

UDC 271.2(477.62)“1920/1950”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.24.264747

Mykola RUBAN

Postgraduate student of Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University, 59-a Tsentralnyi Prospect, Severodonetsk, Ukraine, postal code 93400 (nikolas.kindle@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-6396-4531

ResearcherID: 4339281

Микола РУБАН

аспірант Східноукраїнського національного університету імені Володимира Даля, просп. Центральний, 59а, м. Северодонецьк, Україна, індекс 93400 (nikolas.kindle@gmail.com)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Ruban, M. (2022). The clergy of the orthodox reformation confessions and preconditions of institutionalisation of the Moscow Patriarchate Dioceses in the Donbas (at the beginning of the 1920s – mid-1950s). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 24, 112–122. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.24.264747

THE CLERGY OF THE ORTHODOX REFORMATION CONFESSIONS AND PRECONDITIONS OF INSTITUTIONALISATION OF THE MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE DIOCESES IN THE DONBAS (at the beginning of the 1920s – mid-1950s)

Abstract. *The purpose* of the research is to elucidate the clergy's influence of the oppositional Reformation denominations on the prerequisites for institutionalization and development of the Ukrainian Exarchate dioceses of the Moscow Patriarchate in the Donbas (at the beginning of the 1920s – mid-1950s). **The methodology of the research** is based on the principles of historicism, systematicity, scientificity, verification, the author's objectivity; as well as the use of general scientific and special historical methods. **The scientific novelty** of this study consists in the attempt to do an unbiased systematic analysis of the circumstances of the Orthodox Church eparchial network development in the Donbas based on a comprehensive analysis of sources and scientific publications. **The Conclusions.** The historical analysis of the prerequisites and circumstances of the institutionalization of Voroshylivhrad Diocese proves that the clergy's integration of the Reformation Orthodox denominations allowed the leadership of the renewed Moscow Patriarchate, headed by the former member of the renewed VCU, Patriarch Serhii (Strahorodsky), not only to solve the acute personnel shortage of the higher hierarchy and workers of the Diocesan Administrations, but also to minimize partially the consequences of the marginalization of the religious consciousness of the believers. Due to the abolishment of the legal parish life in the Donbas by force at the end of the 1930s, the confessional division resumed against the background of a general church revival during the German occupation of 1941 – 1943. However, owing to the lack of the liberal UAOC episcopate, the restoration of church structures was mainly implemented under the jurisdiction of the conservative Autonomous Church, which indicates the scarcity of awareness concerning the importance of church reforms by local followers of the opposition denominations in the 1920s and 1930s. At the same time, the exclusive discrediting of the Orthodox Reformation and the concealment of their original confessional affiliation by the clerics led to the emergence of unresolved key issues of the church system and the restoration of division under the conditions of religious policy liberalization at the end of the 1980s, the consequences of which could be felt in the religious discourse of the post-Soviet countries up till nowadays. Further analysis of interfaith dialogue experience and integration of the oppositional Reformation clergy will allow us to elaborate new conceptual approaches to restoring the unity of the Ukrainian Orthodoxy.

Key words: Ukrainian Orthodoxy, Renovatist Movement, political repression, the German-Soviet war, the Nazi occupation, the postwar period, Donbas, Voroshylivhrad Diocese.

ДУХОВЕНСТВО РЕФОРМАЦІЙНИХ ПРАВОСЛАВНИХ КОНФЕСІЙ ТА ПЕРЕДУМОВИ ІНСТИТУАЛІЗАЦІЇ ЄПАРХІЙ МОСКОВСЬКОЇ ПАТРІАРХІЇ НА ДОНБАСІ (початок 1920 – середина 1950-х рр)

Анотація. Мета дослідження – розкрити вплив духовенства опозиційних реформаційних конфесій на передумови інституалізації та розвиток єпархій Московської Патріархії на Донбасі (початок 1920 – середина 1950-х рр). **Методологія дослідження** базується на принципах історизму, системності, науковості, верифікації, авторської об'єктивності, а також використанні загальнонаукових і спеціально-історичних методів. **Наукова новизна** розвідки полягає у спробі неупередженого системного аналізу обставин розвитку єпархіяльної мережі Православної Церкви на Донбасі на підставі комплексного аналізу джерел та наукової літератури. **Висновки.** Історичний аналіз передумов та обставин інституалізації Ворошиловградської єпархії доводить, що інтеграція духовенства реформаційних православних конфесій дозволила керівництву оновленої Московської Патріархії на чолі з колишнім членом обновленського ВЦУ патріархом Сергієм (Страгородським) не тільки ліквідувати гострий кадровий дефіцит вищої ієрархії та працівників єпархіяльних управлінь, але й частково мінімізувати наслідки маргіналізації релігійної свідомості вірян. Оскільки наприкінці 1930-х рр. легальне парафіяльне життя на Донбасі було силоміць ліквідоване, конфесійне розділення відновилося на тлі загального церковного відродження під час німецької окупації 1941 – 1943 рр. Однак, з огляду на брак єпископату ліберальної УАПЦ, відновлення церковних структур здійснювалось переважно в юрисдикції консервативної Автономної Церкви, що свідчить про недостатність усвідомлення значення церковних реформ місцевими послідовниками опозиційних конфесій 1920 – 1930-х рр. Водночас виключна дискредитація православної реформації та приховування кліриками своєї первісної конфесійної належності призвели до нерегульованості ключових дискусійних питань церковного устрою та відновлення розділення в умовах лібералізації релігійної політики наприкінці 1980-х рр., наслідки чого відчутні в релігійному дискурсі пострадянських країн до нашого часу. Подальший аналіз досвіду міжконфесійного діалогу та інтеграції опозиційного реформаційного духовенства уможливить запропонувати нові концептуальні підходи до відновлення єдності Українського Православ'я.

