year later, the St. Mary branches of the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League and the Ukrainian Women's Association followed suit by becoming branches of the Ukrainian National Federation of Canada and the Ukrainian Women's Organization of Canada. The federation and its affiliates was strictly a secular organization founded in 1932.³³ Its strongest appeal was to the most recent immigrants, and it reached them through its organ, *Novyi Shliakh* (*New Pathway*). Swystun joined the federation in 1939 and played a leading role in its conventions and activities for the next three years. The Self-Reliance League, which Swystun had helped to found and used to lead, simply acted as if he did not exist.

Despite the openly hostile attitude of the Church authorities and the leaders of the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League, the St. Mary parish sent Father Mayewsky, Swystun and Nicholas Kinash as delegates to the eighth sobor in Saskatoon on 4-5 August 1940. The move was all the more incredible as it came barely a month after the verdict of the Supreme Court of Canada. To the cathedral delegates, their congregation was part of the Church, though not under the corporation. The Church leaders, however, conducted themselves "as if there had not been a court decision", and chose to continue "to identify the church with the corporation."³⁴ Accordingly, the delegates were not admitted because they were "people entirely foreign to our church."³⁵ The defenders of "autocephalous" principles and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church found that they were not welcome among their brothers and sisters in the Canadian Church. Crusader Swystun had run into an impenetrable wall.

32. For further details see Paul YUZYK, *The Ukrainians in Manitoba: A Social History*, 85-7.

33. SWYSTUN, *Avtokefalia*, 57.

34. *Visnyk*, 15 August 1940.

35. *Visnyk*, 15 February 1941.

The eighth sobor took steps to consolidate and clarify the legal position of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada to prevent a repetition of the problems experienced in court. Since the charter had not provided for spiritual jurisdiction, a resolution was passed stating that "the incorporated body of the Church embraces the totality of church life, namely, spiritual and temporal matters."³⁶ All the attending priests pledged loyalty to the Church, and it was resolved that each parish must adopt a resolution "to unite with the whole Church."³⁷ The delegates also left the door open for the return of the parish of St. Mary the Protectress, "when that congregation will apply according to the requirements of the constitution of our church."³⁸ This step was finally taken by the dissident parish ten years after the original altercation.

Next, amendments were made to the constitution that increased the disciplinary powers of the Church's administration. The sobor also expressed confidence in the old consistory by re-electing all but one of its members to another term of office. Thus, the governing body of the Church consisted of the following: Father S. W. Sawchuk (administrator and president), Father W. Kudryk (vice-president), J. Dmytriw (secretary), Myroslaw Stechishin (vice-secretary) and Joseph Bohonos (treasurer). The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Brotherhood, which had been inactive for a decade, was then revived with the following on its executive: Theodore Humeniuk (Toronto), M. Materyn (Toronto), A. Hukalo (Montreal), W. Fastyga (Hamilton) and Joseph Lysy (Windsor).

Father Sawchuk's report dispelled any mistaken notions that the delegates might have had about the damage wrought by Swystun and his supporters. He had no trouble establishing the stability of the Church, for substantial progress had, in fact, been made since the last sobor. The number of priests had increased to twenty-eight, and approximately fifty new church buildings had been erected. There was a total of 203 congregations — as compared to 181 in 1935 — spread over six Canadian provinces and one American state:

Saskatchewan	— 81 parishes and 9 priests
Alberta	— 55 parishes and 5 priests
Manitoba	— 53 parishes and 6 priests
Ontario	— 9 parishes and 4 priests
Québec	— 3 parishes and 1 priest
B.C.	— 3 parishes and 1 priest
U.S.A.	— 1 parish and 1 priest

36. *Visnyk*, 15 August 1940.

37. *Ibid.*

38. *Visnyk*, 15 November 1940.

Three parishes had been lost in the interim: Winnipeg (cathedral) in Manitoba and Sopoff and Redfield in Saskatchewan. To this report could be added the census figures for 1941, which showed 88,874 Ukrainians (29 per cent) professing Greek Orthodoxy out of a Ukrainian population of 305,926. This marked a considerable increase from 1931, when 55,386 Ukrainians had stated that they were Orthodox.³⁹

Clearly, the storm, centred in Winnipeg, had been weathered by the Church, and progress was being made. The lessons learned in the experience were absorbed by the eighth sobor and incorporated into the structure and operation of the Church. On the whole, the future looked bright. It remained to be seen, however, whether the changes would stand the difficult test of time.

39. An analysis of the different religious denominations is given in N. J. HUSCHAR, *Canadians of Ukrainian Origin: Population*, 9-12.

CHAPTER NINE

The Consummation of the Hierarchy

The fundamental problem that confronted the leaders of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada was its continued dependence on foreign churches. For its first five years the Church had been under the protection of a Syrian bishop. Since 1924, it had an elected bishop of its own who was a fellow-Ukrainian; under his care the Church prospered and established itself as a powerful force in the life of Ukrainian Canadians. But the tragic fate of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in Ukraine — from whose ranks the Canadian bishop had been drawn — had serious repercussions for Orthodox Ukrainians around the world. The liquidation of the mother Church by the Stalinist government in the early 1930s was so complete that only one active bishop remained: Ioann (Ivan) Theodorovich. Since he refused, along with the Canadian Church, to resort to the Alexandrian method to consecrate another bishop, the two-decade old formation was left in a very precarious position. Should the bishop die, the Church would have no other recourse but to seek the protection of a "foreign" Church. And this contradicted the very basis of its autocephaly.

It was therefore crucial to ensure that the hierarchy could perpetuate itself without "outside" assistance. With the Church strong enough to support its own episcopate with at least two bishops who could then canonically ordain other bishops as needed, the idea of a self-perpetuating hierarchy became a realistic and pressing concern. But it was to take ten years and cost the Church two bishops, to reach that objective.

During the Second World War the Church was at peace with itself and its enemies, as all energies were directed towards strengthening Canada's war effort. The Ukrainian Churches did not participate directly in the formation of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee in 1940,¹ the co-ordinating body for all Ukrainian organizations in

1. For a general account of the Committee, see Paul YUTYK, *The Ukrainians in Manitoba: A Social History*, 89-91.

Canada (excluding the communists) formed to aid the Canadian government in the war against the Nazis and as a focal point for the struggle to win Ukraine's national liberation.² The Churches were only indirectly represented in the committee through their lay sections, with Father S. W. Sawchuk, the administrator of the Orthodox Church, becoming vice-president as the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League's representative. In supporting the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, both the Greek Orthodox and Greek Catholic Churches — who stopped attacking each other openly for the duration of the war — greatly contributed to the success of recruiting campaigns, war bonds sales and all aspects of Red Cross work, including the rehabilitation of returned veterans. To administer to the spiritual needs of the Orthodox soldiers among the approximately 35,000 Ukrainian men and women in the Canadian armed forces,³ the Orthodox Church assigned three padres to military duty: Fathers S. W. Sawchuk, S. P. Symchych and T. Kowalyshyn.⁴ Money and parcels were sent by the parishes to the Ukrainian Canadian Servicemen's Canteen in London, England, and to Ukrainian soldiers, airmen and sailors in various theatres of war. Without the whole-hearted assistance of the Church, there is no doubt that the humanitarian work would have been less successful than it was.

The war years also saw the first concrete steps toward the creation of a Ukrainian Orthodox college. The idea, first introduced at the 1932 clerical conference in Saskatoon led to the establishment of a permanent clerical seminary, which, by 1944, had trained eleven priests for the Church.⁵ With classes conducted in the consistory building, only a small number of students could be accommodated. Accordingly, a resolution passed at the clerical conference on 29 June 1943 approved the establishment of a regular college that would also include the seminary. The institution was soon to play an important role in the Church's pursuit of self-sufficiency and independence.

The purchase in December 1944 of the St. John's College building in north end Winnipeg provided the facilities for St. Andrew's College, named in honour of the apostle who is regarded as the first to plant the cross in Ukraine. Pending alterations to the building, the official opening of the college did not take place until 26 November 1946. Archbishop Ivan Theodorovich, several priests an

2. The policies and achievements of the Committee are recorded in the proceedings of the triennial congresses (1943, 1946, 1950, 1953, 1956), published in book form.

