

UDC 271.2 (477)

DOI: 10.17721/sophia.2021.18.3

Andrii Kobetiak, PhD of Philosophical Sciences, Doctoral Stud.
Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University, Zhytomyr, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0001-6899-0571
e-mail: kobetiak@meta.ua

PROSPECTS OF CONSTITUTION OF THE UKRAINIAN LOCAL CHURCH

The article analyzes the process of formation of the newly created Local Ukrainian Church at the present stage. Ukrainian church life is a dynamic process. The church is constantly moving forward and must respond to societal requests and problems. It is determined that the institutional design of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine takes place in a multi-religious environment. Therefore, the article predicts that today in Ukraine, there is no reason to talk about the United Church in the future. It has been established that the proclamation of the independence of the Ukrainian Church took place as a significant event of the last decade on a church-wide scale. Today, the Orthodox Church of Ukraine is on the path of universal recognition.

The study found that over the past century, two diametrical concepts of understanding the structure of Ecumenical Orthodoxy have been formed. In particular, Fanar insisted and continues to insist on his own primacy and special status in the world church, and the reason for this is the canons of the Ecumenical Councils and the age-long tradition of Christianity of the Eastern rite. Instead, the Russian Orthodox Church declares the existence of Local Churches in the general system of Orthodoxy as a certain confederation of independent and fully autonomous entities. It has been proved that the future recognition of the newly formed Ukrainian Church by other Local Churches depends on the acceptance of the position of a certain party.

It is determined within this study that the Ukrainian church issue is a kind of watershed in terms of the main controversial issues that have troubled the Ecumenical Church in recent centuries. Therefore, it has been proved that the settlement of the Ukrainian question is of great importance not only for the Orthodox believers of Ukraine, but also for the whole Orthodoxy. This sets a precedent for the currently unrecognized churches of Macedonia and Montenegro.

The article claims that none of the Local Churches emerged in an independent status completely painlessly. Most countries that have received autocephaly in our time have been waiting for decades for world recognition of their own church. Therefore, the recognition of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine by only a part of the Local Churches is a natural process. It is established that autocephaly in modern conditions of society development and hybrid war is a vital condition for the country's survival.

It has been studied that in modern conditions the Kyiv Church has received a great credit of trust in the eyes of the Ecumenical Patriarch. Today it is necessary to unite for the future recognition of the Ukrainian status by other Local Churches. The consolidated Kyiv metropolitanate may become the largest national Orthodox church in the world, which will significantly change the balance in the structure of the Universal Orthodoxy.

Keywords: Ukrainian Church, autocephaly, metropolitan, religion, local council, society, interfaith relations.

Today, the religious sphere occupies one of the leading places in the life of the modern society. Even in a secularized society, most sociological studies confirm the high degree of trust of the population in the church and religious institutions. As for Ukraine, our people have always had a high level of religiosity, therefore religious issues are especially close and important to most its citizens. Nowadays, the religious situation is such that Orthodoxy, which is the dominant religion in the country, is divided into two main jurisdictions. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which is subordinate to the Moscow Patriarchate, and the Orthodox Church of Ukraine, which in early 2019 received a Tomos on autocephaly.

2021 marks the 30th anniversary of the independent Ukrainian state. In its modern history, Ukraine has never managed to maintain its statehood for so long. This is a certain age that allows to draw certain conclusions, summarize certain achievements, analyze the history, as well as predict short-term and long-term prospects. One of the most important achievements since independence is undoubtedly the acquisition of autocephalous status by the Ukrainian Church. Historically, this event has taken place quite recently, but it is crucial for the formation of a new Ukrainian civil society, the strengthening of the foundation of independence, and it is a key issue for national security. In addition, the autocephalous status of the church clearly contributes to the growth of Ukraine's authority in the international arena.

The granting of the Tomos for the Ukrainian Church has significantly raised the bar of public interest in church issues. In addition, this event caused a great resonance in the world and led to some thorough theological discussions. Today, only some of the Local Churches have recognized this act as a legitimate one. Moreover, the urgency of the topic is exacerbated by the fact that there are a number of national churches that also seek their own universal recognition (Montenegrin, Macedonian OC).

