

UDC 271.2(477.52)-788:323.281(470+571)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.34.324621

Viacheslav OLITSKYI

PhD (History), Associate Professor, Head of the Department of History of Ukraine, Sumy Makarenko State Pedagogical University, 87 Romenska Street, Sumy, Ukraine, postal code 40002 (olitskyi@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0001-5518-5127
Researcher ID: AEG-1120-2022
Scopus Author ID: 57848096400

В'ячеслав ОЛИЦЬКИЙ

кандидат історичних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри історії України, Сумський державний педагогічний університет імені А. С. Макаренка, вул. Роменська, 87, м. Суми, Україна, індекс 40002 (olitskyi@gmail.com)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Olitskyi, V. (2025). Manifestations of the conflict between the monk community of the Hlynska Hermitage with the Soviet authority at the end of the 1950s – the beginning of the 1960s. *Skhidnoevropeiskiy Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 34, 115–124. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.34.324621

MANIFESTATIONS OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE MONK COMMUNITY OF THE HLYNSKA HERMITAGE WITH THE SOVIET AUTHORITY AT THE END OF THE 1950s – THE BEGINNING OF THE 1960s.

Abstract. *The purpose* of the article is to clarify the causes and nature of the conflict between the monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage and the Soviet authorities at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s, to study the forms of resistance of the monastic community and the reaction to them by state authorities, and to determine the consequences of this confrontation. **The research methodology** is based on the principles of objectivity and systematicity. To achieve the goal and objectives, general scientific methods have been used – analysis, synthesis, generalization, induction, deduction, as well as special methods of historical research – classification and criticism of sources, problem-chronological, comparative historical. **The scientific novelty** consists in the fact that for the first time, the manifestations of the conflict between the monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage and the Soviet authorities on the eve of the monastery's closure have become the object of a separate scientific study. **Conclusions.** The monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage used passive and active forms of resistance. Passive forms include assistance to pilgrims, provision of food, lodging, and failure to take measures recommended by the authorities to stop such assistance. A form of active resistance was the sabotage of Soviet elections, the refusal of individual monks to commemorate the Soviet regime during church services. This was prompted by an internal ethical and spiritual call, since praying for a godless regime that actively destroyed the Church and closed monasteries and temples seemed contradictory. The monks' resistance was spontaneous and unorganized, but in terms of ideological significance it was of serious importance to the authorities.

The authorities actively responded to any attempts by the monastic community to resist the established order; using various means of influence – from formal control to pressure and direct persecution of dissenting monks. The confrontation between the monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage and the Soviet authorities had significant consequences for the monastic community, as a significant part of the monks were expelled, and the monastery itself was under constant surveillance.

Key words: Orthodox Church, monastery, monks, clergy, Soviet government, repressions, Sumy region.

ПРОЯВИ КОНФЛІКТУ ЧЕРНЕЧОЇ ГРОМАДИ ГЛИНСЬКОЇ ПУСТИНИ ІЗ РАДЯНСЬКОЮ ВЛАДОЮ В КІНЦІ 1950 – НА ПОЧАТКУ 1960-х рр.

Анотація. Метою статті є з'ясування причин та характеру конфлікту між чернечою громадою Глинської пустині та радянською владою у кінці 1950 – на початку 1960-х років, вивчення форм спротиву чернечої громади та реакцію на них з боку державних органів, визначення наслідків цього протистояння. **Методологія дослідження** базується на дотриманні принципів об'єктивності та системності. Для реалізації мети і поставлених завдань використано загальнонаукові методи – аналізу, синтезу, узагальнення, індукції, дедуції, а також спеціальні методи історичного дослідження – класифікації та критики джерел, проблемно-хронологічний, порівняльно-історичний. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше прояви конфлікту чернечої громади Глинської пустині із радянською владою напередодні закриття монастиря стали об'єктом окремого наукового дослідження. **Висновки.** Чернеча громада Глинської пустині використовувала пасивні й активні форми спротиву. До пасивних відносимо допомогу паломникам, забезпечення харчуванням, ночівлею та невиконання рекомендованих владою заходів, спрямованих на припинення такої допомоги. Формою активного спротиву було саботування радянських виборів, відмова окремих монахів від поминання радянської влади на богослужіннях. Це було викликано внутрішнім етичним і духовним покликом, оскільки молитися за безбожну владу, яка активно руйнувала Церкву, закривала монастирі та храми, здавалося суперечливим. Спротив ченців був спонтанним і не організованим, але за ідеологічною значимістю мав серйозне значення для влади.