Ключові слова: Українське Православ'я, обновленський рух, політичні репресії, німецько-радянська війна, нацистська окупація, післявоєнний період, Донбас, Ворошиловградська єпархія.

The Problem Statement. The prerequisites for the formation and the circumstances of the institutional formation of Voroshylovhrad Diocese of the Ukrainian Exarchate of Moscow Patriarchate belong to the least covered pages in the domestic church historiography. The main peculiarity of the issue is that in the Donbas a religious life revival was carried out under the conditions of the German occupation and was marked by confessional division on the basis of contradictions regarding the canonical status of the Ukrainian Orthodoxy, moreover, after the de-occupation of the territory under the conditions of the political course of the Soviet government implementation in support of the unified pro-government denomination, there was a mass transition of the clergy's survived representatives of separate denominations to Moscow Patriarchate clergy, owing to which many reformation practices and ideas entered the liturgical and canonical tradition of the latter. Finally, the topicality of studying the historical experience of the Orthodox dioceses organizational formation in the Donbas during the post-war period, the influence of the renewalist clergy on the implementation of the specified process acquires exceptional importance in the context of researching the final period of separate denominations activity in Ukraine, the search of the reunification model of the Ukrainian Orthodoxy and the definition of conceptual approaches regarding the local Church development in the Ukrainian-Russian border region.

The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications. The issue of the historical circumstances of the Orthodox confessions formation and development in Ukraine is

considered to be of a high topicality on the national religious historiography pages. Among the Ukrainian researchers the topic of the Orthodox Church position in Ukraine in the 1920s – 1950s is presented in the works of Yu. Voloshyn (Voloshyn, 1997), O. Lysenko (Lysenko, 1999), A. Kyrydon, V. Pashchenko (Pashchenko & Kyrydon, 2004), P. Bondarchuk, V. Danylenko (Bondarchuk & Danylenko, 2012), A. Smyrnov (Smyrnov, 2019; 2020) and the others. The analysis on tendencies concerning the key reformation confessions development was carried out in the scientific works of S. Zhyliuk (Zhyliuk, 2002), V. Sylantiev (Sylantiev, 2005), O. Ihnatyusha, T. Hruzova (Ihnatusha, 2006; Ihnatusha & Hruzova, 2021), O. Tryhub (Tryhub, 2009). Among foreign historiography representatives, the prominent monographs published by the Russian researchers should also be mentioned: Metropolitan Theodosius (Protsiuk) (Protsiuk, 2004), L. Regelson (Regelson, 2007), Archpriest V. Lavrinov (Lavrinov, 2007; 2017) and priest I. Soloviov (Soloviov, 2002). The historical aspect of church revival in the occupied territories and subsequent transformation of the state-church relations during the years of Stalin's rule was presented in the articles written by R. Boer (Boer, 2018) and D. Harrisville (Harrisville, 2019). The works of O. Forostiuk (Forostiuk, 1999; 2000; 2004), I. Lukovenko (Lukovenko, 2011), M. Rebrova (Rebrova, 2016) and V. Pidhaiko (Pidhaiko, 2020) deal with the study of the circumstances of the Orthodoxy institutionalization in the Donbas, and the human dimension of this issue is considered in the researches carried out by I. Hridina (Hridina, 2001), I. Dovzhuk (Dovzhuk, 2012) and the others. However, since the available historiography is often marked by the tendency of confessional reception and there could be some inaccuracies, there is a drastic need not only to involve new sources into scientific circulation, but also to carry out a detailed comparative analysis of available factual material in the context of a regional section of the above-mentioned issue.

Hence, the subject of the study is the historical circumstances and a personal factor of the Moscow Patriarchate dioceses institutionalization in the Donbas. The chronological boundaries of the study cover the period from the organizational formation of the movement for the Orthodoxy renewal at the beginning of the 1920s to the leadership of Voroshylovhrad Diocese by the former cleric of the Synodal Church – Metropolitan Borys (Vik) in 1956. The territorial boundaries of the study are delineated by the actual boundaries of the dioceses – the territories of Stalinska and Voroshylovhrad (at that time) regions.

The purpose of the research is to trace, based on a comprehensive analysis of historical sources and scientific publications, the influence of the clergy of the Reformation Orthodox denominations on the prerequisites for the creation, organizational formation and development of the Moscow Patriarchate dioceses in the Donbas, which involves solving the following research objectives: first of all, to find out the prerequisites for the emergence and quantitative composition of the reformation Orthodox denominations in the Donbas; second of all, to analyze the peculiarities of church revival in the territory of the region during the period of the German occupation; third of all, to find out the integration circumstances of the reformation denominations clergy into the composition of local dioceses of the Moscow Patriarchate. The following methods were used while working on the research: general scientific methods and principles of historical research. The article is based on the principles of historicism, objectivity, continuity, multifactoriality, complexity and pluralism. Historical comparative, prosopographic, problem chronological methods were applied in the research (Fullerton, 2011).

The Results of the Research. The ideological design of the movement for the Orthodox Church reformation in Ukraine dates back to the time of the Pre-Conciliar presence in 1906. The revolutionary events of 1917 – 1921 contributed to the destruction of the control system

over a spiritual life of society that existed during the autocracy and intensified the activities of reformation movements due to the liberalization of religious policy and the possibility of creating communities without the hierarchy sanction. The policy of oppression concerning the conservative hierarchs, who were marked by a political unreliability, began right after the establishment of the Bolshevik dictatorship. The actual instrument for the destruction of the organized structure of the Orthodox Church was the deepening of its internal contradictions and the establishment of multi-confessionalism. However, the first experience of an open discussion on possible reforms regarding the depoliticization and normalization of the parish life in accordance with the challenges of the era remained unrealized at the All-Ukrainian and All-Russian Councils of 1917 – 1918, and within the Church a powerful opposition of ordinary clergy and intelligentsia was formed, whose participation in the management of church affairs was minimal. In May of 1922, the imprisoned Patriarch Tykhon was visited by a group of the clergy – the supporters of church reforms – and persuaded the hierarch to renounce power. By his resolution, Patriarch Tykhon transferred the clerical office to the specified clerics until the arrival of the vicar, which was interpreted a bit later as permission to transfer church power to them.