3. Estimate of the *Toronto Star Weekly*, 12 November 1943, and the *Winnipeg Free Press*, 2 June 1943.

4. The Greek Catholic padres were Fathers M. Pelech, M. Horoshko and T. Dobko.

5. Semen KOWBIL and Dmytro DOROSHENKO, eds., *Propaniama Kryha Ukrainskoho Narodnicha Domu v Viniegu*, 386.

representatives of leading educational institutions in Winnipeg participated in the opening ceremonies.

Besides providing instruction in Grade XI and XII (junior and senior matriculation), the college offered a four-year course leading to a Bachelor of Divinity degree for candidates for the priesthood in the Orthodox Church.⁶ Courses regularly taught at the Winnipeg institution included Ukrainian language, history, literature, music and handicrafts. A six-week Ukrainian summer school sponsored by the college enrolled youth in Ukrainian studies. The staff included qualified teachers as well as priests. The first principal of St. Andrew's College, F. T. Hawryliuk, was a former superintendent of schools in Saskatchewan; the first dean of theology was Oxford-educated Dmitri Martinowski; and Dr. Dmytro Doroshenko, a leading Ukrainian historian, taught history at St. Andrew's until 1950. It was not long before the board of directors began to seek affiliation with the University of Manitoba.⁷

The ninth sobor of the Church in Saskatoon on 28-30 July 1946 initiated the process that would lead to the twin goals of complete independence and canonical conformity. No official account of the sessions was ever published. To facilitate efforts to obtain legitimate autonomy for the Church, the following article was deleted from the constitution: "The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada finds itself in spiritual ties with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church through its bishop or bishops."⁸ This meant that the bond with the non-existent Church was severed and the path was now clear for a new relationship. The other significant development at the sobor was the resignation of Archbishop Theodorovich.

The archbishop explained his resignation with the statement that "the Canadian Church needed to have its own separate bishop or bishops... A church with one bishop cannot exist and it is not desirable for it to be in such a state.... It would always be best to have three bishops. When one departs from this life there are always two others who can elevate a third to the rank of bishop."⁹ The archbishop, who had served the Church for twenty-two years, then gave the sobor his assent to find a new bishop and asked to be released "with peace, blessings and prayers."

The real reason for his resignation was revealed by Archbishop Theodorovich in correspondence, which he mimeographed and distributed to priests, parish executives and Church leaders in Canada and

6. See "The Birth and Beginnings of a College", in *Opinion*, May-June 1947.

⁷ In 1965, St-Andrews College moved to a large newly-built structure on the campus of the University of Manitoba, with which later it became affiliated.

7. Wasyl Swystun, *Autokefalia — Chy Zelezhniat vid Chuzhekh*, 57-8.

8. *Visnyk*, 15 November 1946.

the United States in July 1947. In a letter to Metropolitan Polikarp Sikorsky, primate of the exiled Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Europe, written before the ninth sobor, the archbishop lamented that the act of the 1921 sobor in Kiev had severed "canonical unity with the Ecumenical Orthodox Church."⁹ He proposed that a "painless and good way out of the situation" would be for the forthcoming sobor of the Church in Europe to adopt a resolution "raising the dignity of its archbishop to the rank of Metropolitan and to commission the Archbishop to enter into relations with the Sobor of Bishops of the U.A.O.C. in Europe for the purpose of performing the hieratic act of elevating him to a Metropolitan." "Whether this [the elevation] will be an act of consecration — blessing or whether it will be an act of full episcopal ordination will depend on us, the bishops of the Church...." From his next letter, it is apparent that the consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada and conference of the clergy held prior to the July 1946 sobor, decisively condemned the archbishop's designs.¹⁰ Theodorovich therefore concluded that "if the Canadian Church did not regard it as possible to trust my competence in this matter, I saw no other alternative but to ask the church to release me in peace and to bid it farewell, which I did."

Acting on the decisions of the ninth sobor, the consistory dispatched the administrator of the Church on a mission to Europe. Father Sawchuk's task was to establish new ties and find a bishop for the Canadian Church. He left on 25 October 1946. Upon his return on 14 February 1947, the consistory reported that he "had discussed church affairs with Metropolitan Polikarp and other bishops." His visit was vaguely described as having a "dual significance — for the Church in Europe and for the Church in Canada. Obscure matters were clarified and live ties were established between our Church in Canada and the one overseas, which in the future may have great significance."¹¹ The brief communique was all that was said about the European trip for several months, but it was the first indication that the Church was embarking on a new course. It hinted that canonical relations were to be established with the second formation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Europe, which considered itself to be canonical. If true, it was indeed a development of great significance.

9. Theodorovich correspondence: Letter to Metropolitan Polikarp, dated 4 June 1946.

10. *Ibid.*, letter to Metropolitan Polikarp and all the bishops of the U.A.O.C. in Europe, dated 28 February 1947.

11. *Visnyk*, 1 March 1947.

The results of Father Sawchuk's negotiations were reflected in the resolutions of the third sobor of bishops of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Europe, held in Munich on 12-15 May 1947. Details of the meeting were only cursorily reported in a *Visnyk* editorial (15 July 1947). The twelve participating bishops "resolved with joy to welcome the intention and desire of the Canadian Greek Orthodox Church to merge into one the two branches of the U.A.O. Church for the welfare and glory of the Orthodox Church of the Ukrainian nation."¹² In compliance with the request of the Canadian Church, the bishop also agreed to authorize the transfer of Bishop Mstyslaw Skrypnyk, formerly of Pereiaslav, to Canada. A note appended to the authorization noted that Archbishop Theodorovich had vacated the office and that he approved the efforts of the Canadian Church to obtain a bishop or bishops independently.

The resolution regarding potential union with the Ukrainian American Orthodox Church in the United States — headed by Archbishop Theodorovich — included an important proviso. The act of union had to be consummated "in accordance with the obligatory canons of the Ecumenical Orthodox Church" on the following basis:

1. The unification of Archbishop Ioann Theodorovich [was] to be achieved by means of episcopal ordination [specific canons were then cited].
2. After the unification of Archbishop Theodorovich was achieved, he was to be commissioned, as the regional bishop, to legalize canonically the clergy ordained by him, in accordance with the canonical regulations and resolutions of the Sobor of Bishops in Pinsk [act cited].¹³

In other words, the bishops of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Europe did not regard Archbishop Theodorovich to be a canonical bishop, nor did they recognize as canonical the priests ordained by him. No mention was made of any stipulation that the canonical legalization of the Canadian priests ordained by the archbishop was also a specific pre-condition upon which acceptance of the Canadian Church hinged.

That the leaders of the Church in Canada believed that the proviso did not apply to them is evident from a letter of the consistory to Archbishop Theodorovich.¹⁴ The consistory members took no responsibility for the predicament of their former prelate, and placed the blame for the situation on Theodorovich himself: "The fact

12. SWYSTUN, *Avtokefalia*, 15.

13. *Ibid.*, 14.

14. Theodorovich correspondence: letter of the Consistory of the U.G.O.C. to Archbishop Theodorovich, dated 11 June 1947.

remains a fact that You, Yourself, in advance and from personal motives, gave your consent to a renewed ordination.... You, Yourself, and on Your own accord began this matter, therefore now You, Yourself, must finish it." Their final judgment was even more severe:

In view of the expected imminent arrival in Canada of His Excellency Bishop Mstyslaw, and also [in view] of the decision of the Sobor of Bishops in Europe in the matter of the unification of His Excellency Archbishop Ioann with the hierarchy of the U.A.O.C. in Europe — this decision being in general harmony with the position of the same Archbishop Ioann, which by virtue of this fact, in the opinion formed at the deliberations of the Consistory, excludes a joint appearance in prayer with Bishop Mstyslaw until the unification of His Excellency Archbishop Ioann will be consummated — this year's visitation of His Excellency Archbishop Ioann to Canada must be cancelled.

But the archbishop had another point of view and challenged this manoeuvre on the part of the consistory. His immediate reply chided the members of the Canadian consistory for overlooking certain regulations of the constitution and consequently overstepping the bounds of their authority:

Regarding the settlement of the hierarchical question of Bishop Mstyslav, You refer to the resolution and blessing of the Sobor of Bishops in Europe. So You therefore accept their resolution and blessing as canonical for Yourself. You only inform me of this. The decision of such canonical subordination is accepted by You without me and without the sanction of the Sobor of the Church. I cannot accept such a decision by You. The Sobor in Canada has not yet approved a resolution concerning either our consummated act of unification with that church or the acceptance of the resolutions of the Episcopate of this church as canonical for us.