Влада активно реагувала на будь-які спроби чернецтва протистояти встановленим порядкам, використовуючи різні засоби впливу – від формального контролю до тиску та прямого переслідування незгодних ченців. Протистояння між чернечою громадою Глинської пустині та радянською владою мало суттєві наслідки для монастирської братії, адже значну частину монахів було виключено, а сам монастир перебував під постійним наглядом.

Ключові слова: Православна церква, монастир, ченці, духовенство, радянська влада, репресії, Сумщина.

Problem Statement. At the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s in the USSR, despite declared liberalization reforms, the authorities did not stop their strict control over religious organizations, but rather improved the methods of restricting their activities. This trend encompassed political, economic, and ideological mechanisms of pressure, and also unfolded at the level of official campaigns against religion, which influenced a religious life of citizens and organizations significantly, in particular monasteries and monastic communities.

The Hlynska Hermitage, as one of the spiritual centres of Orthodoxy in Ukraine, was an important centre of a religious life. It remained a significant place of pilgrimage, being one of the centres of a spiritual support for believers, giving them the opportunity to confess and receive advice by a spiritual father. However, its activities during this period were subject to significant pressure from the authorities. The monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage, which had long historical and spiritual traditions, found itself under pressure from restrictive measures aimed at liquidating the monastery.

The relevance of the research topic is associated with the desire to understand the conflict dynamics, which reflects the nature of relations between the Soviet state and religious communities, as well as the consequences of this conflict for both religious life of the Ukrainian Exarchate and monastic community. It is important to note that despite the desire of the Soviet authorities for a complete atheization of society, monasteries remained an important source of a religious stability and resistance, and also preserved their cultural and spiritual traditions. Studying the conflict between the monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage and the Soviet authorities allows us not only to better understand the nature of Soviet policy towards

religion, but also to analyze how religious communities were able to preserve their identity and survive under constant pressure. Thus, research on this issue will contribute to a better understanding of social and spiritual processes in the Soviet society and the role of religious communities in maintaining moral stability in the context of atheistic politics.

Review of Recent Research and Publications. The history of state-church relations and the Orthodox Church in Ukraine in the 20th century occupies an important place in modern historiography. Given this, there is a significant historiographical basis of the issue. Despite a massive historiographical output, there is no special study on the conflict between the monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage and the Soviet authorities. Among the total number of historical studies that consider the peculiarities of a religious policy and the position of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine in the second half of the 20th century, it is necessary to single out the monograph by V. Pashchenko (Pashchenko, 2005). Within narrower chronological limits, the issue was studied by N. Schlikhta (Shlikhta, 2011). Yu. Danyliuk and O. Bazhan analyzed the opposition movement in Ukraine in the second half of the 20th century, in particular opposition sentiments and their manifestations in the environment of the Ukrainian Exarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church (Danyliuk, & Bazhan, 2000). The collective monograph of the Institute of History of Ukraine of the NAS of Ukraine on the history of everyday life dedicated to the period of late Stalinism and the Khrushchev era contains a separate section dedicated to monastic communities (Danylenko, 2015). State-church relations in the USSR in 1939 – 1964 were analyzed by M. Shkarovskyi (1999). Certain aspects of the situation of the Orthodox clergy, in particular in Sumy region, were studied by V. Olitskyi (Olitskyi, 2024; Olitskyi, & Podriez, 2022). The issues of state-church relations and Soviet anti-religious policy are covered in articles by I. Danylets, V. Mishchanyn, M. Palinchak, and V. Bokoch (Danylets, & Mishchanyn, 2022; Palinchak, & Bokoch, 2021). The Ukrainian resistance to the Soviet anti-religious policies in the 1960s and 1970s was studied by N. Kindrachuk and V. Vasylichuk (Kindrachuk, & Vasylichuk, 2022). Some theoretical and methodological aspects are contained in the work of Mykola Haliv and Vasyl Ilnytskyi (Haliv, & Ilnytskyi, 2023).