On May 29, 1922, the founding meeting of the renewed Higher Church Administration for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church (hereinafter referred to as the VCU) was held in Moscow (Soloviev, 2005, p. 104), and already on June 16, 1922, the future Patriarch of Moscow (at that time – Metropolitan) Serhiy (Strahorodsky) as part of a group of hierarchs signed an open appeal to the episcopate, in which he recognized the VCU as the only canonical, legal, Supreme Church Authority, and all its decrees were legal and binding, calling the following: “*all true shepherds and believing sons of the Orthodox Church to follow our example*” (Gubonin, 1994, pp. 218–219). As a result, soon Metropolitan Serhiy became a member of the VCU and was proposed as one of the candidates for its leadership (Soloviev, 2005, p. 105). It should be stated that the VCU was recognized by 37 out of 73 bishops of the Moscow Patriarchate already in 1922 (Regelson, 2007, pp. 84, 310). The VCU was officially recognized by the future heads of the Moscow Patriarchate – bishops Oleksiy (Symansky) and Mykolai (Yarushevych), who, however, showed a wait-and-see attitude (Krasnov-Levitin & Shavrov, 1996, p. 140).

As a result of significant disagreements regarding the degree of reforms radicality, the mass separation of a number of renewalist groups began. On May 8, 1923, Metropolitan Serhiy (Strahorodsky) did not join the renewed composition of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which was named the Supreme Church Council, but already on August 27 he repented in public, in front of Patriarch Tykhon (Lavrynov, 2017, p. 516). As the threat of collapse loomed over the renovationist movement as a result of a significant organizational crisis, the course was taken to curtail reforms, which, however, did not improve its situation. Instead, the Soviet special services searched for the mechanisms to control the activities of the remaining Orthodox denominations. On June 4 – 5, 1925, in Ukraine, Lubensky assembly was held with the participation of 5 hierarchs, at which the Cathedral-Episcopal Church was formalized – a canonical alternative to the UAOC and the renewed Synodal Church (hereinafter – USC). There were registered 207 parishes of reformation denominations (UAOC, USC, and USEC) in the Donbas on January 1, 1928, which was only 36,8% of the total number of the Orthodox communities in the region (CSAHAAU, f. 5, d. 3, c. 116, pp. 114–119).

On July 29, 1927 the Declaration of Loyalty to the Soviet Government was proclaimed and the Temporary Patriarchal Holy Synod of Metropolitan Serhiy was formed, who after

the death of Patriarch Tykhon became the Deputy Patriarchal Vicar of Metropolitan Peter Krutytsky (Poliansky) and soon actually headed the Moscow Patriarchate, crisis arose – a part of bishops accused the hierarch of exceeding his authority, abusing the highest church authority and creating “*a newly renewed split*” (Shumilo, 2011, p. 42). Since Metropolitan Serhiy resorted to numerous concessions to the authorities in his actions, in particular, the introduction of the practice of actual intervention of the authorities in church personnel policy, a number of clerics and hierarchs formed the basis of the so-called Catacomb Church. Under those circumstances, Metropolitan Serhiy carried out personnel rotations of the governing bodies of the Moscow Patriarchate at the expense of hierarchs loyal to the Soviet government, many of whom were in the Renewal Movement previously. Hence, according to R. Rehelson, Metropolitan Serhiy carried out “*a terrible and irreparable act – a purposeful change in the hierarchy of the Russian Church*” (Regelson, 2007, p. 117). However, despite the hierarchs’ loyalty of the renewed Moscow Patriarchate, Synodal and Cathedral-Episcopal Churches, all denominations were subjected to repression. Thus, at the end of the 1930s, in the Donbas, a legal religious life was brought to a halt completely. The exception was only two congregations of the Renovationist Church: Pokrovsky Church (khram) in the village of Staromykhailivka, Stalin Region, and Ascension Church, in the city of Oleksandrivsk, Voroshylovhrad Region (Pidgayko, 2020, p. 538).

However, the German-Soviet war changed the situation drastically. With the beginning of the Nazi occupation, Metropolitan Feofil (Buldovsky), the last First Hierarch of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Ukraine, restored Kharkiv Diocesan Administration, whose jurisdiction included more than 400 parishes in Kharkiv, Poltava, Luhansk, Donetsk, Kursk, and Voronezh regions by the middle of 1942 (Voloshyn, 1997, p. 56). On July 27, 1942, at the meeting of Kharkiv diocesan administration, with the participation of Bishop Mstyslav (Skrypnyk), a protocol was signed on the integration of parishes subordinate to Bishop Feofilo into the Administration of the UAOC of Archbishop Polikarp (Sikorsky) (Zinkevych, 1987, pp. 726–727). First of all, the revival of a religious life in the Donbas covered its western part (from October of 1941 – the beginning of the occupation of Stalino), and by July of 1942, when Voroshylovhrad and Rostov were captured, it spread to the eastern part of the region. The occupation government did not interfere with a religious revival in Ukraine, but, on the contrary, sought to use it for its own ideological purposes.

