Between Kyiv and Constantinople

Oleksander Lototsky and the Quest for Ukrainian Autocephaly

Andre Partykevich

Church Studies Papers

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
University of Alberta

Between Kyiv and Constantinople:
Oleksander Lototsky and the
Quest for Ukrainian Autocephaly

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
University of Alberta

Church Studies Papers

Between Kyiv and Constantinople:

Oleksander Lototsky and the Quest for Ukrainian Autocephaly

Andre Partykevich

Church Studies Papers

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
University of Alberta
Edmonton 1998

The publication of this volume has been made possible by the generous support of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the USA.

ISBN 1-895571-27-8

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Partykevich, Andre.
Between Kyiv and Constantinople

(Church studies papers)
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 1-895571-27-8

1. Lotots'kyi-Bilousenko, Oleksander, 1870–1939. 2. Orthodox Eastern Church — Ukraine — History — 20th century. 3. Ukraine — Church history — 20th century. 4. Ukraine — History — Revolution, 1917–1921. I. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. II. Title. III. Series.

BX729.5.Z8L676 1998 281.9'477'092 C98-910939-9

Printed in Canada

Dedicated to Mstyslav (Skrypnyk) (1898–1993), Patriarch of Kyiv and all Ukraine, Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church of the USA and Diaspora, on the hundredth anniversary of his birth

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	ix
Note on Transliteration, Dates, and Scriptural Quotations	xi
Introduction	xiii
1. Lototsky as Cultural and Political Activist	1
2. Revolution and Autocephaly, 1917–1919	27
3. The Ecumenical Patriarchate and Ukrainian Orthodoxy, 1919–1920	43
4. Lototsky's Study of Autocephaly	65
5. Conclusion	83
Bibliography	85

Acknowledgments

Many people to whom I am grateful have helped me in the preparation of this study, which was originally written as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Illinois (Chicago). First and foremost I am thankful to my supervisor, Professor James Cracraft, for his diligent attention to this work. His guidance and suggestions were invaluable in helping me to improve the content and style of the study. Above all, I am beholden to him for his constant faith in my ability to complete the project, as well as in the relevance of the topic. When I began my research, I received a great deal of assistance from Dr. Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, former professor of political science at Carleton University. I am grateful not only for his suggestion of the topic, but also for his guidance in identifying sources of information. The late Borys Lotocki (1904–1997) allowed me to make copies of several of his father's works. While a guest at his home in Switzerland for one week, I had the opportunity to interview him on several occasions about his father. I am very grateful for his hospitality and support of my research. I am also grateful to Dr. Dmytro M. Shtohryn of the University of Illinois (Champaign-Urbana) and to staff members at Harvard University, the New York Public Library, and the University of Illinois (Chicago), where most of the research was completed. Dr. Andrew Sorokowski kindly searched for material on Lototsky in Warsaw. I thank him for his assistance in locating materials and for his advice. Dr. Frank E. Sysyn, director of the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, was very helpful. I wish to thank him for his advice during the initial phase of the project. I am particularly grateful to Judith Villarreal for her valuable editing and advice during the writing of this study. Two friends, Rev. Roman Mirchuk and Jurij Hiltajczuk, have verified some of the translations: I am thankful for their assistance. Without financial support over the years, this study would not have been completed. For supporting my research, I wish to thank the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the U.S.A., the Ukrainian Orthodox League of the U.S.A., St. Volodymyr Ukrainian Orthodox Cathedral in Chicago, the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta (Edmonton), the Department of History and the Graduate College of the University of Illinois (Chicago), and

the Ukrainian National Association. Lastly, I would like to thank my parents for having helped me in many ways.

Note on Transliteration, Dates, and Scriptural Quotations

The system of transliteration used in the text of this study is a simplified version of the Library of Congress system that omits the soft sign and, in masculine personal names, omits the final "й" (thus Lototsky, not Lotots'kyi). The transliteration of personal names in quotations has been standardized accordingly. In bibliographical references, however, the strict form of the Library of Congress system (omitting ligatures) is used, and spelling is modernized.

In the Russian Empire, the Julian calendar was in effect until 31 January 1918, while elsewhere the Gregorian calendar was in use. In this study, all dates before 1 March 1918 (when the Ukrainian government introduced the Gregorian calendar) are given according to the Julian calendar, which in the twentieth century lagged thirteen days behind the Gregorian.

All quotations from Scripture are taken from *The Orthodox Study Bible: New Testament and Psalms*, ed. Joseph Allen et al. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1993).

Introduction

It is impossible to discuss any period of Ukrainian history without considering the impact that the church, notably the Orthodox Church, has had upon that history.[1] Oleksander Lototsky (1870–1939), the subject of the present study, dedicated much of his life to the establishment of a canonical and autocephalous[2] Orthodox Church in Ukraine, in full communion with the family of Eastern Orthodox Churches.

The Orthodox Church in Kyivan Rus' had been under the jurisdiction of the

---

1. The standard history of the church in Ukraine is the four-volume work by Ivan Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys istorii Ukraïns'koï Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy* (New York, 1955–66). Standard works on the history of the Russian Church are: E. E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi* [to 1563] (Moscow, 1900–1911); A. V. Kartashev, *Ocherki po istorii Russkoi Tserkvi* [to 1917], 2 vols. (Paris, 1959); John S. Curtiss, *Church and State in Russia: The Last Years of the Empire, 1900–1917* (New York, 1940). For the history of the church after the 1917 revolution, see John S. Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State, 1917–1950* (Boston, 1953); Dimitry V. Pospielovsky, *The Russian Church under the Soviet Regime, 1917–1982*, 2 vols. (Crestwood, NY, 1984); idem, *A History of Marxist-Leninist Atheism and Soviet Antireligious Policies* (New York, 1987); idem, *Soviet Antireligious Campaigns and Persecutions* (New York, 1988); idem, *Soviet Studies on the Church and the Believer's Response to Atheism* (London, 1988). For the history of the Ukrainian Church after 1917, see Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, "Soviet Church Policy in the Ukraine, 1919–1939" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1961); idem, *The Politics of Religion in the Ukraine: The Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1919*, Occasional Paper no. 202 (Washington, DC, 1985); idem, "The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, 1920–1930: A Case Study in Religious Modernization," in *Religion and Modernization in the Soviet Union*, ed. Dennis J. Dunn (Boulder, CO, 1977), 310–47; Friedrich Heyer, *Die Orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine von 1917 bis 1945* (Cologne, 1953).

2. The term autocephaly is derived from the Greek words *autos* (self) and *kephalē* (head). Historians disagree about the dating of the term, but it was in use by the fourth century. In its simplest form, it signifies the right of a church to elect its bishops independently. In modern times, it has been applied to those local or national Orthodox churches that are administered independently of other churches.

religious affairs in 1918. Addressing a sobor (council) of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in November 1918 and expressing the views of the Ukrainian government, he insisted that

> [A]utocephaly of the Ukrainian Church represents not only an ecclesiastical but also our national and state necessity.... On behalf of the Government of the Ukrainian State, I have the honor to announce its firm and unshakable view that the Ukrainian Church should become autocephalous.[10]

In 1919, Lototsky became Ukraine's ambassador to Turkey. In Constantinople, he appealed to the Ecumenical Patriarchate to recognize the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Since an independent Ukrainian Church had been established and the Ukrainian state had proclaimed it autocephalous, Lototsky considered that the Ecumenical Patriarchate was bound to accede to his request, clearing the way for the recognition of the Ukrainian Church by the rest of the Orthodox world. Lototsky was not to achieve that goal. In a chapter titled "My Resignation" in the last volume of his memoirs, Lototsky not only discusses the canonical grounds for the refusal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to recognize the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church, but also laments that he was unable to secure such status.

"[My] prayer went unanswered,"[11] wrote Lototsky in his memoirs. In an undated letter to the secretary of the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Archimandrite Dionysios, probably written after May 1922, Lototsky chastised the Patriarchate for not coming to the assistance of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine when it proclaimed its independence of the Russian Orthodox Church:

> ...[W]hen the spirit of God once again renewed church life in Ukraine, and when the daughter turned her eyes in supplication to her Mother, and fate assigned my unworthy person to deliver these supplications and I unceasingly knocked at the door of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, that door did not open and the prayer went unanswered.[12]

This study examines Oleksander Lototsky's career as a political activist, advocate of Ukrainian Orthodox autocephaly, and scholar. It is based primarily on Lototsky's memoirs, *Storinky mynuloho*, covering most of his life, which were published in four volumes in Warsaw (1932–39; see n. 7). The first three volumes concern his early years, especially his studies at the Kyivan Academy and his years of service in the Russian imperial government. The last volume focuses on Lototsky's service as Ukraine's ambassador to Turkey in 1919–20. There are, however, two very important periods in Lototsky's life about which he wrote very little, one more vital than the other. The first comprises his years

10. Lotots'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki dzherela tserkovnoho prava* (Warsaw, 1931), 134.

11. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 102.

12. Ibid.

of service in two Ukrainian governments: the Central Rada (1917–18) and the Hetmanate (1918). In Lototsky's own words, it was too painful for him to write about those years.[13] The second such period was that of his political exile, primarily in Prague and Warsaw, from 1921 until his death in 1939. Lototsky devoted those years to writing about his life in Ukraine, as well as to scholarly work. Another valuable source for the study of Lototsky's life, especially for the years in which Lototsky himself wrote nothing about himself, are the memoirs of his son, Dr. Borys Lotocki (1904–1997).[14] In 1988 I had the opportunity to conduct several interviews with Dr. Lotocki in Muralto, Switzerland. Lototsky's copious publications on a wide variety of subjects, estimated to number at least five hundred, are of course the principal source for the study of his views. Although a few of Lototsky's contemporaries, such as Hetman Pavlo Skoropadsky and the historian Dmytro Doroshenko, discussed his service in Ukrainian governments and his contribution to scholarship, no scholarly study of the life of Lototsky has been published or, so far as I know, undertaken.

13. Ibid., 5.

14. "The Personal Memoirs of Dr. Borys Lotocki de Veligost," MS in the possession of the estate of Borys Lotocki, Muralto, Switzerland. An edited version was published under the title *Borys' Odyssey* (Denver, 1994).

Chapter One

Lototsky as Cultural and Political Activist

Oleksander Lototsky was born on 9 March 1870 in the village of Bronnytsia, situated on the Dnister River near the city of Mohyliv-Podilskyi in Podilia gubernia (now Vinnytsia oblast) on the Ukrainian-Moldavian border. His son and trustee-executor, Borys Lotocki, traces the Lototsky family roots to Belarus.[1] Oleksander's father, Ihnatii, was the pastor of the local Orthodox parish church. Oleksander's respect for his father went beyond the usual regard and was rooted in his great reverence for his father's ability, as a priest, to command respect from a wide variety of people. Father Ihnatii considered himself a Ukrainian patriot. As a result, in the words of Oleksander, "the entire character of our family life was thoroughly Ukrainian."[2] The family spoke Ukrainian exclusively, not only at home, but also in social situations and in the conduct of local business in the city.

Lototsky's initial formal education took place at home. His parents hired a disabled deacon who, although not employable in the church, was still able to tutor. When the deacon could no longer teach because of illness, Oleksander sat for tests at the end of the first semester of 1879–80, and was admitted to the district (*povit*) school in Sharhorod.[3] As the son of a priest of the district, Oleksander had special access to that school.

In 1884, Oleksander entered the seminary in Kamianets-Podilskyi, benefiting once again from the fact that priests' sons in imperial Russia had special access to and privileges in the district schools and seminaries of the empire.[4] The Podilia region, where the seminary was located, was well known for its

---

1. In his memoirs (*Borys' Odyssey*, 15), Borys Lotocki spells his father's name Alexander Lotocki and his own surname Lotocki, hence that spelling is used in quotations from his memoirs. Otherwise, the spelling used in the text of this study is Oleksander Lototsky, transliterated from standard Ukrainian.
2. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 8.
3. Sharhorod is located some fifty km northeast of Bronnytsia.
4. See Gregory Freeze, *The Parish Clergy in Nineteenth-Century Russia: Crisis, Reform, Counter-Reform* (Princeton, 1983), 433–40.

Ukrainophile clergy. The seminary promoted the use of the Ukrainian language in the local parish schools and was known for its Ukrainian patriotism. For instance, while many of the local priests preached in Russian, seminarians went out of their way to use Ukrainian in everyday life and viewed the use of Russian in a sermon as an "archaic" way of preaching. At the other extreme, Lototsky mentions two Ukrainian seminarians who decided to speak only Russian between themselves. Never having had the opportunity to hear standard Russian, those seminarians made many mistakes and were laughed at by others.

Lototsky evaluated almost everyone at the seminary according to his receptivity to the "Ukrainian cause"; that is, whether he was a nationally conscious Ukrainian or not.[5] Lototsky also remembered that at the seminary the Ukrainian and Georgian students vowed to render mutual assistance in the struggle against Russian domination. But he questioned whether the dream of liberation would ever become a reality. In one very telling incident, a Russian teacher approached a Georgian seminarian writing a letter to his mother. "Why are you writing in Georgian," asked the teacher, "and not in Russian?" "Because my mother does not understand Russian," was the reply. "Well, it is time to forget that dog's language." The student slapped the teacher in response, setting off a three-day riot in the dormitory. Lototsky vividly compares this incident with the many occasions on which Russians made fun of the Ukrainian language.[6]

Following annual examinations in the spring of 1889, Lototsky decided to enroll in the Kyiv Seminary[7] to complete his schooling. He describes his first trip to Kyiv in the autumn of 1890 as having made a "sublime impression" upon him, especially his first views of the Cathedral of St. Sophia, the monument to Bohdan Khmelnytsky, the Monastery of the Caves, the Golden Gate, and other historic places that he had read about as a child. He was grieved by the Russification of the Ukrainian capital, most notably by the dominance of Russian publications in the bookstores. Yet, in the company of a small circle of friends, mostly Ukrainian seminary students, he did find happiness there. One evening he met a prominent organizer of the Ukrainian seminarian community, Luka Skochkovsky. It was also in Kyiv that Lototsky was introduced to Ukrainian political literature, mainly from Galicia,[8] most notably a speech by Volodymyr

5. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 33–39.
6. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 44–45. A similar incident involving Stalin occurred while he was a student at the Tbilisi Theological Seminary. See Robert Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879–1929* (New York, 1973), 78, 83.
7. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 48–49.
8. Lototsky comments that it was often difficult to read articles by Galician Ukrainians, as their language was somewhat different from that of Ukrainians in the Russian Empire. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 51.

Barvinsky at a commemoration of the great Romantic poet Taras Shevchenko.[9] The differences between the political attitudes of Ukrainians living under Austrian rule and those living under Russian rule were, for Lototsky, distressingly great. "Our sad history created this dualism of Ukrainian interests, and it will long inflict painful wounds on the Ukrainian national body, as it has in the past, until that preceptor of nations, difficult experience, teaches us some sense."[10] In sum, for Lototsky, the young seminarian in Kyiv, the great Ukrainian problem was the division of the country into two parts, each subjugated by a different foreign state.

The meetings of the Ukrainian seminarian community were not limited to seminary business. After the usual administrative and organizational matters had been dealt with, talks were given, usually on historical or literary themes; on occasion, political topics were also introduced.[11] The mere discussion of Ukrainian topics in the Ukrainian language would have been considered subversive by many, but the seminarians viewed the elevation of the Ukrainian word as simply the first battle. The importance of these gatherings and lectures cannot be overestimated. This was essential pioneering work, as there were no textbooks setting forth, for example, the history of the church in Ukraine or the grammar and other features of the Ukrainian language. Thus, the seminarians' meetings were exercises in a conscious process of Ukrainian nation-building. As Zenon Kohut notes, "Young students came to identify themselves by the term 'Ukrainian,' which to them signified a cultural rather than a political affiliation."[12] Eventually, the topics discussed by the seminarians helped to

9. For an appreciation of Shevchenko's importance in the shaping of Ukrainian national identity, see George S. N. Luckyj, ed., *Shevchenko and the Critics, 1861–1980* (Toronto, 1980).

10. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 52.

11. While writing on this particular theme, Lototsky answers what he believed might be a question posed by the reader: why would literary and historical topics take precedence over political ones? Lototsky responds that Ukrainian political life was restricted to Galicia; in imperial Russia it barely existed before the 1905 revolution. For Lototsky, the priority of literary and historical subjects was natural, since knowledge of a nation's culture and history must precede the development of political activity. Outside Galicia, there were no history or literature textbooks in Ukrainian, and even those published in Galicia were elementary. Thus, the seminarians saw much to be done. They also discussed the necessity of eliminating the prohibitions against Ukrainian publications so that the language could be used in schools and in the preaching of sermons. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 58–60.

12. Zenon Kohut, "The Development of a Little Russian Identity and Ukrainian Nationbuilding," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10 (December 1986): 575. On the development of a distinct Ukrainian religious culture, see Frank E. Sysyn, "The Formation of Modern Ukrainian Religious Culture: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth

precipitate what Lototsky called the stroke of midnight, that is, the time when the Ukrainian cause would become revolutionary and anti-imperial.[13]

Once a year, usually before the start of Great Lent,[14] a gathering of the graduates and students of the Ukrainian seminarian community took place. These annual gatherings began in 1890.[15] Special meetings were also held to commemorate important persons or events, for example, to honor Shevchenko. At one such gathering Lototsky gave his first formal speech to the society on "The Political and National Ideals of Taras Shevchenko."[16] These gatherings gave the members an opportunity to listen to lectures, exchange ideas and, most importantly, to give reports on their own actions "in the field." The graduates became leaders of that process, as they were not only priests and cantors, but also teachers.[17] Working within the church, the former seminarians were thus able to educate the Ukrainian populace about the national cause. While such community activities occupied much of Lototsky's time, he nonetheless continued his studies. Having passed his final examinations at the Kyiv Seminary, Lototsky applied for admission to the Kyivan Academy, long the center of higher Orthodox learning in the region. Because of illness, his entrance was postponed for a year. He then put into practice what his fellow seminarians had preached—teaching "in the field" and bringing Ukrainian national consciousness to the villages. This "year in the village"[18] of Bilousivka, to which his parents had moved in 1881, proved very significant for Lototsky.

The members of the Lototsky family each played a role in their village. The peasants understood the role of Father Ihnatii as their pastor and the religious and moral leader of the village, but the roles of his wife and children were initially

---

Centuries," in *Church, Nation and State in Russia and Ukraine*, ed. Geoffrey A. Hosking (New York, 1990).

13. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 60.
14. The term used in the Orthodox Church to designate the penitential period that precedes the feast of Pascha (Easter).
15. Such gatherings were also prevalent at the Poltava Seminary. For a discussion of gatherings held there in 1899, see John D. Morison, "The Church Schools and Seminaries in the Russian Revolution of 1905–06," in *Church, Nation and State in Russia and Ukraine*, 204.
16. The speech was published in 1894 in the Galician newspaper *Pravda*.
17. According to an official decision rendered in 1884 by the Oberprocurator of the Holy Synod, Konstantin Pobedonostsev, church schools were to be under the authority of the clergy. As some 5,000 schools in Right-Bank Ukraine were church schools, teachers who had been members of the Ukrainian seminarian community in Kyiv were in a position to impart ideas discussed by the Kyiv seminarians to their students.
18. The title of chapter 4 of *Storinky mynuloho*, vol. 1.

less clear. While Lototsky's mother, Ielysaveta, came to serve as a nurse and as the leader of the women of Bilousivka, Oleksander and his brother Viktor became teachers in the village school. Viktor, who was ten years older than Oleksander, was a graduate of the Kyivan Academy and eventually became a teacher at the Tbilisi Seminary in Georgia. With the help of Oleksander and the moral support of their father, Viktor was able to establish a school in Bilousivka. Not only were classes held for the children but, more significantly, adult lectures and classes were also given there. Although the adults and older children spent the vast majority of their time in the fields, there remained certain times or seasons when the adults could gather for educational pursuits. The brothers' efforts ranged from explanations of the Sunday Gospel readings to lectures on Ukrainian history, from teaching Ukrainian Christmas carols, fables, and ecclesiastical chants to talks about nature. They were amazed at the great interest in and popularity of their adult classes. "Nowhere and never have I seen such attention to every word. It remains incomprehensible to me how people unaccustomed to intellectual work could listen with unflagging attention...."[19]

Oleksander taught Ukrainian history in the village school by telling stories about the medieval princes of Ukraine or, more frequently, about the Cossacks and their hetmans. This material was usually taken from the works of the historian Volodymyr Antonovych.[20] Later, primary classes in reading and writing were also offered to adult students to enable them to read simple books in Ukrainian. In addition to these literacy classes, Oleksander and his brother went to great lengths to establish and enrich the village library. Twenty-five years later, during the Ukrainization of religious life in 1917, the parish in Bilousivka was one of the first to request that its priest celebrate the divine services in Ukrainian. It would seem, therefore, that Lototsky's "year in the village" ultimately proved successful.

That year in the village, along with his home upbringing and his years of involvement in the student communities in Kamianets-Podilskyi and Kyiv, prepared Lototsky for study at the Kyivan Academy and for Ukrainian political life in general. The Kyivan Academy had been located in the Brotherhood Monastery in the Podil district of Kyiv since the seventeenth century, when it

19. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 76.

20. Volodymyr Antonovych (1834–1908) was professor of history at Kyiv University from 1878. He was an editor of the voluminous *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii* (Archive of Southwestern Russia), which dealt with the history of Right-Bank Ukraine from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. Antonovych was the founder of the Kyivan historical school, whose most distinguished representative was Mykhailo Hrushevsky. This school laid the foundations of modern Ukrainian historiography.

began as a brotherhood school.[21] Although Lototsky's father wanted his son to further his education, he was unable to provide financial support. Accordingly, Lototsky's receipt of a full scholarship was central to his decision to attend the Academy, which he entered in the autumn of 1892 as a nationally conscious Ukrainian.[22]

During his four years at the Academy (1892–96), many of Lototsky's views on Ukrainian identity were formed, as were his views concerning the structure of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine. While at the Academy, Lototsky came into contact not only with fellow students, but also with many of the Academy's graduates, who, by long tradition, went on to become leaders of the Orthodox Church and to assume other responsible positions in the empire. Many of the students at the Academy were Ukrainians, but many others were Russians, Belarusians, and Georgians. Nevertheless, as Lototsky comments in his memoirs, the birthplace of a given student had little to do with his ethnic self-identification.[23]

At the Academy, Lototsky encountered the deliberate and relentless policy of Russification practiced by the imperial authorities.[24] In his characterization of that policy, the historian Hugh Seton-Watson maintains that "Ukrainians were among the main victims."[25] Lototsky felt himself one of those victims when he heard certain statements made by his teachers at the Academy. He recorded them in his school notebooks, including such comments as "from the Caucasus to the Danube, from the Amur to the Dnipro" there was only one Russian people.[26]

---

21. These schools were founded by lay religious organizations (brotherhoods). Aside from religious instruction, the schools offered the equivalent of a secondary education. See Marian Jean Rubchak, "The Cultural and Political Activities of the Lviv Stavropigiia Brotherhood and the Development of a Ukrainian National Consciousness, 1585–1632" (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Chicago, 1988).

    The Kyivan Academy, founded in 1632 by Metropolitan Petro Mohyla, was the leading center of higher education in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Ukraine. Intended to compete on an equal basis with the Jesuit-run Polish academies, the school had a decisive impact on the development of Ukrainian culture through its literary and scholarly achievements. See Alexander Sydorenko, *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century* (Ottawa, 1977); *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8, no. 1/2 (June 1984), a special issue devoted to the Academy; and Ihor Ševčenko, "The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla" in his *Ukraine between East and West: Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century* (Edmonton, 1996), 164–86.

22. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 98.

23. Ibid., 1: 103–4.

24. Ibid., 1: 103.

25. Hugh Seton-Watson, *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism* (Boulder, CO, 1977), 187.

26. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 107.

It also concerned Lototsky that so few of his classmates, at least half of whom were Ukrainians, were as troubled by such assertions as he was. Although some students were interested in their Ukrainian roots and openly discussed Ukrainian topics, there were many others, described by Lototsky as Nicodemuses,[27] who only rarely, and then secretly, took part in any activity that might appear pro-Ukrainian. Lototsky considered that such people could have been participants in the Ukrainian movement, as many of them "felt a national obligation," but lacked the necessary courage to apply their talents in that capacity.[28]

A few of Lototsky's classmates at the Kyivan Academy did become very active in the Ukrainian Church and Ukrainian politics. For example, Hryhorii Iaroshevsky, who took the monastic name Iurii, became Metropolitan of Warsaw and of the Orthodox Church of Poland.[29] Other Academy graduates who later became influential cultural and political figures included the historian Serhii Ivanytsky[30] and the ideologue of the autocephalist movement in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Volodymyr Chekhivsky.[31]

Lototsky's pro-Ukrainian attitudes did not go unnoticed at the Academy. During his third year of study, he asked to see the rector in order to secure permission to return to Bilousivka. At that meeting, the rector, Bishop Sylvestr Malievansky, informed Lototsky that he and his friend Serhii Lypkivsky had been observed by the police and were being accused of leading Ukrainophile gatherings. Although such a matter should ordinarily have been brought to the attention of the inspector[32] of the Academy, the rector chose simply to inform and warn Lototsky.

---

27. Nicodemus, a Pharisee and secret follower of Jesus, appears in the Gospel of St. John (3: 1; 7: 50; 19: 39). He would speak with Jesus at night in order to learn from him.
28. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 104–5.
29. Metropolitan Iurii frequently defended Ukrainian customs within and outside his diocese. One of the few studies of the Orthodox Church in inter-war Poland is Orest F. Kupranets', *Pravoslavna tserkva v mizhvoiennii Pol'shchi, 1918–1939* (Rome, 1974).
30. Serhii Ivanytsky-Vasylenko (1883–1938?) was a historian of Ukrainian law.
31. Volodymyr Chekhivsky (1876–1937) was a prominent civic, political, and church leader. A graduate of the Kyivan Academy, he served as assistant provost at the Kamianets-Podilskyi Seminary. Chekhivsky was elected to the First Duma in 1906. He headed the cabinet of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic. Chekhivsky was active in Ukrainian Orthodox Church affairs, and in 1921 was elected to the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council in Kyiv. In 1929 he was arrested on a trumped-up charge of membership in the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine and sentenced to a thirty-year prison term, served first in Kharkiv and Iaroslavl and then on the Solovets Islands. He was executed on 3 November 1937.
32. Equivalent to a vice-rector or provost.

In his fourth year of study at the Academy, Lototsky researched and wrote his thesis for the candidate degree (equivalent to the second degree in the empire's universities) in theology. He chose as his theme the moral status of Ukrainian priests in the eighteenth century, studying the character of the clergymen, their influence on standards of morality, and their social, educational, and financial status as compared with that of their Russian counterparts. Subsequently, Lototsky published a number of articles based on his thesis in Ukrainian and Russian scholarly journals.[33]

Graduation from the Academy in 1896 should have secured Lototsky a good position as a teacher, but his pro-Ukrainian actions, he believed, caused him to be viewed as an undesirable candidate for pedagogical work.[34] Because of his Ukrainophile reputation, Lototsky was unable to obtain an ecclesiastical teaching position. "The path to pedagogical work, and apparently to all work in the spiritual realm, was closed to me. I soon learned this by traveling to Kyiv and informing myself from sources at the Academy."[35] In his memoirs, Lototsky treats this rejection as a blessing in disguise, maintaining that the stifling atmosphere of the seminary would only have interfered with the work that he felt called upon to do for the Ukrainian cause.[36] No longer a student, and unable to work in ecclesiastical circles, Lototsky embarked upon a new course with Nimfodora Rudenko, whom he married in 1896.

Nimfodora Rudenko was born on 17 September 1875. Borys Lotocki's memoirs give us a glimpse of her: "She was gay, gifted...extremely modest and self-effacing...very musical and enjoyed singing."[37] Lototsky himself was always reluctant to discuss the character of his wife, whom he affectionately called Dora, at any great length. Referring to Nimfodora as his greatest friend in life, Lototsky described her as the embodiment of dedication to the national cause. Lototsky stated that he felt a deep spiritual unity with his wife, who brought him great joy, as well as strength to work for the various Ukrainian causes with which he was involved.[38] Oleksander and Nimfodora had two children—Oksana, born in Kyiv in 1897, and Borys, born in St. Petersburg in 1904.[39]

---

33. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 144–45.
34. Ibid., 1: 147.
35. Ibid., 1: 149.
36. Ibid., 1: 150.
37. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 23.
38. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 218–19.
39. When the Lototsky family left Ukraine for Constantinople, Borys Lotocki's documents were altered to state that he had been born in Kyiv. It was important to Borys, as well as to his father, that the son of the Ukrainian ambassador be able to claim a Ukrainian birthplace. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 15.