Also, permit me to remind the Consistory of a known fact, namely, that I am in possession of a declaration by the same Bishop Mstyslaw which at any time makes possible my "joint appearance in prayer" with him; but the Consistory apparently wishes to create "an external manifestation of such canonicity" and for this reason avoids it and leans on the blessings and the resolutions of the Sobor of Bishops in Europe.

The acceptance of a bishop of the U.A.O.C. in exile, the acceptance of him by the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, may be realized either in conjunction with the settlement of our hierarchical question in the unification of prayer of the Episcopate with myself and the clergy of my placement, or after such an act, but never before such an act or without such an act.¹⁵

15. *Ibid.*, letter of Archbishop Theodorovich to the Consistory of the U.G.O.C., dated 17 June 1947.

Subsequent events tended to vindicate the position taken by Theodorovich. With the arrival of Archbishop Mstyslaw Skrypnyk in Winnipeg on 13 September, an extraordinary sobor was convened in the Manitoba capital 12-13 November to formalize the transfer of power. Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Theodorovich, the bishop-elect being present in a mantle.¹⁶ Father Sawchuk's lengthy report on his administrative activities discussed his negotiations with Metropolitan Polikarp Sikorsky in Europe and the final agreement concerning unification and the nomination of a new bishop. The candidature of Metropolitan Ilarion Ohienko, who had arrived in Winnipeg on 19 September to join the cathedral of St. Mary the Protectress, was rejected because he had secretly corresponded with the outcast "conspirator", Father Peter Mayewsky, and because he refused to recognize the canonicity of the hierarchy of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in exile as well as the legitimacy of Archbishop Theodorovich.¹⁷ After the election of Archbishop Mstyslaw Skrypnyk as head of the Canadian Church, Archbishop Theodorovich formally handed over the crozier of office in a solemn ceremony.¹⁸ Resolutions passed by the sobor approved the union with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Europe with the stipulation that the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada "continues to remain independent in internal life and in the administration of the church organization in Canada."¹⁹

The third bishop of the Canadian Church brought with him a wide and diverse range of political and ecclesiastical experiences. Archbishop Skrypnyk was born in 1898 into a religious family in Poltava; his father was a Cossack descendant and his mother came from the famous Petliura family. During the Ukrainian revolution of 1917-1921, the future archbishop served in the staff headquarters of Symon Petliura, the commander-in-chief of the Ukrainian Republican army. He was later arrested in Volynia for his anti-Polish activities and moved to Galicia for several years, where he was active in educational and economic affairs. Returning to Orthodox Volynia in 1926, he pursued university studies in political science at Warsaw. His interest in politics, however, was more than academic and he eventually won a deputy seat in the Polish Sejm. There, he became known as a defender of Ukrainian autonomy in Poland and as a champion of the rights of the Orthodox Church.

During the Soviet occupation of Volynia, 1939-1941, he moved to Kholm and served as an administrator to Archbishop Ilarion

16. *Visnyk*, 15 March 1948.

17. *Visnyk*, 1 and 15 April; and 1 May 1948.

18. *Visnyk*, 15 June 1948.

19. *Visnyk*, 15 November 1947.

Ohienko. The Nazi occupation of Volynia and Ukraine found him actively engaged in the restoration of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church under Archbishop Polikarp Sikorsky. After his wife was murdered in 1942, Skrypnyk became a monk and in May was ordained bishop of Perciaslav. Defying German animosity toward the Ukrainian Church, he helped Archbishop Polikarp in Volynia to expand its hierarchy. The advance of Soviet armies in 1943 forced the fifteen bishops of this formation to flee westward, eventually to Germany, where, after the war, Bishop Skrypnyk energetically organized congregations in the displaced persons' camps. In 1946 he established a western European eparchy with a cathedral in Paris and congregations in England, Belgium, Holland, France and Switzerland. In March 1947, with the consent and blessing of the hierarchy of his Church, he accepted the invitation to head the Orthodox Church in Canada.

Despite the growing popularity of Archbishop Skrypnyk, some of his actions increasingly alarmed the Canadian Church leaders. He initiated and successfully completed several projects without either consulting or obtaining the approval of the consistory, and he had direct links with a Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States that questioned the canonicity of the Canadian Church and assisted Archbishop Theodorovich in his efforts to establish his canonical legitimacy. Interested in the problems of Ukrainian Orthodoxy beyond the confines of his Canadian diocese, Archbishop Skrypnyk launched a monthly religious magazine, *Tserkva i Narod* (*The Church and the People*). Edited by Father Ivan Wlasowsky, the Orthodox church historian, the first issue was published in Winnipeg and appeared in May 1949. It described itself as dedicated "to the great cause of preserving, propagating and intensifying the Christian ideas and ideals of our ancestral Ukrainian Orthodox in all the Ukrainian Orthodox centres in the Old and the New World, whose aspirations are to establish one Independent Ukrainian Orthodox Church." The archpastoral letter further explained that the

Orthodox Ukrainian publications existing on American soil are intended only to serve a limited territory, predominantly the faithful of one Church in one state, and that is why they are not in a position to properly and fully satisfy the solitary emigrant to Peru, Paraguay or Chile. In addition, the appearance, in the present immigration, of a large number of people who for over 25 years were forced to live in the atmosphere of the Godless regime of the U.S.S.R., requires a special approach to strengthen revived religious feelings.²⁰

20. *Tserkva i Narod*, April-May 1949.

That the consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada did not share these views is evident in the fact that nowhere on the pages of the *Visnyk* (to July 1950) was mention made of *Tserkva i Narid*. The Church leaders, too, ignored the publication in ominous silence. The *Visnyk* was equally silent when Archbishop Skrypnyk established the St. Nicholas Ukrainian Orthodox Monastery near Grimsby, Ontario.²¹ The six-acre orchard was purchased in December 1949 and the building on the site was completely reconstructed to include rooms for monks and retired men, a large chapel, a church museum, a library and a reception hall. The consecration of the monastery took place on 20 May 1950, followed next day by a celebration of the Feast of St. Nicholas, the patron of the ancient monasteries in Ukraine. These activities drew no comment until after the tenth sobor, when the consistory published the following statement:

To the questions of the faithful of our Church in the matter of the monastery in Grimsby, Ont. (St. Nicholas), the Consistory hereby provides interested persons with the following information:

The monastery referred to is not the property of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, which has nothing in common with it and which is not responsible for it. According to the explanation provided by Archbishop Mstyslav Skrypnyk himself to the Tenth Sobor of our Church in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, the monastery was purchased by him privately and, as much as is known to the Consistory, appears still to be his private property.²²

But what irritated the leaders of the Canadian Church most was the archbishop's intervention in American Church life. At a sobor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America held in Allentown, Pennsylvania on 8-9 December 1948, Archbishop Skrypnyk was elected to lead the breakaway Zukite formation. In the process, Bishop Bohdan Shpylka, head of the Church since Bishop Zuk's death in 1937, was obliged to relinquish his jurisdiction and become the archbishop's suffragan.²³ Since the American Orthodox Church was part of the Greek diocese in the United States, the election of Archbishop Skrypnyk required the sanction of the Patriarch of Constantinople, a move delayed for many months because of repeated postponements in the installation of Patriarch Athenagoras, the former exarch of America. This provided Bishop Shpylka with the opportunity to nullify the resolutions of the Allentown sobor and to suspend several of the priests who had engineered the takeover. The

21. *Tserkva i Narid*, May-June 1950.

22. *Visnyk*, 1 July 1950.