In the absence of local bishops and an organized system of church administration, believers spontaneously created temporary diocesan administrative bodies on their own, which were given the functions of restoring liquidated churches, coordinating the activities of district deacons, and also ensuring the conditions for appointing a bishop. The surviving representatives of the clergy were found by the parishioners themselves, less often by the occupation administration, and they were involved in the restoration of divine services. In November of 1941, a member of the All-Ukrainian Synod from Donetsk Diocese of the Synodal Church, a priest Prokip Drahozhynsky, was appointed the abbot of Mykylsky Church (Krasnoarmiysk) and Deacon of Krasnoarmiysk District. Owing to his efforts, 11 mostly former renewal communities were restored, which became part of the Autonomous Church, which recognized canonical submission to the Moscow Patriarchate (Нікольський, 2013, с. 122). On December 1, 1942, permission was received to create Donetsk Diocesan Administration of the Autonomous Church, with its center in Bakhmut. However, due to the impossibility of holding services at the dilapidated former renovated Trinity Cathedral of the city, the center of the diocese, which included most of the Orthodox communities of Stalin

and Voroshylovhrad regions (544 parishes) (Rebrova, 2016, p. 60), was situated in the city of Ordzhonikidze (nowadays – Yenakiyev). There was also Makiyiv Diocesan Administration, subordinate to the Vicar of Rostov Diocese (Pidgayko, 2020, p. 538).

After signing the unification act of the Autocephalous and Autonomous Churches on October 8, 1942, Metropolitan Feofil, having the ambitions of a superior, made an unsuccessful attempt to convene the Synod session of the United Church in Kharkiv in December of 1942 (Prykhodchenko, 2011, p. 47). Taking into account the failure of the unification, on December 8, 1942, Metropolitan Feofil was given the authority of the administrator of the UAC in Left-Bank Ukraine and was asked to appoint bishops to the main cities of the eastern dioceses, including Mariupol and Voroshylovhrad immediately (Feodosii (Protsiuk), 2004, p. 475). Among the possible applicants, the candidacy of Bishop Mstyslav (Skrypnyk) was considered, whom the occupation authorities demanded to be transferred to one of the eastern cathedrals to choose from: Rostov, Stalin or Voroshylovhrad (Vlasovsky, 1998, p. 238), as well as the secretary of Kharkiv Diocesan Administration, Archpriest O. Kryvomaz, whose episcopal ordination was approved at Lutsk Cathedral of the UAPC on October 10, 1942 (Feodosii (Protsiuk), 2004, p. 453). There is information about the activities of the Trinity Deanery of Valuisk Diocese of the UAPC, which covered the northern regions of Luhansk region (Forostiuk, 2004, p. 197).

In January of 1943, Bishop Dymytriy (Mahan), who received the title of “Katerynoslav and Donetsk”, was appointed the head of Donetsk Diocese of the Autonomous Church (Feodosii (Protsiuk), 2004, p. 562), and already on January 11, 1943, by order of the Reich Commissariat, the activities of bishops and their movement outside the boundaries of their own dioceses were strictly limited to local general commissioners, whose competence also included permission for new episcopal ordinations and the transfer of the clergy (Zinkevych, 1987, p. 751). Because of these circumstances, the formation of new diocesan administrations became impossible. On February 14, 1943, the Soviet troops occupied Voroshylovhrad, and by September of 22, the entire territory of the Donbas. On the eve of this, Metropolitan Feofil requested his acceptance into the Moscow Patriarchate. In the fall of 1943, the hierarch was arrested, and on January 23, 1944, he died in prison (Prykhodchenko, 2011, pp. 47, 50). It is worth noting that during the war, the Soviet authorities also managed to support the religious feelings of society, trying to use this factor in ideological speculations. In particular, religious communities restored during the Nazi occupation not only continued to operate in the liberated settlements, but new ones were also opened. Taking into consideration the ideological isolation and physical destruction of the most radical hierarchs, the minimization of reformation tendencies in the majority of communities, the Soviet party leadership aspired to form a single loyal pro-government denomination – the renewed Moscow Patriarchate with the aim of its further use to increase international authority among allied countries and as a response to the Nazi policy of a religious revival with its subsequent use as a controlled ideology. On September 4, 1943, during the personal reception by Y. Stalin of the above-mentioned Metropolitan Serhiy (Strahorodsky), Oleksiy (Symansky) and Mykolai (Yarushevychi), it was agreed to hold the Council of Bishops, at which Metropolitan Serhiy was elected Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia on September 8 (Lavrinov, 2017, p. 517).

On February 29, 1944, during a meeting with the head of the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church, H. Karpov, Metropolitan Oleksandr Vvedensky raised unsuccessfully the issue of permission to appoint Metropolitan Filaret (Yatsenko) as Exarch of Ukraine (Soloviev, 2002, p. 48). On March 2, 1944, the former Renovation First Hierarch

Metropolitan Vitaliy (Vvedensky) was accepted into the Moscow Patriarchate in the rank of bishop, who was already promoted to the rank of archbishop on May 5, 1944, and on July 13, 1944, he was appointed archbishop of Tula and Bielevsky. Since July 19, 1946 – Archbishop Dmitrovsky, Vicar of Moscow Diocese, Chairman of the Missionary Council at the Holy Synod (Lavrinov, 2017, p. 173). As of July 1, 1944, 98 renewal parishes were officially functioning on the territory of Ukraine, and 88 priests, 16 deacons, and 18 psalmists were registered (CSAHAAU, f. 4648, d. 3, c. 3, pp. 24–25.). However, by April 1, 1945, not a single Renewal cleric was registered on the territory of Ukraine (CSAHAAU, f. 4648, d. 3, c. 3, p. 49.). In June of 1945, under the conditions of actual liquidation of the Renewal Church due to the refusal to register the clergy, Metropolitan Oleksandr requested to be accepted into the Moscow Patriarchate. However, after a long consideration, the final decision was made that it could only be accepted by a layman, so the reunion never took place (Lavrinov, 2017, p. 52). The last renewalist hierarch, Metropolitan Filaret (Yatsenko), having made a number of unsuccessful attempts to restore the Church, passed away at the beginning of 1951 (Lavrinov, 2017, p. 560).