In 1896, following his graduation from the Academy, Lototsky began to seek employment, which he eventually found in the auditing office of the imperial Ministry of Finance in Kyiv. Over the next several years, Aleksandr Nikolaev, the office manager later referred to by Lototsky as a "Russian liberal,"[40] granted Lototsky special assignments within the ministry, leading to a new and more responsible position in charge of auditing the operations of the state liquor monopoly. Part of the reason for this promotion was Lototsky's ability to write reports in good Russian and present them well. According to Borys Lotocki, thanks to his father's "capabilities and strong will, he had within a short time mastered matters pertinent to his work. This acquired knowledge, combined with my father's inborn literary talent, enabled him to draw up reports that impressed his superior."[41]

The group of seminarians with whom Lototsky had been involved earlier (Serhii Iefremov, Vasyl Domanytsky, Fedir Matushevsky, and Volodymyr Durdukivsky, whom "only death could separate," as Lototsky said),[42] remained active in Ukrainian literary and political life. At this same time, the Society of Ukrainian Progressives (Tovarystvo ukrainskykh postupovtsiv, TUP) had its genesis in Kyiv. This clandestine political and community organization was founded in 1908 by members of the Ukrainian Democratic Radical Party in order to coordinate Ukrainian political activity, which was beginning to flourish after the 1905 revolution. TUP included members of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party and those previously unaffiliated with any party. In St. Petersburg, it was responsible for maintaining contact with the few opposition members of the Russian parliament. Lototsky became a charter member and served on TUP's board. All of this work demanded financial resources as well as time, neither of which Lototsky had to spare. But there was enthusiasm, faith, and friendly cooperation. Especially in his family life, Lototsky enjoyed great support, which gave him strength for the tasks he had undertaken.[43]

Lototsky and his friends frequently changed the venue of their meetings in Kyiv so as not to draw attention to themselves. Lototsky and the noted historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky[44] were frequent hosts of those gatherings, which were illegal and thus had to be held in secrecy. Nevertheless, Lototsky wrote that the members of this community had become so fervent in their beliefs that even

40. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 155, 2: 165–66.

41. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 18.

42. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 157.

43. Ibid., 2: 185.

44. For a biography of Hrushevsky, see Thomas M. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture* (Toronto, 1987). For his involvement with the Ukrainian movement in the Russian Empire, see ibid., 121–22.

repressive measures could not destroy their organization.[45]

In 1895, Lototsky and his friends formed the publishing group Vik (Age or Epoch) in order to make Ukrainian publications more readily available. "The most painful aspect of Ukrainian national life during the period under consideration was the lack of Ukrainian books."[46] The greatest obstacle to making Ukrainian books available was the imperial censorship office in St. Petersburg, which was responsible for approving Ukrainian manuscripts.[47] Before the 1905 revolution, limited attempts to publish Ukrainian books had been made in Chernihiv and St. Petersburg. Vik, by contrast, wanted to locate its publishing house in Kyiv. Its first major goal was to reprint existing works in Ukrainian, primarily those already published in Galicia. Despite difficulties in locating a printing press, as well as in collecting funds, Vik launched its first series, a collection of Ukrainian classics under the title "Ukrainian Library." Brochures and reprints of articles, primarily from the journal *Osnova* (Foundation),[48] were also published, as were popular Ukrainian fables and selected works of Oleksander Konysky, who wrote about peasant life in Ukraine. Although Vik had collected many other works for publication, there were continuing problems with obtaining approval of the manuscripts from the censor's office. Those problems were somewhat alleviated when Lototsky was offered a transfer from Kyiv to St. Petersburg in 1900.

Initially reluctant, Lototsky accepted the new position with the encouragement of his friends. One of the benefits of the transfer was that Vik now had a representative in St. Petersburg who could develop a good working relationship with the censors. Lototsky's ability to discuss, appeal, explain, and even pressure the authorities helped the cause of Vik tremendously. His duties in St. Petersburg, where he worked in the banking department of the Ministry of Finance, were much wider in scope than they had been in Kyiv. He was now responsible for writing reports on banking practices and making new policy suggestions. His suggestions frequently caught the eye of ministry officials. Lototsky's liberal political opinions, however, did not go unnoticed, and few of the St. Petersburg officials were as tolerant as Nikolaev and others had been in Kyiv. Despite these political difficulties, Lototsky was eventually promoted to the post of deputy

45. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 228.

46. Ibid., 1: 256.

47. On imperial censorship in this period, see Charles A. Ruud, *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804–1906* (Toronto, 1982), 207–26; Jacob Walkin, "Government Controls over the Press in Russia, 1905–1914," *Russian Review* 13 (1954): 203–9.

48. *Osnova*, published in St. Petersburg from January 1861 to October 1862, strongly influenced the development of Ukrainian national consciousness and Ukrainian literature in the Russian Empire.

comptroller-general with the relatively senior service rank of state counselor, a position he was to hold for sixteen years.

Upon arriving in St. Petersburg, Lototsky became a leader of the Ukrainian community. He was deeply concerned about the lack of interest in Ukrainian political causes that he encountered among community members. This apathy was due in part to the distance between the imperial capital and Ukraine, and most community activities were thus limited in scope.

The Ukrainian community in St. Petersburg was divided into older and younger groups. The older group consisted of Ukrainians who had come to St. Petersburg to serve in the various government ministries. Because of the prevailing political reaction, this group could accomplish little for the Ukrainian cause, hence it tended to exaggerate the importance of small achievements. The younger group, primarily students in St. Petersburg, was generally bolder and showed little appreciation for the struggles of its predecessors.

Lototsky generally sympathized with the students,[49] but also went to great lengths to understand and defend the older community. In the final analysis, setting aside the psychological differences between the two age groups, relations between them were generally peaceful and agreeable. An example of their cooperation, Lototsky points out, was the work of the publishing association Blahodiine Tovarystvo (Good Works Society). Although it consisted mainly of members of the younger community, they were aided by a member of the older group, Petro Stebnytsky. Despite such cooperation, Lototsky did not escape criticism from the community elders. He was, for example, chided for an article in *Pravda*[50] in which he was critical of a St. Petersburg commemoration of Shevchenko.

Ukrainian students in St. Petersburg were influenced by the rise of liberalism in the imperial capital, as well as by the activity of associations established in Ukraine. They shared Ukrainian books and speeches on Ukrainian themes, so that the libraries developed by student groups played a central role in the education of their members. Accordingly, students often attained a higher level of national consciousness than other Ukrainians in St. Petersburg. Many of them also took an active role in political life. Lototsky noted this dynamism with satisfaction: "...in every child of the Ukrainian land, there was an inborn, subconscious foundation of Ukrainian feeling, and it was only necessary to cleanse and stir that virgin soil of the national soul, which was overgrown with weeds of foreign

49. Lototsky states that no matter how difficult it was to promote certain Ukrainian causes in St. Petersburg, it was easier there than in the provinces. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 2: 10–11.

50. *Pravda* was a monthly publication of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Union (Spilka) that appeared in Lviv for less than a year in 1905.

influence.... This [was] a process of discovery of one's 'I,' of a spiritual return 'home.'"[51]

As noted, Lototsky's motive for taking up residence in St. Petersburg was the need to have someone arguing for Vik and other Ukrainian publishing ventures at the offices of the imperial censors.[52] One of his first actions in St. Petersburg was therefore to meet with the censors in charge of reviewing manuscripts in Ukrainian and about Ukrainian matters. Lototsky fought both the censorship laws and the censors themselves. Borys Lotocki remembers his father stating that the "censors...behaved like dictators."[53] Lototsky's first step in the struggle with those "dictators" was to intervene on behalf of specific authors who were trying to have their manuscripts approved. He was somewhat successful in those endeavors, and soon became well known as a mediator on behalf of Ukrainian writers.

After his promotion in the ministry, the censors began to take more notice of Lototsky's various appeals. Having established connections with certain members of the imperial Academy of Sciences, Lototsky was instrumental in the issuance of a statement by the Academy in 1904 recognizing Ukrainian as a language, not a dialect of Russian, and calling for the abolition of restrictions on the printing of Ukrainian works. The 1905 revolution brought an end to the ban on Ukrainian publications. While this ended Lototsky's unofficial position as mediator, he could later look back and state that only because of his direct intervention did the publications of Vik and other Ukrainian-language books see the light of day before the official lifting of the ban. By 1906, Vik had published seventy books and pamphlets, twenty-three volumes of the Ukrainian Library, nine volumes of collected works of Ukrainian writers, twenty-one publications in the series Nasha Sprava (Our Cause), and thirteen other works. Without groups such as Vik and Blahodiine Tovarystvo, wrote Lototsky, there would have been a dearth of Ukrainian books as severe as during the most difficult times of Ukrainian national life. Lototsky had helped to "lift the chains from the Ukrainian word."[54]

In 1906, Lototsky contributed to the publication of a Ukrainian-language New Testament, which was approved by the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church. Prior to this publication, the import of Ukrainian-language Scriptures into the Russian Empire had been forbidden. Lototsky was also able to have his own Ukrainian-language works approved by the censors. In 1905, his children's reader, an anthology titled *Vinok* (Wreath), was published; the stories

51. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 2: 131.
52. Ibid., 1: 276–77.
53. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 21.
54. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 2: 245.

in this book were often about a little boy named Borys and a girl named Oksana, the names of Oleksander's children.

The lifting of the ban on Ukrainian publications and the granting of freedom of assembly had dramatic results for cultural life in Ukraine. Before 1905, there was only one Ukrainian-language newspaper in the Russian Empire; by 1906, there were seventeen. The number of publishing houses rose from two to seventeen during the same period, with thirteen of the new firms located in Kyiv.[55] Various associations were formed and political parties arose not only throughout Ukraine, but also in parts of Russia where Ukrainians were a significant minority.

One of the St. Petersburg associations in which Lototsky took part was a Ukrainian club named Hromada (Community). In fact, the "days of liberty," as Lototsky referred to the revolution, were directly responsible for the establishment of this political club. By 1906, Hromada was well enough established to campaign for Ukrainian candidates during the elections to the Russian parliament—the First Duma. Later, from 1910 to 1912, Lototsky served as Hromada's president. Hromada sponsored monthly lectures on various Ukrainian historical and cultural themes and distributed Ukrainian publications. Often these included "illegal" (political) books. The culmination of Lototsky's presidency of the Hromada was the creation of an underground Ukrainian university, which functioned from the autumn of 1914 until the spring of 1917, when it was closed by the police.

A second endeavor in which Lototsky was involved after 1905 was the translation of the Gospels into modern Ukrainian. Although the hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church argued that Church Slavonic was a sacred tongue that should not be abandoned, there were many within the church who understood the necessity of making the word of God available in the vernacular. A Russian translation of the Bible was completed in 1876.[56] While there were demands to make the Scriptures available in Ukrainian for home reading and reference, there were no attempts at this early date to use them in liturgical worship. During the pre-1917 period, the Orthodox Church in the Empire was allowed to use only Church Slavonic, and clerics were taught in the seminaries to chant the readings with a Russian pronunciation.[57]

Lototsky argued the need for a Ukrainian-language Bible. "In the life of

55. Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 2d ed. (Toronto, 1994), 297.

56. On the translation of the Bible into Russian, see I. A. Chistovich, *Istoriia perevoda Biblii na russkii iazyk* (St. Petersburg, 1899); M. I. Rizhskii, *Istoriia perevodov Biblii v Rossii* (Novosibirsk, 1978).

57. Although Church Slavonic orthography is standard, with slight variations, throughout the Slavic world, there are Bulgarian, Russian, Serbian, Ukrainian, and other pronunciations.

almost every nation of Christian culture, the issuance of a native-language Bible is one of the main foundations for the establishment and promotion of the national culture. In the life of the Ukrainian nation as well, from the earliest times, there was a tendency to nationalize the monuments of the Old Bulgarian language that came to us at the genesis of our Christian era."[58] Using such arguments, Lototsky approached Archbishop Dymytrii Kovalnytsky of Kherson, a former professor and provost of the Kyivan Academy whom he had known since his student days. Lototsky proposed the publication of a manuscript of the Gospels that had earlier been positively appraised by the Imperial Academy of Sciences, and the archbishop welcomed the suggestion. Then, as Lototsky elaborated upon the reasons that such a translation was necessary for the religious education of the masses, the archbishop began to change his mind and refused to take up the cause, saying that the "Ukrainophiles" might "exploit this holy cause for their nefarious ends."[59]

The lifting of the ban on Ukrainian-language publications turned the tide for the issuance of the Ukrainian-language Gospels. Metropolitan Antonii Vadkovsky, who represented the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church on the matter, gave the initial approval, stating that "our Lord Jesus Christ taught us to teach all nations."[60] The Synod charged Archbishop Parfenii Levytsky of Kamianets with evaluating and providing the final approval of the translation. An eleven-man commission, including a priest, and headed by academicians Fedor Korsh and Aleksei Shakhmatov of the Russian Academy of Sciences, prepared the text. Lototsky was also a member of the commission. Acquainted with Archbishop Parfenii, and counting on their friendship, Lototsky approached him with a request to chair the committee that would prepare the Acts of the Apostles for publication in Ukrainian. Parfenii refused, without giving a reason to Lototsky, who concluded that Parfenii was adhering to the anti-Ukrainian policies of the Holy Synod.[61] Despite such opposition, the text of the Gospels was printed in Moscow in Church Slavonic and Ukrainian (1906–11) and then in

58. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 2: 382. In his memoirs, Lototsky provides a survey of the translations of the Bible into Ukrainian (2: 383–85).

59. Ibid., 386.

60. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 2: 397. A reference to the Gospel according to St. Matthew, 28: 19.

61. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 1: 399. It is worth noting that in 1917, Parfenii was removed from his diocese of Kamianets and retired by the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church for his "Ukrainophile" activities. See Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, "Ukrainization Movements within the Russian Orthodox Church, and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4, Part 1 (1979–1980): 95.

Ukrainian alone (1914).[62]

Among politically active Ukrainians, Lototsky was well known in St. Petersburg and elsewhere for his writings. Between 1900 and 1917, when he lived in the imperial capital, Lototsky published more than 200 articles, ranging in scope from book and theater reviews to lengthy scholarly articles on economic, ecclesiastical, educational, and historical themes. One of his early projects was the first major reference work on Ukraine, a two-volume encyclopedia titled *Ukrainskii narod v ego proshlom i nastoiashchem* (The Ukrainian People in Its Past and Present), published in Moscow in 1914–16. Many of Lototsky's articles on Ukrainian topics also appeared in Russian newspapers and journals. For example, a survey of Ukrainian literature, *Kratkii obzor ukrainskogo literaturnogo dvizheniia v Rossii i zagranitsei* (A Brief Survey of the Ukrainian Literary Movement in Russia and Abroad), was published by the imperial Academy of Sciences in 1905. That year also saw the publication of the Russian version of his article on social ideals in Shevchenko's poetry. In addition, Lototsky worked with *Ridna sprava—Dums'ki visti* (Native Cause—News of the Duma), the official organ of the Ukrainian faction of the Second Duma.

Lototsky considered that his most important work of this period was the book *Ukrainskii vopros* (The Ukrainian Question), which he co-authored in Russian with Petro Stebnytsky. Although the 1905 revolution and the outbreak of World War I had brought the Ukrainian question to the forefront of political discussion, most of the imperial political elite was poorly informed about it. It was therefore important to present the issue in a readable and well-argued manner. *Ukrainskii vopros*, published in Moscow in 1915, was so well received that it was reprinted in 1916 and 1917. Comprising almost two hundred pages, *Ukrainskii vopros* was a collection of articles surveying Ukrainian culture and politics and covering such subjects as the sources of Ukrainian identity, the Ukrainian language as an expression of national individuality, Ukrainian literary monuments, and the history of the national movement. Lototsky also published *Galichina, Bukovina, Ugorskaia Rus'* (Galicia, Bukovyna, and Hungarian Ruthenia), which concerned the Ukrainian territories under Austrian rule. The book appeared in Moscow in 1914 and 1915.

Lototsky described the period before the 1917 revolution as the "time before the storm." There was renewed resistance within the imperial government and political circles to the emergence of Ukrainian national consciousness and its claims for national rights. As Lototsky put it, "After the first [1905] revolution,

62. Ivan Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys istorii Ukraïns'koï Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy* (New York, 1955–66), 3: 297–98.

Ukraine experienced no change in its political status."[63] While that statement may seem too sweeping, the gains made by the Ukrainian movement were in fact quickly reversed. There had been Ukrainian representation in the first two Dumas, but Premier Petr Stolypin's electoral reforms effectively silenced the Ukrainian voice in the later ones. Permission had been granted to publish in Ukrainian as well as to establish Ukrainian community organizations, but these gains, termed small by Lototsky, were short-lived, as the outbreak of World War I led to the suppression of all national organizations and cultural activities deemed dangerous in wartime by the imperial government.[64]

At the beginning of World War I, Ukraine was politically divided between the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires. While Ukrainians within the Russian Empire thought it best to support liberal-democratic forces in Russia as the key to Ukrainian autonomy, those under Austrian rule, who had experienced much more cultural freedom, supported the Habsburg Monarchy. As Lototsky saw it, both groups of nationally conscious Ukrainians understood their responsibility to the national cause. The war was to be the pivotal moment in the life of the Ukrainian people in both empires; it would decide their fate. In the Russian Empire, Symon Petliura, who would head the Ukrainian government in 1919 and with whom Lototsky was already associated, called on Ukrainians to take an active part in the war in order to achieve their national liberation. "As an active person, as a realistic politician taking advantage of the current situation, [Petliura] did not lose the opportunity to declare his position from the platform that was available at the time."[65]

In the months preceding the 1917 revolution, Lototsky met regularly with Ukrainian and Russian leaders in Petrograd (as St. Petersburg was renamed in August 1914) to discuss the future of Ukraine in the empire. He argued that the Russian intelligentsia should stop "washing its hands" of the Ukrainian issue and actively support Ukrainian national rights and autonomy. At the beginning of the revolution, however, Lototsky noted a radical change: his Russian colleagues in Petrograd now took an active and vocal anti-Ukrainian stance. Even those who had supported Ukrainian cultural demands were now firmly opposed to any political concessions. The philologist Aleksei Shakhmatov, a friend of Lototsky's who had helped to lift the ban on Ukrainian publications, now told him, "Until now I was with you. However, when it comes to autonomy for Ukraine, I fasten all my buttons. For this involves the most vital interests of the Great Russian

63. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 253.

64. The suppression of Ukrainian organizations, especially Prosvita (Enlightenment Society), in Poltava, Kyiv, Kherson, Kharkiv, and elsewhere, is discussed by Lototsky in *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 255–61.

65. Ibid., 3: 262.

[*velikorusskii*] nation, which you are separating from the warm [ice-free] sea."[66]

Lototsky believed that Tsar Nicholas II and his government had not learned anything from the Revolution of 1905 or the developments that followed. "By 1916 talk of revolution had started even in the most conservative, 'unrevolutionary' circles and in January 1917 it became clear to almost everyone—except the government—that a revolution was inevitable."[67] To this threat, the government replied with repression and police measures.

Lototsky considered that the empire had become a police state in which everyone was under surveillance. Although he had never belonged to a revolutionary party or organization, Lototsky was associated with many groups that the authorities might consider subversive, and he often suspected that he was being followed.

Borys Lotocki relates a characteristic incident, told to him by his father, that indicates how vigilant the political police actually were on the eve of the revolution:

> On the second or third day [of the revolution] two young students passing the square where the building of the secret police stood, popularly called "Okhranka" ("okhrana" meaning in Russian "protection"), observed a triumphant mob making a great pyre of folders and papers that had been carried or thrown out from the windows of the building. It is possible or even probable that the initiators of this auto-da-fé were not the happy citizens, but rather unhappy agents of the secret police, who, by destroying the files of the police department, were hoping to destroy the record of their spying activities. The young men grabbed two files lying on the ground and brought them to their friend, a Ukrainian lady named Mrs. Bohuslavska. She in turn brought the files to my father.
>
> One file contained the correspondence between the central secret service office and its provincial offices regarding trips to the capital made by various Ukrainian "suspects." For instance, the Kiev office, noting the departure to St. Petersburg of the "known Little-Russian...activist, Sergei Aleksandrovich Efremov," had requested information regarding his whereabouts in the capital and his departure from it. In answer the St. Petersburg office reported that the "said S. A. Iefremov had upon his arrival in St. Petersburg gone to stay in the apartment of the Counselor of State, Alexander Lotocki, situated at...and had left the capital toward the general direction of Kiev on..."
>
> Visits of other well-known Ukrainians were also faithfully noted in the folders, but the correspondence between the St. Petersburg and Moscow offices offered the greatest sensation. Before the Revolution my father had heard that Volodymyr Vynnychenko, a well-known Ukrainian writer, had boasted how cleverly he had outwitted the police, living in Moscow with a falsified passport

66. Ibid., 3: 306.

67. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 37–38.

> under the very noses of the secret police. He had even offered to host meetings in his apartment. In his file my father read the following report: "Take note that the known Little-Russian writer and agitator, Vladimir Kirillovich Vinnichenko, living in Moscow in...Street No...on a falsified passport in the name of Andrei Zinovievich Pavlenko, left today for St. Petersburg. Please let us know...." How cleverly the secret police took advantage of the self-confident people imagining themselves to be perfect conspirators and behaved accordingly.[68]

When it finally did occur, wrote Lototsky, "The All-Russian Revolution [of 1917] opened for Ukraine not only a new page of existence, but also entirely new perspectives. The autocratic regime had a single despotic character and the same perpetual goals of unification throughout Ukraine's coexistence with Muscovy."[69] Ukrainian political, community, and national life had decayed, and Ukraine itself was threatened with extinction. The end of "despotism," or so Lototsky hoped, offered Ukraine a tremendous opportunity to return to its historical traditions of autonomy, democracy, and the rule of law.

This did not mean that the way ahead would be easy. The literary scholar Volodymyr Doroshenko opined that the revolution found Ukrainians "without a backbone" and "without an understanding of their own national and state tasks as Ukrainians."[70] Lototsky, agreeing, was nevertheless amazed that within two or three months of the outbreak of the revolution, large groups of Ukrainians were able to reestablish "organic links...with the old national and state traditions" and "renew" a Ukrainian state. Lototsky marveled that despite the barrage of negative influences from the schools, the press, literature, and scholarship, Ukrainians nonetheless set about creating their own institutions.[71]

In very short order, Lototsky was elected president of the newly formed Ukrainian National Council (Ukrainska Natsionalna Rada) in Petrograd (19 March 1917), as well as a delegate to the Central Rada, which had been formed in Kyiv on 7 March. On 19 March, in the Lototsky home, there was a large gathering at which Lototsky discussed with those present the current situation of Ukrainians in general and in Petrograd in particular. Representatives of the following organizations established the Ukrainian National Council: the Society of Ukrainian Progressives (two branches), the Democratic Radical Party, the Ukrainian caucus of the Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the Ukrainian Revolutionary Committee, the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party, the Ukrainian Students' Union in Petrograd, the publishers of *Nashe zhyttia* (Our Life), and several other smaller organizations. In his memoirs,

68. Ibid., 36–37.

69. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 318.

70. Ibid., 3: 321. Volodymyr Doroshenko (1879–1963) was a bibliographer, literary scholar, and civic leader.

71. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 321, 323.

Lototsky comments that "I was now burdened with responsible tasks, which, in addition to the technical business aspect, were also in the nature of external representation. I found this very unpleasant, as it was not in accord with my nature."[72] In one of his few references to his wife, Nimfodora, Lototsky acknowledges her "moral influence, [which] brought me back to spiritual equanimity when circumstances threatened to upset it."[73]

The Ukrainian National Council presented its demands to the government of Prime Minister Prince Georgii Lvov in Petrograd, calling for the replacement of Russian governors with Ukrainian ones in the previously Austrian-ruled Ukrainian territories, which had been occupied by Russian forces. Since the population was largely Ukrainian, the council maintained that Ukrainian officials would better represent and protect the rights of the inhabitants of those areas.[74] Moreover, the council generally acted as host and ambassador to those politicians from Ukraine who came to Petrograd.

The Ukrainian National Council functioned for only two months, from mid-March to mid-May 1917. In June, the Central Rada in Kyiv ceased merely to represent Ukrainian interests before the Provisional Government and proclaimed Ukraine's autonomy. As a result, many of the council's key workers, including Lototsky, left Petrograd and went to the Ukrainian capital to serve in the new government.

As the unofficial "ambassador of Ukraine in Petrograd," Lototsky needed to maintain contact with the various leaders in Kyiv. The arrival of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Kyiv on 14 March 1917 gave the Rada and its campaign for the complete autonomy of Ukraine a much-needed national leader.[75] Lototsky decided to go to Kyiv himself in order to confer with Hrushevsky.

Lototsky arrived on 24 March, one day before the beginning of a scheduled TUP gathering. At Rada headquarters, Lototsky reported to TUP members on the general political situation in Petrograd and the activities of the Ukrainian National Council. Although the consensus was one of satisfaction with the council's work, others voiced the opinion that there was no need to hold talks with, let alone make requests of, the Provisional Government of Russia. Lototsky replied that to break off discussions with the Provisional Government would be an "absurdity, given the current situation in Ukraine."[76]

---

72. Ibid., 3: 345.
73. Ibid.
74. As a result of these representations, Dmytro Doroshenko was appointed commissioner of Galicia and Bukovyna, and Lototsky was later appointed governor of Bukovyna. See below, pp. 23–24.
75. See Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky*, 127–28.
76. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 348–49.

At the same TUP meeting, Hrushevsky was elected president of the society and Lototsky became associate vice-president with Illia Shrah, a lawyer and deputy to the First Duma. One of the most significant actions taken by the gathering was the change of the society's name to the Union of Ukrainian Autonomists-Federalists (Soiuz Ukrainskykh Avtonomistiv-Federalistiv). The Union also decided not to align itself with any one party, permitting its members to maintain any party affiliation or none. It announced that it would make every effort to obtain autonomous status for Ukraine, and a committee was struck to draft a proposal to that end.

The resulting draft called for a union of forces within Ukraine and outside it to work for Ukrainian autonomy. Members of the Ukrainian intelligentsia were asked to return from Russia in order to promote political, economic, and cultural development. Chosen to head the drafting committee, Lototsky became directly involved with the movement for Ukrainian autonomy. Ultimately, that movement would seek full independence for Ukraine.

There were many divisions among those politically active Ukrainians who supported autonomy. Lototsky lamented the lack of time and, more particularly, the dearth of political experience in Ukraine during the revolution, when the movement for autonomy had its greatest chance of success. He noted that certain elements lost sight of their original objectives—national rights for Ukrainians and national autonomy for Ukraine. All the more important, then, was the role of a central figure, a person of moral authority who could unite and lead the autonomist movement. For Lototsky, that leader was Mykhailo Hrushevsky.

Lototsky knew Hrushevsky personally and shared many of his ideas and goals. Since his student days, Lototsky had worked with Hrushevsky in Kyiv and later in St. Petersburg. Because of what Lototsky described as Hrushevsky's selfless commitment, he felt an unusual love and piety for the historian. "No one other than Hrushevsky, with his broad political outlook, talent and energy, could have taken this leadership role at that historical moment."[77] Indeed, in the words of his biographer, Hrushevsky became the "living symbol of the nation."[78]

When Lototsky returned to Petrograd, he characterized the political situation in the revolutionary capital as one of total political bankruptcy. Despite this perceived bankruptcy among the Russians, the idea of national liberation was not only alive in Petrograd's Ukrainian community but, as Lototsky stated, it prevailed above all others. "However the autocratic regime stifled Ukrainian

77. Ibid., 3: 354. In his memoirs, Lototsky analyzes the changes in Hrushevsky's political thinking before and after World War I, as he observed them. See Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 352–57.

78. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky*, 131.

political thought, it did not manage to stifle the idea of national liberation."[79] The historian Michael Hamm notes of this period that "the desire of Kievans and Ukrainians to rid themselves of Russian control remained a potent political force, awaiting the right historical moment to blossom."[80] For Lototsky and many of his political colleagues, that moment had now arrived.

While in Petrograd, Lototsky maintained only limited contacts with the various Russian political parties. In May 1917, a gathering of the Constitutional Democratic Party (Cadets) took place in Petrograd. The party sought to address the issue of autonomy for Ukraine, and Lototsky was one of the members of an ad hoc committee that presented the Ukrainian position on autonomy at the gathering.