23. *Tserkva i Narid*, April-May 1949.

great majority of priests, however, opposed Shpylka and at a conference in Allentown on 3 May 1949 passed resolutions requesting the Patriarch to sanction Archbishop Mstyslaw Skrypnyk.²⁴

Meanwhile, Archbishop Skrypnyk was busy laying the foundations for the union of the Church that he now headed with the American Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States, led by Archbishop Ivan Theodorovich. In June, the synod of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Europe approved a resolution which stated that "The union of Orthodox Ukrainian Churches should be enacted according to canonical principles and with the blessing of the Ecumenical Patriarch."²⁵ There was, therefore, only one obstacle preventing union between the two Ukrainian Orthodox Churches in the United States, namely, Archbishop Theodorovich, who still had no formal recognition from any "canonical" Orthodox Church. The Alexandrian method of his ordination in 1921 remained the main stumbling block thwarting the union, but this time Theodorovich was able to do something about it. The announcement of his re-ordination by the Patriarch of Alexandria was made in the official organ of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America, published under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople:

...the act took place on 27 August 1949. Archbishop Ioann, who was a hierarch of one formation of the episcopate of the U.A.O. Church in Ukraine — elevated without the participation of bishops in 1921 — on that day received consecration in accordance with the Holy Canons of the Ecumenical Orthodox Church. This was a great sacrifice on the part of Archbishop Ioann for the cause of Church unification. Other hierarchs had put forward suggestions [on how] to make his episcopacy canonical, if he would only follow them. Nevertheless, he accepted episcopal ordination from Metropolitan Christopher, Exarch of the Alexandrian Patriarch, and from Archbishop Mstyslaw of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America. This act terminated the hierarchy of the U.A.O. Church of 1921, which did not have recognition from the Orthodox Church.²⁶

The next step toward the union of the two Ukrainian Orthodox Churches was the unification prayer by Archbishop Skrypnyk and Archbishop Theodorovich with the clergy of both Churches participating. This symbolic gesture was made at the St. Vladimir Church in New York on 28 August 1949.²⁷ A joint communique was then issued to the clergy and faithful of both Churches, announcing the establish-

24. *Ukrainskyi Pravoslavnyi Vsiyky* (Ukrainian Orthodox Herald), June 1949.

25. *Dnipro*, June-August 1950.

26. *Ukrainskyi Pravoslavnyi Vsiyky*, March-April 1950.

27. *Ibid.*

ment of a pre-sobor commission and the convoking of a joint sobor in December. When it was postponed, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America held an extraordinary sobor in Wilmington, Delaware, on 18-19 April 1950, which formally sanctioned Archbishop Mstyslaw Skrypnyk as its sole bishop, repudiated Bishop Bohdan Shpylka and approved the proposed union. The extraordinary sobor of the American Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States, held in New York on 13 October of the same year, approved the union. This cleared the way for the joint sobor, which took place in New York on the following two days. There, the two former Churches were merged into the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States of America, with Archbishop Theodorovich as metropolitan and Archbishop Skrypnyk as chancellor and president of the consistory.²⁸ The great event then received the blessing of Metropolitan Polikarp Sikorsky.

Although three observers from the Canadian Church attended the joint sobor, they must have watched the proceedings with a sense of detachment, for before the act of union the Canadian Church had dispensed with Archbishop Skrypnyk, as it had earlier dispensed with Archbishop Theodorovich. The turn of events led the editor of *Visnyk* (1 November 1950) to wonder "what the ideological side of the sobor looked like."

It has already been seen that the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada pursued a very cautious policy toward union with other Orthodox Churches. An earlier editorial statement in the *Visnyk* (1 November 1949) gave a good indication of how Archbishop Skrypnyk's actions would be received by any future sobor:

...For the Canadian Church to unite with the American Churches would require the Canadian Church to repudiate the principle of independence and become subordinated to Constantinople or Alexandria or to someone else. The union of the American Churches with the Canadian Church will only be possible after they have adopted the principle of church independence.

This strict adherence to complete independence precluded any kind of ties with foreign churches, as the following statement in the *Visnyk* (15 October 1949) indicated:

[The U.G.O.C.] does not regard formal foreign "recognition" necessary to prove that our Church is a real Orthodox Church. Its quality is manifest in its contents and in the decisions of its faithful to have it Orthodox.

Thus, it was in a tense atmosphere reminiscent of the mood characterizing the seventh sobor in 1935, that the tenth sobor took

28. *Ukrainske Pravoslavne Slovo*, December 1950.

place in Saskatoon on 18-21 June 1950. The 52 priests and 523 delegates and registered guests had received advance notice of the resignation of Archbishop Skrypnyk. As the proceedings of the sobor were never published, it is difficult to know what actually transpired. The general account presented in a *Visnyk* editorial (1 July 1950) merely stated that the bishop's resignation was accepted and the search for a new bishop was approved. In what was termed "the American affair", the archbishop was accused of arbitrary dealings with a Church under foreign jurisdiction and complicity in the reconsecration of Archbishop Theodorovich. His ouster was justified as follows:

If Archbishop Mstyslav agreed to be bishop of an American Church which continues to remain under foreign subordination and which desires to see all parts of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church under foreign subordination, then how can he, at the same time, be bishop of the Canadian Church, which is independent of foreigners? Such contradictory positions cannot be maintained, for one cannot head a Church in America subordinated to foreigners and in Canada stand in defence of church independence.

If to this is added the American affair of reconsecration, which took place wholly without the knowledge of our Canadian Church — a reconsecration which was a blow to our Church — then the causes of the "misunderstandings" and the resignation become understandable.

The conflict and tension of this sobor showed when Father Sawchuk refused re-election as administrator of the Church and president of the consistory. The delegates, in a resolution, begged him to continue until the arrival of the next bishop, and Father Sawchuk reluctantly agreed. To cope with the increased burdens the consistory was enlarged to thirteen members, including the administrator: Father Sawchuk (president), Father E. Hrycyna (vice-president), Father S. Boychuk (secretary), Professor P. Kondra (vice-secretary), J. Syrnick (treasurer), and Father W. Sluzar, Father P. Sametz, Father P. Stefiuk, Father M. Fyk, W. Sarchuk, J. W. Stechishin, A. Oryschak, and Dr. J. Verchomin (members).

In the bitter polemics that followed the sobor, many details about the heated controversy were revealed. A long article, "At the Breaking Point", in Archbishop Skrypnyk's *Tserkva i Narid* (June-August 1950) disclosed that his resignation was accepted by only a narrow majority (96-91) and that he actually did not want to resign. The archbishop claimed that those pressing for his resignation avoided the Church's greater problem and concentrated on his activities in America, the monastery at Grimsby, the publication of *Tserkva i Narid* and his attitude toward the *Visnyk* and its editor, Father Kudryk. As a result, the sobor never did get an "explanation

of the real causes" of the archbishop's resignation. The discussion "turned into an act of accusation", with the reading of the archbishop's private letters to Metropolitan Polikarp, "procured by methods unknown." Furthermore, Archbishop Mstyslaw provided evidence that the consistory was fully aware of actions leading up to his election as head of the American Church, and did not oppose them; in fact, the matter was to be on the agenda of the sobor of the Canadian Church. He also claimed that the November 1949 sobor of bishops of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Europe approved his participation in the reconsecration of Archbishop Theodorovich. Skrypnyk argued that the consistory had behaved irrationally when it forbade him, on the occasion of his installation as bishop of the Canadian Church in 1947, to celebrate mass with his predecessor, Archbishop Theodorovich.

What was really at stake in the struggle that forced the archbishop's resignation was "whether the bishop was to be in reality an archhierarch in the Orthodox Church or an appendage to the Consistory." Skrypnyk then challenged the Church to come out of its "formative stage" and adopt "the course of true autocephaly by forming its own canonical Episcopate and true conciliarism without autocracy — whether episcopal, administrative or consistorial — but with the preservation, simultaneously and following our Ukrainian traditions, of the church hierarchy with its special-hierarchical arch-pastoral and pastoral authority."

The *Visnyk* defended the majority opinion in two series of articles. The first in four installments (1, 15, October, 1, 15 November) dealt with the "obstructionist tactics" and "filibustering" of the archbishop at the sobor; his alleged arbitrary and arrogant treatment of the priests and faithful; his assumption of the leadership of the American Church, which automatically deprived him of being bishop of the Canadian Church ("Who left, he no longer is. Who died, he is no longer alive."); and his complete disregard for the *Visnyk*, the organ of the Church.

The second series in three installments (1, 15 December, 15 January 1951) headed "What the True Causes of the Troubles Are", was most uncomplimentary and was written in a style that insinuated that the archbishop merely got what he deserved. Several of the archbishop's letters were cited to prove that his intentions were "to harm our Church in Canada"; these had been read at the sobor in his presence. The leaders of the Church were also insulted by several outrageous statements attributed to Skrypnyk. One had the independent-minded archbishop referring to "the obvious banditry of my consistorial fathers, who according to the binding Constitution have greater rights than the bishop." To the *Visnyk*, it was obvious that

Archbishop Skrypnyk desired "unlimited rights" and in the process "had to get rid of Fathers Sawchuk and Kudryk", who regarded themselves as the guardians of conciliarism. That was one of Mstyslaw's projects that would not succeed, especially after his cardinal error in accepting the leadership of a Church under foreign jurisdiction and then trying "to drag the Canadian Church into subordination." His failure to the consistory virtually ensured that he would not last long as the Canadian bishop.