The purpose of the article is to clarify the causes and nature of the conflict between the monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage and the Soviet authorities at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s, to study the forms of resistance of the monastic community and the reaction to them by state authorities, and to determine the consequences of this confrontation.

Results of the Research. In 1940, there were 64 Orthodox monasteries and hermitages in the USSR. During the German occupation, a process of revival of a religious life took place, as a result of which their number increased to 101. After World War II, despite the establishment of state-church relations, the number of religious communities decreased. As a result of such events, from 1947 to 1957, 38 monasteries were liquidated by means of unification in the USSR. If in 1946 there were 101 monasteries operating in the Soviet Union, then in 1948 there were 85, in 1950 – 75 and 4,787 monks, by 1957 there were 63 monasteries operating and 4,601 monks. All decisions to liquidation of monasteries were made by the ruling hierarchs under pressure from the ROCh (Russian Orthodox Church) authorities, which gave the impression that the government was not involved in the process. This approach contributed to the fact that these measures did not cause mass outrage among believers and the church hierarchy. In 1959, out of 63 monasteries of the Russian Orthodox Church, 40 belonged to the Ukrainian Exarchate. However, under conditions of the growing anti-religious campaign, the current pace of liquidation did not satisfy the Soviet regime.

On April 7, 1959, the Council of Ministers of the USSR adopted a secret resolution “On the Reduction of Monasteries and Hermitages in the USSR,” which provided for the liquidation of 22 monasteries and 7 hermitages during the period of 1959 – 1960, of which 18 were in the Ukrainian SSR: 4 for men and 14 for women. Thus, it was planned to close almost half of the existing monasteries in less than two years. The Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, which developed this resolution, initially suggested closing all planned monasteries in Ukraine during the summer of 1959. The Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR supported this idea in general, but suggested implementing it gradually, because a simultaneous closure of half of the existing monasteries could cause unrest both within the Russian Orthodox Church and abroad. As a result, the implementation period was extended by a year. Patriarch Oleksiy was forced to agree to the reduction of monasteries and hermitages in accordance with the list on April 2, 1959, under pressure by state authorities. On April 4, 1953, the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church received a letter from the Patriarch in which he noted that “under conditions where there is a need to continue reducing the number of monasteries, as was the case in previous ones before 1958, the reduction plan determined by the Council, is the most painless solution to this issue... a painless nature of the plan lies mainly in the fact that it is proposed to reduce not so many of the total number of existing monasteries... the closure will not be carried out immediately, but gradually over the coming years”. Thus, the only thing the hierarch could do for his flock was to request a gradual implementation of the plan so that it would be as painless as possible (CSAHAAU, f. 4648, d. 3, c. 227, pp. 11–17). As a result of the implementation of this resolution, by the beginning of 1965, only nine monasteries remained operating in Ukraine, of which two were male and seven female (Danyliuk, & Bazhan, 2000, p. 231).

The Nativity-Virgin Mary Hlynska Hermitage, founded in the 16th century, operated in Sumy region. With the establishment of the Bolshevik power, the monastery was closed in 1921. It resumed its activities in October of 1942, having a significant impact on the religious situation not only in the region but also outside the Republic. The monastery was regularly visited by pilgrims from various regions of the USSR. At the end of the 1950s, the number of monks reached about 60 people, of whom 38 were over 55 years old. At the same time, the monastic community was constantly replenished by young monks: 8 people were under 30 years old, another 7 were between the ages of 31 and 40 (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 7a, c. 5, pp. 60–62).

Since 1959, the Commissioner for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church in Sumy region has constantly focused on this monastery. One of the most important tasks that the local authorities tried to solve in relation to the monastery even before its closure was to limit the appearance of new monks and reduce the number of pilgrims to the monastery in order to reduce the monastery’s influence on the religiosity of the population. Accordingly, the issues were constantly raised that would contribute to their implementation. Some of them were fundamental to the existence of the monastery, as they concerned the very essence of a monastic service, the main goal of which was the pursuit of perfection of life through devotion to a prayer and repentance, and through it to service to one’s neighbour and the performance of mercy acts. In addition, an important task of the monastic community existence was the preaching of Holy Scripture, preservation and spread of the faith, and the instruction of believers.

In a report on the Hlynska monastery in 1959, the regional commissioner for the affairs of the ROCh, Ye. Valakhov, especially emphasized that the monks, through personal contacts

with the population, carried out significant work to attract believers to pilgrimage. Believers from various cities and regions of the USSR came to the service. Near Lokot railway station, the monastery maintained a separate room for visiting pilgrims and organized meals. After the ban on maintenance of this premises, the monks used monastery transport to meet pilgrims, who were provided with free overnight accommodation and two meals a day at the monastery. In some cases, preschool and school-age children, especially from surrounding villages, visited the monastery with their parents. By agreement between the regional commissioner and the leadership of the Ministry for Internal Affairs department, in 1959, police officers checked the passport regime in the monastery several times, which made it possible to get rid of people undesirable to the commissioner. The abbot of the monastery, Archimandrite Theogen, received repeated warnings from the commissioner about the inadmissibility of such a situation. After the abbot ignored these warnings, the commissioner demanded through the Archbishop of Chernihiv and Nizhyn, head of Sumy eparchy, Andriy (Sukhenko), to stop this practice. The monastery management complied with the request, but with a minimal harm to the faithful – the meals for pilgrims in the dining room were cancelled, but the food for them was delivered directly to the premises where the faithful were staying. All these factors contributed to the conflict escalation between the monastic community and the authorities (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 7a, c. 5, pp. 7–10, 59–60; c. 13, pp. 37–38).

A kind of apogee of the conflict between the monks and the Soviet authorities was the refusal of some monks to commemorate the latter during divine services. In the Orthodox Church, during divine services, in particular the liturgy, there is a rite of commemoration in addition to the religious authority, the state. In the tradition of Kyivan Orthodoxy, under different historical conditions, two forms of such commemoration developed – commemoration of the head of state by name or simply a prayer for the government bodies. Under the Soviet anti-theocratic regime, a situation arose when the Russian Orthodox Church was forced to pray for the government, which was building a society of militant atheism and trying to destroy the Church. This led to a certain transformation of the commemoration form. The commemoration of the government bodies in litanies became general – “for our God-preserved country, its government and army”. It was performed in a peaceful and solemn litanie, and the commemoration of government was completely excluded from the priest’s speech at the Great Entrance (Horbyk, 2016; Pravoslavnyi, 1986, pp. 65, 72).

In June of 1960, the monks of the Nativity of the Mother of God Hlynska Hermitage, Hieromonk Ambrose (Pechienv) and Hierodeacon Isaiah (Korovai), refused to commemorate the Soviet government during divine services. On June 4, 1960, at All-Night Vigil, Hierodeacon Isaiah stopped commemorating the government during the litanies. Instead of the statutory request, he recited “we still pray for our God-protected country and for its salvation”. The abbot of the monastery, Archimandrite Theogen, immediately spoke out against such actions, noting that the monk had done the wrong thing. To the abbot’s remark, Hierodeacon Isaiah replied, “The authorities do not need prayer and I will not commemorate them”. The monks argued their refusal by saying that one cannot pray for a godless authorities. After the service, Hieromonk Ambrose objected to the abbot and treasurer who tried to rectify the situation. He stated that “the Church has no right to pray for those who do not recognize the power of the Lord, but reject it” (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 12, c. 53, pp. 5–6).

It can be argued that the monks committed these actions without the consent of the monastery leadership. Based on the explanatory note of Abbot Modest addressed to the Commissioner for the Affairs of the ROCh of Sumy Region, during the incident the abbot

immediately reacted to it and was somewhat confused, consulting with Abbot Modest on how to act in this situation. The latter advised to remove the monks from performing divine services and to report to the hierarch. On June 7, on the instructions of the abbot, Abbot Modest personally reported to Archbishop Andriy, who wanted to meet with the monks in person. The abbot, through Abbot Modest, asked the bishop, if the monks had a meeting with him, to influence them and convince them that they were wrong in this case (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 12, c. 53, pp. 2–4).

The regional commissioner for the ROCh affairs had a conversation with Bishop Andriy on this matter and recommended that he should summon the dissenting monks to him (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 7a, c. 13, pp. 39). A few days later, this meeting took place in Sumy. Once again the monks stated that they would not pray for the current government, because they believe that “based on the Holy Scriptures and the teachings of the Fathers of the Church, it is impossible to pray for the government that destroys the Christian faith and liquidates churches”. Additionally, the monks argued their position by referring to the book of Archpriest Kalnev (unfortunately, it was not possible to determine which book was ment). The Bishop tried to convince them that, according to the instructions of the Apostle Paul, it is necessary to pray for all authorities, regardless of how they treat the Church. These arguments did not yield any results (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 12, c. 53, pp. 2–3, 7). In March of 1961, while examining the monastery books, in the main building the regional commissioner discovered the book published in Canada by missionary V. Konovalov, “The Attitude of a Christian to Soviet Power,” which could also be used as one of the arguments in favour of this act (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 12, c. 55, pp. 37–38).

On July 8, 1960, Bishop Andriy visited the Hlynska Hermitage, and the next day, in the presence of the abbot, Archimandrite Theogen, his deputy, Abbot Modest, and the confessors of the monastery, Abbots Andronikos and Seraphim, he met with these monks. The conversation took place with each one separately. Despite the arguments of such authoritative figures, Hieromonk Ambrose and Hierodeacon Isaiah still remained in their positions. After spiritual conversations and persuasions did not yield any results, the ruling hierarch’s last argument was that in this case they would be forced to leave the monastery. In response, both monks declared, “Do with us whatever you want, but we will not pray for this government”. Hierodeacon Isaiah added, “Even if they shoot me, I will not pray for Mykyta, who closes the churches”. Having failed at achieving concessions from the dissidents, Archbishop Andriy banned both from performing religious services and sent a report on the incident to the Commissioner for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church. According to the Commissioner, the decision to evict the opposition-minded monks from the monastery was made by the bishop in agreement with him. After the monastery was informed of this decision, on July 13, Hieromonk Ambrose came to Archbishop Andriy in Chernihiv with a letter from the abbot of the Hlynska Hermitage, in which he asked, in view of the repentance of the monks Ambrose and Isaiah, to forgive them and not to bring any case against them. In response, the bishop stated that this was a very serious issue that had already gained resonance, and accordingly he was unable to stop the matter.

On July 19, both monks left the monastery. On August 12, the new abbot, Abbot Modest, wrote a report to the ruling bishop with a request to exclude from the lists of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary Hlynska Hermitage those who had left the monastery without permission: Hieromonk Ambrose, Hierodeacon Isaiah, and novice Mykola Melnyk. The Bishop approved this report and banned them from performing religious services. The Commissioner reported

the anti-Soviet statements of these monks to the KGB in Sumy region. Archimandrite Theogen's letter asking for forgiveness for Hieromonk Ambrose and Hierodeacon Isaiah was used by the commissioner as one of the arguments for replacing the abbot of the Hlynska Hermitage. Archimandrite Theogen was accused of not punishing these monks, but rather trying to protect them (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 12, c. 53, pp. 2–4, 11; d. 7a, c. 13, p. 39).

Despite the fact that none of the monks supported this action openly, we should say that at least some of them shared such actions. In a report addressed to the commissioner, Archbishop Andriy mentions that almost all the monastery monks with whom he had a conversation condemned the monks' actions. The regional commissioner for the ROCh, describing this event in his report, stated that in the monastery, individual hostile monks made judgments and slander against the Soviet reality (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 12, c. 53, p. 3, 11; d. 7a, c. 13, pp. 38). During the period of 1958 – 1959, 8 people were expelled from the monastery, who, according to the conclusion of the regional commissioner, were "hostile and made judgments" (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 7a, c. 5, p. 61). Given such statements, we should say that some of the monks expressed their dissatisfaction with the actions of the Soviet authorities, and at least in a conversation with the bishop, shared the position of not commemorating it, while some sympathizers, aware of all the risks, could not declare their views.

The issue of Archbishop Andriy's position on this fact remains open. On the one hand, we see his participation in overcoming impermanence, and on the other, given the statements of the regional commissioner, the question arises as to how sincere and comprehensive this participation was. The bishop, as the head of the hierarchy, was supposed to care for its well-being, including the proper conditions for the monastery to exist. He realized that this action could not be ignored or not responded to, because in the context of growing anti-religious pressure, it served as a good pretext for closing the monastery and criminally prosecuting the monks, and in the case of ignoring it, for his imprisonment as well. Throughout the time when he was required to remove objectionable monks from the monastery or priests from parishes, in every way the Bishop tried to avoid these steps and took them only after significant pressure from the Commissioner for the Affairs of the ROCh. In such cases, Bishop Andriy, in conversations with believers and even in official correspondence with the patriarchate and deacons, reported that the expulsion of a particular monk from the monastery took place on the instructions of the authorized person, while he had a different view on this issue (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 7a, c. 21, pp. 10; c. 13, p. 78).

On the eve of the closure of the Hlynska Hermitage in 1961, Ye. Valakhov compiled a list of 15 monks who were subject to expulsion from the monastery, indicating the reason. Among the total number of different reasons, 5 can be characterized as a manifestation of conflict with the authorities, which made it possible to regard these monks as hostile to the Soviet power. Thus, Hieromonk Vissarion (Hordienko) was accused of spoiling the ballot in the elections of December 18, 1960, Hierodeacon Pavlin (Mishchenko) of refusing to participate in the same elections, Hieromonk Vlasiy (Sumyn) of healing the demon-possessed and baptizing children in a cell, Monk Ivan (Sehyda) of storing and distributing anti-Soviet literature, Hierodeacon Ilarion (Prykhodko) of supporting the views of Hieromonk Ambrose and Hierodeacon Isaiah (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 12, c. 55, pp. 21–22).

The practice of spreading various rumors and gossip among the population to justify pressure became widespread. One of them was the imposition of the idea that, taking advantage of the monastery's secluded location, its inhabitants were engaged in espionage (Danylenko, 2015, p. 606). One of the means of mass propaganda that was actively used

for this purpose was the press. On May 16, 1961, in order to discredit the monks, an article was published in the Sumy regional newspaper “Leninska Pravda”, which was supposed to show the general public the anti-Soviet sentiments among the monks and contribute to the formation of an opinion about the need to close the monastery (Savchenko, 1961, p. 4).

On July 13, 1961, Archbishop Andriy issued an order to close the Nativity of the Mother of God the Hlynska Monastery, in which he noted that the monastery was being closed in accordance with the blessing of His Holiness the Patriarch, with the knowledge and consent of the Exarch of Ukraine, the consent of the ruling bishop, and also taking into account the request of the local authorities. The monks of the monastery were given the right to receive all their personal belongings and food for the first time. The monks were provided with money in advance. They were given the opportunity to leave for their relatives and acquaintances, and to get a civilian job. Elderly monks were offered to move to nursing homes. The monks were allowed to leave in groups of two or three immediately after determining where they would move. Religious property and the monastery library were transferred for safekeeping to the St. Anastasia Church in the town of Hlukhiv, the rest of the property to the house for the disabled in Sosnivka, which was located next to the monastery. In order for the closure to take place without any kind of excesses, the father abbot and the monks were warned to behave consciously and remember that they were monks and a vow of obedience, and the closure of the monastery was approved and blessed by the church authorities (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 12, c. 55, pp. 67–68).

It can be argued that the closure of the Hlynska Hermitage was the culmination and resolution of the conflict between the monks the Soviet authorities. Thus, the Soviet regime, on the one hand, carried out its plan to reduce the number of monasteries, and on the other, got rid of the unwelcome monastic community with which it had had a long-standing conflict. Considering that the decision of the bishops to close the monasteries was only a method of formalizing the decisions of the authorities and was signed under significant pressure from them, it should be noted that the order of Archbishop Andriy was also formal in nature. At the same time, it should be noted that he knew in advance about the plans to close this monastery and informed its leadership about it. Six months before the closure, all the money was withdrawn from the bank account and distributed to the monks. The most valuable things and materials were taken out of the monastery (SASR, f. P-2196, d. 12, c. 54, p. 35). Owing to such actions, it was possible not only to preserve the most valuable monastery property, but most importantly, to provide the monks with the means of subsistence after their eviction from the monastery, which was specifically stated in the order on the closure. These actions of the bishop were not forgiven by the Soviet regime; they became one of the charges during his criminal imprisonment at the end of 1961. Thus, Bishop Andriy, shortly after the closure of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary Hlynska Hermitage, was punished for opposing the authorities' closure of churches and monasteries.

Conclusions. The manifestations of the conflict between the monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage and the Soviet power at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s testify to deep contradictions between the atheistic ideology of the Soviet state and the spiritual needs of religious communities, as well as to a significant place and authority of monasteries in the lives of believers, which remained strongholds of spiritual resistance to the regime. The Hlynska Hermitage became an example of how, even under strong pressure, the monks tried to preserve their traditions, fulfill religious duties, and resist atheistic policies that sought to oust the Church from public life.

The monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage used passive and active forms of resistance. Passive forms include assistance to pilgrims, provision of food, lodging, and failure to take measures recommended by the authorities to stop such assistance. A form of active resistance was the sabotage of Soviet elections, the refusal of individual monks to commemorate the Soviet regime during church services. This was prompted by an internal ethical and spiritual call, since praying for a godless regime that actively destroyed the Church and closed monasteries and temples seemed contradictory. The monks' resistance was spontaneous and unorganized, but in terms of ideological significance it was of serious importance to the authorities.

The authorities actively responded to any attempts by the monastic community to resist the established order, using various means of influence – from formal control to pressure and direct persecution of dissenting monks. The confrontation between the monastic community of the Hlynska Hermitage and the Soviet authorities had significant consequences for the monastic community, as a significant part of the monks were expelled, and the monastery itself was under constant surveillance.

Funding. The author received no financial support for the research or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Danylenko, V. (Ed.) (2015). *Sotsialni transformatsii v Ukraini: pizni stalinizm i khrushchovska doba: Kolektyvna monohrafiia* [Social Transformations in Ukraine: Late Stalinism and the Khrushchev Era: Collective Monograph]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2015. [in Ukrainian]

Danylets, I., & Mishchanyan, V. (2022). The anti-religious policy of the Soviet state in Transcarpathia in 1953. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 24, 177–188. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.24.264735 [in English]

Danyliuk, Yu., & Bazhan, O. (2000). *Opozytsiia v Ukraini (druha polovyna 50-kh – 80-ti rr. XX st.)* [Opposition in Ukraine (the second half of the 1950s – 1980s)]. Kyiv: Ridnyi kraj. [in Ukrainian] *Derzhavnyi arkhiv Sumskoi oblasti [State archive of Sumy region – SASR]*

Haliv, M., & Ilnytskyi, V. (2023). Education between “class” and “nation”: the influence of the theory of class struggle on Ukrainian educational historiography (1920s – 1980s). *Echa Przeszlosci*, 24 (2), 123–139. DOI: 10.31648/ep.9671 [in English]

Horbyk, S., prot. (2016). *Poimenne pomynannia vlady na Liturhii v tradytsii kyivskoho pravoslavia* [Commemoration of Authorities by Name at the Liturgy in the Tradition of Kyivan Orthodoxy]. URL: <http://kyiv-pravosl.info/2016/04/15/poimenne-pomynannya-vlady-na-liturhiji-v-tradytsiji-kyivskoho-pravoslavya/> (date of application 29.06.2024). [in Ukrainian]

Kindrachuk, N., & Vasylychuk, V. (2022). The Ukrainians' Resistance to the Anti-Religious Policy of the Soviet Totalitarian State on the Way of Preserving their National and Spiritual Values: the 1960s – the 1970s. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 25, 189–199. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.25.269558 [in English]

Olitskyi, V., & Podriez, Yu. (2022). A figure of the Orthodox Bishop on the Pages of “The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchy” during the Period of Late Stalinism. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 24, 150–162. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.24.264742 [in English]

Olitskyi, V. (2024). Dukhovenstvo Sumskoi yeparkhii v umovakh sotsialnykh transformatsii piznoho stalinizmu [Clergy of Sumy Eparchy under Conditions of Social Transformations of Late Stalinism]. *Eminak*, 4(48), 42–58. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.24.264742 [in Ukrainian]

Palinchak, M., & Bokoch, V. (2021). Soviet religious policy and its consequences in independent Ukraine. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 20, 184–194. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.20.240037 [in English]

Pashchenko, V. (2005). *Pravoslavna tserkva v totalitarnii derzhavi. Ukraina 1940 – pochatok 1990-kh rokiv* [The Orthodox Church in a Totalitarian State. Ukraine in 1940 – the beginning of the 1990s]. Poltava: ASMI. [in Ukrainian]

Pravoslavnyi. (1986). *Pravoslavnyi molytvoslov* [Orthodox Prayer Book]. Vydannia Ekzarkha vsiiei Ukrainy, mytropolyta Kyivskoho i Halytskoho. [in Ukrainian]

Savchenko, M. (1961). Taiemnytsi “vladyka” monastyrsykh. [Secrets of the “Lords” of the Monasteries]. *Leninska pravda*, 96, 4. [in Ukrainian]

Shkarovskyi, M. (1999). *Ruskaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov pry Staline i Khrushcheve (Gossudarstvenno-tserkovnye otnosheniya v SSSR v 1939 – 1964 hodakh)* [The Russian Orthodox Church under Stalin and Khrushchev (State-Church Relations in the USSR in 1939 – 1964)]. Moskva: Krutitskoe Patriarshee Podvorie. [in Russian]

Shlikhta, N. (2011). *Tserkva tykh, khto vyzhyv. Radianska Ukraina, seredyna 1940-kh – pochatok 1970-kh rr.* [Church of the Survivors. Soviet Ukraine, the mid-1940s – early 1970s.]. Kharkiv: Akta. [in Ukrainian]

Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchykh orhaniv vlady ta upravlinnia Ukrainy [The Central State Archive of the Higher Authorities and Administration of Ukraine – CSAHAAU]

The article was received April 19, 2024.

Article recommended for publishing 27/02/2025.