In June, the Union of Ukrainian Autonomists-Federalists officially became the Ukrainian Party of Socialists-Federalists. Socialist in name only, the UPSF was in fact a middle-of-the-road liberal party that attracted no mass following, but provided a number of well-qualified functionaries to the Central Rada. Lototsky, who would become one of those functionaries, remained a member of the party's Central Committee.[81]

Despite Lototsky's limited involvement with the Provisional Government, that body did take advantage of his skills in certain areas. One of the first and most important concessions made to Ukrainians by the Provisional Government was a directive to its ministry of education to increase the use of the Ukrainian language in schools in Ukraine. The ministry of education had earlier decided that the language of instruction in schools should correspond to the linguistic requirements of the students; thus, in Ukrainian grammar schools, Ukrainian was to be the language of instruction, although the languages of other minorities would be taught as well. The Russian language would also be taught from the second year of instruction as a compulsory subject in all schools. Moreover, in teacher training institutions, there would be courses on the Ukrainian language, history, literature, and geography. Similarly, at institutions of higher learning, chairs were to be established to teach the history of the Ukrainian language and literature, Ukrainian history and geography, and the history of Ukrainian law.

While this program appeared ambitious, Lototsky, who had himself been involved in creating and establishing a similar plan, believed that it could be implemented. In fact, he remarked that the plan was, "from the Ukrainian viewpoint, perhaps the sole achievement of the Provisional Government."[82]

---

79. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 357.

80. Michael F. Hamm, *Kiev: A Portrait, 1800–1917* (Princeton, 1993), 227.

81. Jurij Borys, *The Sovietization of Ukraine, 1917–1923: The Communist Doctrine and Practice of Self-Determination*, rev. ed. (Edmonton, 1980), 84–85.

82. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 366. There is a dearth of literature on education

Mykola Vasylenko, a historian chosen by the Provisional Government's minister of education, A. A. Manuilov, to be superintendent of the Kyiv school system, consulted Lototsky concerning the implementation of the plan in Kyiv. Following an official visit to the ministry by Vasylenko, Lototsky was asked to finalize the general plan for Ukrainian-language grammar schools, as well as for the establishment of chairs in Ukrainian studies at institutions of higher learning. Although Lototsky was not asked to provide a more detailed plan for the establishment of Ukrainian secondary schools (gymnasia), he dealt with this obvious lacuna by preparing two separate plans for the Ministry of Education: one included guidelines for establishing secondary schools; the other, following the ministry's specifications, did not. Vasylenko submitted the second variant, which then became the ministry's official plan concerning Ukrainian schools and subjects of study. Only later did Lototsky see his original appeal heeded, when Manuilov issued a special decree concerning Ukrainian secondary schools and authorized the establishment of two Ukrainian middle schools.

Another matter in which Lototsky achieved success was the return from exile of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky.[83] Following the arrest of the metropolitan in 1915, Lototsky had begun looking for ways to secure his freedom or ease his exile. Working with two Greek Catholic priests in the capital, Lototsky attempted to write about Sheptytsky in the Petrograd press, but found editors generally reluctant to permit such an appeal. Aleksandr Kerensky, who was then justice minister, issued instructions in March 1917 to free the metropolitan in response to appeals made by Lototsky in his capacity as president of the Ukrainian National Council. The council prepared to greet Sheptytsky on his return from exile on 18 March. Lototsky not only welcomed the metropolitan, but was also the first non-cleric officially to greet him in Petrograd. In his remarks, Lototsky praised Sheptytsky for his devotion to his flock, the Ukrainian people, for whom he had been a good shepherd willing to give up his life.[84] On 24 April, Sheptytsky left Petrograd for Kyiv and later Lviv to enthusiastic greetings in both cities.

In his memoirs, Lototsky provides some important details about the life, arrest, exile, and return of Metropolitan Sheptytsky. For Lototsky, the arrest of the metropolitan violated international standards of conduct. An Orthodox

---

in Ukraine during the revolution and the early years of the Soviet Union. See I. Krylov, *Systema osvity v Ukraïni (1917–1930)* (Munich, 1956).

83. For a biography of Sheptytsky, see Cyril Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew (1865–1944)* (Lviv, 1993); Volodymyr Doroshenko, *Velykyi Mytropolyt: Pam''iati Mytropolyta A. Sheptyts'koho: spohady i narysy* (Yorkton, 1958). See also Andrii Krawchuk, *Christian Social Ethics in Ukraine: The Legacy of Andrei Sheptytsky* (Edmonton, Ottawa, and Toronto, 1997).

84. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 377.

Christian, Lototsky considered the exile of Metropolitan Sheptytsky an injustice against the entire Ukrainian nation, and not one committed against a particular Ukrainian church. Thus, the enthusiasm for the return of the metropolitan on the part of all Ukrainians, according to Lototsky, was not motivated by particular confessional concerns but by national and human ones.[85] After his release, Sheptytsky was a guest at the Lototsky home, and someone asked the metropolitan how he had managed to survive his arrest and exile. Lototsky noted that Sheptytsky did not complain, but simply remarked "half-jokingly that in exile he had had the opportunity to read many things for which there would have been no time under normal circumstances."[86]

Lototsky was not without his personal views concerning the Greek Catholic Church in Ukraine. Father Stepan Iuryk, a close associate of Metropolitan Sheptytsky, had remarked to Lototsky that now, after the fall of the Russian Empire, there remained no further obstacle to establishing the Greek Catholic Church as the national church of the Ukrainian people. Lototsky notes in his memoirs that he tried to persuade the priest otherwise, stating that his desire to see Metropolitan Sheptytsky free should not be interpreted as an invitation to the Greek Catholic Church to attempt to convert Ukrainian Orthodox Christians to Catholicism. Lototsky rejected any attempt to challenge what he termed the ancestral Orthodox faith of the Ukrainian people. Such attempts, he believed, would change the nature of the feelings Orthodox Ukrainians had for Sheptytsky and his church, renewing "the ugly scenes already experienced in our medieval history."[87]

Lototsky's last association with the Provisional Government was in the capacity of governor of Bukovyna, to which post he was appointed in mid-May 1917. At this time, the situation of Ukrainians in Bukovyna was, according to Hugh Seton-Watson, "tolerable but unpleasant," given the neglect of their culture.[88] In accepting the post of governor, Lototsky thought that he would be

85. Lototsky was impressed with Sheptytsky's support for the Ukrainian national movement. For the role of Sheptytsky and the Greek Catholic Church in Ukrainian nation-building, see John-Paul Himka, "The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Building in Galicia, 1772–1918," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8 (December 1984): 444–46.

86. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 377.

87. Lototsky was referring to the events that followed the Union of Brest (1596), when most of the Ukrainian bishops entered into a union with Rome and established the Uniate or Greek Catholic Church. See Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 379. Concerning the Union of Brest, see A. V. Kartashev, *Ocherki po istorii Russkoi Tserkvi*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1959), 1: 665–73; Oscar Halecki, *From Florence to Brest (1439–1596)*, 2d ed. (Hamden, CT, 1968).

88. Hugh Seton-Watson, *Eastern Europe Between the Wars, 1918–1941*, 3d ed.

helping to secure Ukrainian rule over traditional Ukrainian lands. The opportunity for the appointment arose when Lototsky's colleague, the historian Dmytro Doroshenko, was appointed commissioner of Galicia and Bukovyna by the Provisional Government, and proposed the position of governor to his friend. Lototsky had been distressed by the Russian authorities' destruction of national institutions in the occupied western Ukrainian lands. "When the prospect arose of contributing to the improvement of [western Ukrainian] life, it became difficult to resist such a temptation."[89] Lototsky's son, Borys, provides considerable detail about the family's trip to Chernivtsi, as well as his father's work in Bukovyna during this brief appointment of less than five months.

> In Chernivtsi we resided in a beautiful house belonging to Baron Styrcea, who had fled before the arrival of the Russian troops; this house was later requisitioned by the authorities to serve as the residence of the governor. From local sources my father learned that his predecessor, whose daughter had recently been married, was able to provide her with a bountiful dowry because he had plundered the linen closets of the Baron. His wife and her maids had been busy for weeks and weeks undoing the embroidered initials and crests on the bed and table linen. On our arrival, my father had a complete inventory made by an employee of the city hall.... My father had taken me along on two of his inspection tours and I had been able to see the beautiful scenery of that region and its inhabitants, good looking people, neatly dressed in Ukrainian costumes that were a gay sight, especially on Sundays when they were going to church.[90]

Lototsky was soon summoned by Hrushevsky to Kyiv to assist in the establishment of the new Ukrainian government. During the three years following his service in Bukovyna, Lototsky was directly involved in Ukrainian nation-building. Doroshenko described Lototsky's years in Ukrainian government service: "Calmly and with a feeling of duty accomplished could Oleksander Lototsky look back at the years of work that lay behind him. When, during the unforgettable years 1917 and 1918, he was fortunate enough to witness the rebirth of the Ukrainian nation, few of us, to such as an extent as he, could say: 'My work was part of this accomplishment.'"[91]

Lototsky arrived in Kyiv in September 1917 to take up the post of General Chancellor for the Rada under the leadership of Hrushevsky. He held that position for only three months, since he found himself in disagreement with the Rada's activities. The Socialists-Federalists recalled their members from the

---

(Hamden, CT, 1962), 336.

89. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 382.

90. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 42–43.

91. Dmytro Doroshenko, "Lytsar pratsi i obov''iazku," in *Lytsar pratsi i obov''iazku*, ed. Bohdan Hoshovs'kyi (Toronto, 1983), 22.

cabinet "because it proved incapable of taking on real work and [was] unfit for the task"[92] of running the government. Ultimately, the Rada failed, according to the historian John S. Reshetar, Jr., because of the underdevelopment of the Ukrainian national movement.[93]

At the end of April 1918, Pavlo Skoropadsky, a descendant of a Ukrainian noble family who commanded a Russian army corps, took power in a coup against the Rada,[94] adopting the title of Hetman. Initially, Lototsky was determined not to serve under Skoropadsky, stating that he could not support the activities of a government whose actions were, in Lototsky's words, "anti-national."[95] Lototsky was, for example, at odds with Skoropadsky's policy of imprisoning persons he considered ardent nationalists. These included Symon Petliura, who was jailed for four months.[96] Notwithstanding his original decision, in October of the same year Lototsky entered the service of the Hetman government as minister of religious affairs at the urging of the Ukrainian National Union, an opposition body. He resigned when Skoropadsky proclaimed the federation of Ukraine with Russia.

That proclamation precipitated an uprising against the Skoropadsky regime that had been in the making for some time. On 14 December 1918, Skoropadsky resigned, later escaping to Germany. On 26 December, the Directory, a leftist Ukrainian government led by Petliura, came to power in Kyiv. With the emergence of this new government, Lototsky continued his work as minister of religious affairs until mid-January 1919, when he accepted appointment as Ukraine's ambassador to Turkey.

It was in 1918, as minister of religious affairs in the Skoropadsky government, that Lototsky would become directly involved in the movement for Ukrainian autocephaly.

---

92. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Istoriia Ukraïny 1917–1921 rr.*, 2 vols. (Uzhhorod, 1930), 2: 7.

93. John S. Reshetar, Jr., *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1920: A Study in Nationalism* (Princeton, 1952), 142.

94. For a discussion of the Hetmanate, see Taras Hunczak, "The Ukraine Under Hetman Pavlo Skoropadskyi," in *The Ukraine, 1917–1921: A Study in Revolution*, ed. Taras Hunczak (Cambridge, MA, 1977). For a discussion of German support of Skoropadsky, see Oleh S. Fedyshyn, *Germany's Drive to the East and the Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1918* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1971).

95. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 9.

96. Reshetar, *Ukrainian Revolution*, 161.

Chapter Two

Revolution and Autocephaly, 1917–1919

Because Lototsky believed that the church could be a tremendous catalyst for the formation of an independent Ukrainian state, he concerned himself with many aspects of church life. Although initially involved only in the education of the clergy, which he believed would then proceed to educate the masses concerning the importance of a national church, Lototsky later also involved himself directly in the administration of the church while holding various posts in the Ukrainian government. Through his personal contacts with colleagues at the Kyivan Academy, including clergymen who would later assume positions of authority in the church, as well as through his writings, Lototsky influenced the thinking of the church administration in Ukraine.[1]

The fall of the autocracy in March 1917 ushered in a new period of history for the Russian Orthodox Church. When the procurator called upon the Holy Synod to issue a statement of support for the monarchy, it declined to do so. Instead, the Synod focused its attention on reestablishing the Patriarchate. With the structure of the Russian Church in question, proponents of Ukrainization gained an opportunity to assert themselves. Although only a minority of the lower-ranking Ukrainian clergy supported the movement for Ukrainian autonomy, a larger number favored changes in the structure of the church. The Rev. Vasyl Lypkivsky, who would be elected Metropolitan of Kyiv and all Ukraine four years later,[2] spoke of the sense of new possibilities that Ukrainians felt for their nation and church with the fall of the Russian Empire. "[T]he day is one

1. Lotots'kyi, *Storinky mynuloho*, 3: 204.
2. On Lypkivsky, see the recent study by Arsen Zinchenko, *Vyzvolytysia viroiu: zhyttia i diiannia Mytropolyta Vasylia Lypkivs'koho* (Kyiv, 1997). A great deal of information about Lypkivsky is also to be found in Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys istorii*, vol. 4, bk. 1, and in the work of a participant in the activities of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, Demyd Burko, *Ukraïns'ka Avtokefal'na Pravoslavna Tserkva: vichne dzherelo zhyttia* (South Bound Brook, NJ, 1988). See also Ivan Korovyts'kyi, "...Mriia oholoshena...Vasyl' Lypkivs'kyi, Mytropolyt UAPTs," *Suchasnist'* 307 (November 1986): 70–86.

that...begins a new era in the history of the Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian Church."[3] The national spirit of which Lototsky wrote was exhibited most clearly when the Central Rada proclaimed Ukraine's autonomy and later its full independence of the Russian state.

This national spirit was also evident at various diocesan gatherings throughout Ukraine. While some groups strongly supported an autonomous Ukrainian church, others were more conservative, voting only to Ukrainize certain elements of the divine liturgy. The idea of a national, as well as an ecclesiastical, rebirth was most apparent in the Volhynian diocese. At their congress, the priests and lay delegates of that diocese voted to support Ukrainian church autonomy, with the newly autonomous church to be headed by a Kyivan Metropolitan. The same procedure was repeated in the dioceses of Kyiv, Poltava, and Podilia, traditional centers of the Ukrainian national movement. The movement in Kyiv was headed by the Rev. Vasyl Lypkivsky. The Poltava diocese, like that of Kyiv, adopted resolutions that supported not only the Ukrainization of the church, but also its full autonomy:

> 1) In a free, territorially autonomous Ukraine, there must be a free, autocephalous Church, independent from the state in its internal order...
> 4) Church services in the Ukrainian Church shall be celebrated in Ukrainian.[4]

The Poltava diocese also called for Ukrainian bishops to administer Ukrainian dioceses and for an end to the practice of filling those sees with ethnic Russians. The movement toward an autonomous church was everywhere evident in Ukraine. Even in highly Russified Odesa, which opposed autocephaly, members of the diocesan gathering adopted Ukrainian elements in their liturgical services.

In June 1917, at a gathering of the All-Russian Congress of Clergy and Laymen held in Moscow, supporters of Ukrainian autocephaly proposed a resolution stating that should "Ukraine become an independent state, the Ukrainian Church, too, should be autocephalous; should there be an autonomous Ukraine, the Church should also be autonomous."[5] On that basis, the Kyiv diocesan council elected a commission charged with convening a sobor to proclaim Ukrainian autocephaly. In July, however, the Holy Synod in Petrograd rejected all the demands made by the commission. It stated:

---

3. Vasyl' Lypkivs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïns'koï Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy*, Rozdil 7, *Vidrodzhennia Ukraïns'koï Tserkvy* (Winnipeg, 1961), 3.
4. *Pro ukraïnizatsiiu tserkvy: doklad prochytanyi na poltavs'komu eparkhiial'nomu z''ïzdi dukhovenstva i myrian, 3–8 travnia 1917 roku*, 3d ed. (Lubni, 1917), 8, quoted in Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, "The Church and the Ukrainian Revolution: The Central Rada Period," in *The Ukraine, 1917–1921: A Study in Revolution*, ed. Taras Hunczak (Cambridge, MA, 1977), 224.
5. Quoted in Bociurkiw, *Politics of Religion*, 7.

> The Synod refuses to consider the question of establishing a separate Ukrainian Church; it is not intended to raise this question at the All-Russian Local Sobor since there was never an autocephalous church in...Ukraine and the Kyivan Metropolitan has been subordinated to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and, since the end of the seventeenth century, to the Moscow Patriarch and, by succession, to the Synod.[6]

Having failed to receive the proper hierarchical authorization to convene a council, certain clerics made attempts to call a Ukrainian sobor without the Holy Synod's approval. Owing to lack of support, however, that sobor was never convened.

The work carried out by the various diocesan congresses was eventually to lead to the creation of the All-Ukrainian Church Council, which, as Lototsky wrote, "saw it as its task to transform church life in Ukraine on the basis of old religious and national traditions and in conformity with the new, contemporary demands of life."[7] The council's greatest detractors would be the upper hierarchs, whom Lototsky saw as unalterably committed to the status quo because of self-interest.

In its Third Universal of 7 November 1917, the Central Rada proclaimed an independent Ukrainian People's Republic. At this time, members of the various Ukrainization movements within the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, many of whom belonged to the newly established Resurrection Brotherhood, appealed to the Ukrainian government to intervene in ecclesiastical affairs. The brotherhood was chaired by the Archbishop of Vladimir, Oleksii Dorodnytsyn, who had been deposed by the Holy Synod for alleged involvement with Grigorii Rasputin. While it was important that the Ukrainian church movement have a bishop on its side, Dorodnytsyn was not a recognized hierarch.

At its first gathering in late November 1917, the Resurrection Brotherhood called for a sobor that would cut the Ukrainian church's ties with the Holy Synod by declaring Ukrainian autocephaly. Brotherhood members appealed to the Rada for support with little positive result, despite the similarity of their aims to the Rada's own political goals. Nonetheless, Lototsky, as General Chancellor in the Hrushevsky government, addressed a November meeting of the cabinet and outlined "the necessity of bringing matters of ecclesiastical administration into the general sphere of the Ukrainian government's activities, and of establishing certain external controls over the administrative activities of the leading clerical bodies to prevent their malfeasance in church affairs."[8] Lototsky's appeals to the

6. *Rech'*, 13 July 1917, quoted in Bociurkiw, "The Church and the Ukrainian Revolution," 226.
7. Lotots'kyi, "Znevazhena sprava," *Tryzub* (Paris) 3, no. 12 (20 March 1927): 7.
8. Ibid., 7.

socialist majority government were rejected on the general grounds that matters of church and religion were private, not public. Specifically, the official response was that "our ideal is a system in which religion would be a private matter, hence the establishment of any administrative institution for that sphere would be a departure from the ideal."[9]

Doroshenko, who sympathized with Lototsky's views at the time, did not comprehend this lack of support. "The young Ukrainian state that emerged as early as the summer of 1917 did not appreciate the Ukrainian church movement and did not give it the necessary support, [which]...was utilized by elements hostile to the Ukrainian movement."[10] Lototsky, perhaps believing that the socialists in the Rada might push for the complete separation of church and state, continued to argue the need for the Rada to support the independence movement within the church "as long as the separation of church and state had not been formally implemented and as long as an alien episcopate was making use of our state apparatus and various powers of state."[11] Lototsky was unable to persuade Hrushevsky to offer stronger official support for the church. Ironically enough, in the early 1920s, after Hrushevsky had fallen from power, he tried to assist the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, seeing it as an important factor in the reassertion of the Ukrainian national movement.[12]

Lototsky was dismayed by the lack of support from the Ukrainian government. It was, in his opinion, as if the government ministers were placing the interests of revolutionary socialism above those of the Ukrainian state. "An interest in church matters was characterized as a certain narrow interest...and that greatly compromised the reputation of a right-thinking revolutionary, even more so of a socialist."[13] The newspaper *Nova Rada* also expressed concern at the apparent apathy of the Rada:

> Members of the Small Rada, adhering to higher, inaccessible socialist ideals and party purism, have not dealt, unfortunately, with the clearly vital affairs of the Ukrainian Church, which should be of concern to them as well....[14]

Lack of support from the Rada did not incapacitate those who were working for an autocephalous Ukrainian church. A gathering on 6 December 1917 that

9. Ibid., 8.
10. Dmytro Doroshenko, *Pravoslavna Tserkva v mynulomu i suchasnomu zhytti ukraïns'koho narodu* (Berlin, 1940), 50.
11. Lotots'kyi, "Znevazhena sprava," 7.
12. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky*, 201.
13. Oleksander Lotots'kyi, "Tserkovna sprava na Ukraïni," *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk*, no. 5 (1923): 65, quoted in Nataliia Polons'ka-Vasylenko, *Istoriia Ukraïny*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1972–76), 2: 468.
14. Doroshenko, *Istoriia Ukraïny 1917–1923 rr.*, 1: 411.

included members of the Resurrection Brotherhood, as well as clerics and laymen, primarily from the Kyiv diocese, established the Provisional All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council. Declaring itself the provisional government of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, the council attempted to convene a Ukrainian Sobor on 10 January 1918. In an emotional appeal, council members stated the purpose of the proposed sobor:

> ...[Y]ou have lost your freedom, not only political but also ecclesiastical. Now, having rebuilt your People's Republic, you should have restored your once independent, autocephalous, holy Church....
>
> [T]he Russians, having rid themselves of a temporal tsar, have created a new spiritual autocrat—the Patriarch of Moscow—in order to usher...our Ukrainian people into a new spiritual slavery....
>
> [Y]ou should immediately elect your All-Ukrainian Orthodox Sobor of clergy and laymen...[and] restore the ancient independence of the Ukrainian Church....[15]

The council's appeal also called for liturgical services in Ukrainian churches to be celebrated in Ukrainian. Furthermore, the Patriarch of Moscow was no longer to be mentioned in litanies. Instead, the council asked all clerics to pray for "the God-loved and divinely protected Ukrainian State, its supreme ecclesiastical authority—the All-Ukrainian Church Council—and the Ukrainian Army" during all liturgical services.[16] The council also sought to limit delegate status at the proposed sobor to those who were Ukrainians by birth and supportive of the Ukrainian cause. Bociurkiw terms these latter actions "revolutionary."[17]

Changes in the Rada's attitude to the Ukrainian church movement began to become evident in late December 1917. The Rada recognized the All-Ukrainian Church Council by asking that a Rada representative be included in it, which was done. In response, the Rada created the office of commissar of religious affairs within the General Secretariat for Internal Affairs. These actions may have prompted the Russian church authorities to deal at last with the All-Ukrainian Church Council. Thus, an agreement was reached to call a sobor at which all bishops of Ukraine would have delegate status, along with clerical and lay representatives from each district in Ukraine.

The First All-Ukrainian Church Sobor opened at St. Sophia's Cathedral in Kyiv on 20 January 1918. Following a bitter dispute about its presidium and chairmanship, six commissions were established to deal with matters such as the administration and Ukrainization of the church. The most important issues were the relationship between the Patriarch of Moscow and the Ukrainian Church, as

15. Bociurkiw, "The Church and the Ukrainian Revolution," 236.
16. Ibid., 239.
17. Ibid., 237.

well as between the church and the Rada. In a drastic reversal of its earlier posture, the Rada enthusiastically supported an autocephalous church. However, it soon became apparent that the bishops present at the Sobor, acting in the interests of the Patriarchate of Moscow, had a markedly different interpretation of autocephaly for the Ukrainian Church than those delegates who supported complete independence from the Russian Church. Lototsky regarded the proposals made on behalf of the Patriarchate as a "complete negation" of all traces of autonomy.[18]

The Minister of Internal Affairs, Volodymyr Vynnychenko, had finally been persuaded by a delegation of the All-Ukrainian Church Council to send a representative to the Sobor. Lototsky, as General Chancellor of the Rada and an interested party in church affairs, was the intermediary between Vynnychenko and the church delegation. The Rada designated A. M. Karpinsky as its representative: he greeted the Sobor and stated that the government would "not tolerate Muscovite ecclesiastical guardians in our state," calling upon the Sobor to "grant autocephaly to the Ukrainian Church."[19] This appeal was made as the Bolshevik army was encroaching on Kyiv. As it entered the city on 1 February, the Sobor had reached no substantive agreement on the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church.

The Rada's failure to provide timely and substantive support to the church was commented on by an official, Serhii Shelukhyn, who stated that the government was not only uninterested in the church but hostile toward it. "Hrushevsky would not hear of it, and Vynnychenko merely scoffed. This happened because they did not comprehend the national significance of the matter."[20] Without doubt, the lack of support on the part of the government was instrumental in the Sobor's failure to reach agreement with the bishops.

Lototsky thought that from its inception the Sobor could not have yielded any positive result for the Ukrainian Church, as most of the representatives attending it were, in his judgment, anti-Ukrainian. "The majority of participants in the two church sobors in Kyiv in 1918 were people of reactionary and Russifying tendencies, enemies of Ukrainian statehood and the Ukrainian Church."[21] Accordingly, in his two-volume work *Avtokefaliia* (Autocephaly),

18. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 2 vols. (Warsaw, 1935–38), 2: 460.

19. D. Skrynchenko, "Vseukrainskii tserkovnyi sobor," *Kievskii pravoslavnyi vestnik*, no. 4 (1918): 90, quoted in Bociurkiw, "The Church and the Ukrainian Revolution," 243.

20. *Ukraïns'kyi holos* (Winnipeg), 12 August 1925, as quoted in Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys istorii*, vol. 4, bk. 1, 23.

21. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 2: 459. Lototsky is in fact referring to two sessions of a single Sobor.

Lototsky referred to the gathering as a "quasi-Ukrainian Sobor"[22] that did not represent the interests of the Ukrainian state or the Ukrainian faithful. This was further evidenced, he concluded, by an analysis of the projected articles of autonomy for the Ukrainian Church. They called for the Patriarch of Moscow to give his blessing, that is, his permission, for the calling of a Ukrainian sobor and for the election of the Metropolitan of Kyiv and all the diocesan bishops of Ukraine. Thus, neither the Metropolitan of Kyiv nor any other bishop in Ukraine could accede to his see without the consent of the Patriarch of Moscow. The articles also stated that every Ukrainian diocese was part of the Russian Church. Lototsky saw these stipulations as negating the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church.[23] Further, in a direct repudiation of the earlier decision of the All-Ukrainian Church Council, the Patriarch of Moscow was to be commemorated in all divine services celebrated in Ukraine. Since the ecclesiastical title of the Patriarch of Moscow includes the words "of all Russia," Lototsky argued that, in an independent Ukraine, such terminology was clearly inappropriate.[24] If the proposals were to be adopted, wrote Lototsky, then the autonomy of the Ukrainian church would constitute a "fiction."[25] Indeed, the church would be reduced to the status that it had had when it originally came under the rule of the Moscow Patriarchate.

At this low point, the fortunes of the autocephalist movement were unexpectedly revived by the Hetman regime.[26] The cordial relationship between the new Ukrainian government and the Orthodox Church was emphasized by the liturgical anointing of Hetman Skoropadsky by Bishop Nikodim, without the blessing of the Patriarch of Moscow, in St. Sophia's Cathedral in Kyiv on 29 April 1918.[27] In the section "Concerning Religion" of the Hetman's initial decree, issued on the same day, Orthodox Christianity was referred to as the leading religion of the Ukrainian state. The decree, however, also provided that all citizens of Ukraine would be free to practice their own religions.[28]

The new government proceeded to establish a ministry of religious affairs headed by Vasyl Zinkivsky, a professor at the University of Kyiv. The ministry

22. Ibid.

23. Lotots'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki dzherela tserkovnoho prava*, 131–32.

24. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 2: 460.

25. Ibid.

26. For an account of the failure of the Rada and the establishment of the Hetmanate, see Alexander J. Motyl, *The Turn to the Right: The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism, 1919–1929* (Boulder, CO, 1980), 5–32.

27. Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State*, 53–54. Curtiss states that apparently the Patriarch did not punish Bishop Nikodim for "this pro-German act" (54).

28. For the text of the decree, see Doroshenko, *Istoriia Ukraïny 1917–1923 rr.*, 2: 49–53.

soon found itself at odds with the Russian bishops. The first major battle was waged over the election of the Ukrainophobe Antonii Khrapovitsky to the Metropolitanate of Kyiv. He had forbidden his priests to read the Gospel in Ukrainian at liturgical services when he was archbishop of Kharkiv, and Lototsky notes that Khrapovitsky had referred to the Ukrainian language as suitable for the marketplace, but not for the worship of God.[29] Prior to this election, the usual practice had been to elect the Metropolitan of Kyiv at a local diocesan congress. The Sobor rejected Zinkivsky's suggestion that the Metropolitan of Kyiv was the ranking hierarch of Ukraine and should therefore be elected by representatives from every diocese in the country. At the diocesan congress that elected Khrapovitsky, decisions were also made against the autocephalist movement, as well as against the Ukrainization of liturgical services. The newspaper *Golos Kieva* (Voice of Kyiv) referred to the actions of the congress as a return to the "unity of the Russian state."[30]

The Hetman government, however, refused to recognize the election of the new metropolitan. The government hoped that the next session of the Sobor, scheduled for June, would unseat Khrapovitsky; in the meantime, it did nothing to prevent him from assuming the rights of the Kyivan see. Describing the reaction of the Ukrainian intelligentsia to Khrapovitsky's election, Serhii Iefremov wrote, "They elected a man...who made for himself the reputation of the staunchest Russifier...[whom] the 'flock' and all nationally conscious Ukrainians will [regard]...as an enemy of the Ukrainian idea."[31] Far from endorsing autocephaly, the June session of the Sobor purged most supporters of Ukrainization from its ranks and made Khrapovitsky head of the Supreme Church Council. The Ukrainian church movement was left profoundly frustrated.