To relash the arguments on both sides would be pointless. What is obvious is that the conflict was an unavoidable clash between differing personalities shaped in different worlds. The "misunderstanding" was part of the painful process that accompanied the growth and maturation of the Church. It was a learning experience for the leadership, which absorbed the setback temperately and planned the future accordingly.

The tenth sobor had placed the Church under the guardianship of Metropolitan Polikarp Sikorsky and had invited the European primate to visit Canada. At a meeting in Winnipeg on 24-25 October 1950, it was decided that the time had arrived for the Church to become fully autocephalous and free from all foreign influences by having a self-perpetuating hierarchy of three bishops.²⁹ Metropolitan Polikarp was therefore asked "to invite two Bishops from among the present hierarchs of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Europe and to seek a candidate for the third bishop in Canada...." On 18 December the metropolitan's reply announced the appointment of Archbishop Mykhail Choroshy and Bishop Platon Artemiuk to the Canadian Church.

The extraordinary sobor, convened in Winnipeg on 8-9 August 1951, was attended by 49 priests, 132 delegates and 361 registered guests; it will long be regarded as the most memorable sobor in the history of the church.³⁰ The session had a surprise ending, for the unexpected death of bishop Platon Artemiuk in Toronto a few days prior to the assembly left a vacancy in the episcopal triumvirate and seemed to shatter immediate hopes of establishing a full hierarchy. At this critical point, however, Metropolitan Ilarion Ohienko, in virtual exile at St. Mary the Protectress Cathedral, stepped forward and offered his services, accepting the terms laid down by the Church leaders. Archbishop Mykhail Choroshy then withdrew his candidacy for the primateship out of deference to Ohienko's seniority and prestige. The election of both was unanimous. Unanimous also was the request that Archpriest Wasyl Kudryk become the third bishop, but he declined the honour for various reasons.

29. *Fizyk*, 1 November 1950.

30. *Fizyk*, 1 October to 1 January 1951.

The central event of the sobor was, of course, the election of Metropolitan Ilarion Ohienko. Because of his previous criticism of the Canadian Church and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Europe, the consistory decided to draw up a contractual agreement signed by both parties. Its terms reflected well the characteristic policy of the Church.³¹ The metropolitan agreed to recognize the principles of autocephaly and conciliarism, the canonicity of the hierarchy of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Europe and of all the priests of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada. He also pledged to confine his archpastoral activities exclusively to Canada, and accepted as his official title, "Metropolitan of Winnipeg and All Canada." The terms were approved by the sobor and the document was signed in the presence of the delegates. In his address, Metropolitan Ilarion further confirmed the principles of the Church, thereby reassuring the faithful of his sincerity.

The sobor's resolutions incorporated the above changes into the Church's constitution and by-laws.³² Approval was given to the establishment of a separate hierarchy, to the proclamation of autocephaly and to an appeal for the union of all Orthodox Ukrainians in one Ukrainian Orthodox Church in each country. The democratic administration of the church was safeguarded in the following all-encompassing resolution:

The Extraordinary Sobor of the U.G.O.C. of Canada resolves that the administration of the U.G.O.C. of Canada as a whole is conciliar; it is the manifestation of the will of the majority of the Sobor, recognizing one administration, i.e., a Consistory, which includes all the Bishops of the U.G.O.C. of Canada by right of their position, and the members elected by the Sobor.

Decisions of the Consistory are made by a majority vote. When the ruling bishop disagrees with a decision of the Consistory, such a decision does not go into force, and the dissatisfied parties have the right of appeal to the Sobor of the Church.

A decision of the Sobor is final.³³

With place for three bishops on the consistory, to maintain a balance the number of priests and laymen was increased to eighteen. Archpriest Sawchuk took a leave of absence, while the following consistory took office: Archpriest E. Hrycyna (president), Father J. Dmytriw (vice-president), Father F. Kernisky (secretary), Professor L. Bilecky (vice-secretary), Professor P. Kondra (treasurer), Fathers

31. *Ukrin*, 1 November 1951.

32. The constitution and by-laws were published in booklet form in 1951.

33. *Ukrin*, 1 November 1951.

D. F. Stratyshuk, P. Stefiuk, P. Sametz, T. Kowalyshyn, P. Melnychuk, and M. Bodnarchuk; Dr. J. Verchomin, Judge J. W. Arsenych, J. Syrnick, J. W. Stechishin, L. Tomaschuk, A. Oryschak and General M. Sudowsky (members). The good news of the Canadian Church's great achievement was heralded in the *Visnyk* (15 September 1951) in the "Message of the Episcopate":

A great historical aspect of the fruitful development of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada has been realized. During the past 30 years, it has steadily progressed, with the number of its faithful increasing as well as the quality of its spiritual life. Our church has now almost 300 parishes and close to 70 priests. At last the Gracious Lord has generously blessed His Church, and it has become a Holy Metropolitanate, having received its own church hierarchy. The canonical completeness of the church organization, for which our people have patiently waited for more than 30 years, has been consummated.

The first metropolitan of the Canadian Church needed no introduction to the faithful or to Ukrainians in Canada. Formerly the Minister of Religious Affairs and of Education in the government of the Ukrainian National Republic, he was a distinguished scholar in linguistics and an author of Ukrainian grammar and lexicographical texts; he was also the editor of a popular journal named *Ridna Mova* (The Native Language) and a high-ranking prelate in the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Exile in Europe. His reputation long preceded his arrival in Canada in 1947. He soon became prominent in the movement for the canonical union of the various Ukrainian Orthodox Churches in North America. In his four years in Winnipeg he had edited and published a religious magazine, *Slovo Istyny* (The Word of Truth), which he advisedly discontinued after his installation as primate of the Canadian Church, and several books of his literary and historical studies and poetry.³⁴ With his acceptance into the Canadian church, the Cathedral of St. Mary the Protectress also returned to the fold; the historic reunification was formally proclaimed on 4 November 1951, making the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada whole once more.³⁵

Thus in 1951, on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of Ukrainian settlement in Canada, Orthodox Ukrainians had much to celebrate. They had finally consummated a native hierarchy, and they were under the spiritual leadership of a metropolitan who was one of the most distinguished living Ukrainians; peace had been restored in their Church, and the number of adherents was

34. YUZYK, *Ukrainians in Manitoba*, 133, 135-6.

35. *Visnyk*, 15 November 1951.

steadily growing.³⁶ The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada was, in fact, on the threshold of a brilliant future "to blossom fruitfully for the glory of God and for the redemption and welfare of the Ukrainian people."³⁷

36. The Canadian census for 1951 identified 111,045 Greek Orthodox Ukrainians out of a total Ukrainian population of 395,043, i.e. 28 per cent of the group.