The relevance of the studied problem today is caused by a significant public resonance of the covered issue. Moreover, the issue of the Ukrainian Church touches on a number of problems of the Universal Orthodoxy and relations between the Local Churches, which have been troubling the church for the last century and do not have the prospect of an immediate solution. The constitution of the Ukrainian Church is directly related to the problems of the formation of a new autocephalous church; superiority in the diptych; bounds of the canonical territory; general jurisdiction and problems of the relationship between the mother church and the daughter church; Orthodox diaspora. So, the relevance of the topic for research is beyond doubt, because it is caused by significant Ukrainian and global interest in the issue of proclaiming a new Local Church, as well as a number of unresolved issues of Ecumenical Orthodoxy.

As for the scientific development of the topic, it is worth noting right away that this is a new topic for discussion at first glance. The Local Ukrainian Church was formed only in 2019, so there is no fundamental research regarding it. Most materials are presented in public speeches, statements, documents. However, the autocephalous movement in Ukraine is about a hundred years old. Domestic researchers were especially interested in the issue of the United Ukrainian Local Church after the proclamation of its independence in 1991.

On the one hand, there are hundreds of public statements, speeches and official letters from hierarchs and theologians from various Local Churches, but most of them has a polemical nature. On the other hand, public interest in the issue of the unity of Orthodox churches in the face of civilizational challenges has become much more active. Such a surge of interest in the problem of autocephaly is undoubtedly associated with the proclamation of 15 in the diptych of the autocephalous church, which is the Orthodox Church of Ukraine.

Especially valuable are the works of the researchers of Ukrainian church history and the canonical structure of the Orthodox Church. I. Vlasovsky, O. Kyridon, O. Lototsy, Y. Mulyk-Lutsyk and others. Relevant today is the work of the famous fighter for the independence of the Ukrainian Church, Metropolitan Alexander (Drabinko) "Ukrainian Church: the path to autocephaly", in which the author in-depth reveals the way to implement various concepts of autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church in the twentieth century [11]. It is necessary to mention the work of V. Butynsky on the jurisdiction of Ukrainian Orthodoxy and the possibility of canonical formation of the Local Church [2] and M. Gergelyuk on the canonical and ecclesiological foundations of the autocephalous structure of churches in the Ecumenical Orthodoxy [4]. In general, the works of such philosophers, theologians and theologians as: D. Gorevoy, V. Yelensky, O. Sagan, L. Filipovych, Y. Chornomorets and others are devoted to the religious analysis of the processes of obtaining autocephaly. Of importance for this study are the work of A. Aristova on ways to resolve religious conflicts, as well as P. Saukha on religious experience and the phenomenology of religion.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the state and prospects of development of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, its institutionalization and religious and ideological activities in Ukraine in modern historical conditions as well as in the nearest future.

Recognition of the newly created Local Orthodox Churches in the 20th century is a long process. Most of the countries that have received autocephaly already in present time have been waiting for the world recognition of their own church for decades. In addition, the canons of the church testify to the need for church independence after the state itself, the carrier of the religion, is proclaimed sovereign. In other words: an independent state should receive an independent church [9, p. 14].

The institutional formalization of the new Ukrainian Independent Church is taking place in a multi-confessional environment. Ukraine has never been a mono-confessional state, therefore, significant religious pluralism is inherent in Ukrainian society in the 21st century. This means that the OCU today is not the only Orthodox confession in Ukraine, and therefore believers will not visit its churches "out of despair and lack of alternatives." There must be healthy competition, and the OCU must show its best side. Confessional blurring, according to researchers, is the result of the transitional state of society, which manifests itself in the crisis of the traditional mechanism of reproduction of religious identity, destruction of value orientations, the presence of pluralism in society and predetermines the polyvariety of self-identifications [1, p. 832].

During the late XX – early XXI centuries, there became to be an expressive tendency towards the transformation of Orthodoxy from a single Cathedral Church, united in religion and service to Christ, to an agglomeration of individual Local churches, which prioritize the realization of their own interests, and often the political interests of states with which they are connected. At the same time, the controversy around the nature of faith or the application of church canons become only a means of realizing quite earthly, material interests.