Meanwhile, the eparchial network of the Moscow Patriarchate underwent an active development. In the summer of 1944, 128 religious communities functioned on the territory of Voroshylovhrad region (CSAHAAU, f. 4648, d. 3, c. 3, p. 53), 126 of which were opened during the German occupation. In September of 1942, Archpriest Leontiy Yarzhemsky, a cleric of the USEC (SAKhR, f. P-845, d. 2, c. 825, pp. 2–4), later a clergyman of Voroshylovhrad District of the Autonomous Church, headed the former Renewal community of Kazan Cathedral (Voroshylovhrad) (Forostiuk, 1999, p. 16), whose starosta (head) received permission from the city administration to restore the cathedral and the center of the Orthodox diocese in the city (Pidgayko, 2020, p. 539). On October 1, 1942, the restored congregation of the Ascension Church (Voroshylovhrad) was headed by Archpriest Ioakim Oleksiuk, a former commissioner of the renewal Donetsk Diocese, who in the spring of 1943 became a Deacon of Voroshylovhrad district, and in the spring of 1944, at the local clergy Congress, was elected as a candidate for the bishop of Voroshylovhrad (Pidgayko, 2020, p. 539). However, during the discussion of this issue by Patriarch Serhiy with the head of the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church H. Karpov, due to the anti-Soviet speeches of Archpriest I. Oleksiuk during the Nazi occupation, the cleric's candidacy was rejected, and already on September 16, 1944, he was arrested (Holenko, 2005, p. 686).

On May 19, 1944, a former Revivalist priest was appointed Bishop of Voroshylovhrad, Vicar of Dnipropetrovsk Diocese, and later Archpriest Oleksandr Petin, Deacon of Kalinin district of Kalinin region. It should be noted that O. Petin was in the Renewal Movement since 1922 (Lavrinov, 2017, p. 457). In 1928, a celibate, he was ordained a priest and appointed Abbot of Kazan Cathedral in Penza. In the fall of 1931, he was promoted to the rank of Archpriest. There is information that in the Renewal Church, the issue of the episcopal ordination of Archpriest O. Petin was raised three times. On August 24, 1932, he was appointed Bishop of Ural and Huryevsk, however, on September 7, the appointment was cancelled. On December 7, 1932, the cleric was recommended to replace the vacant Kozlov Diocese, and in 1933 he was appointed Bishop of Kimra. However, the episcopal ordination never took place, as he was already arrested on March 8, 1933 (Lavrinov, 2017, p. 457). Hence, Archpriest O. Avdiugin's statement that only after returning from exile in the summer of 1937, the future bishop "*joined the revivalist split ... in order to obtain a priestly position*" is false (Avdiugin, 2010, p. 17). At the end of 1943, Archpriest O. Petin

repented to Patriarch Serhiy and was admitted to the clergy of the Moscow Patriarchate with the recognition of a priestly rank (Lavrinov, 2017, p. 457). On May 20, 1944, he was ordained a monk, and on May 21 he was ordained a bishop, presided over by Metropolitan Mykolai (Yarushevych) (Narecheniye i khirotoniya, 1944, pp. 8–9). One of the priority tasks of the hierarch was the consolidation of the surviving clergy, including reformation confessions. Hence, the documents contain references to clerics' complaints about the "liberalism" of the hierarch (CSAHAAU, f. 4648, d. 3, c. 23, pp. 192–193).

In October of 1944, priest Dymytriy Klepachevsky, a former member of the renewal Luhansk Diocesan Administration, was appointed to the Petro and Pavlo Cathedral in Voroshylohrad (Zhyliuk, 2002, p. 189; Sumishyn, Kornieyev, Brel & Kravchenko, 2011, p. 31). In the autumn of 1947, after a 10-year imprisonment, a graduate of Moscow Theological Academy (1927 – 1931), candidate of Theology, Revivalist priest Volodymyr Molchanov was admitted to the clergy of Voroshylohrad Diocese (CSAHAAU, f. 4648, d. 3, c. 8, p. 54), as well as the former secretary of Metropolitan Feofilo (Buldovsky) of the USEC, Archpriest Fiodor Obmok, were enrolled in the clergy of Voroshylohrad Diocese (later – Archimandrite Feofan) (Feodosii (Protsiuk), 2004, p. 399; Forostiuk, 2004, p. 113). In the summer of 1947, Archpriest Leontiy Yarzhemsky acted as a lecturer at three-month theological courses organized by Voroshylohrad Diocesan Administration (CSAHAAU, f. 4648, d. 3, c. 8, pp. 40–41).

Since 1947, the strengthening of anti-religious policy began in the USSR. On August 3, 1948, after the conflict aggravation between Bishop Nykon and the commissioner of the Russian Orthodox Church in Stalin region regarding the expropriation of the Trinity Cathedral in Sloviansk, the hierarch was appointed temporarily in charge of Odesa Diocese, and on October 21, 1949 – the Bishop of Kherson and Odesa Dioceses with the right to manage Voroshylohrad Diocese (Pidgayko, 2020, p. 539). Actually the above-mentioned decision started a long-term practice of the leadership of the Donbas Dioceses by Odesa Bishops and provided for the limitation of their role in a spiritual life of the region. In October of 1949, the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church agreed to close and remove the building of Mykyl Cathedral in Voroshylohrad. In March of 1950, by decree of Bishop Nykon, the episcopal chair was moved to Petro and Pavlo Cathedral of the city (Forostiuk, 2004, pp. 88, 90). Despite this, the process of staffing the clergy of the diocese continued due to the hierarch's measures. In particular, on December 10, 1950, Archpriest Leonid Borodulin, a former Deacon of the Renewal Diocese of Nizhnyi Tahil, was enrolled in the clergy of the Diocese, and he was appointed to the position of Rector of the church in the village of Khanzhenkovo, Stalin region. From January 22, 1952, he became the Abbot of Mykylska Cathedral and Deacon of Voroshylohrad District, from April 14, 1953, he was transferred to Petro and Pavlo Cathedral of the city, and from 1954 – the Abbot of Mykylska Cathedral in Artemivsk (Lavrinov, 2007, p. 210).