37. Quoted from Metropolitan Ilarion Ohienko's acceptance address, *Vistnyk*, 1 November 1951.

Bibliography

I. - THE CHURCH IN UKRAINE

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS IN UKRAINIAN AND RUSSIAN

- ANDRUSIAK, Mykola. *Narysy z Istorii Halychakoho Muscovophilismu* [Sketches from the History of Galician Muscovophilism]. Lviv: Prosvita, 1935.
- ANTONOVYCH, Volodymyr. *Sheho Pryneslo Ukraini Unia* [What the Union brought Ukraine]. Winnipeg: Ukrainiska Hreko-Pravoslavna Tserkva v Kanadi, 1952.
- Dziannia Soboru Hreko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy v Lvovi, 8-10 bereznia 1946* [Proceedings of the Sobor of the Greek Catholic Church in Lviv, 8-10 March 1946]. Lviv: Prezidium Synodu, 1946.
- Dziannia Vseukrainskoho Pravoslavnoho Tserkovnoho Soboru v. m. Kyivi 14-30 zhovtnia n.s. 1921 r.* [Proceedings of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Sobor in the City of Kiev, 14-30 October, n.s., 1921]. 2d ed. Frankfurt: Ukrainiska Avtokefalna Pravoslavna Tserkva Zakordonom, 1946. 2nd edition.
- DOROSHENKO, Dmytro. *Korotkyi Narys Istorii Khrystianskoi Tserkvy* [Short Sketch of the History of the Christian Church]. Winnipeg: Naukove Товариство pry Kolegii sv. Andriia v Viniepi, 1949.
- . *Pravoslavna Tserkva v Mytnomu i Suchasnomu Zhitti Ukrainiskoho Narodu* [The Orthodox Church in the Past and Present Life of the Ukrainian Nation]. Berlin: Natsiia v Pekshti, 1940.
- GOLUBINSKY, Evgenii E. *Istoria Russkoi Tserkvy* [History of the Russian Church]. 2 vols. Moscow: Imperatorskoe Obshchestvo Istorii i Drevnostei pr Moskovskom Universitete, 1900-17.
- HRUSHCHYNSKY, Mykhailo [Michael]. *Z Istorii Relihiinoi Dumky na Ukraini* [From the History of Religious Thought in Ukraine]. Lviv: Naukove Товариство im. Shevchenka, 1925.
- ISAIV, PETRO. *Zvidky Rus-Ukraina Pryniata Khrystianstvo?* [From Where did Rus-Ukraine accept Christianity?]. Philadelphia: Ameryka, 1952.
- KRYPIAKENYCH, Ivan and Holubets, Mykola. *Velyka Istoria Ukrainy* [Great History of Ukraine]. Winnipeg: Ivan Tyktor, 1948.
- KUDRYK, Wasyl [Vasyl]. *Istorychni Materialy* [Historical Materials]. Winnipeg: Eklerzia, 1949.
- . *Malovidome z Istorii Hreko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy* [The Little-known History of the Greek Catholic Church]. 4 vols. Winnipeg: Tryzub, 1952-6.
- . *Zhyttia Iosyfata Kuntsevycha* [The Life of Iosyf Kuntsevych (Josaphat Kuntsevich)]. Winnipeg: Eklerzia, 1951.
- LEVYTSKY, KOST. *Istoria Politychnoi Dumky Halychakikh Ukrainciv, 1848-1914* [History of the Political Thought of the Galician Ukrainians, 1848-1914]. Lviv: Privately published, 1928.
- LOTOTSKY, Oleksander. *Avtokefalia* [Autocephaly]. 2 vols. Warsaw: Ukrainskyi Naukovyi Instytut, 1935.

- . *Ukrainski Dzhherela Tserkovnaho Prava* [Ukrainian Sources on Church Law]. Warsaw: Ukrainskiyi Naukovyi Instytut, 1931.
- LIKOWSKI, Edward. *Berevetska Unia* [The Union of Brest]. Zhovkva: Ukrainski Bohoslovtsi im. Markiana Shashkevycha, 1916.
- LYPKIVSKY, Vasyi. *Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva. Korta Kistoria* [The Ukrainian Orthodox Church: A Brief History]. Winnipeg: Konsistoriia Ukrainskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi, 1934.
- LYPINSKY, Viacheslav. *Religia i Tserkva v Istorii Ukrainy* [Religion and the Church in the History of Ukraine]. Philadelphia: Ameryka, 1925.
- NAHAYEVSKY, Isydor. *Katolytska Tserkva v Mynulomu i Sushchasnomu Ukrainy* [The Catholic Church in Ukraine's Past and Present]. Philadelphia: Ameryka, 1950.
- OHHENKO, Ivan [Metropolitan Ilarion]. *Kniaz Volodymyr Pryniav Pravoslavlia, a ne Katolytstvo* [Grand Prince Volodymyr accepted Orthodoxy, not Catholicism]. Winnipeg: Ukrainiska Hreko-Pravoslavna Tserkva v Kanadi, 1951.
- . *Podil Iedynoi Khrystovoi Tserkvy* [The Division of the One Christian Church]. Winnipeg: Ukrainiska Hreko-Pravoslavna Tserkva v Kanadi, 1952.
- . *Prylydnannia Tserkvy Ukrainskoi do Moskovskoi v 1686 roci* [The Incorporation of the Ukrainian Church by the Russian in 1686]. Winnipeg: Mytropolytalnyi Sobor, 1948.
- . *Ukrainska Tserkva* [The Ukrainian Church]. 2 vols. Prague: Jury Tyscenko, 1942.
- . *Ukrainska Tserkva za Chas Bohdana Khmelnytskoho, 1647-1657* [The Ukrainian Church during the Time of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, 1647-1657]. Winnipeg: Ukrainske Naukove Pravoslavne Bohoslovske Tovarystvo, 1955.
- . *Ukrainska Tserkva za Chas Ruiky, 1657-1687* [The Ukrainian Church during the Time of the Destruction, 1657-1687]. Winnipeg: Ukrainske Naukove Pravoslavne Bohoslovske Tovarystvo, 1955.
- . *Vizantlia i Ukraina* [Byzantium and Ukraine]. Winnipeg: Ukrainske Naukove Pravoslavne Bohoslovske Tovarystvo, 1954.
- RANEVSKY, S. *Ukrainska Autokefalna Tserkov* [The Ukrainian Autocephalous Church]. Jordanville, N.Y.: Privately published, 1948.
- SHAKHMATOV, Aleksei A. *Raziskaniia o Drevnisskh Russkikh Listopisnkh Svodakh* [Research on the Most Ancient Russian Chronicle Codes]. St. Petersburg: M. A. Alexandrov, 1908.
- SICHYNSKY, Volodymyr. *Chuzhentsi pro Ukrainu* [Foreigners on Ukraine]. Augsburg: Petro Pavlovych, 1946.
- SWYSTUN, Wasyi [Vasyi Svyntun]. *Kryza v Ukrainskii Pravoslavni (Autokefalni) Tserkvi* [The Crisis in the Ukrainian Orthodox (Autocephalous) Church]. Winnipeg: Privately published, 1947.
- TARNOVYCH, Iulian. *Ilustrovana Istoria Lemkivshchyny* [An Illustrated History of the Lemko Region]. Lviv: Prosvita, 1936.
- THEODOROVICH, Ivan [Ioann Teodorovich]. *Blahodatnist Ierarhii U.A.P.Ts.* [The Grace of the Hierarchy of the U.A.O.C.]. Regensburg: Ukrainiska Autokefalna Pravoslavna Tserkva Zakordonom, 1947.
- TOMASHIVSKY, Stepan. *Istoria Tserkvy na Ukraini* [History of the Church in Ukraine]. Philadelphia: Ameryka, 1932.
- VOLYNSEY, Volodymyr. *Pokhodzhennia Epyiskopatu* [The Origin of the Episcopacy]. Volodymyr: Ukrainiska Vydavnycha Spilka, 1926.

- . *Jak Vydobudysia Sobory v Davnii Ukrainskii Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi* [How Sobors were Held in the Early Ukrainian Orthodox Church]. New York: Ukrainiska Pravoslavna Tserkva v Z.D.A., 1954.
- VLASOVSKY [Wlasowsky], Ivan. *Kanonichni i Istorychni Pidstavy Avtokefalii Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy* [The Canonical and Historical Bases for the Autocephaly of the Orthodox Church]. Augsburg: Ukrainiska Avtokefalna Pravoslavna Tserkva Zakordonom, 1948.
- . *Narys Istorii Ukrainskoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy* [Outline History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church]. 2 vols. New York: Ukrainiska Pravoslavna Tserkva v. Z.D.A., 1955, 1956.
- . *V Oborony Viry* [In Defence of the Faith]. 2 vols. Toronto: Pravoslavne Bratstvo pry Katedri Sviatoho Volodymyra v Toronti, 1955, 1956.
- WINTER, Eduard. *Vizantii ta Rym v Borotbi za Ukrainu 955-1939* [Byzantium and Rome in the Struggle for Ukraine 955-1939]. Prague: Jury Tyszenko, 1944.

B. ARTICLES IN UKRAINIAN

- BIDNOV, Vasyi. "Ukraina: Tserkva (Pravoslavna Tserkva)" [Ukraine: Church (Orthodox Church)]. *Ukrainska Zahalna Entsyklopediia* [Ukrainian General Encyclopedia]. Vol. 3. Lviv, 1930.
- MILLER, Mykhailo. "Znyshchennia Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy Bolshevykamy" [The Destruction of the Orthodox Church by the Bolsheviks]. *Ukrainskyi Zhurnyi* (Ukrainian Review). Book 10. Munich, Germany, Institut Glia Soudli SSSR, 1957.
- "U Dvadsiatu Richnytsia U.A.P.Ts." [The Twentieth Anniversary of the U.A.O.C.]. *Visnyk* [Herald], 15 November 1941.
- "Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva v Evropi v rokakh 1939-1947" [The Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Europe during the years 1939-1947]. *Visnyk* [Herald], 1 October 1947-15 October 1948.
- VASYLENKO-PONONSKA, Natalia and Nicholas CHURATY. "Tserkva: Istoriia Tserkvy" [The Church: A History] *Entsyklopediia Ukrainoznavstva N.i.Sh.*, Section 8. Paris, France, Ukrainiske Naukove Towarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1953.