Only in the autumn of 1918 did the Hetman government seek reconciliation with the Ukrainian opposition parties, at which point Zinkivsky tendered his resignation as minister of religious affairs. Lototsky, the Hetman government's first choice for that position in April, had declined because of his commitment to the Ukrainian People's Republic and the cause of autocephaly. He now accepted, seeing an opportunity to implement the policies that he favored.

At a cabinet meeting held on the day of Lototsky's appointment, 24 October 1918, the matter of autocephaly for the Ukrainian Church and the activities of the All-Ukrainian Church Council were discussed. This discussion arose in part because a third session of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Sobor was scheduled for late October in Kyiv. That meeting, held in Kyiv at the Monastery of the Caves,

29. Lotots'kyi, "Znevazhena sprava," 8.

30. *Golos Kieva* (Kyiv), 29 May 1918, quoted in Bociurkiw, *Politics of Religion*, 20.

31. *Nova Rada* (Kyiv), 21 May 1918, quoted in Doroshenko, *Istoriia Ukraïny 1917–1923 rr.*, 2: 325.

was delayed for two days in a vain attempt to reach its quorum of three hundred delegates.[32] The first issue that arose was that of the amendments made by the Patriarch of Moscow to the Provisional Church Statute and the Hetmanate's reservations concerning them.[33] As minister of religious affairs, Lototsky addressed the Sobor, appealing on behalf of the government for autocephaly for the Ukrainian Church. Most of the assembled delegates responded with vehement protests. Lototsky then took the issue to the cabinet and persuaded it to rule in favor of autocephaly.

The cabinet decision, issued on 13 November, was announced by Lototsky to the Sobor on the very next day:

> The Government, during my predecessor's term of office, adopted a provisional and compromise solution and sought to reach an understanding with the Moscow Patriarch in view of the previous connection of our Church with the former Russian Church. But these attempts not only did not help to solve the problem, but made it even more complex. The autocratic demands of the Moscow Patriarch, who even wishes to approve Ukrainian bishops, revert the question to its original state. The Ukrainian Government and the Church Sobor are again facing the same task: to establish order in the Church and to this end, first of all, to create the fundamental law for the Ukrainian national Church. The situation requires that the Government state clearly and firmly those basic assumptions from which it approaches the formulation of the legal relations between the Church and the State. In our country the Church is connected with the State and, therefore, the Government has not only the right but also the duty to formulate their mutual relationship....
>
> The basic principle of the Ukrainian state power consists in the following: in an independent state, there must also be an independent Church. This is required by the interests of both the State and the Church. No government that understands its duties to the State would agree to having the center of ecclesiastical authority located in another state. The less is it admissible in the present case, in view of the cardinal differences between the two states with regard to both their political regimes and the legal status of the Church in Muscovy and in...Ukraine. Therefore, in its relations to other churches, the Ukrainian Church must be autocephalous, headed by the Kievan Metropolitan and maintaining canonical ties with other independent churches. As to the other aspects of our Church-State relations, their relations should rest on the immutable basis: Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's....
>
> Accordingly, the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church represents not only an ecclesiastical but also our national and state necessity.... On behalf of the Government of the Ukrainian State, I have the honor to announce its firm and

32. Bociurkiw, *Politics of Religion*, 27.

33. The entire statute is printed in Dmytro Doroshenko, *Istoriia Ukraïny 1917–1923 rr.*, 2: 328–30.

unshakable view that the Ukrainian Church should become autocephalous.[34]

While the government's position had its supporters within the church, there were also delegates at the Sobor who claimed that there was greater freedom for the church in Bolshevik Russia. D. Skrynchenko, a supporter of Metropolitan Khrapovitsky, stated:

> The Sobor expresses the will of the people. This will is clear. Only the Government fails to understand it. The ground is already prepared, now is the time to realize it, and, having extended [the Government's] hand to the Sobor, to admit: we [have] erred; we shall now join the people who do not desire separation from Russia and her Church. But if the Government even now fails to comprehend the events, if it still intends to violate the Sobor's decision, who knows whether the Sobor would not have to resort to...the excommunication of the violators.[35]

It is likely, states Bociurkiw, that influential delegates to the Sobor were aware of the Hetman's impending federation with Russia,[36] and therefore could be bold with threats of excommunication. There was also talk of excommunicating Lototsky in particular for his suggestion that those who were not happy with government policy toward the church could feel free to move to Soviet Russia.[37] The Holy Synod of Bishops eventually resolved that those who rejected the decisions of the Sobor should be defrocked if they were priests and excommunicated if laypersons.

The Hetmanate's support for the emerging national church in Ukraine was not tested because, three days after Lototsky's declaration to the Sobor, the cabinet itself was dissolved. When the Hetmanate declared its federation with Russia on 14 November, the day of Lototsky's address to the Sobor, he gave up his ministerial position and was temporarily replaced by Mykhailo Voronovych. Although Lototsky states in his memoirs that he "resigned" from the post of minister,[38] it was in fact Skoropadsky who authorized the removal of cabinet members known to support Ukrainian sovereignty in an attempt to appease the Entente-supported Russian Whites.[39] Given the announcement of Ukraine's federation with Russia, the November session of the Sobor vehemently rejected

34. Lotots'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki dzherela*, 133–34, quoted in Bociurkiw, *Politics of Religion*, 27–28.
35. *Golos Kieva* (Kyiv), 16 November 1918, quoted in Bociurkiw, *Politics of Religion*, 28.
36. Bociurkiw, *Politics of Religion*, 59.
37. Lotots'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki dzherela*, 134.
38. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 9.
39. See Doroshenko, *Istoriia Ukraïny 1917–1923 rr.*, 2: 415–17; Hunczak, "The Ukraine under Hetman Pavlo Skoropadskyi," 78.

any notion of autocephaly for the Ukrainian church. It also rejected the Ukrainian government's "interference" in all ecclesiastical affairs. The Ukrainization of the liturgy was halted, and Church Slavonic was adopted as the official liturgical language of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine. The bases for the Sobor's decisions are cited by Lototsky in his later work on ecclesiastical law:

> the spiritual need of all peoples to pray in a language different from the usual language of everyday speech...the general and unanimous desire of the entire Ukrainian populace, expressed through their representatives at the diocesan congresses in 1918; as well as...the fact that the Church Slavonic language...unites all Slavic churches and peoples....[40]

Lototsky, who had worked on one of the translations of Scripture into modern Ukrainian, as well as the translation and publication of a series of Orthodox liturgical books, was adamantly opposed to the Sobor's decisions. He considered that the purpose of translating Scripture and liturgical rites into Ukrainian was to bring them "closer to the popular consciousness, to broaden and deepen their influence on the life of the nation through the living vernacular."[41]

Vasyl Lypkivsky, in analyzing the developments in the Ukrainian autocephalous movement, stated that there was one supreme flaw in the effort to establish an autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine. The ground had not been properly prepared for it: "Their [the movement's] decision to begin the renaissance at the top...was incontestably mistaken, for without the necessary preparation at the bottom...the less conscious people, though excessively fervent, are not a firm foundation for the establishment of a church."[42] In effect, Lypkivsky was referring to the process of building a Ukrainian national identity, which was far from complete when supporters of Ukrainian autocephaly attempted to establish an independent church on that insecure political foundation. While the church historian Ivan Vlasovsky disagrees, maintaining that one had "to begin at the top with the creation of a national Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchy," he also notes that government support was indispensable if the church were to survive.[43]

The fall of the Hetmanate and the eventual occupation of Kyiv by the forces of the Directory under the leadership of Symon Petliura (14 December 1918) began a new phase of relations between the Ukrainian government and the Orthodox Church, one in which Lototsky would once again play a significant role.

---

40. Lotots'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki dzherela*, 49n.
41. Ibid., 49.
42. Lypkivs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïns'koï Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy*, 13.
43. Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys istoriï*, vol. 4, bk. 1, 59.

An interim Ukrainian Revolutionary Committee headed by Volodymyr Chekhivsky assumed power in Kyiv until the arrival of the Directory. One of the committee's first actions was the arrest and exile of Metropolitan Antonii Khrapovitsky and Archbishop Evlogii Georgievsky for their appeal to the population to oppose the Directory. They were sent to a Greek Catholic monastery in Buchach in western Ukraine. Although Lototsky held the office of commissar for the ministry of religious affairs during this interim phase, the arrest of the two clerics took place without his knowledge. Subsequently he accepted the decision of the government, as well as the official justification of the hierarchs' exile on grounds of seditious activity.

The removal of Khrapovitsky and Georgievsky gave some freedom of action to the autocephalist clergy. Directory officials were welcomed by Archbishop Ahapit Vyshnevsky of Katerynoslav in St. Sophia's Cathedral on 19 December 1918. Symon Petliura, the Directory's commander-in-chief (*otaman*), was greeted there as a liberator. Ahapit, it should be noted, had been the vice-rector of the Poltava seminary while Petliura was a student there. Another participant in the ceremonies was the Rev. Vasyl Lypkivsky, who delivered a welcoming address.[44]

The autocephalists gathered under the auspices of the SS. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood, which had been created when they were outvoted at an earlier Sobor. The brotherhood renewed the call for the state proclamation of ecclesiastical autocephaly and the creation of a Ukrainian Synod of Bishops. Petliura appointed supporters of autocephaly to senior government posts. Chekhivsky, for example, was appointed premier, and Serhii Shelukhyn, also a member of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood, became minister of justice. Similarly, the ministry of religious affairs was headed by Dr. Ivan Lypa of Odesa. There had been an initial decision by the cabinet to abolish the ministry of religion, probably, as Bociurkiw notes, because of "pressure from Vynnychenko, the most anticlerical member of this body."[45] But Petliura's appointees were influential enough to override the objections of those cabinet members of the Directory who were described by John S. Reshetar, Jr., as "secularists...opposed to the perpetuation of the close relationship between Church and State which had existed under the Hetman's regime...."[46] There had also been support for subordinating the ministry of religious affairs to that of public education, but, after protests from the autocephalists, the proposal was dropped.

The Directory moved quickly to make the Ukrainian Orthodox Church

44. Bociurkiw, *Politics of Religion*, 32, 60.

45. Ibid., 61.

46. John S. Reshetar, Jr., "Ukrainian Nationalism and the Orthodox Church," *American Slavic and East European Review* 10 (1951): 41–42.

independent. The law on autocephaly, enacted on 1 January 1919, was officially titled "The Law on the Supreme Authority of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Conciliar Church."[47] It was drafted by the new minister of justice, Serhii Shelukhyn. Upon its enactment, Lototsky received the special assignment of obtaining from the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople a *tomos* (decree) of autocephaly for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, that is, the Patriarch's official recognition that the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was indeed an independent church and an equal member of the family of Orthodox churches.

Government decrees of autocephaly were not unprecedented in the Orthodox world. For example, the Greek government declared its Orthodox Church autocephalous in 1833 without the consent of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. In consequence of that decree, the Patriarch refused all contact with the Orthodox Church of Greece for two decades. Its affairs were administered by a Holy Synod, which constituted a department of state—a system based on the Holy Synod in the Russian Empire. A procurator was appointed by the Greek government to oversee the Synod's activities. Not until 1850 did the Ecumenical Patriarchate recognize the autocephalous Orthodox Church of Greece by issuing a *tomos*.[48]

The Directory's law on autocephaly, consisting of seven articles, established a Ukrainian Church Synod (Ukrainskyi Tserkovnyi Synod) composed of two bishops, one archpriest, one priest, one deacon, three members of the laity, and a chaplain. Members of the Ukrainian Synod were to be elected by a Sobor, which would present them to the government for approval.[49] Although the Synod was given the responsibility for directing the affairs of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, "supreme ecclesiastical authority in Ukraine—legislative, judicial, and administrative" was invested in the All-Ukrainian Church Sobor.[50] The statute also provided that the state would have certain powers over the church.

The requirement for the Ukrainian government's approval of all church activity was contained in Articles 2, 4, and 7:

> 2) Until the convocation of a Sobor, which shall elect members of the Synod and present them for the Government's approval, members of the Church Synod shall be appointed by the Supreme Ukrainian Republican Government....
> 4) The Ukrainian Synod shall meet in the presence of a representative of the

47. The entire text, first published in *Trybuna* on 2 January 1919, is cited in Lotots'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki dzherela*, 297–98.

48. See Theofanis G. Stavrou, "The Orthodox Church of Greece," in *Eastern Christianity and Politics in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Pedro Ramet (Durham, NC, 1988), 187–91.

49. Lotots'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki dzherela*, 297.

50. Ibid.

> Republican Government...as the State Representative. His duties shall include: the supplying of information, the explanation of laws, [and] supervision over the implementation of laws and decisions of the Synod which do not violate the interests of the Republic....
>
> 7) The Ukrainian Church Synod shall elaborate rules directing its activities, as well as those relating to the convocation of the Church Sobor, which shall enter into force upon their approval by the Ukrainian Republican Government.[51]

These provisions were intended to give the upper hand to the Ukrainian autocephalist movement, whose members were still a minority within the church. In analyzing the autocephaly law, Bociurkiw notes that it "paradoxically resembl[ed] prerevolutionary ecclesiastical legislation in some respects."[52] The church remained subordinate to the state, as before 1917, but the state was now an independent Ukrainian republic, and according to Article 6 of the law on autocephaly, all ties with the Moscow Patriarchate were severed.

Petliura, as head of the Directory, gave autocephaly his full support. Later, in exile, Petliura voiced his opinion that the church in Ukraine should be a national church and that the road to that goal would be ensured by autocephaly. Indeed, Petliura went so far as to advocate a Ukrainian Patriarchate. As he wrote in 1921, "I believe that the Ukrainian autocephalous church should have as its head *its own* patriarch as a logical completion of its hierarchical structure and of the evolution of our national thought, our national ecclesiastical ideology."[53]

The attempt to establish an autocephalous church was again aborted when Kyiv fell to the Bolshevik army in February 1919. Forced to retreat to the west, the Directory established its headquarters in Kamianets-Podilskyi. In August 1919, its forces managed to regain Kyiv for a short time, only to lose it to General Anton Denikin's White Army. By the autumn of 1919, the Red Army had taken control of Kyiv, and on 21 December 1919, a Soviet government was formed in Ukraine. When the Soviet Union was established on 30 December 1922, Ukraine became a member along with Russia, Belarus, and Transcaucasia. The autocephalist movement continued under Soviet rule in Ukraine, its activities culminating in a Ukrainian Sobor in Kyiv (14–30 October 1921) that consecrated bishops for the church.[54]

---

51. Bociurkiw, *Politics of Religion*, 33–34; Ukrainian text in Lotots'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki dzherela*, 297–98.

52. Bociurkiw, *Politics of Religion*, 33. See also Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, "The Issues of Ukrainization and Autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in Ukrainian-Russian Relations, 1917–1921," in *Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj et al. (Edmonton, 1992), 245–73.

53. Letter to the minister of religious affairs, Ivan Ohiienko, dated 19 December 1921, in Symon Petliura, *Statti, lysty, dokumenty*, 2 vols. (New York, 1956–79), 1: 403.

54. An account of the 1921 Sobor of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and

The revolution gave the autocephalist movement an opportunity to establish an independent Ukrainian church. There was, as we have seen, more or less limited support for that goal on the part of the three Ukrainian governments in power from 1917 until the establishment of Soviet rule in late 1919. The Rada had not been very interested in church matters, although the church may have had its best chance to Ukrainize itself under the authority of the populist Hrushevsky. The Hetmanate, by contrast, was involved and interested in the affairs of the church, but was supported primarily by conservative landed and industrial interests, among whom Russian influence was dominant. These people generally favored the restoration of a united Russian Empire and of the former social system.[55] Finally, the church might eventually have been established canonically, with the support of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, under the Directory, but there was simply too little time to carry out Petliura's policy. In the words of Bociurkiw, "Of the several causes that prevented the autocephalists from breaking the opposition of the ecclesiastical authorities, the instability of the Ukrainian national government was the most obvious."[56]

When Lototsky wrote in his memoirs about the events in Ukraine in 1917–20, he still had a difficult time recording what he termed the "stormy period."

> Part three of my *Pages from the Past* ended with the beginning of the Revolution. The chronological continuation of notes from my memory ought to consist of remembrances from the period of the revolutionary storm—the Central Rada, the Hetmanate, and the Directory. However, the events of that stormy period are still so fresh; they pass through my memory and I still experience them as immediate impressions, and those impressions...contain a good deal of bitterness. It would therefore be difficult not to say a bitter word about that which took place and about the dramatis personae of the time, who even today are either dispersed in exile or, worse, on that side [in Soviet Ukraine]; of the latter, for obvious reasons, it is best to say nothing at all.[57]

---

the church's further history is beyond the scope of this paper. See Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys istorii*, vol. 4, bk. 1, 106–58; Lypkivs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïns'koï Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy*, 34–56.

55. Bociurkiw, *Politics of Religion*, 19.
56. Bociurkiw, "Rise of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church," 230.
57. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 5.

Chapter Three

The Ecumenical Patriarchate and Ukrainian Orthodoxy, 1919–1920

Once Lototsky gave up his ministerial duties, he hoped to devote time to political and literary activities. He wanted to work for the Central Committee of the Socialist-Federalist Party, as well as for the Kyiv branch of Prosvita.[1] In addition, he planned to devote time to writing Ukrainian books for children.

The Bolshevik advance made such plans impracticable. Realizing that the Bolshevik occupation of Kyiv was only a matter of time, Lototsky began to make plans for securing the safety of his family and himself. The question was whether to remain in Kyiv or to accept one of several diplomatic missions offered to him.[2] Accepting such a mission, besides removing him from the reach of the Bolshevik forces, would give Lototsky an opportunity to complete the projects he had put aside earlier because of his governmental work. In making the decision to leave Kyiv, Lototsky took advice from two of his most trusted friends, Petro Stebnytsky and Serhii Iefremov. The latter was so depressed by the approaching catastrophe that he confessed to Lototsky, "it was better not to live, to let the Bolsheviks kill me so as not to commit this act myself."[3] Although Lototsky had the utmost respect for Iefremov, he could not himself imagine being so despondent.

On 20 January 1919, Lototsky was formally named Ukraine's ambassador to Turkey to replace the outgoing ambassador of the Hetmanate. During the Hetmanate, an ambassador had already been sent there. Under the influence of Volodymyr Chekhivsky, head of the Council of Ministers, the Directory decided to continue representing Ukrainian interests in Constantinople. Chekhivsky also wanted to have an ambassador in Constantinople in order to secure autocephaly

---

1. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 9–10. Prosvita (Enlightenment Society) was first organized in Galicia in 1868; in eastern Ukraine, the first branch was established in Katerynoslav in 1905, and the organization soon spread to many other centers. It was primarily responsible for publishing popular literature. The Kyiv branch organized libraries and offered concerts and lectures.
2. Lototsky does not mention where these other diplomatic missions were located.
3. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 10.

for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church from the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

The decision to accept the ambassadorial post was not made by Lototsky alone, as we learn from his son's memoirs; Lototsky's wife also played an important role in that process. Borys further states that his father,

> Not being a career diplomat...hesitated to accept, but my mother, who had never before intervened in my father's affairs, observed that other potential candidates were not career diplomats either and, moreover, did not have the advantage of a thorough knowledge of the church problems they were expected to discuss and solve. Furthermore, she felt my father's extensive bureaucratic experience would be very helpful. So he finally accepted the offer....[4]

As Borys Lotocki affirms, "All these happenings had a decisive influence on the fate of our family."[5]

Before leaving for Constantinople to assume his duties, Lototsky chose his new embassy staff. Although the embassy in Constantinople already had a staff appointed during the Hetmanate, Lototsky knew none of them except the embassy secretary, Petro Chykalenko, and wanted to work with people he knew personally. While some members of the original staff were allowed to stay, Lototsky also selected nine new members. Among them was his daughter, Oksana, who spoke French as well as Russian and Ukrainian, and would act as official translator in Constantinople.

Premier Chekhivsky called a meeting in Kyiv of all of Ukraine's new ambassadors before they left for their new posts. Lototsky recalled that the purpose of this gathering was to remind the ambassadors of the Ukrainian government's policy and attitude toward the political situation in Russia. It was no secret, Chekhivsky stated, that Ukraine would soon be cut off from the rest of Europe by the imminent Bolshevik invasion.[6] Although Chekhivsky firmly believed that Ukraine would emerge from this temporary Bolshevik occupation, he still anticipated a difficult road ahead. Lototsky recalls in his memoirs Chekhivsky's admission that Ukraine would have to battle for its independence on two fronts: locally against the approaching Bolshevik forces and internationally against anti-Ukrainian sentiment outside the now defunct Russian Empire.

The policy of the Directory, stressed Chekhivsky, was to defend Ukraine's independence resolutely and oppose all foreign intervention. The rights of foreign citizens on Ukrainian territory would be protected, but interference in Ukraine's internal affairs would not be tolerated. It was also the assigned responsibility of each ambassador to study the economic base of the country of his embassy and

4. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 51.

5. Ibid.

6. For a discussion of the Bolshevik occupation of Ukraine, see Arthur E. Adams. *Bolsheviks in the Ukraine: The Second Campaign, 1918–1919* (New Haven, 1963).

develop a plan for foreign trade with, and investment in Ukraine by, that country. Finally, the ambassadors were to maintain constant contact not only with Kyiv, but also with one another, and to file weekly reports on their activities and observations. Admonishing the ambassadors to remember that they must always represent the best interests of an independent Ukraine, Chekhivsky also reminded them to be respectful of their foreign hosts, as their actions and attitudes would reflect upon Ukraine.[7]

When he wrote his memoirs, Lototsky was amused that "after twenty years of wandering the earth,"[8] he still had his notes from the meeting. All those ABCs of diplomatic work, as Lototsky described Chekhivsky's instructions, would not have been necessary if the Directory had been in a position to appoint people to the corps with previous experience in diplomacy. While the first anniversary of the Ukrainian People's Republic was being celebrated in Kyiv, Oleksander Lototsky and his family prepared for their departure from Ukraine to Turkey. Because Lototsky's posting was among the government's last ambassadorial appointments, he left Kyiv later than his colleagues. He participated in the anniversary celebrations in Kyiv—celebrations overshadowed by the political problems of the young Ukrainian state and the approach of the Bolshevik forces.

The appointment of Lototsky as the Ukrainian ambassador to the Turkish Sultanate was an important one for the Ukrainian government, as well as for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church.[9] The Directory had proclaimed the Orthodox Church in Ukraine jurisdictionally independent of the Russian Orthodox Church; recognition of the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church by the Ecumenical Patriarchate was indispensable to the consolidation of that status.[10]

---

7. Chekhivsky's comments at the gathering of ambassadors are summarized by Lototsky in *V Tsarhorodi*, 12–14.
8. Ibid., 12.
9. There is a dearth of scholarly literature on this period of Ukrainian history and Ukrainian-Turkish relations. There has also been very little written concerning the relationship between the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate during this period. One of the few commentaries is Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys istorii*, vol. 4, bk. 1, 60–82. For the history of Turkey during this period, the standard works in English are: G. L. Lewis, *Turkey*, 3d ed. (London, 1965); Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 2d ed. (London, 1968); Stanford J. Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. 2, *Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808–1975* (Cambridge, UK, 1977); William Miller, *The Ottoman Empire and its Successors, 1801–1927*, 3d ed. (London, 1966).
10. On autocephaly and its importance in church-state relations, see Pedro Ramet, "Autocephaly and National Identity in Church-State Relations in Eastern Christianity: An Introduction," in *Eastern Christianity and Politics in the Twentieth Century*, ed.

During the trip to Istanbul,[11] Lototsky reflected upon the relationship between Ukraine and Turkey "in the past, present and future."[12] That relationship included centuries of conflict. During the First World War, however, Turkey became a sympathizer and supporter of an independent Ukrainian state, expressing its desire to establish full diplomatic relations with Ukraine. Lototsky was confident that mutual interests would make the two countries good neighbors. Ukraine had two natural allies, Poland to the west and Turkey to the south, wrote Lototsky, both of which would be valuable in defending Ukraine. "Their difficult experiences in the past were largely due to the inability of all three [Ukraine, Poland, and Turkey] to come to an understanding of their mutual interests. In the future, their mutual fate will depend on whether they attain that understanding...."[13]

The historical and contemporary significance of the relationship between Ukraine and Turkey gave Lototsky a greater appreciation of his unique new post and increased his determination to succeed in it. As Turkey had historically been both an enemy and an ally of Ukraine, Lototsky believed that his first diplomatic steps and decisions would greatly affect the countries' new relationship. Moreover, those tasks would have to be accomplished while working under difficult and adverse conditions. To begin with, Istanbul was governed at the time by Allied commissioners who controlled the Turkish foreign ministry, which would decide whether to recognize Lototsky as the ambassador of Ukraine.

In his memoirs, Borys Lotocki reflects upon the political events in Turkey that affected his father's new career:

> This new period was by no means a treat for my father. In Constantinople he represented the Ukrainian government (which was conducting a losing battle on two fronts against Red and White Russians) at the court of Mehmed VI, whose country had been defeated in the war and was occupied by the Allied troops. The Allied command was behaving in a most reckless way; it had its own military police and they shamelessly interfered in all kinds of local matters.
>
> Constantinople had been invaded by tens of thousands of refugees, first

---

Pedro Ramet (Durham, NC, 1988). Steven Runciman discusses the relationship between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Ukraine in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in his *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (London, 1968), 262–65, 332–34.

11. In his memoirs, Lototsky uses the modern name, Istanbul (Stambul), as well as the Byzantine name, Constantinople (Tsarhorod).
12. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 20–32. Also included in *V Tsarhorodi* are Lototsky's views on Turkish history, politics, and culture, as well as on Ukraine's relationship with Turkey.
13. Ibid., 24.

from Odessa and then from the Crimea. It had become the center of their activities directed toward the restoration of the Russian Empire; so, of course, they were fanatically opposed to the independence of Ukraine.[14]

Lototsky describes his first step on Turkish soil on 23 April 1919 as very moving. "The morning was sunny and, before my eyes, as if in a fairy-tale dream, was the picturesque panorama of Constantinople."[15] Worried that he and his family, as well as the embassy delegation, might have trouble with their documents, having already had great difficulty in reaching Turkey, Lototsky was relieved to encounter no complications whatever in being admitted to Istanbul. Having been met by the outgoing members of the Ukrainian embassy, the family and staff arrived at the Péra Palace Hotel, where they would stay for a month until permanent lodgings were found.

On 3 December 1919, the Lototsky family moved from its original dwelling to what Borys Lotocki describes as "the elegant section of Constantinople."[16] The move, according to Lototsky, was designed to promote the viability, by improving the visibility, of the Ukrainian presence in Constantinople.[17] From this new location, Lototsky was able to organize the embassy offices and learn firsthand about the political situation in Turkey.[18] His first major task was to review the activities of his predecessor, Mikhail Sukovkin, and then to advise the authorities about the new government in Ukraine, as well as his own ambassadorial appointment.

The transfer of power, once Lototsky had arrived in Istanbul, did not go well. When Lototsky met with his predecessor and handed him the official orders of the Ukrainian government to surrender documents, as well as other property of the embassy, Sukovkin refused to release the property. Later it was discovered

14. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 57.

15. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 33.

16. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 69.

17. Interviews with Dr. Borys Lotocki de Veligost conducted in Muralto, Switzerland, 17–20 August 1988.

18. Frequently Lototsky received information from an unlikely source, his own bodyguards. Known as *kavas*, these manservants were on staff at all embassies in Constantinople to protect the ambassadors. Borys Lotocki comments particularly on one of those "guards," a Montenegrin by the name of Demo, who liked Oleksander Lototsky very much. "His most important characteristic was his absolute devotion to his boss, my father. At important diplomatic receptions, when the Embassy's own butler and *kavas* could not cope alone, they usually called in their colleagues from other embassies to help.... Demo...was quite often called to help out on such occasions. Usually the very next morning he made a confidential report to my father about everything he had seen and heard the evening before. Much of the time his information was quite valuable." Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 60–61.

that he had sold the car and furniture belonging to the Ukrainian legation. These incidents did not make for a smooth introduction for Lototsky, who was angered by them. Additionally, the last person he had expected to give him trouble in Istanbul was his predecessor, of whom Hrushevsky had spoken so highly. However, Lototsky was most angered by Sukovkin's opposition to Ukrainian statehood, which seemed to have become manifest immediately following the announcement of the federation with Russia. In Lototsky's own words:

> The activity of my predecessor was not only ruinous in principle of the interests of the Ukrainian state, but also completely ruined the entire working apparatus of the embassy. Mr. Sukovkin...openly stated that there could be no question of Ukraine's state sovereignty, as Ukraine lacked an armed force to defend its independence.[19]

Lototsky and his predecessor also disagreed about the future status and role of an independent Ukrainian Orthodox Church. When Sukovkin visited the Patriarch of Constantinople, he had spoken of the unity of the Ukrainian people and the Russian Orthodox Church. Such views were consistent with his support for the Hetmanate and its declaration of a federation with Russia.