In 1955, Archbishop Nykon (Petin) was diagnosed with leukemia, and on May 16, 1956, he died prematurely. In the end, it was the hierarch's efforts that not only created the organizational structure of the Voroshylohrad Diocese, but also strengthened it with powerful personnel potential and new parishioners, including former representatives of reformation denominations. Thus, it was his activity that marked a new stage in the religious life of the Donbas. On April 25, 1956, Archbishop Borys (Vik) was appointed the new head of the Diocese, who also began his service in the Renewal Church, where in 1926 he was ordained celibate to the rank of Deacon, and already in 1934 he became a monk in Moscow Patriarchates without recognition of ordination (Kopylova, 2003, p. 35).

The Conclusion. Thus, at the beginning of the 1920s, in view of the unsolvedness of many urgent problems of church life, a number of oppositional Orthodox denominations arose in Ukraine, differing in the degree of the reform programme radicality. As legal parish life was abolished at the end of 1930s, religious life and denominational separation resumed during the Nazi occupation of 1941 – 1943. However, taking into consideration the lack of a bishopric of the liberal UAOC, the restoration of church structures in the Donbas, in particular the former congregations of the USC and USEC, was carried out under the jurisdiction of the conservative hierarchs of the Autonomous Church. After the end of the war, in view of the ideological discrediting of the majority of denominations, there arose objective prerequisites for the formation of a single Diocesan network in Ukraine loyal to the Soviet leadership of the Moscow Patriarchate, which was significantly strengthened by the clergy of the Synodal and Cathedral-Episcopal Churches. A special role in the formation of Voroshylovhrad Diocese was played by the activities of the former Renewal cleric – Archbishop Nykon (Petin).

The historical analysis of the formation of Voroshylovhrad Diocese proves that the integration of the opposition clergy allowed the leadership of the renewed Moscow Patriarchate not only to solve the acute personnel shortage of the higher hierarchy and employees of the Diocesan Administrations, but also to minimize the consequences of the marginalization of the religious consciousness of the faithful, since a number of former representatives of the renewalist clergy of the Donbas had high authority of clergy and preachers. At the same time, the exclusive discrediting of the Orthodox Reformation and the concealment by clerics of their original confessional affiliation led to the unresolved key debated issues of the church system, the deepening of secularism and, ultimately, the restoration of division under the conditions of the liberalization of religious policy at the end of the 1980s, the consequences of which are felt in the post-Soviet religious discourse to our time. We believe that further analysis of the experience of interfaith dialogue and the circumstances of the integration of the opposition clergy will allow us to offer new conceptual approaches to restoring the unity of the Ukrainian Orthodoxy.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for the given advice during the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. The authors did not receive financial assistance for research, preparation and publication of the article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aydiugin, A., archiepriest. (2010). *Pervyi arkhiverei Luganshchiny. Zhizneopisaniye arkhiepiskopa Nikona (Petina) (1902 – 1956)* [The First Bishop of the Luhansk Region. Biography of Archbishop Nikon (Petin) (1902 – 1956)]. Lugansk: Luganskoye yeparkhial'noye upravleniye Ukrainskoy Pravoslavnoy Tserkvi, 74 p. [in Russian]

Boer, R. (2018). Sergei and the “Divinely Appointed” Stalin: Theology and Ecclesiology in Church-State Relations in the Soviet Union in the Lead-up to the Cold War. *Social science*. 7(4):67, 1–19. Doi: 10.3390/socsci7040067 [in English]

Bondarchuk, P. M. & Danylenko, V. M. (2012). Osoblyvosti relihiynoyi sytuatsiyi v URSS (seredyna 1950-kh – persha polovyna 1960-kh rokiv). [Features of the Religious Situation in the USSR (mid-1950s – first half of the 1960s)]. *Visnyk Mykolayivs'koho natsional'noho universytetu imeni V.O. Sukhomlyns'koho*, 3(33), 166 – 180. [in Ukrainian]

Dovzhuk, I. V. (2012). *Rosiy's'ka pravoslavna tserkva v kul'turnomu ta ekonomichnomu zhytti Donbasu u 20-kh rr. XX st.* [The Russian Orthodox Church in the Cultural and Economic life of Donbas in the 20s of the Twentieth Century]. Luhansk: SNU im. Volodymyra Dalya. 135 p. [in Ukrainian]

Fedosii (Protsiuk), metrop. (2004). *Obosoblencheskye dvyzheniya v pravoslavnoi Tserkvy na Ukrainy (1917 – 1943)* [Separate Movements in the Orthodox Church in Ukraine (1917 – 1943)]. Moscow: Obshchestvolivubiteleitserkovnoi istoriy, 635 p. [in Russian]

Forostiuk, O. D. (1999). *Pravoslavnaya Luganshchina v gody gonenyi i tragicheskikh ispytaniy (1917 – 1988 gg.)* [Orthodox Luhansk Region during the Years of Persecution and Tragic Ordeals (1917 – 1988)]. Lugansk: RIOLYVD. 120 p. [in Russian]

Forostiuk, O. D. (2000). *Pravove rehuliuвання derzhavno-tserkovnykh vidnosyn u radianskii Ukraini v 1917 – 1941 rokakh (na materialy Donetskoho rehionu)* [Legal Regulation of State-church Relations in Soviet Ukraine in 1917 – 1941 (based on the material of the Donetsk region)]. Luhansk: RVV LIVS. 151 p. [in Ukrainian]

Forostiuk, O. D. (2004). *Luhanshchyna relihiyna. Istorychnyi i pravovyi aspekty* [Religion in the Luhansk Region. Historical and Legal Aspects]. Luhansk: Svitlytsya. 206 p. [in Ukrainian]

Fullerton, R. (2011). Historical Methodology: the perspective of a professionally trained historian turned marketer. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, 3 (4), 436–448. Doi: 10.1108/17557501111183608 [in English]

Gubonin, M. (Ed.). (1994). *Akty svyateyshego patriarkha Tikhona i pozdneyshiye dokumenty o preymstve vyshey tserkovnoy vlasti 1917 – 1943 gg.* [Acts of His Holiness Patriarch Tikhon and Later Documents on the Succession of the Highest Ecclesiastical Authority in 1917 – 1943]. Moscow: Izd-vo Pravoslavnogo Svyato-Tikhonovskogo Bogoslovskogo Instituta, 1062 p. [in Russian]

Harrisville, D. (2019). Unholy Crusaders: The Wehrmacht and the Reestablishment of Soviet Churches during Operation Barbarossa. *Central European History*, 52(4), 620–649. Doi: 10.1017/S0008938919000876 [in English]

Holenko, V. M. (Ed.). (2005). *Reabilitovani istoriyeyu: Luhans'ka oblast'* [Rehabilitated by History: Luhansk Region]. Vol. 2. Luhansk, 702 p. [in Ukrainian]

Hridina, I. M. (2001). *Pravoslavna Tserkva v Ukraini pid chas Druhoiy svitovoyi viyny 1939 – 1945 rr.: lyuds'kyi vymir* [The Orthodox Church in Ukraine during World War II 1939 – 1945: the human dimension]. (*Candidate's thesis*). Donetsk. 224 p. [in Ukrainian]

Ihnatusha, O. M. & Hruzova, T. S. (2021). Tserkva v umovakh Holodomoru 1932 – 1933 rr.: istoriografichnyy dyskurs [The Church under the Conditions of the Holodomor of 1932 – 1933: Historiographic Discourse]. *Storinky istoriyi – History Pages*, 53, 196–222. Doi: 10.20535/2307-5244.53.2021.248481. [in Ukrainian]

Ihnatusha, O. M. (2006). *Instytutsiynny rozkol pravoslavnoy tserkvy v Ukraini v umovakh modernizatsiyi (XIX st. – 30-ti rr. XX st.)* [Institutional Split of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine under the Conditions of Modernization (the XIXth Century – the 30s of the XXth Century)]. (*Doctor's thesis*). Zaporizhzhya, 520 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kopylova, O. N. (2003). Boris. *Pravoslavnaya entsiklopediya – Orthodox Encyclopedia*. (Vol. 6, pp. 35–36). Moscow: Pravoslavnaya entsiklopediya. [in Russian]

Krasnov-Levitin, A. & Shavrov, V. (1996). *Ocherki po istoriyi russkoi tserkovnoi smuty* [Essays on the history of the Russian Church Troubles]. Moskva: Krutytskoe Patryarshche podvore, 670 p. [in Russian]

Lavrinov, V. archiepriest. (2007). *Ocherki istorii obnovlencheskogo raskola na Urale (1922 – 1945)* [Essays on the History of the Renovationist Split in the Urals (1922 – 1945)]. Moscow: Obshchestvo lyubiteley tserkovnoi istoriy, 308 p. [in Russian]

Lavrinov, V. archiepriest. (2017). *Obnovlencheskyi raskol v potretakh eho deiateley* [Renovation Split in the Portraits of his Figures]. Moscow: Obshchestvo lyubiteley tserkovnoi istoriy, 736 p. [in Russian]

Levitin, A. & Shavrov, V. (1996). *Ocherki po istorii russkoy tserkovnoy smuty* [Essays on the History of Russian Church Troubles]. Moscow: Obshchestvo lyubiteley tserkovnoy istorii, 672 p. [in Russian]

Lukovenko, I. H. (2011). *Radyans'ka derzhava i Rosiys'ka pravoslavna tserkva na Donechchyni u 1943 – 1964 rokakh* [The Soviet State and the Russian Orthodox Church in Donetsk Region in 1943 – 1964]. Donetsk: Donbas, 353 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lysenko, O. Ye. (1999). *Relihiyna sytuatsiya na Ukraini v 1941 – 1946 rr.* [The Religious Situation in Ukraine in 1941 – 1946]. (*Doctor's thesis*). Kyiv, 480 p. [in Ukrainian]

Narecheniye i khironiya. (1944). Narecheniye i khironiya iyeromonakha Nikona (Petina) vo yepiskopa Voroshilovgradskogo [Naming and Consecration of Hieromonk Nikon (Petin) as Bishop of Voroshilovgrad]. *Zhurnal Moskovskoy Patriarkhii – Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, 7, 8–9. [in Russian]

Nikolsky, V. N. (2013) *Pravoslavnoye dukhovenstvo Donetchiny, repressirovannoye v 1920 – 1950 gg. (v dokumentakh i materialakh)* [The Orthodox Clergy of Donetsk Region, Repressed in the 1920s – 1950 s (in documents and materials)]. Donetsk: Izd-vo DonNU, 194 p. [in Russian]

Pashchenko, V. & Kyrydon, A. (2004). *Bil'shovyts'ka derzhava i pravoslavna tserkva v Ukraini (1917 – 1930-ti roky)* [The Bolshevik State and the Orthodox Church in Ukraine (1917 – 1930s)]. Poltava, 335 p. [in Ukrainian]

Pidgayko, V. G. (2020). Luganskaya I Alchevskaya yeparkhiya. [Lugansk and Alchevsk Diocese]. *Pravoslavnyaya entsiklopediya – Orthodox encyclopedia* (Vol. 41, pp. 530–541). Moscow: Pravoslavnyaya entsiklopediya. [in Russian]

Prykhodchenko, V. (2011). Mytropolyt Feofil (Buldovs'kyi) – orhanizator Ukrayins'koyi Avtokefal'noyi Pravoslavnoyi Tserkvy na Slobids'kiy Ukraini [Metropolitan Theophilus (Buldovsky) is the Organizer of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Sloboda Ukraine]. *UAPTS chasiv Druhoyi svitovoyi viyny mytropolyt Feofil (Buldovs'kyi)*. (pp. 31–52). Kharkiv. [in Ukrainian]

Rebrova, M. I. (2016). Vozobnovleniye tserkovnoy zhizni v Stalinskoy (Donetskoy) oblasti v usloviyakh germanskoj okkupatsii (1941 – 1943 gg.) [Renewal of Church Life in Stalin (Donetsk) Region during the German Occupation (1941 – 1943)]. *Vestnik PSTGU. Seriya II: Istoriya. Istoriya Russkoy Pravoslavnoy Tserkvi*, 3 (70), 55–68. [in Russian]

Regelson, L. L. (2007). *Tragediya Russkoy Tserkvi* [The Tragedy of the Russian Church]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Krutitskogo podvor'ya, Obshchestvo lyubiteley tserkovnoy istorii, 640 p. [in Russian]

Shumilo, S. V. (2011). *V katakombakh. Pravoslavnoye podpol'ye v SSSR. Konspekt po istorii Istynno-Pravoslavnoy Tserkvi v SSSR* [In the Catacombs. The Orthodox Underground in the USSR. Synopsis on the History of the True Orthodox Church in the USSR]. Lutsk, Teren, 272 p. [in Russian]

Smyrnov, A. (2019). The Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Movement during the Years of German Occupation. *Annals of the University of Craiova, History*, 1(35), 43–53. [in English]

Smyrnov, A. I. (2020). *Tserkovno-institutsiyni transformatsiyi Ukrayins'koho Pravoslav'ya v roky Druhoyi svitovoyi viyny* [Church-institutional Transformations of the Ukrainian Orthodoxy during World War II]. (*Doctor's thesis*). Ostroh, 405 p. [in Ukrainian]

Soloviev, I. deacon. (2005). *Vyssheye Tserkovnoye Upravleniye. Pravoslavnyaya entsiklopediya – Orthodox Encyclopedia*. (Vol. 10, pp. 104–106). Moscow: Pravoslavna yaentsiklopediya. [in Russian]

Soloviov, Y. V. (Ed.). (2002). *Obnovlencheskiy raskol (Materyaly dlia tserkovno-istoricheskoyi kanonicheskoy kharakterystyky)* [Renovation Schism (Materials for Church-historical and Canonical Characteristics)]. Moscow: Izd-vo Krutitskogo Patryarshego Podvor'ia, Obshchestvo lyubiteley tserkovnoy istorii, 1100 p. [in Russian]

Sumishyn, Yu. S, Korniyev, Ye. S, Brel, Ya. M. & Kravchenko, H. M. (2012). *Luhans'ka yeparkhiya. Informatsiyno-dovidkove vydannya*. [Luhansk Diocese. Information and reference publication]. Lugansk: Maksim. 600 p. [in Russian]

Sylantiev, V. I. (2005). *Vlada i pravoslavna tserkva v Ukraini (1917 – 1930 rr.)*. [Authorities and the Orthodox Church in Ukraine (1917 – 1930)]. (*Doctor's thesis*). Kharkiv. 461 p. [in Ukrainian]

Tryhub, O. P. (2009). *Rozkol Rosiiskoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvyv Ukraini (1922 – 39 rr.): Mizh Derzhavnym Politychnym Upravlinniam ta reformatsiieiu* [The Split of the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine (1922 – 39): Between the State Political Administration and the Reformation]. Mykolaiv, 300 p. [in Ukrainian]

Tsentral'nyy derzhavnyy arkhiv vyshchyykh orhaniv vlady ta upravlinnya Ukrainy [Central State Archive of the Highest Authorities and Administration of Ukraine – CSAHAAU]

Vlasovsky, I. F. (1998). *Narysistoriyi Ukrayins'koyi Pravoslavnoyi Tserkvy* [Essay on the History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church: in 4 vols. 5 books.]. (Vol. IV). Kyiv, 415 p. [in Ukrainian]

Voloshyn, Yu. (1997). *Ukrayins'ka pravoslavna tserkva v roky natsyst-s'koyi okupatsiyi (1941 – 1944 rr.)* [Ukrainian Orthodox Church during the Nazi occupation (1941 – 1944)]. Poltava, 127 p. [in Ukrainian]

Zhyliuk, S. I. (2002). *Obnovlenska Tserkva v Ukraini (1922 – 1928)* [Renewal Church in Ukraine (1922 – 1928)]. Rivne: RDGU, 384 p. [in Ukrainian]

Zinkevych, O. (Ed.). (1987). *Martyrolohiya ukrayins'kykh tserkov. Vol. 1: Ukrayins'ka Pravoslavna Tserkva: dokumenty, materialy, khrystyians'kyi samvydav Ukrainy* [Martyrology of Ukrainian Churches. Vol. 1: Ukrainian Orthodox Church: documents, materials, Christian samizdat of Ukraine]. Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1207 p. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received September 12, 2021.
Article recommended for publishing 30/08/2022.*