C. BOOKS IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN

- BRIANCHANINOV, Nikolai. *The Russian Church*. New York: Macmillan, 1930.
- CURTIS, John S. *Church and State in Russia, 1900-1917*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.
- . *The Russian Church and the Soviet State, 1917-1950*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1953.
- DOROSHENKO, Dmytro. *History of the Ukraine*. Edmonton: Institute Press, 1939.
- DOSHENYK, Walter. *Martyrdom in Ukraine*. New York: America Press, n.d.
- EMHARDT, William C. *Religion in Soviet Russia*. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1929.
- First Victims of Communism: White Book on the Religious Persecution in Ukraine*. Rome: Analecta QSBN, 1953.
- GUDZY, N. K. *History of Early Russian Literature*. New York: Macmillan, 1949.
- HEYER, Friedrich. *Die Orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine von 1917 bis 1945* [The Orthodox Church in Ukraine from 1917 to 1945]. Koeln, Germany, 1953.

- HRUSHCHVSKY, Michael [Mykhailo]. *A History of Ukraine*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.
- KARPOVICH, Michael. *Imperial Russia, 1801-1917*. New York: Henry Holt, 1932.
- KONCEVICIUS, Joseph B. *Russia's Attitude Towards Union with Rome*. Washington, D.C.: Privately published, 1927.
- MANNING, Clarence A. *Ukraine Under the Soviets*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953.
- PELESZ, Julian. *Geschichte der Union der Ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom* [History of the Union of the Ruthenian Church with Rome]. 2 vols. Vienna, 1878-80.
- RESHETAR, John S. *The Ukrainian Revolution 1917-1920*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- SPINKA, Matthew. *The Church and the Russian Revolution*. New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- . *The Church in Soviet Russia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- TIMASHEFF, Nicholas S. *Religion in Soviet Russia, 1917-1942*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1943.
- VERNADSEY, George. *Bogdan, Hetman of Ukraine*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949.
- WLASOWSKY [Vlasovsky], Ivan. *Outline History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church*. New York: Ukrainian Orthodox Church of USA, 1956.
- ZERNOV, Nicolas. *Moscow, the Third Rome*. London: Macmillan, 1937.

D. ARTICLES IN ENGLISH

- ANDRUSIAK, Nicholas. "The Ukrainian Movement in Galicia." *Slavonic and East European Review* 14, nos. 40-1 (1935-6): 163-75, 372-9. London.
- SIMPSON, George W. "Peter Mohyla, Ecclesiastical Educator." *Ukrainian Quarterly* 3, no. 3 (Spring-Summer 1947): 242-8. New York.
- . "The Names 'Rus', 'Russia', 'Ukraine' and Their Historical Background." *Slavistica* 10 (1951). Winnipeg.
- WALSH, Warren B. "Pobedonostsev and Pan Slavism." *The Russian Review* 8, no. 4 (October 1949): 316-21. New York.

II. - THE CHURCH IN CANADA

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

(a) Government Publications

- Canada Year Book*. Ottawa: King's Printer, annually.
- Statutes of Canada*, 19-20 Geo. V, c. 98 (1929).
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Religious Bodies*. 1916 and 1928.

(b) Judicial Publications

- Canada Law Reports, 1940: Supreme Court of Canada*. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1941.
- Law Journal Reports for the Year 1908. Privy Council Cases*. 77, London, 1908.
- Manitoba Reports*, 40, Calgary: Law Society of Manitoba, 1940.

(c) *Official Reports and Committees*

- Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Canada.* Toronto: Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, 1906 to 1913.
- Collectanea 1. Congregationis de propaganda fide seu secreta instructionis reserita pro apostolicis missionibus.* 2. Rome, 1907.
- Pravyla Rusko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy v Kanadi* [Regulations of the Ruthenian Catholic Church in Canada]. Winnipeg: Epyskup Nykyta Budka, 1915.
- Protokol Semoha Soboru Ukrainskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi* [Proceedings of the Seventh Sobor of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada]. Winnipeg: Konsistoriia Ukrainskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi, 1935.
- Statut i pravyla Ukrainskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi* [Constitution and By-Laws of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada]. Winnipeg: Konsistoriia Ukrainskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi, 1951 and 1956 (revised).

(d) *Newspapers and Periodicals*

Extensive Research

- Dnipro* [Dnieper] (Philadelphia).
- Kanadyiskyi Farmer* [Canadian Farmer] (Winnipeg).
- Kanadyiskyi Rusyn* [Canadian Ruthenian] (Winnipeg).
- Kanadyiskyi Ukrainets* [Canadian Ukrainian] (Winnipeg).
- Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk* [Orthodox Herald] (Winnipeg). (After 1928, *Vistnyk* [Herald]).
- Ridna Tserkva* [Native Church] (Winnipeg).
- Slovo istyny* [Word of Truth] (Winnipeg).
- Tserkva i Narod* [The Church and the People] (Winnipeg-Grimsby, Ont.).
- Ukrainske Pravoslavne Slovo* [Ukrainian Orthodox Word] (New York).
- Ukrainskyi Holos* [Ukrainian Voice] (Winnipeg).
- Ukrainskyi Pravoslavnyi Vistnyk* [Ukrainian Orthodox Herald] (New York).
- Ukrainskyi vistnyk* [Ukrainian Herald] (New York).
- Vistnyk* (Herald), (Winnipeg).

References

- Kanadiiskyi Ranok* [Canadian Dawn] (Winnipeg).
- Logos* [Word] (Meadowdale, Ont.).
- Novyi Shliakh* [New Pathway] (Winnipeg).
- Opinion* (Winnipeg).
- Ranok* [Dawn] (Winnipeg).
- Sviet* [Light] (Jersey City).
- Trident* (New York).
- Tserkva i Zhyttia* [Church and Life] (Kiev).
- Winnipeg Free Press*.
- Winnipeg Telegram*.
- Winnipeg Tribune*.

(e) *Memoirs and Official Histories*

- BILON, Petro. *Spohady* [Memoirs]. 2 vols. Pittsburgh: Privately published, 1956.
- CZUMER, William [Vasyl] A. *Spomyny Pro Perezhyvannia Pershykh Ukrainskykh Pereselentsiv v Kanadi, 1891-1941* [Memoirs of the Experiences of the First Ukrainian Settlers in Canada, 1891-1941]. Edmonton: Privately published, 1942.
- KOSTUSKA, Natalia L. *Chvert Stolitia na Hromadskii Nyri, 1926-1951* [A Quarter Century of Community Activity, 1926-1951]. Winnipeg: Soiz Ukrainok Kanady, 1952.
- . *Jubileina Krychka Soizu Ukrainskoi Molodi Kanady, 1931-1956* [Jubilee Book of the Canadian Ukrainian Youth Association, 1931-1956]. Winnipeg: Soiz Ukrainskoi Molodi Kanady, 1956.
- KOWBEL [Kovbel], Semen and Dmytro Doroshenko, ed. *Propamiatna Kryha Ukrainskoho Narodnogo Domy v Winnipegu* [Memorial book of the Ukrainian Peoples' Home in Winnipeg]. Winnipeg: Ukrainskyi Narodnyi Dim, 1949.
- LAZAROWICH, Peter J., [Petro I. Lazarovych] *Jubileina Kryha 25-lytia Instytutu im. Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v Edmontoni* [Jubilee Book of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Mykhailo Hrushevsky Institute in Edmonton]. Edmonton: Ukrainskyi Instytut im. Mykhaila Hrushevskoho, 1943.
- Propamiatna Kryha Pstelennia Ukrainskoho Narodu v Kanadi, 1891-1941* [Commemorative Book of the Settlement of the Ukrainian People in Canada, 1891-1941]. Winnipeg: Episcopal Ordinariate, 1941. (Ukrainian Catholics.)
- SAWCHUK, Semen W. [Semen V. Savchuk]. *Piatnadtsiat Lit Pratsi Ukrainskoi Hreko-pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi* [Fifteen Years of the Work of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada]. Winnipeg: Konsistoriia Ukrainskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi, 1933.
- STECHISHIN, Julian W. [Julian V. Stechysbyn] "Istoriia Ukrainskoho Instytutu im. Petra Mohyla v Saskatoni" [The History of the Petro Mohyla Ukrainian Institute in Saskatoon], in *Jubileina Kryha Ukrainskoho Instytutu imeny P. Mohyla v Saskatoni, 1916-1941* [Jubilee Book of the P. Mohyla Ukrainian Institute in Saskatoon, 1916-1941]. Saskatoon: Instytut im. Petra Mohyla, 1945.