As Lototsky was opposed to the federation, and indeed had sided with the Directory because of it, it is easy to understand his difficulty in accepting Sukovkin's political position and activities. They were of great concern to Lototsky, not only during his time in Turkey, but also two decades later during the writing of his memoirs, as evidenced by his devoting an entire chapter to Sukovkin and the activities of the embassy under his leadership. Lototsky felt that he now had to clean up the disorder resulting from Sukovkin's "scandalous" conduct.[20]

Lototsky found the embassy completely disorganized. It had no offices: the official address of the embassy was the private residence of one of its staff members. Official papers were either missing or incorrectly filed. Valuable books, which were official property of the embassy and important for diplomatic work, were also missing. Fortunately, the financial records had been kept by the embassy accountant, who lived outside the embassy and was responsible for them. Given these conditions, one of Lototsky's first acts was to rent an embassy office.

Lototsky saw three major obstacles to his work for the Ukrainian cause in Turkey. "The negative attitude of the Allied military authorities, the captive situation of the Turkish government under Allied occupation, and the destructive activity of the former Ukrainian ambassador—all this created circumstances highly unfavorable to the activity and indeed to the very existence of a Ukrainian

19. Lotots'kyi. *V Tsarhorodi*, 35–36.

20. Ibid., 34, 37.

diplomatic representation."[21] Lototsky believed that in general the Turks viewed Ukrainian independence favorably, as later documents would confirm. However, the Hetmanate's proclamation of federation with Russia had lowered Ukraine's standing with the Turkish government, as portions of eastern Turkey had been seized by Russian forces in 1916.

Lototsky was keenly aware of the need to provide accurate information about Ukraine. Constantinople was one of the few places where the European press could obtain information about events in the former Russian Empire, and Lototsky began to make use of that fact. Through an interview with the Turkish daily newspaper *Ifham*, published on 4 September 1919,[22] he was able not only to inform the press about the political and military situation in Ukraine, but also to assure the Turkish people of Ukraine's good will toward them. Aside from general questions about Ukraine, its government, and its struggle for independence, Lototsky was questioned about Turkish-Ukrainian relations.

> Turkey and the Turks have attained a very high standing, based on historical memories, in Ukrainian public opinion. I have not the slightest doubt that these two countries will be natural allies in the future. This union has already existed in the past.... In the late eighteenth century, the Russian government, having destroyed the Ukrainian army, conquered Ukraine...political figures who fled from the persecutions of Russia found refuge in Turkey. Because of the hospitality that Turkey extended to them, it acquired and consolidated Ukraine's firm support.
>
> Today, Ukraine is an independent country, free of Russian absolutism. It is noteworthy that, having acquired independence, Ukraine considered the establishment of good relations with Turkey its first responsibility.[23]

Aside from giving interviews, the embassy embarked on a program of publishing brochures about various Ukrainian issues. The anonymous brochure *Turechchyna ta Ukraïna* (Turkey and Ukraine), published in Turkish during World War I by the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine,[24] was reprinted with a long introduction by Lototsky. Two collections in French were also prepared for publication. One of them, titled *L'Ukraine indépendante* (Independent Ukraine), contained brief articles stressing that theme; the other included reports on the activity of several Ukrainian embassies. However, the Allied censors refused to permit publication. In order to inform the Patriarchate and the Orthodox Greeks in Constantinople about the Ukrainian Church and its quest for

21. Ibid., 38.

22. The entire interview is reprinted in Ukrainian translation in Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 106–9.

23. Turkey also had representation in Ukraine, as it had earlier sent an ambassador to Kyiv. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 107.

24. The first page of this brochure is reproduced in *V Tsarhorodi*, 112.

autocephaly, a Greek-language brochure on the Ukrainian church was published by the embassy. Although it had been easy earlier on to publish such materials, the situation became increasingly complicated. The local Allied officials, for example, issued a special decree that forbade the local press from writing about Ukrainian issues. Not only were articles about Ukraine prohibited, but, according to Lototsky, even the word "Ukraine" was taken out of some articles, "as during the worst old days of the tsarist regime in Russia."[25]

Lacking the resources to publish on his own and unable to rely upon the local press to provide accurate information about Ukraine, Lototsky prepared a lengthy diplomatic letter addressed to the various foreign representatives in Constantinople.[26]

> [The current] situation cannot be considered normal, for not only does it infringe on the interests of Ukraine, but generally it does not correspond to the interests of the struggle against Bolshevism, the interests of establishing order in Eastern Europe. I see it as my duty to present to you these...facts...that you may deem necessary to bring to the attention of the Governments by which you are accredited.[27]

Having explained the current political situation in Ukraine, including some of its history, Lototsky set forth the reasons why Ukraine's independence would be in the best interests of the states to which he was addressing his appeal. The only true strength in Ukraine, Lototsky wrote, was not in the various Russian forces, White or Red, but in the Ukrainian people,

> who are defending their true interests on their own territory with their own strength and resources. This nation, previously enslaved by a foreign state that drained its economic and cultural powers, has now understood its interests; a witness of its consciousness and of its strength and energy is its current intense struggle with Bolshevism, which is foreign to its psyche, not only socially, but also nationally, for Bolshevism confronts it also in the concrete form of Muscovite national imperialism. It is perfectly apparent that a physically healthy and spiritually talented nation of forty million,[28] having awakened to a new life in its nation-state, will not cease to struggle against any new enslavement, no matter where the threat may originate, until it achieves its goal.[29]

Lototsky hoped that the letter had made some impact upon certain foreign representatives and would rally political support for Ukraine in general and the

25. Ibid., 110–11.

26. The entire letter is reprinted in Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 111–17.

27. Ibid., 113.

28. According to the *Encyclopedia of Ukraine* ("Population of Ukraine," 4: 150), in 1914 Ukraine had a population of 37.4 million.

29. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 115.

Directory in particular.

The difficult situation of war-torn Ukraine did not allow diplomatic activity to flourish as Lototsky had originally hoped. As the Directory began to lose support and the Bolshevik forces gained more territory in Ukraine, it became much harder for Lototsky to speak in the name of a strong and independent Ukrainian state. Indeed, the embassy staff was having great problems in obtaining regular information and carrying on correspondence with the Ukrainian government.[30] Lototsky noted that his diplomatic activity was increasingly reduced to that of making formal declarations. Nonetheless, he believed that without the Ukrainian presence in Constantinople, Allied hostility toward Ukraine would have been vastly more aggressive and much greater in scope.[31]

As the political situation in Ukraine deteriorated, Lototsky's relations with the representatives of the Allies worsened as well. "The psychology and logic of the victors [i.e., the Allies] usually did not tolerate any corrections of their decisions and actions, and all arguments confronted them like a blank wall."[32] And whenever Ukrainian diplomats tried to counteract Allied actions, they were driven to despair, wrote Lototsky. "Having closed their eyes to the truth and to the facts themselves, the victors used only their strength."[33]

Another major problem for the Ukrainian embassy was its financial status. Its bank accounts in Constantinople had been frozen by the Turkish government. Although several individuals had offered to lend Lototsky money for the embassy, he declined, knowing that the financial situation could worsen and the loans might never be repaid. Nimfodora Lototsky temporarily solved the financial crisis by setting aside a considerable sum brought with the family from Ukraine. Stating that he had never felt so poor in his life, Lototsky understood that the embassy's operation might be ended by a financial rather than a political catastrophe.

By late 1919, the political situation in Ukraine had become extremely tense as a result of successive military defeats. Communications with the Ukrainian government were becoming much more difficult, and the financial situation continued to be critical. Referring to the shortages, Borys Lotocki states that "To survive, costs had to be cut drastically. My father decided to resign...."[34] The Ukrainian government was at first reluctant to accept, probably seeing the loss of Lototsky as an additional setback in its efforts to cling to power. However, unable to monitor the situation in Constantinople, the government ultimately

30. Ibid., 72.
31. Ibid., 43.
32. Ibid., 48.
33. Ibid.
34. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 70.

agreed to Lototsky's recommendation to close the embassy.

In his memoirs, Lototsky reflected on his period of duty in Constantinople. "I was in Constantinople at the post of ambassador less than a year—from the end of April 1919 to the end of March of the following year. But during that short time circumstances changed greatly. The hopes with whose realization diplomatic missions were charged at the beginning of 1919 were constantly frustrated in conjunction with and depending upon the general situation in Ukraine."[35] Lototsky did not conclude that his mission had been futile. He believed that initially his presence and influence had been positive, as even the representatives of the Entente, which did not recognize an independent Ukrainian state, had begun to develop a more positive attitude. Most difficult for Lototsky was the fact that he had never been fully accepted by anyone other than the Ukrainian government as the ambassador of an independent Ukraine. He lamented that circumstance in his memoirs:

> ...the Ukrainian ambassador...could not obtain the formal rights that he deserved. Although I managed to establish the very best relations with the Turkish government, I received only de facto semi-official recognition, and the important act that would have officially confirmed me in the ambassadorial dignity, a meeting with the Sultan, never took place.... Thus the presence in the capital of Turkey of such an important...representative of the Ukrainian state, in such an uncertain situation, to say the least of it, lowered our sovereign prestige, which I felt continuously.[36]

Despite all these problems, in the final analysis Lototsky considered his efforts to establish Ukrainian-Turkish relations to have been positive, as they might serve future generations that would work for an independent Ukraine.

One of the Directory's primary reasons for sending Lototsky to Turkey was to have its representative at the throne of the Ecumenical Patriarch of the Orthodox Church. When the Directory issued its own law on the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church, it intended to follow normal ecclesiastical procedures in securing that status. The right of a national church to autocephaly had to be conferred by a special law, referred to as a *tomos*, promulgated by one of the ancient patriarchates of the Orthodox Church. When issued, a *tomos* was usually ratified by the remaining Orthodox Patriarchates. Once a church had received the right of autocephaly and self-government, it was no longer dependent upon a given patriarchate.[37] As the Ukrainian Church had had a special historical

35. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 138. The final days of Lototsky's ambassadorship are discussed in a chapter titled "My Resignation."

36. Ibid., 140.

37. Literature on the theology of autocephaly is quite scarce. For the canonical basis of

relationship with the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople since the very baptism of Rus', the logical choice for the Ukrainian government had been to appeal to that ancient see for ecclesiastical autocephaly. The task of securing the *tomos* was given to Lototsky.

The meeting between Lototsky and the clerics of the Patriarchate in the Phanar[38] could only take place after Lototsky had established himself in Turkey as the Ukrainian ambassador. Because the Ecumenical Patriarchate functioned at this time only at the pleasure of the Turkish government and the Allied occupying forces, the Orthodox leaders did not have a free hand when it came to matters involving international diplomacy. Receiving the Ukrainian ambassador was, moreover, an act with political ramifications, complicated by the fact that Lototsky was a government official and not a cleric.

While Lototsky was in Constantinople, the Ecumenical Patriarchal throne was vacant, and the *locum tenens* (guardian or temporary administrator) of the office was Metropolitan Dorotheos. Lototsky was accompanied to the Phanar by a Greek layman, I. Spafaris, who had completed theological studies at the Kyivan Academy. Not only did Spafaris serve as Lototsky's interpreter, but also, as an official of the Phanar, he knew the exact protocol that Lototsky would be expected to follow in order to win favors from the church hierarchy. Lototsky was met at the gates of Phanar by an entire parade of church dignitaries. He was first greeted by a lay secretary of the Patriarchate, a graduate of the St. Petersburg Academy. Lototsky was then escorted to what he describes as the "humble" patriarchal palace and greeted by the secretary of the Holy Synod, Archimandrite Dionysios. After a further greeting from the patriarch's deputy, a metropolitan,[39] Lototsky was formally escorted by bishops, priests, and monks to the office of the patriarch, where he met Metropolitan Dorotheos, the *locum tenens* of the Ecumenical throne. Lototsky asked for the metropolitan's blessing and, after kissing the latter's hand in the manner in which an Orthodox Christian greets a cleric, began his long-awaited meeting with the representative of Ecumenical Orthodoxy.[40]

---

autocephaly, see Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, vol. 1, *Zasady avtokefalii* (Warsaw, 1935). Two articles deal primarily with the proclamation of autocephaly for the Orthodox Church in America by the Patriarchate of Moscow in 1970, yet provide useful theological arguments on the subject generally. See Alexander Schmemann, "A Meaningful Storm: Some Reflections on Autocephaly, Tradition and Ecclesiology," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 15 (1971): 3–27; John Erickson, "Autocephaly in Orthodox Canonical Tradition to the Thirteenth Century," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 15 (1971): 28–41.

38. The chief Greek quarter of Istanbul where the Patriarchal Center is located.

39. Lototsky does not provide the name of this metropolitan.

40. Lototsky explains that he spoke to the metropolitan in Ukrainian, which was then

Lototsky was somewhat dismayed that this first meeting with the metropolitan proved more formal than substantive, with the parties merely discussing such matters as the geography of Constantinople and the architectural styles of churches in the city. Wanting to address more substantive matters, Lototsky asked that he be allowed to visit the metropolitan again. Surprisingly, the metropolitan responded that he would like to visit Lototsky's home in order to meet his family. Lototsky was taken aback at this request, but stated that his familial church[41] would gladly receive the metropolitan, even as early as the next day. The meeting was quickly arranged.

Metropolitan Dorotheos and his secretary were greeted with flowers by the entire family at the Lototsky home on the following day. Over breakfast, Lototsky informed the metropolitan about the current state of the church in Ukraine. It was apparent that a third meeting would have to be scheduled with the metropolitan in order to consider fully the issue of autocephaly for the Ukrainian church.

Lototsky arrived for that meeting "armed to the teeth" with a memorandum in Greek, approximately 100 pages in length, concerning the Ukrainian Orthodox Church.[42] He was well aware that the Ecumenical Patriarchate would be wary of granting autocephaly to any church located in a state that was experiencing political turmoil. Moreover, the issuance of a *tomos* of autocephaly for the Ukrainian Church was sure to be interpreted as an act hostile to the Russian Church and, indeed, to the Russian state.

Lototsky's mission was further complicated by the visit of a delegation of the Russian Orthodox Church to Constantinople. The Metropolitan of Kyiv, Antonii Khrapovitsky, and Bishop Evlogii Georgievsky of Volhynia made an official visit to Metropolitan Dorotheos. In addition to informing the metropolitan about the state of the church in the former empire, they sought to discredit Lototsky as an enemy of the Orthodox Church.[43] According to Lototsky, he was

---

translated into Greek by Spafaris. At the end of the meeting, the metropolitan inquired of Spafaris what language Lototsky had spoken. Upon learning that it was Ukrainian, the metropolitan noted that Lototsky's predecessor, Sukovkin, had addressed him in Russian. Sukovkin had also assured the metropolitan that the Ukrainian Church had no desire to separate from the Russian Church. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 87.

41. Lototsky was appropriating the words of the Apostle Paul, who referred to the familial home as the familial church.

42. This memorandum was never published. The original, in Ukrainian, was destroyed in a fire at Lototsky's residence in Warsaw in 1939. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 187.

43. Lototsky states in his memoirs that he learned of the visit from Archbishop Oleksii Dorodnytsyn and Metropolitan Dorotheos. He gives no details about his relations with Archbishop Oleksii. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 90.

described by the Russian bishops as a "wolf in sheep's clothing."[44] Metropolitan Dorotheos responded negatively to the Russian delegation, stating that the clerics of the Phanar had the right to meet with anyone who had an interest in the Orthodox Church. The metropolitan also recommended to the Russian bishops that they reconsider their opinion of the Ukrainian ambassador. Because Lototsky identified himself so closely with the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, he viewed these words and actions of Metropolitan Dorotheos as a defense of the Ukrainian church and nation.

Lototsky understood the legal and political obstacles to the granting of autocephaly. The independence of Ukraine was not assured.[45] Secondly, while the Ecumenical Patriarchate recognized the subordination of the Ukrainian Church to Moscow as an illegal act, that subordination had endured for more than 200 years and was widely accepted as part of the established order of things. The third obstacle—the vacancy of the Ecumenical throne—was also a fact that could not be altered until the political climate of Turkey changed.

Even though he knew all this, Lototsky had a separate, almost naive, view of autocephaly. He thought that autocephalous status should be based upon a mutual understanding of what was in the best interests of the Universal Church. Canon law, he believed, should ultimately be based on Christian love. "However, this ideal method of deciding the issue of autocephaly, as a sign of the bond of love between Christian churches, does not usually find a foundation in the events of church life."[46] In his role as representative of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church at the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Lototsky had to come to terms with that reality.

The refusal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to grant autocephaly to the Ukrainian Church was set forth in a letter from the Phanar to the Ukrainian government, addressed to the premier:[47]

> The Holy Synod of the Great Church of Constantinople, in response to your letter of 15 January 1919, first of all expresses to the Ukrainian government and through it to the devout Ukrainian people its ardent love and maternal sympathy on account of all the sufferings that they have experienced in the course of the World War. We must render gratitude to our Merciful and Omnipotent Lord Jesus Christ, Who has preserved the Ukrainian people safe, intact, and free from

44. Ibid.

45. When Metropolitan Dorotheos suggested in late March 1920 that a representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate travel with Lototsky to Ukraine to view the political and ecclesiastical situation at first hand, Lototsky politely declined. "To take with me an eyewitness to that situation was neither desirable nor beneficial." Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 99.

46. Ibid., 95.

47. Although Lototsky does not state to whom the title of premier refers, the letter was presumably addressed to Petliura.

every evil influence.

Addressing the main desire of Your Excellency, the Holy Synod cannot act otherwise than in accord with the true voice of history, namely, with the one that states that from the ecclesiastical point of view, Ukraine was independent for many years and that later, in 1685, owing to unfavorable circumstances, it was subjugated to the Muscovite Church; and thus both the decision of the Ukrainian people to regain their independence and the just desire of Your Excellency are not devoid of historical and canonical foundations.

The Holy Synod considers that from this point of view, there are no obstacles to its agreeing to this well-founded request, if only it were facilitated by the necessary canonical forms, indispensable in these matters and absolutely adhered to until this time. These are considered to be, first, independence; second, a request from the Ukrainian Government and Church concerning this matter to the Church upon which in one way or another it was dependent; and third, the presence of the Ecumenical Patriarch, which is indispensable so that the subsequent act might acquire the appropriate authority.

The absence of these three canonical prerequisites prevents the Holy Synod from granting the stated request, although it is both proper and just.

Should Your Excellency agree to wait some time until the election of the Patriarch, the Holy Synod believes that favorable circumstances would arise for the execution of the above-mentioned, but currently absent, forms, which would completely and definitely fulfill all your wishes.

With that steadfast hope, the Holy Synod turns with love to the beloved and devout children of the Ukrainian Church, and as their mother greets and thanks them for their filial devotion, and advises them to stand firm, united by faith, hope and charity, until such time as the Lord completes their renewed edifice, turning a deaf ear to all seductive words of non-Orthodox propaganda, and to remain subject to those to whom fate has assigned the honor and responsibility of ruling and leading them in the religious, ecclesiastical, and all other spheres. May the grace of our Lord and His peace and blessing be abundant and unending for Your Excellency and for the whole devout Ukrainian people.[48]

In a separate and more personal letter dated 9 March 1920, Lototsky was informed by Metropolitan Dorotheos of the Holy Synod's decision. The metropolitan read the letter to Lototsky in person, "with tears in his eyes."

In response to Your Excellency's missive of 15 January 1919, we have the honor to inform you as follows, according to the decision of the Synod:

As we have already earlier verbally informed His Excellency, our beloved Mr. O. Lototsky, the consideration and the reaching of a final decision regarding the matter stated in your missive are impossible at the present time for canonical reasons, owing to the vacancy of the Patriarchal throne.

In rendering this response with great love, we avail ourselves of the

48. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 94–95.

> opportunity to express the ardent good will of the Mother Church to the devout Ukrainian people, as well as our firm hope that both they and the distinguished government that has been placed over them will continue to stand firm in the ancestral Orthodox faith, awaiting with absolute certainty the fulfillment of their desire in accordance with the sacred canons and norms.
>
> Conveying on this occasion to Your Excellency and to all the honorable members of the government, as well as to the whole Ukrainian people, the prayerful blessing of [their] Mother, the Great Church of Christ, and entreating the blessing of our Lord for the success of your endeavors, I remain Your Most Distinguished Excellency's devoted and solicitous intercessor before the Lord.
>
> The *locum tenens* of the Ecumenical Throne, Dorotheos.[49]

Lototsky believed that the long-standing political ties between Moscow and Constantinople and the new postwar political realities were largely responsible for the Ecumenical Patriarchate's ultimate refusal to grant a *tomos* of autocephaly to the Ukrainian church. He states that according to private information, Metropolitan Dorotheos was not personally opposed to granting autocephaly.[50] Once the Allied forces had arrived in Turkey, they had removed the then ruling Patriarch, Germanos, from office. During the occupation, he was forced to remain in exile in a monastery until his death in 1918. The removal of the Patriarch and the restrictions placed upon the Holy Synod of Bishops of the Phanar assured the Entente that the Orthodox Church would cause no problems for either the Turkish government or the occupying forces. Since the granting of autocephaly, in the form of a *tomos*, had been the sole right of the Patriarch, it would have been impossible, indeed virtually illegal, for the *locum tenens* to issue such a decree. Accordingly, the vacancy of the Patriarchal throne was the principal official reason given for denying autocephaly to the Ukrainian church.

Ultimately, Lototsky would leave Constantinople without the *tomos* of autocephaly and with no assurance that it would be granted in the near future. It was even possible, Lototsky thought, that the Turkish government might permanently deny the Holy Synod of Bishops in Constantinople the opportunity to elect a new patriarch. So unstable was the political situation, not only in Ukraine but also in Turkey, that the three canonical circumstances necessary for the granting of the *tomos* to the Ukrainian Church discussed by Metropolitan Dorotheos in the Synod's letter to the Ukrainian government might never be fulfilled.

During his last days in Constantinople, Lototsky was warmly greeted at the Phanar by Metropolitan Dorotheos and the members of the Holy Synod. Every Sunday, Lototsky and his family would worship in the Patriarchal Church, where a place of honor was reserved for the Ukrainian ambassador. Lototsky returned

49. Ibid., 98–99.

50. Ibid., 92.

the favor by making large financial donations to the church in what he described as the traditional generous Ukrainian manner. Even following Lototsky's resignation, Metropolitan Dorotheos continued to hold the Lototsky family and the remaining members of the Ukrainian delegation in Constantinople in high regard. When the Lototsky family remained in Constantinople for an additional three months after Oleksander had left Turkey for Ukraine, the metropolitan continually invited them to church for major feast days. At Easter in 1920, a special place was reserved for them and for the acting Ukrainian ambassador, Jan Tokarzewski-Karaszewicz (Ian Tokarzhevsky-Karashevych), in the Patriarchal Church next to the American ambassador.[51]

In writing about his time in Constantinople some twenty years later, Lototsky regretted the fact that political circumstances in Ukraine and in Turkey still prevented the recognition of the Ukrainian Church by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. "A new intermission has ensued in relations between Ukraine and the Ecumenical Patriarchate until the bell of Ukrainian independence rings once again."[52]

In 1924, just four years after Lototsky's appeals on behalf of the Ukrainian Church, the Ecumenical Patriarchate under the leadership of Patriarch Gregorios VII granted a *tomos* of autocephaly to the Orthodox Church of Poland.[53] The *tomos* was granted on the basis of Canon 17 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, which stated that "the order of ecclesiastical parishes shall follow the civil and public forms."[54] In the preamble, the Ecumenical Patriarchate recognized the need to grant autocephaly to the Orthodox Church of Poland, owing to "the new circumstances of political life."[55] The *tomos* also noted the historical ties of the Kyivan Metropolitanate with the Church of Constantinople and the fact that the Metropolitanate had been illegally incorporated into the Muscovite Church in 1686:

> ...(for it is recorded that the first separation from our See of the Kyivan Metropolitanate and the Orthodox Metropolitanates of Lithuania and Poland, dependent upon it, as well as their annexation to the Holy Muscovite Church,

51. In 1920, at the Easter reception in the patriarchal palace, Metropolitan Dorotheos issued a special greeting to the Ukrainian delegation and the Lototsky family. "On this joyful day, I have only one sorrow, that being the absence of the ambassador [Lototsky] of the great state of the Ukrainian people, with whom the Ecumenical Church has been in communion for almost a thousand years." Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 100.
52. Ibid., 102–3.
53. For a complete Ukrainian translation of the 1924 *tomos*, see Nataliia Polons'ka-Vasylenko, *Istorychni pidvalyny UAPTs* (Munich, 1964), 113–16.
54. Ibid., 114.
55. Ibid., 113.

> was not accomplished according to canon law, nor was there due observance of all that was agreed upon regarding the complete ecclesiastical autonomy of the Kyivan Metropolitan, who at the time bore the title of Exarch of the Ecumenical See), We and our Holy Metropolitans...[give] Our blessing and approval to its autocephalous and independent administration.[56]

As Lototsky wrote in his memoirs, he believed that his work on behalf of the Ukrainian Church had not been in vain, since many of his arguments for autocephaly had been included in the *tomos* for the Orthodox Church of Poland. Obviously, the see of Kyiv and its metropolitan had not been physically moved to Poland, but the Patriarchate had recognized the fact that a large number of Ukrainians, originally subject to the Kyivan Metropolitanate, as well as ethnic Belarusians, both traditionally Orthodox Christian peoples, now lived in Poland and therefore deserved an autocephalous church administration.

Archimandrite Dionysios, the secretary of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, continued to correspond with Lototsky for many years following the latter's resignation and exile. In a lengthy and detailed letter to the Archimandrite, which bears no date, but was probably written after Lototsky settled in Prague in 1922,[57] he discusses the most recent developments in Ukraine and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church.

> My sincere gratitude for your greeting. You have asked me for an explanation of a matter that is very dear and painful to me. It is with the greatest enthusiasm that I answer you.
>
> More than once I had occasion to direct your attention...to the fact that the Ukrainian Church has an invincible desire for ecclesiastical independence (autocephaly). That demand has already been put into effect de facto, for without it the very religious and ecclesiastical life of the Ukrainian people would be impossible. You are aware that under the old Muscovite system of caesaro-papism, the Muscovite government, for political reasons, appointed as bishops in Ukraine only Russians or those Ukrainians who wholeheartedly supported Muscovite policies. Therefore, when the whole people undertook the struggle for national and at the same time ecclesiastical independence, it found that it did not have its own native hierarchy. You have seen and continue to see in Constantinople those princes of the church from Ukraine who have always served as Moscow's weapons in Ukraine, and who even now still breathe unquenchable hatred for the independence struggle of their Ukrainian flock in both the political and ecclesiastical spheres. But thanks be to the Lord God, the spiritual life of the Ukrainian people has not been extinguished under the

56. Ibid., 114.

57. Although the letter, which is cited in full by Lototsky in *V Tsarhorodi*, 100–103, is not dated, it must have been written after May 1922, since Lototsky thanks Archimandrite Dionysios for the greeting sent on the occasion of the wedding of his daughter, Oksana, to Jan Tokarzewski-Karaszewicz, which took place in that month.

present difficult circumstances; they do not cease to struggle against both the political and the social slavery of the Bolsheviks and the ecclesiastical bondage imposed upon them by the politicians of the Muscovite Church in episcopal miters, which threatens them with great spiritual ruin.

In their struggle for ecclesiastical independence, the Ukrainian people have not seen any moral support from anywhere, even from their former Ecumenical Mother Church. In the course of almost one year, I attempted with the utmost diligence to impart to the Ecumenical Patriarchate the whole truth concerning our struggle for independence and to incline the Patriarchate favorably to provide us with moral support.... It grieves me to state that despite the sincere personal support that I received from the Most Holy Patriarch and from you, my own church has not received from its former Mother even the slightest moral support and has been left to its own devices in the most trying circumstances. Purely formal reasons and, unfortunately, purely political considerations...took precedence over the vital interests of the religious and ecclesiastical life of a nation of forty million. And your humble servant, a faithful defender of the Ecumenical Church, was forced to perform a most sorrowful duty—to inform those who, in accord with living tradition, had turned their eyes with such faith and hope to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, about this decision.[58]

At this point in the letter, Lototsky relates the decision of the All-Ukrainian Church Council to proclaim the independence of the Ukrainian church in October 1921, stating that, because the Ukrainian people and its church had been abandoned by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, they had had to rely on their own resources.