Regarding the participation of the Ukrainian state in this important process, the scientists emphasize: "The state does not stand completely aside from the process of constituting the Local Orthodox Church in Ukraine, because in this case it is about its future".

The first step towards autocephalous status was the official appeal of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to the Ecumenical Patriarch on June 16, 2016, which was accepted

for consideration by the Synod of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and a commission was created to study it. The representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch, Archbishop Job (Getcha), who was present at the celebration of the Baptism of Rus in Kyiv on July 28, 2016, noted that the appeal of the Verkhovna Rada to his Primate was completely legitimate, and the Patriarchate of Constantinople is the Mother Church for the Kyiv Church, and it will actively seek ways to restore the unity of the Ukrainian Orthodox people [6, p. 850].

Thus, the Ukrainian Church is not only gaining independence from the Moscow Patriarchate, but will also receive recognition by other churches, taking its place in the diptych – the list of Orthodox autocephalous and autonomous churches. However, religious scholars, while examining interfaith relations in the socio-political situation in Ukraine, draw attention to the presence of dangers / risks associated with the religious sphere, which means, the threat of conflicts is quite high [15, p. 58].

The creation and recognition of the autocephalous Orthodox Church of Ukraine is natural, because it meets the apostolic rules by which the church lives. They provide for the right of every nation with its own state "to have its own first bishop." In addition, according to the canons, there should not be several parallel church organizations in one territory. So, the unification overcomes the church schism of Orthodoxy in Ukraine.

Today the fate of the Kyiv metropolitanate seems to have been decided, autocephaly has been proclaimed. Although there is a fact, so far only four out of fifteen Local Churches have officially recognized the Orthodox Church of Ukraine and its Primate with the election. Currently, this issue is difficult and there is no immediate solution. On the one hand, we can cite the statement of the professor of the University of Thessaloniki A. Vavuskos that the granting of autocephaly by the Ecumenical Patriarch does not require ratification due to historical precedent and custom, which is equated to the norms of canon law [3]. That is, there is a Tomos and we do not need anything else. We will develop our own Church and we do not need any external contacts and no one's recognition. On the other hand, Constantinople's one-man decision on Ukrainian autocephaly caused outrage among the world Orthodox community, and some churches, such as the ROC of October 15, 2018 [7] and the Serbian OC of February 28, 2019, cut off the Eucharistic communion with Fanar at all. A great church schism is brewing, and there are no prospects for its solution in the near future, except for the meeting of the Primates. The long-standing problem of confrontation between two powerful church structures arises once again. Constantinople itself, like the newly elected Metropolitan Epiphanius and Honorary Patriarch Filaret, have repeatedly declared insane pressure on the Local Churches and opposition to a positive solution of the Ukrainian church issue by the ROC [5].

An important issue today remains the further recognition of the OCU by other Local Churches. The history of the Ecumenical Church does not provide any specific answer as to the very procedure of such recognition. Various Local Churches have historically received autocephalous status in different ways, but no one has yet ratified a single mechanism for universal recognition of the new autocephalous unit. Therefore, it is worth referring to the experience of the Balkan churches, which received independent status in the XIX–XX centuries. In particular, we are talking about such Orthodox churches: Greek (1850), Serbian (1879), Romanian (1885), Polish (1924), Albanian (1937), Bulgarian (1945), as well as the OC of the Czech lands and Slovakia (1988). Their recognition has several features in common. In particular, they all emerged as a result of the formation and acquisition of independent status of their states. In