(f) *Communiqués and Correspondence*

- Consistory of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada. Mimeographed communiqués, some confidential, 1936, 1937, 1948-51.
- SAWCHUK, Semen W. Letters, memoirs and reports to author.
- SVARICH, Peter [Petro Zvarych]. Personal files related to judicial matters and controversial problems of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church, including correspondence with numerous church leaders.
- THEODOROVICH, Ivan [Archbishop Ioann Teodorovych]. Mimeographed letters related to consecration problems, 1946-7.

(g) *Manuscripts*

- BODRUG, Ivan. "Spomyny" [Memoirs]. Toronto, ms., 1949.
- WOODSWORTH, James S. "Ukrainian Rural Communities: Report of Investigation" Winnipeg: Bureau of Social Research for the Governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1917.
- YUZYK, Paul. "The Expansion of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America to 1918." Graduate essay, University of Minnesota, 1950.
- . "The History of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic (Uniate) Church in Canada." M.A. thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1948.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

(a) *Books and Brochures in Ukrainian*

- BACHYNSKY, Iulian. *Ukrainska Immigratsiia v Ziedynenykh Derzhavakh Ameryky* [The Ukrainian Immigration in the United States of America]. Lviv: Naukove Tovarystvo im Shevchenka, 1914.
- BILETSKY [Bietsky], Leonid. *Ukrainski Pionery v Kanadi, 1891-1951* [Ukrainian Pioneers in Canada, 1891-1951]. Winnipeg: Komitet Ukraintsiv Kanady, 1951.
- BOZYK [Bozhyk], Panteleimon. *Tserkov Ukraintsiv v Kanadi* [The Church of the Ukrainians in Canada]. Winnipeg: Kanadyyskyi Ukrainets, 1927.
- BRYK, Oleksander S. *Moi Zhyttyevi Stradi* [My Life Experiences]. Winnipeg: Privately published, 1956.
- JASTREMSKY, T.A. *Kanadianizatsiia* (Canadianization). Winnipeg: Author, 1946.
- KUDRYK, Wasył [Vasył]. *Checha Ruka* [Foreign Hand]. Winnipeg: Visnyk, 1935.
- . *Malovidoma z Istoriï Hreko-Katolytskoi Tserkvy* [The Little-known History of the Greek Catholic Church]. vols. 1-4, Winnipeg: Tryzub, 1955-56.
- OHLENKO, Ivan [Metropolitan Ilarion]. *Knyha Nashoho Buttia na Chuzhyyni* [The Book of Our Experience in Foreign Lands]. Winnipeg: Ukrainske Naukove Bohoslovskoe Tovarystvo, 1956.
- PIHULIAK, I. M. *Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva v Rumynskim Iarmi i Bukovynitsi v Kanadi* [The Ukrainian Orthodox Church under the Romanian yoke and the Bukovynians in Canada]. Winnipeg: Ukrainskyi Holos, 1927.
- SAVARYN, Rev. Nil. *Rolia Otciiv Vasyliian v Kanadi* [The Role of the Basilian Fathers in Canada]. Mundare: oo. Vasyliiany, 1938.
- SAWCHUK, Semen W. [Semen V. Savchuk]. *Osnovni Zasady Ukrainiskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi* [The Fundamental Principles of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada]. Winnipeg: Privately published, 1950.
- . *Tserkovni Kanony v Teorii i Praktyci* [Church Canons in Theory and Practice]. Winnipeg: Tryzub, 1955.
- STECHISHIN, Julian W. [Julian V. Stechyshyn]. *Mizh Ukraintsiamy v Kanadi* [Among the Ukrainians in Canada]. Saskatoon: Soiz Ukraintsiv Samostinnykiv, 1953.
- STECHISHIN, Michael [Mykhailo Stechyshyn]. *Pro Dogmy, Kanony i Pravne Stanovyshche Ukrainiskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi* [Concerning the Dogmas, Canons and Legal Position of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada]. Yorkton: Privately published, 1955.
- SWYSTUN, Wasył [Vasył] Swystun]. *Avtokefalia — Chy Zalezhaist vid Chuzhykh* [Autocephaly or Dependence upon Foreigners]. Winnipeg: Privately published, 1955.
- . *Dogmatychno-Kanoniche Stanovyshche Ukrainiskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi* [The Dogmatical-canonical Position of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada]. Winnipeg: Privately published, 1955.
- . *Kryza v Ukrainiskii Pravoslavni (Avtokefalni) Tserkvi* [The Crisis in the Ukrainian Orthodox (Autocephalous) Church]. Winnipeg: Privately published, 1947.
- THEODOROVICH, Ivan [Archbishop Ioann Teodorovich]. *Teperishnyi Stan Ridnoi Tserkvy i Nashi Problemy* [The Present State of the Native Church and Our Problems]. Philadelphia: Privately published, 1935.
- F *Obronni Viry* [In Defence of the Faith]. 2 vols. Toronto: Pravoslavne Bratstvo pry Katedri Sviatoho Volodymyra v Torontii, 1955, 1956.

Velyki Rohodovny [Great Anniversaries]. Winnipeg: Konsistoriia Ukrainskoi Hreko-Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy v Kanadi, 1938.

(b) *Books in English*

ANDERSON, James T. M. *Education of the New Canadian*. Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1918.

BALCH, Emily G. *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910.

DAFOE, John W. *Clifford Sifton in Relation to His Times*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1931.

DELAURE, Achille. *Memorandum on the Attempts of Schism and Heresy among the Ruthenians (commonly called "Galicians") in the Canadian Northwest*. Winnipeg: West Canada Publishing, 1909.

HUGHES, Katherine. *Father Lacombe, the Black-Robe Voyager*. New York: Moffat, Yard and Co., 1911.

HUNCHAK, Nicholas J. *Canadians of Ukrainian Origin: Population*. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Canadian Committee, 1945.

HUNTER, Alexander J. *A Friendly Adventure*. Toronto: Board of Home Missions of the United Church of Canada, 1929.

KOCHANIE, Peter. *The Most Useful Knowledge for the Orthodox Russian-American Young People*. Passaic: Sviet, 1924.

———. *The Mother Church of Christendom*. Passaic: Sviet, 1948.

SMITH, William O. *A Study in Canadian Immigration*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1920.

WOODSWORTH, James S. *Strangers within Our Gates*. Toronto: The Missionary Society of the Methodist Church (Canada), 1908.

YOUNG, Charles H. *The Ukrainian Canadians*. Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1931.

YUZYK, Paul. *The Ukrainians in Manitoba: A Social History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1955.

(c) *Articles in English, French and Ukrainian*

DEONAHUE, Francis M. "The Ukrainian Orthodox Church". *Trident* 5 (April-May 1941).

JEAN, Joseph. "S.E. Mgr. Adélard Langevin Archevêque de St. Boniface, et les Ukrainiens" [S.E. Mgr. Adélard Langevin, Archbishop of St. Boniface, and the Ukrainians]. *Rapport, La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique* (1944-5): 101-10.

"Lindyna pratsi" [A Person of Work]. *Slovo Istyny* (November-December 1950).

SABOURIN, Adonias. "Les Catholique Ruthènes au Manitoba" [The Catholic Ruthenians in Manitoba]. *La Nouvelle France* (May 1909): 204-18.

SAVCHUK, Rev. Semen W. [Semen V. Savchuk]. "Iak Povstala Ukrainska Pravoslavna Tserkva v Kanadi" [How the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was founded in Canada]. *Pravoslavnyi Visnyk*, May 1924 to September 1925.

YUZYK, Paul. "Orthodox Churches in Canada." *Encyclopedia Canadiana*, (1957); vol. 8 (1957): 65-6.

Achevé d'imprimer à Montmagny
par les travailleurs des Éditions Marquis Ltée
en décembre 1981