Following the council's decision in 1921, the issue of consecrating bishops for the Ukrainian Church became a matter of survival. As Lototsky put it, "For the Ukrainian church, it became an issue of life itself to have its own episcopate and to place ecclesiastical administration in the hands of the leaders of the national church."[59] For Lototsky, the irregular consecrations of Lypkivsky and the other bishops had to be carried out in spite of the resulting canonical difficulties,[60] as they were vital to the existence of the church. The Ukrainian

58. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 100–101.

59. Ibid., 101.

60. The accepted method of consecrating bishops in the Orthodox Church, established at the so-called Apostles' Council in the year 70 C.E., was that three or at least two bishops were needed to consecrate a new bishop. The Sobor of October 1921 consecrated priests to the episcopacy without the participation of bishops. Basing their arguments upon an ancient Alexandrian practice, the lay faithful at the Sobor, together with the priests, consecrated the first two bishops, Vasyl Lypkivsky and Nestor Sharaivsky. Those two bishops then consecrated other bishops for the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. This act was never accepted by the Ecumenical Patriarchate or the other Orthodox churches, and the bishops were referred to as "self-consecrated" (*samosviaty*). The orders of the Ukrainian Orthodox

flock was without pastoral care, hence the nation had taken it upon itself to elect pastors who would provide that care. While Lototsky acknowledged that the consecrations carried out at the Sobor were a sad fact of Ukrainian church history, he also considered it necessary to grasp the psychology of a people fighting for its national church.[61]

Of greater concern to Lototsky during this period was the destruction of the church under Bolshevik rule in Ukraine. In his letter, Lototsky not only informed the Phanar about the struggle between the government and the church in Ukraine, but also made an attempt to gain moral support for the endangered faithful:

> Ukraine is currently ruled by a Bolshevik regime that is hostile to religion in general; it considers all manifestations of religion counterrevolutionary and is carrying on an organized struggle against religion. However, in combating the religious principle, Muscovite Bolshevism in Ukraine is actually fighting against the Orthodox faith.... [F]or Ukrainian patriots there is no worse prospect than to return to the Muscovite yoke in matters both political and ecclesiastical.... The renewal of divine services in a language that the people understand and the renewal of old Ukrainian church traditions and customs has aroused opposition among the Muscovite episcopate in Ukraine, which is attempting to reduce everything to the devastated forms of Muscovite church life.[62]

This letter also reveals Lototsky's concern for the Orthodox population of Western Ukraine, primarily in Galicia and Volhynia. In those regions, the Greek Catholic Church was actively urging the Orthodox faithful to convert. This was facilitated by the Greek Catholic Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky, who, as an "ardent Ukrainian patriot,"[63] in Lototsky's words, was very popular among politically conscious and active Ukrainians. But the metropolitan preached a united Ukraine in union with Rome. Various Protestant missionaries, notably Lutherans, were also proselytizing in western Ukraine, and there was popular support for the establishment of a separate national church that would be neither Orthodox (in union with Constantinople or Moscow) nor Greek Catholic (in union with Rome), but completely independent. In his letter to Archimandrite Dionysios, Lototsky expressed his disappointment at the lack of support for the

---

Church were "normalized" when Metropolitan Ioan Teodorovych, the bishop sent to provide spiritual care to the Ukrainian Orthodox faithful in the United States and Canada, was "reconsecrated" according to standard Orthodox procedures in 1949. For detailed information on the consecrations of 1921, see Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys istorii*, vol. 4, bk. 1, 111–36. See also Bociurkiw, "Rise of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church," 228–49; idem, "Ukrainization Movements within the Russian Orthodox Church, and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church," 92–111.

61. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 101.
62. Ibid., 101–2.
63. Ibid., 101.

Ukrainian Church on the part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. He lamented that if the Patriarchate had acted to defend the Orthodox faithful of Ukraine, then foreign elements, including the Russian Church, would not have had such a great opportunity to weaken the loyalty of the Ukrainian people to their Orthodox Church.

Thus, Lototsky viewed the lack of concern and action on the part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate as responsible for greatly diminishing the national characteristics and liturgical uniqueness of the Ukrainian Church:

> The Moscow Patriarchate has already done enough harm to the Ukrainian Church, which considers herself a daughter of the Ecumenical Church. The Muscovite Church, through fraud and simony, has torn this daughter from the embrace of her spiritual Mother. Following this, the Muscovite Church, by placing herself at the service of the Muscovite Caesars, has systematically extinguished the living church spirit in Ukraine, which had flourished under the protection of the Ecumenical Patriarchs. But when the spirit of God once again renewed church life in Ukraine, and when the daughter turned her eyes in supplication to her Mother, and fate assigned my unworthy person to deliver these supplications and I unceasingly knocked at the door of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, that door did not open and the prayer went unanswered. The Ecumenical Patriarchate maintained diplomatic correctness in its relations with the Moscow Patriarchate; it abided by the formalities. But did the Ecumenical Patriarchate consider sufficiently that by this act of formally washing its hands it was extinguishing the spirit of Christ's Church for a nation of forty million?[64]

Despite the lack of initiative on the part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Lototsky did not give up hope of a revival of the Ukrainian Church. But the church would invest less hope in its ecumenical mother; Ukraine's "eyes no longer turn to her with supplications, but are lowered in shame."[65] Instead, the Ukrainian Church might turn for help, predicted Lototsky, to other patriarchates and autocephalous churches in order to attain full autocephaly.

In conclusion, Lototsky apologized to the cleric for the possibly "bitter flavor" of his letter. Still, he declared himself gratified by Archbishop Dionysios's statement that the Ecumenical Patriarchate was now directing its attention to the Ukrainian Church and other churches of the former empire. Lototsky hoped that this interest would redound

> to the glory of the Holy Eastern Church. And I am profoundly convinced that your devotion to the Ukrainian Church, so well known to me, together with your extraordinary energy, will yield the finest fruits for the sacred cause of the church and bring you the greatest spiritual satisfaction and indelible memory in

64. Ibid., 102.
65. Ibid., 103.

the history of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church.[66]

Having completed his diplomatic service in Constantinople, Lototsky departed in March 1920 to spend the rest of his life in exile, first in Prague and then in Warsaw. During those years, he devoted his life to scholarly research and writing.

66. Ibid.

Chapter Four

Lototsky's Study of Autocephaly

After the fall of the independent Ukrainian state in 1920 and the refusal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to recognize an autocephalous Orthodox Church in Ukraine, Lototsky devoted years of study to the question of autocephaly.

In 1922, at the age of fifty-two, Lototsky traveled to Prague, where the Ukrainian Free University was being established with the aid of the Czechoslovak government. Lototsky wanted to teach a course on the history of the Orthodox Church, but that position had already been filled, and he was asked to teach courses in canon law. While Lototsky was less interested in that subject and lacked familiarity with it, he accepted the position.

Aside from his work at the university, Lototsky remained active within the Ukrainian community, whose numbers in Prague had greatly increased because of the large influx of new immigrants. A Ukrainian Republican Democratic Club already existed in Prague when Lototsky came to Czechoslovakia. Lototsky briefly headed that organization, which was primarily responsible for working with the Czechoslovak government in assisting Ukrainian refugees. Such help came in the form of direct aid, as well as assistance in establishing various cultural and educational institutions in the Ukrainian community.[1]

In 1928, Lototsky accepted a professorship in the Orthodox Theological Section of the University of Warsaw, which gave him the opportunity to lecture on the subject in which he felt most confident, Orthodox church history. Lototsky became the university's sole lecturer on the history of the Slavic and Romanian churches. He also hoped to educate several younger scholars, who, having an interest in the history of the Ukrainian Church, would be able in turn to teach future bishops and priests of the Ukrainian community in Poland.

Ukrainian Orthodox Christians living under Polish rule became members of the Orthodox Church of Poland, whose bishops proclaimed their church autocephalous in 1922. Some of those bishops were ethnic Russians in charge of dioceses on Ukrainian territory that was then under Polish rule. But the Synod

1. *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*, ed. Volodymyr Kubijovyč, 2 vols. (Toronto, 1963-71), 1: 866.

of Bishops of the Orthodox Church of Poland looked favorably on the need for a Ukrainian hierarchy and, in 1922, the Ukrainian Oleksii Hromadsky was consecrated bishop. Ukrainian parishes in Poland enjoyed the right to use the Ukrainian language in divine services and in religious instruction. As noted earlier, in 1924 the newly installed Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, Gregorios VII, recognized the Orthodox Church of Poland and granted it a *tomos* of autocephaly. In 1932 a second Ukrainian, Polikarp Sikorsky, a friend of Lototsky's, was consecrated bishop of the Lutsk diocese in the Volhynia province of Poland. Under bishops Hromadsky and Sikorsky, the Ukrainian population of the Orthodox Church in Poland enjoyed great autonomy in its ecclesiastical life until 1939.

In 1928, Lototsky was among the founders of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute[2] in Warsaw. He served as its director until January 1939 and oversaw the publication of more than seventy volumes. The subject matter of these works was enormously varied, including Ukrainian history, economics, theology, and political science, as well as other topics. Among the most important publications of the institute issued under Lototsky's supervision was a sixteen-volume edition of the works of Taras Shevchenko.

The Commission for the Translation of Scripture and Liturgical Publications of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute, which Lototsky headed, published several important Orthodox liturgical books, including separate volumes of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great, and the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts of St. Gregory Dialogues. The commission also prepared for publication sections of the *Trebnyk* or Book of Needs, which included the sacramental services of the Orthodox Church. The Gospels, Psalms, and Epistles in Ukrainian translation were also prepared for publication by the commission under Lototsky's direction.

To Lototsky's mind, the lack of scholarly literature on the theology of autocephaly in the Orthodox Church was unacceptable. If the Ukrainian Orthodox Church were ever to appeal for autocephalous status again, it would be necessary to support that claim with appropriate research. During his years in Warsaw, Lototsky devoted himself to laying the scholarly groundwork, producing a two-volume study of canon law and the history of autocephalous churches, *Avtokefaliia*, and *Ukraïns'ki dzherela tserkovnoho prava* (Ukrainian Sources of Ecclesiastical Law).

Archbishop Peter L'Huillier, one of the few living scholars of Orthodox canon law, comments that autocephaly is "The legitimate way for a Church entity to become canonically emancipated from the tutelage of a primatial See."[3]

2. See Liubomyr Vynar, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi i Naukove tovarystvo im. Tarasa Shevchenka, 1892–1930* (Munich, 1970).

3. Peter L'Huillier, "Accession to Autocephaly," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*

This topic has been controversial since the fourth century, according to L'Huillier, and remains a problem for which canon law does not provide a solution. The laws of autocephaly govern first of all the relationship among churches, secondly that between church and state, and finally that between church and society.[4] The question of autocephaly was therefore vital for every community (*hromada*) and nation (*narod*), argued Lototsky. Thus, "these circumstances have motivated us to dedicate our humble efforts to illuminate the matter, which has such a cardinal, and at the present moment, even acute importance in the life of the Ukrainian Church."[5]

While the term "autocephaly" is usually applied only to the manner in which Orthodox churches are administered, the concept of "self-headed" churches is not entirely unknown in the West. In the Orthodox Church, autocephaly is a "coordinating structure whose goal is to assure unity of communion of the Church in its universality."[6] Although the Roman Catholic Church knows a strong centralized form of administration in the Papacy, the Anglican and many Protestant churches function in a manner similar to that of the Orthodox Church. For example, the Anglican Church operates as a family of churches united by one faith and one liturgy, yet, within this family, the individual churches are separately administered by local bishops. While the titular head of the Anglican Church, the Archbishop of Canterbury, does not exercise authority comparable to that of the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchates, the structural principle is similar. Both churches are one in that each is united by one faith and one worship, but are diverse in that each component jurisdiction is separate in its administration.[7]

"The question of autocephaly," wrote Oleksander Lototsky in the introduction to his two-volume study of the subject, *Avtokefaliia* (1935), "still has no literature that would exhaust this question or, at the very least, adequately elucidate it. Such a state of research on this aspect of ecclesiastical life is not only unjustified, but also quite incomprehensible."[8] The task, as Lototsky

37 (1993): 267.

4. On the relationship between the Orthodox Church and the secular state, see the brief study by Steven Runciman, *The Orthodox Churches and the Secular State* (Auckland, 1971). Also of interest is an article by Pedro Ramet, "Autocephaly and National Identity in Church-State Relations in Eastern Christianity: An Introduction," in *Eastern Christianity and Politics in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Pedro Ramet (Durham, NC, 1988).
5. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: v.
6. L'Huillier, "Problems concerning Autocephaly," *Greek Orthodox Theological Quarterly* 24 (1979): 186.
7. See "Anglican Communion" in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2d ed. (London, 1974).
8. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: v.

himself recognized, was not without its difficulties, as "we have almost no particular predecessors in this field."[9] Lototsky dedicated his two-volume study to Vasyl Bidnov, a historian of the Ukrainian Church and Lototsky's colleague at the University of Warsaw.[10]

Lototsky had already published many articles and shorter pieces on the history of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine.[11] He saw *Avtokefaliia* as one of the principal foundations of a planned comprehensive history of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine. The other major study intended to serve the same purpose was *Ukraïns'ki dzherela tserkovnoho prava* (Ukrainian Sources of Ecclesiastical Law), published in Warsaw in 1931. In a bibliography of the works of Oleksander Lototsky prepared and edited by Borys Lotocki,[12] three major works are described as "being prepared for publication" at the time of Lototsky's death. Their working titles are: *Istoriia Ukraïns'koï Tserkvy* (History of the Ukrainian Church), a historical survey titled *Ukraïns'ka natsional'na dumka* (Ukrainian National Thought), and an additional volume of memoirs, *Sered revoliutsiinoï buri* (Amid the Revolutionary Storm). The manuscripts were lost in the fire and subsequent bombing in Warsaw that destroyed Lototsky's archives.

The first volume of *Avtokefaliia* opens with a general discussion of the place of religion in society. Lototsky bases his study on two major premises: that religion or spirituality is a necessary part of the life of every person, no matter how it might be suppressed, and that the Christian faith cannot be separated from

9. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 3. For a discussion of the lack of scholarly study of the theology of autocephaly, see Peter L'Huillier, "Problems concerning Autocephaly," 165-66. One of the best general studies of Orthodox canon law is N. Suvorov, *Uchebnik tserkovnogo prava* (Moscow, 1912), which includes a general history of canon law in Rus' (89-134, 170-77). An interesting section (458-506) is devoted to the history of church-state relations.

10. Vasyl Bidnov (1874-1935) was a church historian, educator, and civic leader. He graduated from the Kyivan Academy in 1902 (six years after Lototsky) and became a lecturer in the Katerynoslav Seminary. From 1929 to 1935, he was lecturer in church history at the University of Warsaw. His most important works on church history include: *Materialy po istorii tserkovnogo ustroistva na Zaporozh'e* (n.p., 1907), *Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' v Pol'she i Litve* (Katerynoslav, 1908), and *Tserkovna sprava na Ukraïni* (Tarnów, 1921).

11. Lototsky's shorter monographs on aspects of the history of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church include *Suspil'ne stanovyshche biloho dukhovenstva na Ukraïni i v Rosiï v XVIII st.* (Lviv, 1898) and *Tserkovnyi Ustav kniazia Volodymyra Velykoho* (Lviv, 1925); *Ukraïns'kyi Arkhyieratykon* (Warsaw, 1932). Lototsky wrote some fifty articles of various length about the national characteristics, customs, saints, and liturgical uniqueness of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. He also wrote three catechisms for children.

12. Bohdan Hoshovs'kyi, ed., *Lytsar pratsi i obov''iazku* (Toronto, 1983), 120-56.

the church, a tenet of Orthodox ecclesiology. According to Orthodox tradition, there are actually two churches, the heavenly or "triumphant" church, composed of the angelic orders, saints, and the souls of the righteous, and the earthly or "militant" church, made up of those who are still "fighting the good fight" on earth.[13] The militant church, to which Christ referred as the kingdom of God on earth, was founded on the faith of St. Peter.[14] In stressing the primacy of faith, the Orthodox Church differs from the Roman Catholic, which bases Peter's primacy on his having been the first bishop of Rome.[15]

There is also a second understanding of the nature of the church, according to Orthodox theology, as a community of the faithful. Again Lototsky quotes from Scripture to illustrate his point.

> If your brother sins against you, go and tell him his fault between you and him alone. If he hears you, you have gained your brother. But if he will not hear, take with you one or two more, that by the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he refuses to hear them, tell it to the church.[16]

The gathering of two or three thus defines the nature of the church as a community.[17] The earthly church, writes Lototsky, "like every institution, is subject to certain external organizational influences and must have its own specific external order."[18] The laws of autocephaly, which govern not only the individual churches, but also their relationship with one another and with the state, are part of that order.

It is precisely this relationship between churches in the Orthodox world that

---

13. For an Orthodox understanding of the church militant and triumphant, see John Karmiris, *A Synopsis of the Dogmatic Theology of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (Scranton, 1973), 83-94; Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (Baltimore, 1963), 247-48, 258-59; Michael Pomazansky, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* (Platina, CA, 1984), 230-34.
14. "I say to you that you are Peter and on this rock I will build my church and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it" (Matthew 16: 18).
15. For the Orthodox Church's understanding of Peter's primacy, see John Meyendorff, *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church* (Crestwood, NY, 1992); idem, *The Primacy of Peter* (London, 1963); T. V. Barsov, *Konstantinopol'skii patriarkh i ego vlast nad Russkoiu Tserkov'iu* (St. Petersburg, 1878), 8-10, 26-30; Francis Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy* (New York, 1979).
16. Matthew 18: 15-17.
17. For an understanding of Orthodox ecclesiology, see *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*, ed. Richard S. Haugh, vol. 14, *Ecumenism II: A Historical Approach* (Belmont, MA, 1989), 9-17; John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York, 1974), 79-90.
18. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 2.

is different, according to Lototsky, from that found in the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches. This has been especially true since the fall of the traditionally Orthodox Byzantine and Russian empires. In other words, while the Roman Catholic Church is unified in a monarchical structure and the Protestant churches do not see the need to unite the various Christian communities, insisting upon the independence of each individual community, the Orthodox Church combines elements of unification and independence. This approach is the basis of autocephaly, writes Lototsky:

> Scattered throughout the world, the church, in the Orthodox understanding, is made up of national churches, which emerge among various peoples, who, along with other characteristics, primarily national, and various political orders, create separate churches with different aspects of local order and independent administration. This tendency toward independence in the organization of the church is apparent even in the origins of Christianity, when, at the time of the apostles, churches were established among various peoples, and this continued throughout the history of the Eastern Church until the present, when they took on the form of autocephaly. Thus, the form of autocephaly for the organization of the church order is the specific characteristic of the Orthodox Church.[19]

For Lototsky, then, the practice of autocephaly had its origins in apostolic times and developed throughout the era of the rise and fall of various empires. However, the understanding of autocephaly takes on renewed importance in the age of national churches, which witnessed the fall of the last Orthodox empire. "[I]t is in our times," writes Lototsky, that autocephaly "manifests its rightful and factual efficacy."[20]

Section 1 of *Avtokefaliia* is titled *Dogma tserkovnoho ustroiu* ("The Dogma of Church Organization"). Lototsky explains that the unity of the Christian Church is based upon the teaching of Jesus Christ that "all may be one."[21] Citing the various Scriptural verses referring to the unity of the apostles in the early church (e.g., Acts 3: 44, 4: 32, 4: 34, and 8: 14), Lototsky states that the church, as the "kingdom of God on earth, aspires to become one...under the authority of Christ Himself."[22] It is this unity, based on the Christian teachings of love and community, that affects all aspects of church life, including what we today refer to as church administration. When the apostles were sent out to teach as well as to govern the church, their unity remained intact through their faith and action in the name of Christ. However, the apostles acted separately in proselytizing and governing. This, states Lototsky, constitutes the Orthodox

19. Ibid., 1: 3.
20. Ibid.
21. John 17: 21.
22. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 7.

understanding of autocephaly, which is based not upon Scripture alone, but also on teachings taken from what the Orthodox Church refers to as Tradition.[23] Thus, while all Orthodox Churches have a common faith and exhibit common traits in liturgical worship, each church acts independently, never compromising the unity of faith or the actions of another. In the words of Vladimir Lossky, "As Jesus Christ is the one head of the Church, so the Church, which is His body, must also be one."[24]

Lototsky goes on to ask whether the very existence of separate local Orthodox churches does not contradict the teachings of Christ concerning the unity of the church.[25] "From the Orthodox viewpoint, decentralization is an indispensable and even fundamental feature of church organization. While recognizing the spiritual unity of the Ecumenical Church as a spiritual institution, Orthodoxy does not associate this concept with any one church organization."[26] The unity of Christ and the church transcends all earthly understanding; it is analogous to our acceptance of the idea of the unity of the human race, which is not contradicted by the existence of separate nations.

The concept of the Ecumenical Church in Orthodoxy is expressed, argues Lototsky, through the unity of the local churches, by means of which all Orthodox Christians share a single faith, a single doctrine, and a single expression of that doctrine in worship.[27] Lototsky quotes one of most respected authorities on Orthodox canon law, Ilia Berdnikov, to the effect that "Unity of faith in a union of agreement is the fundamental principle of the eastern Orthodox Church."[28]

Having laid the groundwork for an understanding of the nature of the unity of the Orthodox Church, Lototsky then discusses at length the concept of catholicity or universality (*sobornost'* in Church Slavonic). After unity, the second most important characteristic of the Orthodox Church is its catholicity. The entire system of church governance is based on this concept. The idea of the

23. For example, Orthodox dogmas on the Virgin Mary or the Eucharist, while based on Scripture, are also derived from the traditional devotions and actions of the early church. See John Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church: Its Past and Its Role in the World Today* (New York, 1962), 3-17; Nicholas Zernov, *Eastern Christendom: A Study of the Origin and Development of the Eastern Orthodox Church* (New York, 1961), 227-37.

24. Vladimir Losskii, *O edinstve tserkvi*, as quoted in Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 7.

25. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 9.

26. Ibid.

27. For an Orthodox understanding of the relationship between faith and worship, see Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church*, 61-82, 190-207; idem, *Byzantine Theology*, 191-211; Zernov, *Eastern Christendom*, 238-65.

28. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 11.

church as catholic dates back to the creed of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan fathers of the fourth century, which states that the church is "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic."[29] The term "catholic," as used in church matters, is defined as an organic unbroken unity.[30] In the words of St. Paul, the church is a "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."[31] Catholicity in the church, Lototsky explains, is the very root of Orthodox doctrinal thought. It manifests itself primarily in the relationship between the hierarchy and the faithful: while their roles are different, in matters of faith all are equal.[32] The hierarchy and the faithful are further united in their mutual service to Christ, forming, in words of St. Paul, "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation."[33] Lototsky sets forth their responsibilities by citing Scriptural references to authority in the church, as well as the teachings of the Ecumenical Councils[34] and patristic writings, and even later epistles and letters issued by the hierarchy of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church about the nature of ecclesiastical authority.

Binding decisions of the church on matters of faith and order are formulated at councils, both ecumenical and local, which are the principal and most characteristic vehicles of catholicity in the church and external expressions of its unity. The sixth canon of the seventh Ecumenical Council instructs the council to concern itself with matters of the Gospel and ecclesiastical law.[35]

Lototsky proceeds to review the Ecumenical Councils and then draws a major distinction between the local councils of Rus' and those of the Russian Orthodox Church. "The major feature of Ukrainian Orthodox councils was the presence and activity not only of bishops, but also of representatives of the clergy, both black [monastic] and white [married], and of the whole Orthodox

29. See Karmiris, *Synopsis*, 89-93; Florovsky, *Ecumenism II*, 29-37; Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 243-58. .

30. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 17-18.

31. Ephesians 4: 3.

32. 2 Peter 1: 1b.

33. 1 Peter 2: 9a.

34. The Orthodox Church recognizes seven Ecumenical Councils and many local councils. Only the canons of the Ecumenical Councils are binding for the entire church. The first Ecumenical Council was held in the year 325 and the last in 787. Writings of the church fathers are part of Holy Tradition and are valid teachings for the faithful. On the teachings of the Ecumenical Councils, see Henry R. Percival, *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church*, vol. 14 of A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (New York, 1900; repr. Grand Rapids, MI, 1983), xi-xv; Francis Dvornik, *The Ecumenical Councils* (New York, 1961), 9-46; P. Lapin, *Sobor kak vysshii organ tserkovnoi vlasti* (Kazan, 1909), 30-114; Zernov, *Eastern Christendom*, 39-80.

35. Percival, *Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 559-60.

people."[36] The last such local council of the church of Rus', according to Lototsky, was the council of 1640, convoked by Metropolitan Petro Mohyla.[37] After that council, all ecclesiastical issues were referred to the Patriarchate of Moscow, to which the Ukrainian Church was subordinated in 1686. Up to that point, writes Lototsky, church councils had "served the interests of the Ukrainian nation. They united the dispersed forces of the Orthodox hierarchy, monasteries, brotherhoods, and the broad masses of the people, and it was precisely at the councils that all those elements created one Ukrainian ecclesiastical community...."[38] Lototsky reviews the history of the brotherhoods, dwelling on their substantial contributions, as well as their constant struggle with the hierarchy regarding the extent of their rights and privileges, and concludes that the brotherhoods played a significant and positive role in the history of the church.[39] The laity's active participation in local councils was reasserted at the diocesan councils that began in 1917, of which the faithful were full members, although limited in their ability to voice their opinion or vote on issues reserved for the hierarchy, such as matters of faith and worship.[40]

The manner in which those in the hierarchy and other members of the clergy are elected to their positions of authority is the focus of Lototsky's chapter titled "The Electoral Law of the Ecclesiastical Community" (*Vyborche pravo tserkovnoï hromady*). Lototsky reviews therein the history of electing bishops and priests in the early church and from the Byzantine Empire to his own day. According to Orthodox theology, the apostles were the first bishops of the church, who proceeded to ordain other bishops. This doctrine, frequently referred to in Western theology as "apostolic succession," is a central tenet of the Orthodox faith. The Orthodox Church believes that all Orthodox bishops can trace their individual ordinations back to the apostles.[41] Lototsky points out that the apostle Matthias was chosen by the apostles themselves in order to replace Judas Iscariot (Acts 1: 15-26). Present in the "upper room," where that election was held, were not only the apostles, but also "the women and Mary, the mother

36. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 44.

37. The standard work on Mohyla is S. T. Golubev, *Kievskii mitropolit Petr Mogila i ego spodvizhniki (Opyt istoricheskogo issledovaniia)*, 2 vols. (Kyiv, 1883-98).

38. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 44.

39. Ibid., 1: 60-64.

40. On the participation of the laity in diocesan councils of the church in Ukraine, see Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys istorii*, vol. 4, bk. 1, 11-18.

41. For the Orthodox Church's understanding of apostolic succession, see Michael A. Meerson, "The Doctrinal Foundation of Orthodoxy," in *Eastern Christianity and Politics in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Pedro Ramet (Durham, NC, 1988), 28-29; John Meyendorff, *Catholicity and the Church* (Crestwood, NY, 1983), 58-59; Pomazansky, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, 253-54.

of Jesus, and...His brothers."[42] Lototsky's point is that, according to Scripture, the first election of a bishop for the church was carried out by the apostles in conjunction with the faithful.