addition, a certain period of time elapsed between the granting of the Tomos and the universal recognition. Moreover, all these territories were considered the canonical territory of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Therefore, the Ecumenical hierarch provided the Tomos of autocephaly, and sent the corresponding letters to the hierarchs of other Local Churches with a message about the new autocephalous church [14, p. 39]. No other additional procedure was foreseen for Local Churches. Gradually, all Local Churches included the name of the Primate of the new autocephaly in the general diptych. There were no objections to the historical right of Constantinople to grant Tomoses. This logic of events absolutely corresponds to the 34th Apostolic Rule and the real political situation when a number of independent states were formed. If we look at those documents that were adopted by the Ecumenical Church on Ukrainian autocephaly, it becomes obvious that Fanar revoked the deed of transfer of the Kyivan metropolitanate in 1686 (more precisely, the right to enthrone the Kyivan metropolitan). As a result, the Kyiv metropolitanate officially returned to direct subordination to the Ecumenical Patriarch. He gave his metropolis a new status. The question about the need for its further ratification arises. It has not been yet established that any other Local Church should approve or agree with the decisions of Constantinople. So, if we take into account the abolition of the letter of reassignment of the Kyiv Metropolitanate in 1686, it looks like a purely internal question of the mother church and the daughter church. So, Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew abandoned the Pan-Orthodox discussion of the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church. He justified this with practical expediency – because four Autocephalous Churches refused to participate in the All-Orthodox Council, so Constantinople decided to refrain from such meetings, as members of the meeting "will agree only that they do not agree with each other" [10].

A weighty argument that the Russian side brings in the issue of recognizing the OCU is the joint Eucharist. Of course, this is a serious factor in additional recognition, but it is not decisive and fundamental. Now the OCU may not have a full pan-Orthodox Eucharist, but this issue is not a key for its identity. One way or another, all Local Churches are involved through the Ecumenical Church with the OCU, therefore the official joint ministry is a matter of the near future [14, p. 43]. In addition, the hierarchs of different Local Churches, for example, the Czech bishop had a joint service with the bishops of the OCU, which indicates the future recognition of the OCU.

In general, the rupture of the Eucharist is a new phenomenon in the Ecumenical Church, which arose in the twentieth century. The "author" of such an action was the Moscow Patriarchate, which for the first time made such a dissolution with the clergy of the newly proclaimed Polish Orthodox Church. Later, it was the same Moscow Patriarchate who broke the Eucharist with Constantinople, due to the Estonian church crisis. In fact, the Eucharist break is a statement of the fact that there are certain differences of opinion on specific church-administrative issues. Since the emergence of such a phenomenon is relatively new, and belongs exclusively to the Moscow Patriarchate, it should not be considered a generally ecclesiastical and universally binding norm.

At the same time, in order to be a full-fledged Local Church, according to the modern world-renowned theologian I. Zizioulas, a full-fledged Eucharist must take place with all the churches. It is not enough to be Local, ie to be located in a specific area, it is necessary to be in full communication, otherwise there is a phenomenon of "imperfection of the church" [8, p. 495].

Thus, the problem of the Eucharist now remains open. Certainly, the Ukrainian church should seek to maximize recognition, and therefore the maximum communion with representatives of other churches. For a long time, the UOC-KP and the UAOC were in isolation, did not visit world shrines, and did not perform joint services with the hierarchs of other churches. This leaves not only an ecclesiological but also a purely moral imprint.

In addition to the ideas of state-strategic importance and serious influence on the formation of independent consciousness of our compatriots, the proclamation of the status of autocephaly of the Ukrainian church has another, perhaps the most important task – to cure the schism [11, p. 20]. Millions of Ukrainian believers, thousands of priests were out of communication with the world Orthodoxy. They could not freely attend and participate in services in shrines of world importance (such as Holy Land, Athos). Many of them felt somewhat inferior. The schism always divides. There are divided, as well as hostile, families, friends, work teams. One of the tasks of the new church is to unite and reconcile everyone.

There is one more unresolved problem, which is a certain analogy between the proclamation of the OCU and other Local Churches. On the one hand, we have a different case than, for example, the Albanian and Greek churches, which in the corresponding historical period have self-proclaimed themselves independent of the Constantinople Mother Church. OCU is not self-proclaimed. It was officially recognized by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. That is, officially, the Tomos has been signed. But, on the other hand, there was no such total internal disunity in the Albanian church and, especially, the Church of Greece. For many years, the Ecumenical Patriarch has repeatedly stated the need for consolidation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church under one omophorion. For this, it was necessary to find a common language for all three Ukrainian jurisdictions. There is no such thing today. Only about 5 % of the total number of parishes transferred from the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate.

The granting of autocephaly to the Ukrainian Church is not the competence of the Pan-Orthodox Council, but primarily of the Patriarchate of Constantinople as the Mother Church of the Kyiv Church. The procedure for proclaiming autocephaly was not approved either – due to the lack of agreement between the hierarchs at the stage of preparation of the document. The Moscow Patriarchate played a significant role in this blockaging process, because it is he who feels the main threat of losing its jurisdiction over the Ukrainian Orthodox. At the same time, the Ukrainian question caused some serious discussions on the sidelines of the Council [6, p. 851].

Over its two thousand year history, the Orthodox Church has repeatedly faced the problem of "the returning of heretics to the bosom of the church." This is exactly the question the young Ukrainian Independent Church is facing today. Opponents of granting the Tomos to Ukraine call one of the key arguments to be the "non-canonical" activities of Patriarch Filaret while he was under anathema and a church ban. Therefore, he could not perform the ordinances of the priesthood. That is, all the bishops of the UOC-KP at that time, and now the OCU in one way or another, have "gaps" in the ordination, because in the vast majority of cases this sacrament was headed by Filaret. That is, even after the recognition of the autocephalous status of the Ukrainian Church, opponents of autocephaly consider its clergy uncanonical, because the traditional requirements have not been met. The situation is similar with the head of the OCU, Metropolitan Epiphanius, who was ordained in 2009 by Filaret. Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to the historical prece-

dents of the sacrament of ordination in difficult situations for the final leveling of the arguments of opponents of ukrainian autocephaly. Some bright examples of such ordinations at different times were, as follows:

1. Arians ordained St. Cyril of Jerusalem to the rank of bishop. After his return to traditional Orthodoxy, he was left in the episcopal rank, as well as all those whom he ordained by himself. No re-consecrations took place.

2. All those who accepted the decision of the Council of Chalcedon, but had previously been ordained by the Eutychian heretic Peter (Monga), were left at the appropriate levels of the priesthood without additional sacraments.

3. The Reverend Sava the Consecrated testifies that after the late Patriarch Elijah of Jerusalem, John, a Severian heretic, was elected as patriarch. However, he repented of his heresy and remained a legitimate patriarch without re-ordination.

4. The Church of Bulgaria was in a schism for almost 75 years, however, after reconciliation with the Ecumenical Church, all the clergy remained at the appropriate levels of the priesthood [14, p. 19].

So, from the history of the development of Ecumenical Orthodoxy, we see numerous cases of ecclesiastical oecumeny in relation to various heresies and their representatives. In the case of the formation of the Ukrainian Church, as a result of the recognition of Filaret's anathema as invalid, all questions regarding the ordination of hierarchs and the head of the OCU should not arise. In any case, they, according to church indulgence, can be taken into the bosom of the church in current titles, especially when the Ecumenical Patriarch took responsibility for the annulment of the anathemas on the first hierarchs of the UOC-KP and UAOC.

The issue of the "canonical" hierarchy, which has legal ordination, is indeed fundamental to the Orthodox Church. In contrast to the Protestant streams, which admit "mystical unity with the Ecumenical and Synodic Church," that is, those who believe, who follow some general rules from the outside, can be saved, Orthodoxy is quite dogmatical. Not everyone who follows the rules is a member of the Orthodox Church. A legitimate episcopate is required. Another thing is belonging to a certain patriarchate or one's own autocephalous status. In fact, it is possible not to have a direct connection with another Local Church, but it is necessary to preserve the apostolic heritage [2, p. 93].

Modern domestic researchers in the field of religious studies unequivocally agree on the need to establish a new Local Independent Church. Indeed, this is a matter of national importance. In particular, the leading specialist of domestic science L. Filipovich believes: "Now our society is just beginning to realize the need for locality. It is impossible to drive everyone into one institution by decree and force them to pray in same word, in same language, to read same texts. It is important that this be an initiative both from above and from below – from ordinary believers..." [16, p. 21].

A similar opinion is expressed by a well-known researcher of Orthodoxy, head of the Department of Religious Studies of the Institute of Philosophy O. Sagan, who notes: "... the problem of constituting the Ukrainian Local OC has ceased to be an average issue and has become a desirable path for the evolution of Orthodoxy in Ukraine. Here we are talking about a vital condition for the country's survival. The most important component of such liberation is the constitution of the Ukrainian Local Orthodox Church" [13, p. 189].

Today, Ecumenical Orthodoxy has reached a dead end in a certain way. Each of the Local Churches is closed in its own environment. Common questions and concerns are being ignored. The general crisis of the Ecumenical Church

was shown by the Great Council of Crete. It should be noted that the Ukrainian autocephaly did not create problems, but, on the contrary, showed the existing misconceptions, which were remained hidden before.

First, the Russian Orthodox Church will lose its numerical advantage in parishes and believers, which will make further attempts to implement the theory of "Moscow is the Third Rome" and its modern manifestation – the doctrine of "Russian world" impossible. Thus, the spiritual crisis of Russian Orthodoxy will not turn into an all-Orthodox crisis, the way will be opened to a conciliar approach to resolving this crisis.

Second, it will pave the way for the healing of divisions and conflicts within Ukrainian Orthodoxy, and since Ukraine is one of the largest countries in terms of the number of believers, then the harmonization of relations between the Orthodox will have a positive effect on the pan-Orthodox level.

Third, millions of Ukrainian Orthodox believers will receive an official vote in the Ecumenical Orthodoxy (in the case of full universal recognition of the OCU).

Fourth, there will be a wider opportunity for spiritual and intellectual exchange between the Ukrainian Church and other Local Churches.

So, the settlement of the Ukrainian question is of great importance not only for the Orthodox believers in Ukraine, but for the whole of Orthodoxy as well. Despite the fact that the Ukrainian believers were not directly represented at the Cretan Council, and the issue of the recognition of the Ukrainian Local Orthodox Church and the unification of Ukrainian Orthodoxy was not officially considered there, this Council became an important step towards the resolving of the Ukrainian question.

The proclamation of Tomos and a worldwide recognition, the Eucharist at the universal level, and many other common things of an ecclesiological and theological nature are indeed extremely important. This is one of the priority vectors of the work of the Primate, the department of external relations of the church and the episcopate in general. However, one of the basic directions should be the promotion of OCU within the country. Enlightenment is what traditional churches, and Orthodoxy in particular, lacks in principle. There is almost no positive information about any church accomplishments and achievements. In particular, data from sociological opinion polls show that Ukrainians received the most information about Tomos from the media – 29.7 %. Only 5.2 % of the population of Ukraine have read and do know the content of the Tomos, another 8.2 % learned about it in their religious community. At the same time, each one in four does not read and does not know the content of the document, another quarter is not interested at all [12, p. 11].

Summing up, we note the following features of the formation and development of the new Ukrainian Church. First, the institutionalization of the OCU takes place in a multi-confessional environment. The multi-confessional situation in Ukraine is a historically formed phenomenon of Ukrainian society. Therefore, today in Ukraine, there is no reason to talk about the United Church in the future. The Ukrainian autocephalous church will develop in its own way, and only from its positive development and active missionary activity, one can expect a positive dynamics of an increase in the quantitative indicator. In no way can parish conversions take place through violence or state influence, as this contradicts the Ukrainian mentality and the centuries-old freedom-loving tradition of Ukrainians. It is important that this is not artificial, since the level of manifested religiosity is growing, and the number of practicing believers, on the contrary, is decreasing.

Secondly, the Ukrainian question is a kind of watershed in terms of the main controversial issues that have troubled the Ecumenical Church in recent centuries. It should be noted that the creation of an independent Ukrainian church is an important and necessary not only for the harmonization of the spiritual life of the Orthodox in Ukraine, but also for Ecumenical Orthodoxy in general. This will help solve a number of important issues and balance the distribution of influence in the Orthodox world.

An important issue today remains the continued recognition of the OCU by other Local Churches. The history of the Ecumenical Church does not provide any specific answer as to the very procedure of such recognition. Different Local Churches have historically received autocephalous status in different ways, but no one has ratified a single mechanism for universal recognition of a new autocephalous unit.

The new Ukrainian Church is finally becoming Orthodox in its essence and pro-Ukrainian in its inner content. The main thing is that in the new church organization there should be more Christian and the church proper, will be less nationalistic and hostile to dissidents. Tolerance is the only path to reconciliation and unification. Guarantee of peace in the present situation – popular Orthodoxy, an open one. For this, the hierarchy must forget about its leading ambitions and serve the Ukrainian people. The newly proclaimed and already independent Ukrainian Church has significant potential. This is a historical challenge: will it be able to unite society, will it be attractive to young people, will internal hierarchical strife and the "struggle for spheres of influence" that have not allowed us to be united and independent for centuries recede into the background?

References

1. Boreyko YU. Pravoslavna identychnist' u suchasnomu ukrayins'komu suspil'stvi // Pravoslav'ya v Ukraini : Zbirnyk materialiv VI Mizhnarodnoyi naukovoï konferentsiyi prysvyachenoï 1000-littu dukhovnykh zv'yazkiv Ukrainy z Afonom (1016–2016) ta 25-littu Pomisnoho Soboru Ukrayins'koyi Pravoslavnoyi Tserkvy (1–3 lystopada 1991 r.). 2016. [Vyp. VI]. S. 831–837.
2. Butyns'kyi V. Yurysdyktsiynny status ukrayins'koho pravoslav'ya i perspektyvy kanonichnoho oformlennya pomisnoyi tserkvy: relihiyeznavchi ta ekleziolohichni refleksiyi (1991–2013 rr.) : Dys. na zdobuttya nauk. stu-

penya kand. filosof. nauk. – spetsial'nist' – 09.00.11 – relihiyeznavstvo. Chernivtsi, 2014. 203 s.

3. Vavusk A. Dolzhny ly Tomosy ob avtokefalyakh, vydannye Vselenskym Patriarkhatom, ratyfytirovat'sya pomestnymy tserkvamy? / per. Y. Bey. URL: <https://cerkvarium.org/ru/publikatsii/monitoring-smi/dolzhy-li-tomosy-ob-avtokefalyakh-vydannye-vselenskim-patriarkhatom-ratifitsirovatsya-pomestnymi-tserkvami.html>.
4. Herheliuk M. Kanonichni ta ekleziolohichni zasady avtokefal'noho ustroyu tserkov u strukturi Vselenskoho pravoslav'ya: istorychnyy kontekst : Dys. na zdobuttya nauk. stupenya kand. istor. nauk. – spetsial'nist' – 09.00.11 – relihiyeznavstvo. Chernivtsi, 2014. 199 s.
5. Epifaniy (Dumenko), mytropolyt. RPTS v Ukraini ye ostannim forpostom Putina // Radio Svoboda. URL: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-society/2632568-rpc-v-ukraini-e-ostannim-forpostom-putina-epifaniy.html>.
6. Yeryemyeyev O. Svyaty i velykyy Sobor Pravoslavnoyi Tserkvy ta problema stanovlennya Ukrayins'koyi Pomisnoyi Pravoslavnoyi Tserkvy // Pravoslav'ya v Ukraini : Zbirnyk materialiv VI Mizhnarodnoyi naukovoï konferentsiyi prysvyachenoï 1000-littu dukhovnykh zv'yazkiv Ukrainy z Afonom (1016–2016) ta 25-littu Pomisnoho Soboru Ukrayins'koyi Pravoslavnoyi Tserkvy (1–3 lystopada 1991 r.). 2016. [Vyp. VI]. S. 845–853.
7. Zhurnaly zasedany Svyashchennoho Synoda RPTS // Zhurnal № 71. 15 oktyabrya. 2019. URL: <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/5283687.html>.
8. Zyzyulas Y. Samoponymanye pravoslavnykh y ykh uchaste v èkumenycheskom dvizheniy: mezhpripravoslavna konsultatsiya ob otношенeniy ko Vsemymomu Sovetu Tserkvey Shambezy (Shveytsaryya, 19–24 yyunya 1995 h.) // Pravoslav'ye y èkumenyizm. 2005. S. 495.
9. Kalach D. Mizhyurysdyktsiynny dialoh u pravoslavnomu seredovyschi // Sofiya. Humanitarno-relihiyeznavchyy visnyk. № 2(11). 2018. S. 13–17.
10. Naukovtsi obhruntuvaly, shcho rishennya Vselenskoho patriarkhatu ne potrebuyut' zatverdzhennya. URL: <https://tva.ua/2019/03/11/naukovtsi-obhruntuvaly-shcho-rishennya-vselenskoho-patriarkhatu-ne-potrebuyut-zatverdzhennya>.
11. Oleksandr (Drabynko), mytropolyt. Ukrayins'ka Tserkva: shlyakh do avtokefaliyi. Do dyskusiï navkolo kanonichnoho statusu, bohosluzhbovoyi movy ta istoriyi Ukrayins'koyi Tserkvy. K. : Fond pam'yati Blazhennishoho Mytropolyta Volodymyra, DUKH I LITERA, 2018. 684 s.
12. Osoblyvosti relihiynoho i tserkovno-relihiynoho samovyznachennya hromadyan Ukrainy: tendentsiyi 2000–2020rr. (Informatsiyni materialy) Razumkov centre. K., 2020. 110 s.
13. Sahan O. N. Suspil'nyy zapyt na Pomisnu Tserkvu: problemy, perspektyvy realizatsiyi // Pravoslav'ya v Ukraini: Zbirnyk materialiv V Mizhnarodnoyi naukovoï konferentsiyi. – K.: [Kyiv's'ka pravoslavna bohoslavs'ka akademiya], 2015. CH. 1. S. 181–189.
14. Sahan O. Usya pravda pro ukrayins'ke tserkovne pytannya. K., 2021. 48 s.
15. Fylypovych L., Tytarenko V. Problemni aspekty mizhkonfesiynnykh ta derzhavnokonfesiynnykh vidnosyn u suchasniy suspil'no-politychnyy sytuatsiyi v Ukraini // Relihiyna svoboda. № 24. 2020. S. 55–64.
16. Fylypovych L. "V Ukraini relihiyne bahatomanitnya sformovalo kul'turu povahy do inshoho. Den' No 161–162, p'yatnytsya-subota 9–10 veresnya 2016 r. S. 20–21.

Надійшла до редколегії 11.08.21

А. Р. Кобетяк, канд. філос. наук, докторант
Державний університет "Житомирська політехніка", Житомир, Україна

ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ КОНСТИТУЦІОНУВАННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ПОМІСНОЇ ЦЕРКВИ

Проаналізовано процес становлення новоутвореної Помісної української церкви на сучасному етапі. Визначено, що інституційне оформлення ПЦУ відбувається в умовах поліконфесійності, тому прогнозується, що сьогодні в Україні немає підстав говорити про Єдину церкву у майбутньому.

У дослідженні визначено, що українське церковне питання проходить своєрідним вододілом у розрізі основних спірних питань, що турбували Вселенську церкву останні століття. Доведено, що врегулювання українського питання має велике значення не лише для православних вірян України, але і для всього православ'я. Встановлено, що автокефалія в сучасних умовах розвитку суспільства та гібридної війни є життєво необхідною умовою виживання країни. Консолідована Київська митрополія може стати найбільшою національною православною церквою світу, що значно змінить баланс у структурі Вселенського православ'я.

Ключові слова: Українська церква, автокефалія, митрополит, релігія, помісний собор, суспільство, міжконфесійні відносини.

А. Р. Кобетяк, канд. филос. наук, докторант
Государственный университет "Житомирская политехника", Житомир, Украина

ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ КОНСТИТУЦИОНИРОВАНИЯ УКРАИНСКОЙ ПОМЕСТНОЙ ЦЕРКВИ

Проанализирован процесс становления Поместной украинской церкви на современном этапе. Определено, что институциональное оформление ПЦУ происходит в условиях поликонфессиональности, поэтому прогнозируется, что сегодня в Украине нет оснований говорить о Единой церкви в будущем.

В исследовании определено, что украинский церковный вопрос проходит своеобразным водоразделом в разрезе основных спорных вопросов, которые беспокоили Вселенскую церковь последние столетия. Доказано, что урегулирование украинского вопроса имеет большое значение не только для православных верующих Украины, но и для всего православия. Установлено, что автокефалия в современных условиях развития общества и гибридной войны является жизненно необходимым условием выживания страны. Консолидированная Киевская митрополия может стать крупнейшей национальной православной церковью мира, что значительно изменит баланс в структуре Вселенского православия.

Ключевые слова: Украинская церковь, автокефалия, митрополит, религия, поместный собор, общество, межконфессиональные отношения.