Lototsky reviews the writings of the church fathers and the early canons, demonstrating that in almost all cases bishops and priests of the early church were elected collectively by the clergy and the faithful. However, in the fourth century, the right of the faithful to participate in the election of bishops began to decline. The reason for this, in Lototsky's view, was the rise to power of Christian emperors, who began to rule the church. Referring to Canons 12 and 13 of the council of Laodicea (343-81), Lototsky notes that in the age of the Ecumenical Councils, the practices of the early church in electing bishops were slowly eradicated. Canon 12 of the Laodicean council states: "Bishops are to be appointed to the ecclesiastical government by the judgement of the metropolitans and neighboring bishops, after having been long proved both in the foundation of their faith and in the conversation of an honest life."[43] Canon 13 of that council states: "The election of those who are appointed to the priesthood is not be be committed to the multitude."[44]

The Ukrainian Church followed the ancient practice of allowing the faithful to participate in the election of bishops until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, according to Lototsky. Quoting from a Hierarchical Service Book (*Chynovnyk*) that he dates to the sixteenth century, Lototsky points out that the election of Varlaam Iasynsky to the position of Metropolitan of Kyiv in 1690 took place according to the rite published in that book, i.e., three candidates were proposed by bishops, one of whom was chosen by the senior bishop.[45] When the Ukrainian Church ceased to elect bishops in that manner, writes Lototsky, it broke its ties with the early church.[46]

In Section 2 of the first volume of *Avtokefaliia*, Lototsky reviews the historical foundations of autocephaly, leading into the presentation of a scheme of autocephalous rule in Section 3. Lototsky quotes Canon 34 of the Apostolic Canons,[47] which states: "The bishops of every nation must acknowledge him who is first among them."[48] This canon, in Lototsky's words, attests to the

42. Acts 1: 14b, c.
43. Percival, *Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 131.
44. Ibid.
45. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 72-73.
46. Ibid., 1: 73. Cf. Lotots'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki dzherela*, 127.
47. The Apostolic Canons are a collection of individual canons written before the year 300. They were recognized by the Council of Trullo (692) as being the work of the apostles and therefore valid.
48. Percival, *Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 596.

principle that administrative divisions in the church are based on the territories of particular peoples.[49] With the rise of the modern concept of nationalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, modern-day patriarchates acknowledged national borders and divided the church jurisdictionally on that basis. Thus, autocephalous national Orthodox churches emerged in countries such as Greece, Romania, and Serbia. However, in violation of canon law, the autocephaly of the Bulgarian and Ukrainian churches was not recognized. In the latter cases, writes Lototsky, the political interests of aggressive metropolitan churches continued to prevail.[50]

In the final section of volume 1, Lototsky presents his proposed "Principles of a Normal Statute for Autocephalous Churches" (*Zasady normal'noho statutu Avtokefal'nykh Tserkov*).[51] The statute is based on "Scripture, the writings of the teachers of the church, and the canons of the councils."[52]

The first section of the statute sets forth the general principles of the church and defines terms to be used in the document. Paragraph 1 provides that "An Autocephalous Church is part of the one, holy, universal (*soborna*), and apostolic church, whose head is the Lord, our God, Jesus Christ."[53] Each autocephalous church, acknowledging the dogma and canons of the Orthodox Church, is equal in rights with other churches and independent in its self-governance. In par. 3 of Article 1, jurisdictional boundaries are based upon ecclesiastical and state law. The paragraph further states that within its internal life, an autocephalous church is entirely free; however, it must follow the laws of the state in which it is located and the constitution approved by the government. Members of an autocephalous church are defined as all the citizens of the state who "profess the Orthodox faith, are subject to the hierarchy of the Autocephalous Church, and accept all that is accepted and observed by the Eastern Orthodox Church."[54] Those beliefs are embodied, according to par. 5 of Section 1, in Sacred Scripture and Holy Tradition, i.e., the regulations and canons derived from the teachings of the apostles, the canons of the seven ecumenical and nine provincial (local) councils, future councils recognized by the Orthodox Church, including the local councils of the specific autocephalous church, and finally church regulations concerning liturgical practice and monastic life. The relationship between church and state is defined in par. 6 through 11 of Section 1. As set forth therein, external activity of the church is to be carried out in conformity with the statute

49. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 1: 124.
50. Ibid., 1: 132.
51. Ibid., 1: 191-200.
52. Ibid., 1: 154.
53. Ibid., 1: 191.
54. Ibid.

and with the ministry of religious affairs. Where church law and the law of the state intersect, an agreement is to be worked out between representatives of church and state.[55] Lototsky's commitment to the use of national languages is evident in the final paragraph of Section 1, which states that the language of liturgical services and church teaching in an autocephalous church is the vernacular.[56]

Section 2 of the proposed statute defines the church council (sobor) as the highest administrative authority in the autocephalous church. Councils are to be called by the head of the church (a bishop) in agreement with the state. Members of the council are to include the following: all the bishops of the church; representatives of the clergy and faithful from every diocese (two clerics for every three lay members); and representatives of monasteries, the chaplain corps, ecclesiastical schools, and missions. Finally, representatives of the national legislature, elected from among its Orthodox members, are also to be members of the council. Decisions are to be made by majority vote, with matters of faith and liturgy requiring a majority of votes of the bishops taking part in the council.

According to the proposed statute, the head of an autocephalous church is a bishop who is to be commemorated at all liturgical services, whether he is a patriarch, catholicos, metropolitan, archbishop, or exarch. Elected at a church council, the principal bishop of the church is also the head of the Holy Synod, to which every bishop in the church belongs, along with two members of the clergy and two lay members. The Holy Synod is responsible for matters of faith, liturgics, religious education, and church administration. Matters of faith are relegated to the episcopal members of the Holy Synod alone.

Further paragraphs in the proposed statute concern the Higher Church Council, a legislative branch of the church that administers external church matters, the auditing commission, dioceses and diocesan bishops, diocesan councils, deaneries, parishes, chaplains, monasteries, brotherhoods, and financial rights of the church. A concluding paragraph states that the statute can be changed or amended only at a church council.

In the conclusion of volume 1, Lototsky states that, while there has been no Ecumenical Council of the Orthodox Church for more than a thousand years, many new concerns pertaining to church administration have arisen. This situation has been complicated, he observes, by World War I, which brought about significant divisions between states and churches, as well as between the churches and the faithful. While Lototsky was concerned with church governance, priorities had changed, as he acknowledged in his conclusion in 1935: "Throughout almost all the east, the very idea of religion is threatened...it is now

55. Ibid., 1: 192.

56. Ibid.

necessary to defend the principle of religion itself, no matter what form it takes."[57] The principles of autocephaly and catholicity, concludes Lototsky, offer the best hope of reconsolidation.[58]

The second volume of *Avtokefaliia*, subtitled "A Survey History of Autocephalous Churches" (*Narys istorii Avtokefal'nykh Tserkov*), was published in Warsaw by the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in 1938, three years after the publication of the first volume. The survey is limited, writes Lototsky, to those questions that pertain directly to the governance of the church within the parameters of autocephaly. Although the scope of the study precludes a full-scale account of the history of the Ukrainian Church, Lototsky examines the Kyivan period in detail. Such an analysis is necessary, writes Lototsky, because without it a continuous survey of the history of the Muscovite Church would have been impossible: that church developed on the basis of principles taken over from the church of Kyivan Rus'.[59]

Volume 2 and begins with an explanation of the metropolitanate, which, Lototsky emphasizes, is the first configuration of every autocephalous church. Basing his arguments on the canon law of the Ecumenical Councils, Lototsky discusses those churches that had been or were then headed by a metropolitan, since that office came into existence before the office of patriarch.

Lototsky's studies of individual churches begin with a consideration of the earliest Orthodox patriarchates of the east. He first reviews the development and governing statutes of the four "ancient" patriarchates: Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem.[60] The title of "patriarch" had originally been used to characterize prominent hierarchs, and not until the fifth century was it restricted to the bishops of the above sees.[61] Stressing the Orthodox concept of equality among the patriarchates, Lototsky discusses each patriarchate's history, dwelling on the Patriarchate of Constantinople because of its historical links with the Slavic churches in general and the Ukrainian Church in particular.

Next, Lototsky surveys the history of older, but relatively smaller autocephalous churches, including those of Cyprus, Greece, and Georgia. He pays special attention to the Georgian Orthodox Church, which had lost its

57. Ibid., 1: 202.

58. Ibid., 1: 203.

59. Oleksander Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, vol. 2, *Narys istorii Avtokefal'nykh Tserkov* (Warsaw, 1938), iv.

60. For extensive discussions of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and its influence on the churches of Ukraine and Russia, see Barsov, *Konstantinopol'skii patriarkh*, 296-567; T. I. Butkevich, *Vysshee upravlenie v pravoslavnykh avtokefal'nykh tserkvakh* (Kharkiv, 1913), 3-58; John Meyendorff, *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church* (Crestwood, NY, 1982), 235-46.

61. *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, 1990 ed., s.v. "Patriarch."

independence to Russian expansion in the nineteenth century, only to regain it through a proclamation of the Provisional Government in Petrograd in 1917.[62]

Lototsky then considers the Slavic churches, which emerged in the second millennium of Christianity, at length: two of them, the Bulgarian and Serbian churches, have common roots with the church of Rus'.[63] Beginning with the establishment of each church, Lototsky goes on to analyze their situations under foreign (Ottoman) rule. The church of Romania, the only Latin nation to have a majority of Orthodox Christians, was of great interest to Lototsky. He reviews the history of the churches of Wallachia and Moldavia as part of the Romanian Church and discusses the church of Bukovyna, which was divided between Romania and Ukraine.

More than half of Lototsky's second volume is devoted to the history of the Orthodox Church in Russia. Lototsky begins his study with a history of the church of Rus' from its legendary foundation by St. Andrew the Apostle in the first century[64] to the mid-twelfth century and the genesis of the church of Muscovy, which Lototsky places in Suzdal under the rule of Prince Iurii Dolgoruky (1149-57). Thus, by Lototsky's account, the Muscovite Church took root less than a century before the fall of Kyiv and the transfer of the Kyivan Metropolitanate to Moscow in the thirteenth century. While the Russian church proclaimed its autocephalous status in 1448, it was not recognized by Constantinople as a patriarchate until 1589.[65] Lototsky goes on to discuss the abolition of the patriarchate in 1721 and its replacement with an Ecclesiastical College. The section ends with a brief consideration of the Russian Orthodox Church under Soviet rule, including the reestablishment of the patriarchate in 1917 and the election of Patriarch Tikhon.

The final section of volume 2 examines the new autonomous Orthodox churches—Albanian, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Finnish, and Czechoslovak—established after World War I. The work concludes with a bibliography for both volumes of more than five hundred items in various languages. Included are citations of works on the theology (canon law, liturgics, general histories) of the Orthodox Church and separate bibliographic listings for many of the

62. For a discussion of the Georgian Orthodox Church, see J. Dadeshkeliani, "The Autocephaly of the Orthodox Church of Georgia," *The Christian East* 3 (1950): 65-72.

63. For the history of the Serbian and Bulgarian autocephalous churches, see Butkevich, *Vysshee upravlenie*, 76-165.

64. For an interesting discussion of the legend of St. Andrew, see Francis Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Cambridge, MA, 1958), 138-264.

65. For a discussion of the autocephaly of the Russian Orthodox Church, see E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, 3: 469-515.

autocephalous churches.

Lototsky was vitally aware of the role that a national church could play in the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state.[66] Though cognizant of the principle of the separation of church and state, Lototsky considered it not only foreign to the Orthodox Church in general, but also to the history of the relationship between the Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian state in particular:

> In the history of the Ukrainian people, the Church has played a great constructive role. The acceptance of Christianity, which brought with it a new cultural understanding in the consciousness of the people, came almost at the same time as the beginning of its political existence. This was the origin of the close association between the life of church and state in Ukraine.[67]

Although such a relationship is not unusual in traditionally Orthodox countries, its nature varied over time.

The theory that integrates the ecclesiastical organization into an independent state is not new. The independence of a state implies the autocephaly of the Orthodox church within that state. The principal theoretician of the idea that an independent state has the right to declare the church on its territory autocephalous was Theokletos Pharmakides, who wrote about this special state-church relationship within Orthodoxy in the early nineteenth century.[68]

Lototsky's arguments for autocephaly were based on two considerations—Orthodox canon law and the de facto autocephaly that the church had enjoyed during its history in Ukraine. His interpretation of the seventeenth canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Council was his essential justification for autocephaly. The canon, written and accepted by the Orthodox Church at the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451, stated:

> Outlying or rural parishes shall in every province remain subject to the bishops who now have jurisdiction over them, particularly if the bishops have peaceably and continuously governed them for the space of thirty years. But if within thirty years there has been, or is, any dispute concerning them, it is lawful for those who hold themselves aggrieved to bring their cause before the synod of the province. And if any one be wronged by his metropolitan, let the matter be decided by the exarch of the diocese or by the throne of Constantinople, as aforesaid. And if any city has been, or shall hereafter be newly erected by imperial authority, let the order of the ecclesiastical parishes follow the political

66. For a general study of the subject of church-state relations, see Aristeides Papadakis, "The Historical Tradition of Church-State Relations under Orthodoxy," in *Eastern Christianity and Politics in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Pedro Ramet (Durham, NC, 1988), 37–58.

67. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 80.

68. L'Huillier, "Problems concerning Autocephaly," 185.

and municipal example.[69]

The ancient epitome attached to the above canon gives further weight to the points on which Lototsky based his arguments. "[I]f by the command of the Emperor a city be renewed, the order of ecclesiastical parishes shall follow the civil and public forms."[70] In Lototsky's opinion, and clearly also in the opinion of the Ukrainian state and its church leaders, Canon 17 affirmed the right of Ukraine, wronged as it was by the Metropolitanate of Moscow and later by the Patriarchate of All Russia, to petition the ecumenical throne of Constantinople. Equally important, the new political and civil order in Ukraine, following the revolution and the fall of the imperial regime, called for a change in the character of ecclesiastical rule. Since the new "civil and public form," Lototsky would argue, required an autocephalous Orthodox church in Ukraine, the Ecumenical Patriarchate should recognize that new form by granting a *tomos* proclaiming and recognizing the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church.[71] A further interpretation of Canon 17 is given in the Rudder, the collection of Orthodox canon law:

> If...there has been built any city by imperial authority, or if any be built hereafter, then the neighboring bishop shall not try to subject it to his own authority and claim it as a parish of his own, since the order of the parishes of that church have [*sic*] to follow the civil laws and ordinances which may be decreed by the emperor in regard to the newly built city, and not vice versa.[72]

Accordingly, wrote Lototsky, "[t]he source of ecclesiastical autocephaly is the state power."[73] From the time of Volodymyr until the seventeenth century, he went on, the Church of Rus' had been independent of other churches. While it is clear, states Lototsky, that the church of Constantinople sent bishops to Rus', it is uncertain whether they were sent to rule or guide the new church.[74]

According to Lototsky's historical account, the first manifestation of independence on the part of the Rus' Church took place in the eleventh century. Although the first Metropolitan of Kyiv was a Greek sent by Constantinople in

---

69. Percival, *Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 280.
70. Ibid.
71. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 82.
72. D. Cummings, ed., *The Rudder* (Chicago, 1957), 263.
73. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 84. Here Lototsky offers a short history of the autocephaly of the various Orthodox churches.
74. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 2: 257. Contrary to Lototsky, the Russian church historian Evgenii Golubinskii argues that the church of Rus' was not independent of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (*Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, 1: 270). Georgii Fedotov disagrees, stating that Greek interference in the affairs of the church of Rus' was "rare and moderate" (*The Russian Religious Mind*, vol. 1, *Kievan Christianity: The Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries* [Cambridge, MA, 1946], 402).

1037 to rule the new diocese, in 1051, during the reign of Prince Iaroslav, an episcopal synod in Rus' elected Ilarion, a native of Rus', as ruling metropolitan. The election took place without the approval of Constantinople.[75] Golubinsky states that this act was in a sense a proclamation of autocephaly, as it was an attempt to establish "a new order."[76] Another such act of independence took place in the year 1147, when, during the reign of Iziaslav II, Metropolitan Klym Smoliatych was elected without the consent of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.[77] Golubinsky refers to this act as a schism (*raskol*).[78] A scholarly authority on the question of autocephaly, Archbishop L'Huillier, states that the election of Smoliatych "without the accord of the [E]cumenical [P]atriarch, should not be overestimated. It must be understood within the framework of feudal rivalries."[79] Nonetheless, the practice of electing ruling metropolitans for the land of Rus', whether under Tatar or Polish-Lithuanian rule, without consulting any other Orthodox church, continued until 1686, when the Ukrainian Church came under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Moscow. That act of subordination was considered illegal by Lototsky and leaders of the Ukrainian government and church, and ultimately by the Ecumenical Patriarchate as well. In 1920, the Ecumenical Patriarchate mentioned the act of subjugation of 1686 in its response to the Directory concerning the *tomos* of autocephaly. It did so again in 1924 when, in issuing a *tomos* of autocephaly to the Orthodox Church of Poland, it made reference to the illegal subjugation of the Kyivan Metropolitanate by the "Holy Church of Moscow."[80] In his memoirs, Lototsky maintains that "Against the background of this millennial practice, the legitimacy of the act of the Ukrainian state authorities, who established the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church with the decree of 1 January 1919, arouses not the slightest doubt."[81]

* * *

In September 1939, with the outbreak of World War II, Lototsky advised his son to leave Warsaw. Although he urged his father to travel with him, Borys was unable to persuade him to leave Warsaw, as Oleksander did not want to abandon

75. Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 2: 261–65.

76. Golubinskii, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, 1: 297–98.

77. See Lotots'kyi, *Avtokefaliia*, 2: 265–71.

78. Golubinskii, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, 1: 311.

79. L'Huillier, "Problems concerning Autocephaly," 183.

80. See the *tomos* of autocephaly in Polons'ka-Vasylenko, *Istorychni pidvalyny UAPTs*, 113–16. For a discussion of the proclamation of autocephaly by the Orthodox Church of Poland, as well as the granting of the *tomos*, see Kupranets', *Pravoslavna tserkva v mizhvoiennii Pol'shchi*, 14–17, 29–35.

81. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 84.

his library and papers. As a result, Borys reluctantly left his father in Warsaw and traveled alone to Italy.[82]

While in Rome, Borys and his sister made plans for their father to join them. As the German army had occupied Warsaw, there was no word from Lototsky. Then Borys and Oksana received a postcard from Metropolitan Dionysii Valedynsky, Primate of the Orthodox Church of Poland, stating that on 22 October 1939, Oleksander Lototsky had died of pneumonia in the Warsaw city hospital.

> This first communication was very brief in order to avoid delays by German military censorship. Later we learned more from a long letter written by the bookkeeper of the Ukrainian Institute. He reported that a German shell had started a fire in my father's apartment. In order to save his writings, papers, and books he had carried them down to the cellar and in so doing had caught a cold. As almost all the apartment windows had been shattered, his cold got worse and he developed pneumonia and was taken to a hospital.[83]

Lototsky was buried next to his wife in Warsaw. In 1971, Borys transferred their remains to the St. Andrew Ukrainian Orthodox Cemetery in New Jersey.[84]

82. Interviews with Dr. Borys Lotocki de Veligost conducted by the author in Muralto, Switzerland, 17–20 August 1988.

83. Lotocki, *Borys' Odyssey*, 186–87. A similar version of events is given by a younger acquaintance of Lototsky's, Lev Bykovsky, in "Moï pobachennia z Oleksandrom Lotots'kym," *Ukraïns'kyi istoryk* 16 (1979): 104. Bykovsky relates that the remains of Lototsky's archives, having first been held in the Ukrainian Scientific Institute, were moved to the Krasiński Estate Library (Biblioteka Ordynacji Krasińskich) in Warsaw after the closing of the institute. Those archives of Lototsky's were destroyed when the library was bombed after the Warsaw Uprising.

84. Concerning this transfer, see the correspondence between Borys Lotocki and Metropolitan Mstyslav Skrypnyk in the archives of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Metropolitan's Chancery in South Bound Brook, New Jersey, files m.86 4n.2, m.27 6n3, m.168 3n3, and m.161. In interviews with Dr. Borys Lotocki conducted by this author in Muralto, Switzerland, on 17–20 August 1988, Dr. Lotocki remarked that the birthdate on his father's gravestone is 22 March, but should be 21 March. When calculating the date from the Julian calendar, Lotocki added thirteen days to the date instead of twelve.

Conclusion

In analyzing the Ukrainian Orthodox Church movement of the early twentieth century, historian Bohdan Bociurkiw states that

> the main sources of the movement's strength were its intense faith in the righteousness of its course, its optimism and energy. Its weaknesses were many: its lack of access to the levers of ecclesiastical power; its precarious and limited base among the rank-and-file clergy; and emotionalism, impatience and inexperience of its members in the art of ecclesiastical politics.[1]

Many of the same strengths and weaknesses characterize the role Oleksander Lototsky played in the movement for Ukrainian Orthodox autocephaly. A man of great faith, Lototsky believed that the Ukrainian Orthodox Church most profoundly expressed that faith both for himself and for the Ukrainian nation. It was that unity of church and state to which Lototsky dedicated his life. Lototsky did not insist that one had to be an Orthodox Christian in order to be a responsible Ukrainian citizen, as is shown by his sincere respect for the Greek Catholic Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky. Lototsky also respected the views of those Ukrainian statesmen, such as Hrushevsky, who, unlike him, believed that religion was simply a personal matter and should not involve the state. However, Lototsky did believe that Ukrainian Orthodox Christians had to reject the subjection of their church to the Russian Orthodox Church and to win autocephaly for it. His lifelong creed was: "in an independent state [Ukraine], there must also be an independent Church [the Orthodox Church]."[2] His faith, energy, and optimism were dedicated to that belief.

Lototsky sincerely believed that his efforts on behalf of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church were not in vain and would be useful when Ukraine was once again independent and a new movement for the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church should emerge. "And should the Lord prepare for the Ukrainian Church a new thorny path to test her faith and good will, even then

---

1. Bociurkiw, "Issues of Ukrainization and Autocephaly," 260.
2. Lotots'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki dzherela*, 133.

we will not lose our faith and will not renounce our desire on the road to [our] holy goal—the autocephaly of our church."[3]

The place of Oleksander Lototsky in modern Ukrainian history and in the history of the Ukrainian Church is an important one. As a member of all three independent Ukrainian governments of 1917–20, Lototsky played a major role as General Chancellor, Minister of Religious Affairs, and ambassador. His work in Constantinople on behalf of the Ukrainian Church was important in establishing a relationship—significant to this day—between Ecumenical Orthodoxy and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Such a relationship had not existed since the seventeenth century. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Lototsky produced major works in Ukrainian church studies, history, and culture. His four-volume memoirs are a richly detailed first-hand account of Ukrainian life in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Additionally, Lototsky's scholarly studies of autocephaly and Ukrainian church history are pioneering works in the field. It would be difficult to imagine the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of today without the diligent labor and indispensable contributions of Oleksander Lototsky.

3. Lotots'kyi, *V Tsarhorodi*, 103.

Bibliography

I. Primary Sources

1. Works by Oleksander Lotots'kyi

A complete list of the published and unpublished works of Oleksander Lotots'kyi, comprising more than five hundred items, is given in Bohdan Hoshovs'kyi, ed., *Lytsar pratsi i obov"iazku* (Toronto: Ievshan-Zillia, 1983). The list was compiled by Lotots'kyi himself in 1937. Later works and reprint editions were added to the list by his son, Borys Lotocki, in 1983. Listed below are the works by Oleksander Lotots'kyi that were consulted in the preparation of this study.

A. Manuscripts

Archiwum Akt Nowych, Warsaw. Oleksander Lotots'kyi file no. 4086, containing 17 pages of miscellaneous writings by Lotots'kyi. [Information supplied by Dr. Andrew Sorokowski.]

Lotots'kyi, Oleksander. "Konspekt lektsii po tserkovnomu pravu." 1923. MS in the possession of the estate of Borys Lotocki de Veligost, Muralto, Switzerland.

B. Printed Sources

Avtokefaliia. Vol. 1, *Zasady avtokefalii.* Warsaw: Ukraïns'kyi naukovyi instytut, 1935. Vol. 2, *Narys istorii Avtokefal'nykh Tserkov.* Warsaw: Ukraïns'kyi naukovyi instytut, 1938.

Bat'ky i dity na emigratsii. Lviv: Author, 1937.

Bibliina istoriia Novoho Zapovitu. Volodymyr-Volynskyi: Vidbudova, 1923.

Derzhavnyi provid Symona Petliury. Paris: n.p., 1930.

Derzhavnyts'kyi svitohliad Tarasa Shevchenka. Lviv: n.p., 1937.

"Desiatylittia proholoshennia ukraïns'koï derzhavnoï nezalezhnosty." *Tryzub* (Paris), nos. 110–11 (22 January 1928): 5–8.

Dukha unyniia ne dai meni! Lviv: Biblioteka Dnipra, 1936.

Na rikakh vavylons'kykh. Lviv: Khortytsia, 1938.

Poeziï Tarasa Shevchenka pid rosiis'koiu tsenzuroiu. Lviv: n.p., 1937.

Skhid i Zakhid u problemi ukraïns'koï kul'tury. Lviv: Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1939.

Staryi Zapovit: Bibliina istoriia dlia shkil serednikh. Warsaw: Drukarnia Synodal'na, 1927.

Storinky mynuloho. 4 vols. Warsaw: Ukraïns'kyi naukovyi instytut, 1932–39; reprint, n. p.: Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 1966.

Symon Petliura. n.p.: Komitet dlia vshanuvannia Symona Petliury, 1936.

Tserkovno-pravni osnovy avtokefaliï. Warsaw: Drukarnia Synodal'na, 1931.

Ukraïns'ki dzherela tserkovnoho prava. Warsaw: Ukraïns'kyi naukovyi instytut, 1931; reprint, South Bound Brook, NJ: Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 1984.

Ukraïns'kyi Arkhyieratykon. Warsaw: Drukarnia Synodal'na, 1932; reprint, South Bound Brook, NJ: Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 1983.

V Tsarhorodi. Warsaw: Ukraïns'kyi naukovyi instytut, 1939; reprint, n. p.: Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 1966.

Vinok. Salzwedel: Drukarnia Soiuzu vyzvolennia Ukrainy, 1917.

Virnist' velykii ideï. Paris: Komitet dlia vshanuvannia Symona Petliury, 1951.

"Znevazhena sprava." *Truzyb* (Paris) 3, no. 12 (20 March 1927): 6–11.

2. *Other Primary Sources*

A. Manuscripts

Borys Lotocki to Metropolitan Mstyslav Skrypnyk, 28 February 1972, 14 December 1973, 21 September 1974, 5 May 1975. Archives of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Metropolitan's Chancery, South Bound Brook, NJ.

Lotocki, Borys. "The Personal Memoirs of Dr. Borys Lotocki de Veligost." MS in the possession of the estate of Borys Lotocki de Veligost, Muralto, Switzerland.

B. Published Works

Belliustin, I. S. *Description of the Clergy in Rural Russia.* Trans. Gregory L. Freeze. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Berdnikov, I. S. *Kratkii kurs tserkovnogo prava Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi.* 2 vols. Kazan: Imperatorskii universitet, 1913.

Berdnikov, I. S. *Osnovnye nachala tserkovnogo prava Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi.* Kazan: Imperatorskii universitet, 1902.

Bidnov, Vasyl'. *Tserkovna sprava na Ukraïni.* Tarnów: Ukraïns'ka Avtokefal'na Tserkva, 1921.

Burko, Demyd. *Ukraïns'ka Avtokefal'na Pravoslavna Tserkva: vichne dzherelo zhyttia.* South Bound Brook, NJ: Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 1988.

Butkevich, T. I. *Vysshee upravlenie v pravoslavnykh avtokefal'nykh tserkvakh.* Kharkiv: Mirnyi trud, 1913.

Bykovs'kyi, Lev. "Moï pobachennia z Oleksandrom Lotots'kym." *Ukraïns'kyi istoryk* 16 (1979): 102–7.

Doroshenko, Dmytro. *Istoriia Ukraïny 1917–1923 rr.* 2 vols. Uzhhorod: O. Tsiupka, 1930; repr. New York: Bulava, 1954.

Doroshenko, Dmytro. *Moï spomyny pro nedavnie-mynule (1914–1920).* Munich: Ukraïns'ke vydavnytstvo, 1969.

Evlogii [Mitropolit]. *Put' moei zhizni.* Paris: YMCA Press, 1947.

Freeze, Gregory L., ed. and trans. *From Supplication to Revolution: A Documentary Social History of Imperial Russia.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Gapon, G. A. *Zapiski.* Moscow: Tipografiiia Vil'de, 1918.

Glubokovskii, N. N. *Russkaia bogoslovskaia nauka v ee istoricheskom razvitii i noveishem sostoianii.* Warsaw: Voskresnoe chtenie, 1928.

Hryhorijiv, Nykyfor Y., ed. *The War and Ukrainian Democracy: A Compilation of Documents from the Past and Present.* Toronto: Industrial and Educational Publishing Company, 1945.

Hunczak, Taras, ed. *The Ukrainian Revolution: Documents, 1919–1921.* Sources of Modern History of the Ukraine, vol. 2. New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, 1984.

Iavdas', Mytrofan, ed. *Ukraïns'ka Pravoslavna Tserkva: dokumenty dlia istoriï Ukraïns'koï Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy.* Munich: Kraieva rada UAPTs, 1956.

Karashevich, Platon. *Ocherk istorii Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi na Volyni.* St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Koroleva, 1855.

Kedrovs'kyi, Volodymyr. *1917 Rik: spohady chlena Ukraïns'koho Viis'kovoho Heneral'noho Komitetu i Tovarysha Sekretaria Viis'kovykh Sprav u chasi Ukraïns'koï Tsentral'noï Rady.* Winnipeg: Tryzub, 1967.

Levyts'kyi, Kost'. *Istoriia politychnoï dumky halyts'kykh ukraïntsiv, 1848–1914: na pidstavi spomyniv.* Lviv: Author, 1926.

Lotocki, Borys. *Borys' Odyssey.* Denver: ZZYZX Publishing Co., 1994.

Lypkivs'kyi, Vasyl'. *Istoriia Ukraïns'koï Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy.* Rozdil 7, *Vidrodzhennia Ukraïns'koï Tserkvy.* Winnipeg: John Gryschuk Foundation, 1961.

Lypkivs'kyi, Vasyl'. *Lysty, 1933–1937.* Chicago: Ukraïns'ke Pravoslavne Bratstvo im. Mytropolyta Vasylia Lypkivs'koho, 1980.

Mohyla, Petro. *Trebnyk Petra Mohyly.* Comp. Arkadii Zhukovs'kyi. Canberra, Munich and Paris: Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, 1988.

Percival, Henry R. *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church.* A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, second series, vol. 14. Ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. New York: Scribner, 1900; repr. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983.

Petliura, Symon. *Statti, lysty, dokumenty.* 2 vols. New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, 1956–79.

Pobedonostsev, Konstantin P. *Reflections of a Russian Statesman.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Pokhodzhennia iepyskopatu. Volodymyr-Volynskyi: Na varti, 1926.

Potiienko, Vasyl'. *Vidnovlennia iierarkhiï Ukraïns'koï Pravoslavnoï Avtokefal'noï Tserkvy.* Neu-Ulm: Vyshche Tserkovne Upravlinnia UAPTs, 1971.

Savchenko, Fedir. *Zaborona ukraïnstva 1876 roku.* Kharkiv: Derzhavne vydavnytsvo, 1930; reprint, Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970.

Suvorov, N. S. *Uchebnik tserkovnogo prava.* Moscow: A. Kartsev, 1912.

Tokarzhevs'kyi-Karashevych, Ian. "Tsarhorods'ki spomyny, 1919–1921." *Vyzvol'nyi shliakh* 58 (July 1952): 25–34.

Volkonsky, Pierre, and Michael D'Herbigny, ed. and trans. "Dossier Américain de l'Orthodoxie Panukrainienne." *Orientalia Christiana,* nos. 3, 4 (1923): 73–128, 129–219.

Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. *Vidrodzhennia natsiï.* 3 vols. Vienna: Dzvin, 1920.

Zinkevych, Osyp, and Oleksander Voronyn, eds. *Martyrolohiia Ukraïns'kykh Tserkov.* Vol. 1, *Ukraïns'ka Pravoslavna Tserkva: Dokumenty, materiialy, khrystyians'kyi samvydav Ukraïny.* Toronto and Baltimore: V. Symonenko Smoloskyp Publishers, 1987.

II. Secondary Sources

1. Books and Dissertations

Abraham, Richard. *Alexander Kerensky: The First Love of the Revolution.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.

Adams, Arthur E. *Bolsheviks in the Ukraine: The Second Campaign, 1918–1919.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Armstark, Rudolf. *Die Ukrainische Autokephale Orthodoxe Kirche: Erinnerungen des Metropoliten Vasyl' K. Lypkivs'kyj.* Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1982.

Armstrong, John A. *Nations before Nationalism.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Ascher, Abraham. *The Revolution of 1905.* 2 vols. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988–92.

Balmuth, Daniel. *Censorship in Russia, 1865–1905.* Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1979.

Barsov, T. V. *Konstantinopol'skii patriarkh i ego vlast' nad Russkoiu Tserkov'iu.* St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Remezova, 1878.

Bater, James H. *St. Petersburg: Industrialization and Change.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1976.

Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. "Soviet Church Policy in the Ukraine, 1919–1939." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1961.

Bogolepov, Aleksandr. *Church Reforms in Russia, 1905–1918, in Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the All-Russian Church Council of 1917–1918.* Bridgeport: Russian Orthodox Church of America, 1966.

Borys, Jurij. *The Sovietization of Ukraine, 1917–1923: The Communist Doctrine and Practice of Self-Determination.* Rev. ed. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980.

Bradley, John F. N. *Civil War in Russia, 1917–1920.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.

Bulgakov, Sergius. *The Orthodox Church.* London: Centenary Press, 1935.

Byrnes, Robert F. *Pobedonostsev: His Life and Thought.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968.

Chistovich, I. A. *Istoriia perevoda Biblii na russkii iazyk.* St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Stasiulevicha, 1899.

Cracraft, James. *The Church Reform of Peter the Great.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1971.

Cummings, D., ed. *The Rudder*. Chicago: Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1957.

Cunningham, James W. *A Vanquished Hope: The Movement for Church Renewal in Russia, 1905–1906*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1981.

Curtiss, John S. *Church and State in Russia: The Last Years of the Empire, 1900–1917*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Curtiss, John S. *The Russian Church and the Soviet State, 1917–1950*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1953.

Doroshenko, Dmytro. *Pravoslavna tserkva v mynulomu i suchasnomu zhytti ukraïns'koho narodu*. Berlin: Natsiia v pokhodi, 1940.

Doroshenko, Volodymyr. *Velykyi Mytropolyt: Pam"iati Mytropolyta A. Sheptyts'koho: spohady i narysy*. Yorkton: Biblioteka Lohosu, 1958.

Dvornik, Francis. *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy*. Trans. Edwin A. Quain. New York: Fordham University Press, 1979.

Dvornik, Francis. *The Ecumenical Councils*. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1961.

Dvornik, Francis. *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Dziewanowski, Marian K. *Poland in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Eklof, Ben. *Russian Peasant Schools: Officialdom, Village Culture, and Popular Pedagogy, 1864–1914*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Emhardt, William C. *Religion in Soviet Russia; Anarchy*. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1929.

Emmons, Terence. *The Formation of Political Parties and the First National Elections in Russia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Fedotov, Georgii P. *The Russian Religious Mind*. Vol. 1, *Kievan Christianity: The Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1946.

Fedyshyn, Olch S. *Germany's Drive to the East and the Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1918*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1971.

Fiddick, Thomas C. *Russia's Retreat from Poland, 1920*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Filaret [Archbishop]. *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*. 5 vols. Kharkiv: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1849–53.

Florovsky, Georges. *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*. Ed. Richard S. Haugh. Vol. 14, *Ecumenism II: A Historical Approach*. Belmont, MA: Büchervertriebsanstalt, 1989.

Florovsky, Georges. *Ways of Russian Theology*. Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing, 1979.

Freeze, Gregory L. *The Parish Clergy in Nineteenth-Century Russia: Crisis, Reform, Counter-Reform*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Golubev, S. T. *Kievskii mitropolit Petr Mogila i ego spodvizhniki (Opyt istoricheskogo issledovaniia)*. 2 vols. Kyiv: Tipografiia Korchak-Novitskogo, 1883–98.

Golubinskii, E. E. *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*. 2 vols. Moscow: Imperatorskoe obshchestvo istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh, 1900–1911.

Golubinskii, E. E. *O reforme v byte Russkoi Tserkvi*. Moscow: Imperatorskoe obshchestvo istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh, 1913.

Haimson, Leopold H., ed. *The Politics of Rural Russia, 1905–1914*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979.

Halecki, Oscar. *From Florence to Brest (1439–1596)*. 2d ed. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1968.

Hamm, Michael. *Kiev: A Portrait, 1800–1917*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Harcave, Sidney. *First Blood: The Russian Revolution of 1905*. London: Macmillan, 1964.

Heyer, Friedrich. *Die Orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine von 1917 bis 1945*. Cologne: Rudolf Müller, 1953.

Himka, John-Paul. *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988.

Himka, John-Paul. *Socialism in Galicia: The Emergence of Polish Social Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism (1860–1890)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1983.

Hosking, Geoffrey A. *The Russian Constitutional Experiment: Government and Duma, 1907–1914*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo. *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*. 10 vols. Lviv and Kyiv, 1898–1937; reprint, New York: Knyhospilka, 1954–58.

Hunczak, Taras, ed., with the assistance of John T. von der Heide. *The Ukraine, 1917–1921: A Study in Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1977.

Ilarion [Metropolitan]. *Pryiednannia tserkvy ukraïns'koï do moskovs'koï v 1686 rotsi*. Winnipeg: Mytropolytal'nyi Sobor, 1948.

Kappeler, Andreas, in collaboration with Alan O'Day and Fikret Adanir, eds. *The Formation of National Elites*. New York: New York University Press, 1992.

Karmiris, John. *A Synopsis of the Dogmatic Theology of the Orthodox Catholic Church*. Scranton: Christian Orthodox Edition, 1973.

Kartashev, A. V. *Na putiakh k vselenskomu soboru*. Paris: YMCA Press, 1932.

Kartashev, A. V. *Ocherki po istorii Russkoi Tserkvi*. 2 vols. Paris: YMCA Press, 1959.

Kenez, Peter. *Civil War in South Russia, 1918: The First Year of the Volunteer Army*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

Kenez, Peter. *Civil War in South Russia, 1919–1920: The Defeat of the Whites*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Kharlampovich, K. V. *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikorusskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn'*. Kazan: M. A. Golubev, 1914.

The Kiev Mohyla Academy. Special issue of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1/2 (June 1984).

Klier, John D., and Shlomo Lamboza, eds. *Pogroms: Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian History*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Kohn, Hans. *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology*. 2d ed. New York: Vintage, 1960.

Kohut, Zenon E. *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s-1830s*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1988.

Korolevsky, Cyril. *Metropolitan Andrew (1865–1944)*. Trans. and rev. Serge Keleher. Lviv: Stauropegion, 1993.

Krawchenko, Bohdan. *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine*. London: Macmillan, 1985.

Krawchuk, Andrii. *Christian Social Ethics in Ukraine: The Legacy of Andrei Sheptytsky*. Edmonton, Ottawa, and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies, and The Basilian Press, 1997.

Krylov, I. *Systema osvity v Ukraïni (1917–1930)*. Munich: Instytut dlia vyvchennia SSSR, 1956.

Kryp"iakevych, Ivan, Mykola Holubets', Dmytro Doroshenko, and Iaroslav Pasternak. *Velyka istoriia Ukraïny*. Winnipeg: Ivan Tyktor, 1948.

Kupranets', Orest F. *Pravoslavna tserkva v mizhvoiennii Pol'shchi, 1918–1939*. Rome: Basiliani, 1974.

Lapin, P. *Sobor kak vysshii organ tserkovnoi vlasti*. Kazan: Tsentral'naia tipografiia, 1909.

Leslie, R. F., ed. *The History of Poland since 1863*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. 2d ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Lewis, Bernard. *Istanbul and the Civilization of the Ottoman Empire*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963.

Lewis, G. L. *Turkey*. 3d ed. London: Ernest Benn, 1965.

Liber, George O. *Soviet Nationality Policy, Urban Growth, and Identity Change in the Ukrainian SSR, 1923–1934*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Lossky, Vladimir. *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction*. Translated by Ian and Ihita Kesarcodi-Watson. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1978.

Luckyj, George S. N., ed. *Shevchenko and the Critics, 1861–1980*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Mace, James E. *Communism and the Dilemmas of National Liberation: National Communism in Soviet Ukraine, 1918–1933*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1983.

Magocsi, Paul R. *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographic Guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.

Maloney, George A. *A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453*. Belmont: Nordland Publishing, 1976.

Mandel, David. *The Petrograd Workers and the Soviet Seizure of Power: From the July Days, 1917 to July 1918*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984.

Markovits, Andrei S., and Frank E. Sysyn, eds. *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982.

McKean, Robert B. *St. Petersburg between the Revolutions: Workers and Revolutionaries, June 1907–February 1917*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Meyendorff, John. *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982.

Meyendorff, John. *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1974.

Meyendorff, John. *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia: A Study of Byzantino-Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Meyendorff, John. *Catholicity and the Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1983.

Meyendorff, John. *Imperial Unity and Christian Division: The Church, 450–680 A.D.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989.

Meyendorff, John. *The Orthodox Church: Its Past and Its Role in the World Today*. Trans. John Chapin. New York: Pantheon, 1962.

Meyendorff, John, ed. *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1992.

Meyendorff, John, Nikolai Afanasev, et al. *The Primacy of Peter*. London: Faith Press,

1963.

Miller, William. *The Ottoman Empire and its Successors, 1801–1927.* 3d ed. London: Cass, 1966.

Motyl, Alexander J. *The Turn to the Right: The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism, 1919–1929.* Boulder, CO: East European Quarterly, 1980.

Muravev, Andrei N. *A History of the Church of Russia.* Trans. R. W. Blackmore. New York: AMS Press, 1971.

Nichols, Robert L., and Theofanis G. Stavrou, eds. *Russian Orthodoxy under the Old Regime.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978.

Obolensky, Dimitri. *The Byzantine Commonwealth.* London: Sphere, 1974.

Pintner, Walter M., and Don K. Rowney, eds. *Russian Officialdom: The Bureaucratization of Russian Society from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

Pipes, Richard. *Russia under the Bolshevik Regime.* New York: Knopf, 1993.

Pipes, Richard. *Russia under the Old Regime.* New York: Scribner, 1974.

Pipes, Richard. *The Russian Revolution.* New York: Knopf, 1990.

Pipes, Richard. *Struve: Liberal on the Left, 1870–1905.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Polons'ka-Vasylenko, Nataliia. *Istoriia Ukraïny.* 2 vols. Munich: Ukraïns'ke vydavnytstvo, 1972–76.

Polons'ka-Vasylenko, Nataliia. *Istorychni pidvalyny UAPTs.* Munich: IuH, 1964.

Pomazansky, Michael. *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology.* Platina, CA: Saint Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1984.

Pospielovsky, Dimitry V. *A History of Marxist-Leninist Atheism and Soviet Antireligious Policies.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.

Pospielovsky, Dimitry V. *The Russian Church under the Soviet Regime, 1917–1982.* 2 vols. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.

Pospielovsky, Dimitry V. *Soviet Antireligious Campaigns and Persecutions.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.

Pospielovsky, Dimitry V. *Soviet Studies on the Church and the Believer's Response to Atheism.* London: Macmillan Press, 1988.

Potichnyj, Peter J., Marc Raeff, Jaroslaw Pelenski, and Gleb N. Žekulin, eds. *Ukraine and Russia in their Historical Encounter.* Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1992.

Prymak, Thomas M. *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Raeff, Marc. *Understanding Imperial Russia: State and Society in the Old Regime*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Ramet, Pedro, ed. *Eastern Christianity and Politics in the Twentieth Century*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1988.

Reshetar, John S., Jr. *The Soviet Polity: Government and Politics in the USSR*. New York: Harper & Row, 1989.

Reshetar, John S., Jr. *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1920*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952. Repr. New York: Arno Press, 1972.

Rieber, Alfred J. *Merchants and Entrepreneurs in Imperial Russia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Rizhskii, M. I. *Istoriia perevodov Biblii v Rosii*. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1978.

Robinson, Geroid T. *Rural Russia under the Old Regime*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1932.

Rubchak, Marian J. "The Cultural and Political Activities of the Lviv Stavropigiia Brotherhood and the Development of a Ukrainian National Consciousness, 1585–1632." Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois (Chicago), 1988.

Runciman, Steven. *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Runciman, Steven. *The Orthodox Churches and the Secular State*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1971.

Ruud, Charles A. *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804–1906*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Sablinsky, Walter. *The Road to Bloody Sunday: Father Gapon and the St. Petersburg Massacre of 1905*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Saunders, David. *The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture, 1750–1850*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1985.

Schmemann, Alexander. *The Historical Road of Eastern Orthodoxy*. Trans. Lydia W. Kesich. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Eastern Europe Between the Wars, 1918–1941*. 3d ed. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1962.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1977.

Shaw, Stanford J. and Ezel Kural Shaw. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*. Vol. 2, *Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808–1975*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Smolitsch, Igor. *Geschichte der russischen Kirche, 1700–1917*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.

Smolitsch, Igor. *Geschichte der russischen Kirche.* Vol. 2. Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte, vol. 45. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1990.

Stine, Philip C., ed. *Bible Translation and the Spread of the Church: The Last 200 Years.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990.

Stupperich, Robert, ed. *Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche in Lehre und Leben.* Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1966.

Subtelny, Orest. *Ukraine: A History.* 2d ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

Sullivant, Robert S. *Soviet Politics and the Ukraine, 1917–1957.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

Sydorenko, Alexander. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century.* Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1977.

Sysyn, Frank E. *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–1653.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1985.

Thaden, Edward C. *Interpreting History: Collective Essays on Russia's Relations with Europe.* Boulder, CO: Social Science Monographs, 1990.

Thaden, Edward C. *Russia's Western Borderlands, 1710–1870.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Torzecki, Ryszard. *Kwestia ukraińska w Polsce w latach 1923–1929.* Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1989.

Tsirpanlis, Constantine N. *Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology.* Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991.

Tucker, Robert. *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879–1929: A Study in History and Personality.* New York: Norton, 1973.

Ul'ianovs'kyi, Vasyl'. *Tserkva v ukraïns'kii derzhavi 1917–1920 rr.: doba Ukraïns'koï Tsentral'noï Rady.* Kyiv: Lybid', 1997.

Vlasovs'kyi, Ivan. *Kanonichni i istorychni pidstavy dlia avtokefaliï Ukraïns'koï Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy.* Augsburg: UAPTs, 1948.

Vlasovs'kyi, Ivan. *Narys istoriï Ukraïns'koï Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy.* 4 vols. New York: Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 1955–66.

Vynar, Liubomyr. *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi i Naukove tovarystvo im. Tarasa Shevchenka, 1892–1930.* Munich: Dniprova khvylia, 1970.

Wandycz, Piotr S. *The Lands of Partitioned Poland, 1795–1918.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974.

Ware, Timothy. *Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Ware, Timothy. *The Orthodox Church.* Baltimore: Penguin, 1963.

Wcislo, Francis W. *Reforming Rural Russia: State, Local Society, and National Politics, 1855–1914*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Wortman, Richard S. *The Development of a Russian Legal Consciousness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Wynn, Charters. *Workers, Strikes, and Pogroms: The Donbass-Dnepr Bend in Late Imperial Russia, 1870–1905*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Zaionchkovsky, Petr A. *The Russian Autocracy in Crisis, 1878–1882*. Trans. Gary M. Hamburg. Gulf Breeze: Academic International Press, 1979.

Zernov, Nicolas. *Eastern Christendom: A Study of the Origin and Development of the Eastern Orthodox Church*. New York: Putnam, 1961.

Zhukovs'kyi, Arkadii. *Petro Mohyla i pytannia iednosty tserkov*. Paris: Ukraïns'kyi vil'nyi universytet, 1969.

Zinchenko, Arsen. *Vyzvolytysia viroiu: zhyttia i diiannia Mytropolyta Vasylia Lypkivs'koho*. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1997.

2. *Articles, including Chapters in Books*

"Au dehors aussi," *La Victoire* (Paris), 22 December 1930.

Basil, John D. "The Relations between the Church and the State in Late Imperial Russia: Views of the Canonists." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 59 (1993): 141–67.

Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. "The Church and the Ukrainian Revolution: The Central Rada Period." In *The Ukraine, 1917–1921: A Study in Revolution*, ed. Taras Hunczak, with the assistance of John T. von der Heide, 220–46. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1977.

Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. *The Politics of Religion in the Ukraine: The Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1919*. Occasional Paper no. 202. Washington, DC: Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, 1985.

Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. "The Rise of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, 1919–22." In *Church, Nation and State in Russia and Ukraine*, ed. Geoffrey A. Hosking, 228–49. New York: St. Martin's Press; Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1990.

Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. "The Soviet Destruction of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 1929–36." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 12 (Summer 1987): 3–21.

Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. "The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, 1920–1930: A Case Study in Religious Modernization." In *Religion and Modernization in the Soviet Union*, ed. Dennis J. Dunn, 310–47. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1977.

Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. "Ukrainization Movements within the Russian Orthodox Church, and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4,

Part 1 (1979–1980): 92–111.

Cracraft, James. "Feofan Prokopovich." In *The Eighteenth Century in Russia*, ed. John G. Garrard, 75–105. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Cracraft, James. "Feofan Prokopovich and the Kiev Academy." In *Russian Orthodoxy under the Old Regime*, ed. Robert L. Nichols and Theofanis George Stavrou, 44–64. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978.

Dadeshkeliani, J. "The Autocephaly of the Orthodox Church of Georgia." *The Christian East* 3 (1950): 65–72.

Dvornik, Francis. "Byzantium, Muscovite Autocracy and the Church." In *Re-discovering Eastern Christendom*, ed. A. H. Armstrong and E. J. B. Fry, 106–18. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963.

Erickson, John. "Autocephaly in Orthodox Canonical Tradition to the Thirteenth Century." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 15 (1971): 28–41.

Evtuhov, Catherine. "The Church in the Russian Revolution: Arguments for and against Restoring the Patriarchate at the Church Council of 1917–1918." *Slavic Review* 50 (Fall 1991): 497–511.

Freeze, Gregory L. "A Case of Stunted Anticlericalism: Clergy and Society in Imperial Russia." *European Studies Review* 13 (April 1983): 177–200.

Freeze, Gregory L. "Handmaiden of the State? The Church in Imperial Russia Reconsidered." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (January 1985): 82–102.

Garliński, Józef. "The Polish-Ukrainian Agreement, 1920." In *The Reconstruction of Poland, 1914–23*, ed. Paul Latawski, 55–70. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Goldblatt, Harvey. "Orthodox Slavic Heritage and National Consciousness: Aspects of the East Slavic and South Slavic National Revivals." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10 (December 1986): 336–54.

Hamrets'kyi, Iu. M. "Pravoslavna tserkva na Ukraïni na zlami epokh (1917–1918 rr.)." *Ukraïns'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* 344 (November 1989): 47–59.

Himka, John-Paul. "The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Building in Galicia, 1772–1918." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8 (December 1984): 426–52.

Himka, John-Paul. "Young Radicals and Independent Statehood: The Idea of a Ukrainian Nation-State, 1890–1895." *Slavic Review* 41 (Summer 1982): 219–35.

Huttenbach, Henry R. "The Ukraine and Muscovite Expansion." In *Russian Imperialism from Ivan the Great to the Revolution*, ed. Taras Hunczak, 167–97. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1974.

Kartashev, A. V. "Revoliutsiiia i Sobor 1917–1918 g. (Nabroski dlia istorii Russkoi Tserkvi nashikh dnei)." *Bogoslovskaia mysl'* 4 (1942): 75–101.

Kohut, Zenon. "The Development of a Little Russian Identity and Ukrainian Nation-building." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10 (December 1986): 559–76.

Korovyts'kyi, Ivan. "...Mriia oholoshena...Vasyl' Lypkivs'kyi, Mytropolyt UAPTs." *Suchasnist'* 307 (November 1986): 70–86.

Levin, Alfred. "Toward the End of the Old Regime: State, Church, and Duma." In *Religion and Modernization in the Soviet Union*, ed. Dennis J. Dunn, 23–59. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1977.

L'Huillier, Peter. "Accession to Autocephaly." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 37 (1993): 267–304.

L'Huillier, Peter. "Problems concerning Autocephaly." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 24 (1979): 165–91.

Lieven, Dominic C. "The Russian Civil Service under Nicholas II: Some Variations on the Bureaucratic Theme." *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 29 (1981): 366–403.

Mark, Rudolf A. "Social Questions and National Revolution: The Ukrainian National Republic in 1919–1920." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14 (June 1990): 113–31.

Markus, Vasyl. "Religion and Nationalism in Ukraine." In *Religion and Nationalism in Soviet and East European Politics*, ed. Pedro Ramet, 59–81. Durham: Duke University Press, 1984.

Morison, John D. "The Church Schools and Seminaries in the Russian Revolution of 1905–06." In *Church, Nation and State in Russia and Ukraine*, ed. Geoffrey A. Hosking, 193–209. New York: St. Martin's Press; Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1990.

Pelenski, Jaroslaw. "Russia, Poland and Ukraine: Historical and Political Perspectives." In *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj et al., 308–27. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980.

Pipes, Richard. "Peter Struve and Ukrainian Nationalism." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4, Part 2 (1979–1980): 675–83.

Pritsak, Omeljan, and John S. Reshetar, Jr. "The Ukraine and the Dialectics of Nation-Building." *Slavic Review* 22 (June 1963): 224–55.

Ramet, Pedro. "The Interplay of Religious Policy and Nationalities Policy in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe." In *Religion and Nationalism in Soviet and East European Politics*, ed. Pedro Ramet, 3–30. Durham: Duke University Press, 1984.

Reshetar, John S., Jr. "Ukrainian Nationalism and the Orthodox Church." *American Slavic and East European Review* 10 (1951): 38–49.

Rudnytsky, Ivan L. "The Ukrainian National Movement on the Eve of the First World War." In *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*, ed. Peter L. Rudnytsky, 375–87. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987.

Schmemann, Alexander. "A Meaningful Storm: Some Reflections on Autocephaly, Tradition and Ecclesiology." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 15 (1971): 3–27.

Schmemann, Alexander. "Russian Theology: 1920–1972. An Introductory Survey." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 16 (1972): 172–94.

Ševčenko, Ihor. "The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla." In *Ukraine between East and West: Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century*, 164–86. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1996.

Sheshko, Peter T. "The Russian Orthodox Church Sobor of Moscow and the Orthodox Church in the Ukraine (1917–1918)." *Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii Magni* 8 (1973): 161–240; 10 (1979): 229–363.

Simon, Gerhard. "Church, State and Society." In *Russia Enters the Twentieth Century*, ed. Edwin Oberländer et al., 199–235. New York: Schocken, 1971.

Solchanyk, Roman. "Mykhailo Drahomanov and the Ems Ukase: A Note on the Ukrainian Question at the 1878 International Literary Congress in Paris." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2 (June 1977): 225–29.

Sysyn, Frank E. "The Formation of Modern Ukrainian Religious Culture: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." In *Church, Nation and State in Russia and Ukraine*, ed. Geoffrey A. Hosking, 1–22. New York: St. Martin's Press; Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1990.

Sysyn, Frank E. "Relihiia, kul'tura ta natsiia na Ukraïni XVII st. v ukraïns'kii pravoslavnii dumtsi XX-ho st." *Suchasnist'* 333 (January 1989): 50–62.

Szporluk, Roman. "Polish-Ukrainian Relations in 1918: Notes for Discussion." In *The Reconstruction of Poland, 1914–23*, ed. Paul Latawski, 41–54. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Trembits'kyi, Volodymyr. "Znosyny Ukraïns'koï Derzhavy 1918–1922 rokiv z Tsarhorods'koiu Patriiarkhiieiu." *Bohosloviia* 29 (1965): 63–88.

Walkin, Jacob. "Government Controls over the Press in Russia, 1905–1914." *Russian Review* 13 (1954): 203–9.

Wuyts, A. "Le Patriarcat Russe au Concile de Moscou de 1917–1918." *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 129 (1941): 1–243.

Zinkevych, Osyp. "Sprava Ukraïns'koï Avtokefal'noï Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy na protsesi Spilky vyzvolennia Ukraïny i ïï likvidatsiia u 1930 r." *Suchasnist'* 327–28 (July-August 1988): 218–28.

3. Reference Works

Cross, F. L., and E. A. Livingstone, eds. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 2d ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.

D'iachenko, G. M., ed. *Polnyi tserkovno-slavianskii slovar'*. Moscow: Tipografiia Vil'de, 1899.

Ferguson, Everett, et al., eds. *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. New York: Garland, 1990.

Kubijovyč, Volodymyr, and Danylo Husar Struk, eds. *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. 5 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984–93.

Kubijovyč, Volodymyr, ed. *Entsyklopediia Ukraïnoznavstva*. 2 vols., 13 bks. Paris and New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society and Molode Zhyttia, 1949–84.

Kubijovyč, Volodymyr, ed. *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*. 2 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963–71.

Polnyi pravoslavnyi bogoslovskii ėntsiklopedicheskii slovar'. 2 vols. St. Petersburg: Soikin, n.d. [1913].

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church, whose origins go back to the times of Kyivan Rus', has played a fundamental role in the history of the Ukrainian people. The spiritual tradition of Kyivan Christianity, preserved through the centuries and brilliantly revived in the seventeenth century, inspired the flowering of Ukrainian culture and Cossack statehood in the early modern period. Subordinated to Moscow in 1685, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church strove to maintain its identity and reassert its independence. Since its revival during the Ukrainian Revolution (1917–21), the Church has aspired to the recognition of its autocephaly—independent status within the world Orthodox community.

This study examines the life and writings of Oleksander Lototsky (1870–1939), who served as minister of religious affairs in the government of Hetman Pavlo Skoropadsky (1918). Lototsky contributed greatly to the proclamation of the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and, as Ukraine's ambassador to Turkey in 1919–20, strove to gain official recognition of the Church from the Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople. Although political circumstances doomed his initiative, Lototsky did not waver in his commitment, and the scholarly research that he accomplished in Warsaw during the interwar period laid a firm intellectual foundation for the Church's claim to autocephaly.

The author, Rt. Rev. Archimandrite Andre Partykevich, is pastor of the St. Andrew Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Boston. The present work is based on his doctoral thesis, completed at the University of Illinois (Chicago).

This study is the first publication in the series of Church Studies Papers issued under the auspices of the Church Studies Program at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta.