

УДК 272+29

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/sophia.2024.23.11>

Ioann STETSIK, PhD Student

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8991-3911

e-mail: [harald098@ukr.net](mailto:harald098@ukr.net)

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

## REASONS AND CONTENT OF PROTOPRESBYTER GAVRYIL KOSTELNYK'S CRITICISM OF CATHOLICISM

**Background.** *The intellectual legacy of protopresbyter Gavryil Kostelnyk is notable for its significant influence on the religious thought of early 20th-century Ukraine. His works reflect deep engagement with a range of theological and social issues. A key turning point in his career occurred in 1925 after his visit to Rome, which shifted his focus from critiquing atheism and socialism to examining Catholicism critically. Before this, Kostelnyk had raised concerns about the theological dependence of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) on the Vatican. His opposition to Catholicism was further shaped by the "Easterners", a movement within the UGCC advocating the preservation of Orthodox traditions. This research aims to analyze Kostelnyk's theological transformation, focusing on his call for a return to undivided Christianity and his role in the 1946 Lviv Council.*

**Methods.** *The research is based on a comprehensive methodological approach, incorporating both historical-biographical analysis and textual criticism of Kostelnyk's works. Primary sources include archival materials and published works by Kostelnyk, such as his well-known writings "The New Era of Our Church", "The Dispute on the Epiclesis Between East and West", and "The Revival of the Church".*

**Results.** *The research shows that Kostelnyk's 1925 trip to Rome profoundly influenced his shift toward Orthodox theology. His critique of Catholicism intensified, positioning Orthodoxy as the true representation of Christianity. Kostelnyk's writings consistently advocated for the UGCC to abandon Catholic innovations and return to pre-schism traditions. His participation in the Lviv Council of 1946, which led to the reunification of the Galician Metropolitanate with the Orthodox Church, marked the culmination of his efforts. Despite Vatican opposition, his theological works continued to shape religious discourse in the region.*

**Conclusions.** *Gavryil Kostelnyk's journey from a reformer within the UGCC to a proponent of Orthodoxy underscores his dedication to restoring the original Christian doctrine. His critical analysis of Catholicism played a central role in theological debates and significantly contributed to the processes leading to the 1946 Lviv Council. Kostelnyk's legacy remains influential in discussions about the identity of the UGCC and its place within the broader Christian tradition.*

**Keywords:** *christianity, Catholicism, Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, Orthodox Christianity, religious faith, secularization, religion and science, religious security.*

### Background

The intellectual legacy of protopresbyter Gavryil Kostelnyk is significant both in volume and in the diversity of fields in which this philosopher worked. His works reflect deep engagement with a range of theological and social issues and relevant even now. However, there is a date that distinctly divides his legacy into "before" and "after", into "early Kostelnyk" and "late Kostelnyk". This date is 1925, a transition point after which the themes of Father Gavryil's research took a sharp turn. Before 1925, he primarily focused on criticizing atheism as a theory and socialism/communism as manifestations of atheistic ideas in practice. However, after his trip to Rome in 1925, Kostelnyk shifted the focus of his studies. He produced a series of works that critiqued Catholicism to varying degrees. So, why such a drastic change happened? The search for an answer to this question, as well as to the question of why Kostelnyk began to criticize Catholicism, is the aim of this article.

### Methods

The research is based on a comprehensive methodological approach, incorporating both historical-biographical analysis and textual criticism of Kostelnyk's works. Primary sources include archival materials and published works by Kostelnyk, such as his well-known writings "The New Era of Our Church", "The Dispute on the Epiclesis Between East and West", and "The Revival of the Church". These documents provide insight into the evolution of his theological views and his critique of key Catholic doctrines, such as the primacy of the Pope, papal infallibility, the Filioque, and the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. The study also contextualizes his intellectual debate with Josyf Slipyi and explores the "Easterners" movement within the UGCC, which sought to preserve Orthodox liturgical traditions.

### Results

Analyzing the works of the "early" Kostelnyk, it becomes clear that even before year 1925, Kostelnyk had criticized Roman Catholicism and Greek Catholicism, albeit on a smaller scale. This is most evident in his work "The Limits of Democratism" (1919), where Father Gavryil explores secularization, with one reason for this destructive phenomenon being the excessive politicization of the Catholic Church.

Moreover, Kostelnyk repeatedly emphasized the insufficient subjectivity of Ukrainian Greek Catholicism, its lack of independence. "Internal uncertainty, lack of independence in life, blind and unlimited subordination to foreign influences" (Kostelnyk, 1926, p. 10) – this is how Kostelnyk characterized the contemporary Greek Catholic Church. This comment reflects not just administrative subordination but a deeper level of insufficient subjectivity, specifically pointing out the absence of its own theological tradition in Greek Catholicism, its imitation of foreign models. "Since the Union, all our theological books are just plagiarisms – translations or adaptations of Western books. All Western trends are a model, simply a canon of thinking for us" (Kostelnyk, 1926, p. 11). This drive to find a unique subjectivity for Greek Catholicism is one of the main (if not the main) reasons for the criticism of the Catholic Church.

Another reason for Kostelnyk's criticism of Catholicism can be attributed to his involvement with the so-called "Easterners" – a movement within the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) whose members opposed latinization and the preservation of the Orthodox rite. Kostelnyk himself repeatedly spoke out against the Polonization and Catholicization of Galician Ukraine in his writings. Additionally, he personally opposed celibacy. Even before his trip to Rome, he actively fought against this practice, which was intended to be made mandatory in

Ukrainian Greek Catholicism. It was for this reason that he supported the boycott by the Stanislav seminarians in 1925, declared in opposition to celibacy and the local Uniate bishop H. Khomyshyn.

Another reason for Kostelnyk's sharp turn in research was his intellectual debate with Josyf Slipyi, which can be described as a typical example of the conflict between "pro-Western" and "pro-Eastern" trends in Greek Catholicism. It all started with the figure of Thomas Aquinas, more precisely, the attitude towards this figure. Josyf Slipyi was an advocate of scholasticism. He wrote a work dedicated to the history of scholastic philosophy and theology, "Essay on the History of Medieval (Scholastic) Philosophy". In this work, the author highlights the special role of scholasticism in the Orthodox world – in Byzantium, Rus, and contemporary Ukraine. Briefly, Slipyi first writes about the bias that has formed regarding scholasticism in the Orthodox environment (Slipyi, 1991, pp. 105–106). He then demonstrates examples from the past showing the path to the union of the Catholic and Orthodox traditions in the Union of Brest (Zahrebelnyi, 2019, p. 57).

Kostelnyk immediately began criticizing this work, specifically, on January 4, 1925, Father Gavryil presented his report "Saint Thomas Aquinas and Scholasticism" (Hlynka, & Chekhovych, 1934, p. 46), in which he criticized Josyf Slipyi's report "On the Influence of Saint Thomas on Oriental Theology", which was read on December 19, 1924. Following this, the polemic continued through periodical publications. Kostelnyk used "Niva", where he published thorough reviews of J. Slipyi's works "De principio spirationis in SS. Trinitate", "Saint Thomas Aquinas and Scholasticism", and the work "Let There Be No Misunderstanding" (1926). Josyf Slipyi responded in the pages of the newspaper "Theology" with the works "Further on Scholastic-Dogmatic Themes (Regarding the Reviews by Fr. Dr. Kostelnyk)" and "In Response".

This literary-format polemic then concluded. It is quite possible that some personal conflict occurred, but it cannot yet be proven. Later, in "Memoirs", Slipyi sought the origins of the polemic initiated against him by Kostelnyk, primarily in his intellectual jealousy: "Kostelnyk saw that it was all going over his head, and he attacked my works in a very crude way" (Slipyi, 2014, p. 132).

The first work in which Kostelnyk demonstrated his pro-Eastern stance was the 1926 report "The New Era of Our Church". Former Uniate priest H. Marynovych recalls this work: "By 1926, Fr. G. Kostelnyk had matured in the idea of the necessity of our reunion with the Orthodox Church. Proof of this is his small brochure, only 16 pages long, titled "The New Era of Our Church", which he distributed to all subscribers of the church journal "Niva"... Thus, twenty years before our conciliar reunification, Fr. G. Kostelnyk was already an apostle of our turn towards Eastern Orthodoxy. This was his heartfelt idea and dream, for which he fought and gave his life" (Myrovych, 1958, p. 144). In this work, the idea of the lack of independence and insufficient subjectivity of Greek Catholicism is reiterated. Following these theses, the author points to the "world significance of the Union" (Kostelnyk, 1926, p. 4), expressed through the "restoration of the status of ancient Byzantium" (Kostelnyk, 1926, p. 14). By this, the priest means something very specific, namely bringing Greek Catholicism to a point of subjectivity that would equal the subjectivity of Christianity during the period of unity between East and West. Simply put, in this work, the protopresbyter begins work on what this "new Union" should be. And the key to this, the key to the "restoration of

ancient Byzantium", for Kostelnyk was "developing a living, revitalizing ideology of the Union" (Kostelnyk, 1926, p. 6). That is, a review of the existing doctrine of Greek Catholicism, identifying everything imposed after the 1054 schism, and bringing the Union to a state that would make possible its main function – the unification of Eastern and Western Christianity.

The first significant area of Catholic doctrine that the protopresbyter chose for analysis was liturgical theology. More specifically – the theological question of the "epiclesis", the descent of the Holy Spirit on the bread and wine, transforming them into the Body and Blood of Christ. This theme was addressed in two works. The first – an article "Just Thinking" (1928), which gained wide attention. In this article, Father Gavryil condemned the purely Catholic tradition of performing the liturgy on pre-cut and dried lambs. In the same year, 1928, Father Gavryil wrote the detailed theological treatise "The Dispute on the Epiclesis between East and West". This work was a reaction to the work of the vicar of the Prešov eparchy, Fr. N. Rusnak, "Epiclesis". Kostelnyk sought an answer to the question of when "transubstantiation" (the transformation of ordinary bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ) occurs – after the priest's utterance of Christ's words from the Last Supper, or after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, i.e., the epiclesis. Rusnak took the following position: "Since the Holy Eucharist is performed by the words of Jesus Christ, it is dogmatically clear that the epiclesis, i.e., the words of invocation of the Holy Spirit, can be omitted without any detriment" (Kostelnyk, 1928, p. 4). Kostelnyk criticized this statement and, after detailed consideration, took a theological position that fully coincides with the Orthodox theological position on this issue: "transubstantiation" occurs after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, i.e., the "epiclesis".

Academician Y. Tamash believes that the work "The Dispute on the Epiclesis" demonstrates the position of "radical Easternism" taken by protopresbyter Kostelnyk, which becomes increasingly evident in his work. The climax of this position was the break with the Catholic Church and the transition to Orthodoxy at the Lviv Council of 1946. Y. Tamash notes that starting with "The Epiclesis", Kostelnyk's views, which he expressed in his works, began to increasingly resemble the philosophical views of Solovyov, Berdyaev, and other religious philosophers of this kind (Tamash, 1986, pp. 261–262).

Following "The Epiclesis", Father Gavryil was subjected to sanctions by the Roman censorship – his removal from the position of chief editor of "Niva" and threats of excommunication. Later, he was stripped of his chair at the theological academy, and then transferred to the cathedral under the direct supervision of the metropolitan.

"New Era of Our Church", "Just Thinking", "The Epiclesis" – these works sparked a broad discussion between Kostelnyk and the "Westerners", and animosity from the Roman Curia. It is quite likely that the sanctions from the Vatican and the imposed status of a disgraced theologian only spurred Father Gavryil and deepened his anti-Catholic position. Thus, under the pen of the father, one critical study followed another. Alongside "The Epiclesis" in the years 1927–1928, Kostelnyk wrote the work "Cursed Saints Cyril and Methodius", and in 1931, he worked on the study "The Apostle Peter and the Roman Popes, or the Dogmatic Foundations of the Papacy". This was followed by "The Development of the Papacy in the First Five Centuries" (1933), "How Roman Theologians Fight" (1936), "The Infallibility of the Pope and the Roman

Church" (1936), "The Revival of the Church" (1935), "Mission" (1942), "The Primacy of the Latin Church and the Uniate Churches" (1939), "The Roman Church and the Unity of Christ's Church" (1948), and many others. All these works were consistent in their criticism of everything in the Catholic Church that the protopresbyter considered false and imposed.

More specifically, starting from 1925, the protopresbyter consistently changed his theological views. Through thorough historical-theological analysis, Father Gavryil concluded the erroneousness and even heretical nature of the following new Catholic dogmas:

- the doctrine of the power (primacy) of the Bishop of Rome in the Church;
- the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit "and from the Son" (Filioque);
- the doctrine of the infallibility of the Bishop of Rome;
- the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary;
- the doctrine of the nature of the Eucharist: the doctrine of the form of the "Eucharist" and the epiclesis; the doctrine that each particle contains the whole living Christ ("Eucharistic Jesus"), the use of unleavened bread (wafers), the communion of the faithful only under the form of bread;
- the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage except in cases of adultery.

Moreover, he considered heretical such feasts as:

- the feast of the Body of Christ;
- the feast of the Sacred Heart of Christ;
- the veneration of Saint Joseph the Betrothed as the greatest saint in the Church.

He called the practice of mandatory clerical celibacy unevangelical.

In other words, Kostelnyk considered all the most significant innovations in Catholicism that appeared after the break with Orthodoxy to be heretical and erroneous. If one were to remove from Greek Catholicism everything against which Kostelnyk wrote, the resulting structure would indeed be "old Byzantium": the Union, if stripped of the papacy and doctrinal inventions from the 11th century onward, is doctrinally no longer a Union.

In his article "The Revival of the Church", written in 1935 as a response to the religious searches of Western Europeans during the interwar period, Kostelnyk provides an interim summary of his critique of Catholicism. The main idea of the article is that the religion of the future will be Christianity, represented by Orthodoxy, which alone can rejuvenate religion in the world. The author reached this conclusion after a critical review of the main tenets of faith and principles of religious life across the major Christian denominations: Catholicism, Protestantism, and Orthodoxy.

At the beginning, Gavryil Kostelnyk asks: What will the religion of the future be? According to the priest, the confession capable of fulfilling the historical mission of reviving religion must be able to do the following:

1. Overcome the alienation of the intellectuals from faith and the church;
2. Create objective conditions for the restoration of Christian world unity;
3. Ensure that the theological considerations of this confession do not contradict scientific discoveries.

Through the prism outlined, the protopresbyter systematically examines all Christian confessions and evaluates the potential of each to become the unifying center of the Christian world.

The critical analysis begins with the Roman Church. Noting the external attractiveness of Catholicism, Father Gavryil writes that external gloss cannot hide a history that reveals the true nature of this confession. Kostelnyk states that throughout the second millennium, the Roman Church has been constantly decaying and disintegrating. Why? The protopresbyter attributes this to the "eternal revolution" (Kostelnyk, 1935), which arose within Catholicism after its departure from Orthodoxy. This revolution led to the separation of Protestants, Anglicans, Old Catholics, and Uniates in America and Europe. Kostelnyk explains the Roman Church's desire to absolve itself of responsibility for the destruction of church unity as "tyranny, which makes the Roman Church incorrigible" (Kostelnyk, 1935). He calls attempts to portray this process as the result of individual errors a "sign of timid obscurantism" (Kostelnyk, 1935).

Another reason for the disintegration of the Roman Church is the adoption of new dogmas unknown to the Church of the first millennium. First and foremost is the dogma of the primacy of the Roman bishop, which was based on forged documents. This act Kostelnyk considers the "first and greatest falsehood of the Roman Church" (Kostelnyk, 1935). "The unceremonious falsification of Church history and the Gospel... No other Church has sinned in this regard as much as the Roman Church" (Kostelnyk, 1935). Due to this inner deceit, "the Roman Church can never be sincere, but must always and everywhere dissemble, distort, and obscure reality". (Kostelnyk, 1935) The Catholic Church has accumulated so many errors and distorted history so much that "it has created its own Christian faith, which among all Christian confessions contains the most pagan elements, inherited from ancient pagan Rome" (Kostelnyk, 1935). And the most significant link between the Roman Church and pagan Rome is the papacy, which has transformed the Roman bishop "into a secular king and a religious demigod" (Kostelnyk, 1935).

The next erroneous dogma of the Roman Church is Filioque, which is "indeed falsehood, i.e., heresy". (Kostelnyk, 1935) Revisiting the essence of this theological dispute, Kostelnyk directly states, "The Orthodox Church is right in this matter" (Kostelnyk, 1935).

The root, the methodological reason for the phenomena described above, the protopresbyter believed, was scholasticism, which once played a positive role but failed to understand its own limitations. As a result, Catholic theology became dependent on scholastic concepts and transformed into a "factory of dogmas" (Kostelnyk, 1935). Kostelnyk sharply criticizes the theory of dogmatic development as one that "does not correspond to the spirit of the Gospel" (Kostelnyk, 1935), where it is stated that Christ revealed to the Church all that He deemed necessary.

The Roman Church is deeply secularized, which has led to a prevalence of mechanistic and formalistic attitudes. Kostelnyk describes this situation as Pharisaism. "Ancient Jewish Pharisaism, which is decisively condemned in the Gospel, looks childish compared to Roman Pharisaism. The Roman Church is the great New Testament Pharisaical church" (Kostelnyk, 1935). As an example of Pharisaism, the protopresbyter mentions the practice of celibacy. Kostelnyk writes that it is practically not observed by anyone, leading to the phenomenon of clerical concubinage. This, in turn, leads to the suppression of conscience and ethical indifference. It would be interesting to see how Father Gavryil would comment on modern news regarding pedophilia in the Catholic clergy?

Protopresbyter also briefly reviews other theological innovations: the teaching about Saint Joseph the Betrothed as the greatest saint, the emergence of the feast of the Body of Christ, and the cult of the Heart of Christ under the influence of visions from hysterical nuns.

Summarizing his review of the Roman Catholic Church (RCC), Kostelnyk concludes that it has no future. This structure can only expect success among "savage and non-Christian people who are unaware of its history, and whom it dazzles with its splendor" (Kostelnyk, 1935). In conclusion, he states that in its current state, the Roman Church should not even think about the reunification of Christianity.

After Roman Catholicism, Father Gavryil moves on to review Protestantism. He examines it in contrast to Catholicism: "they lack what constitutes the essence of Catholicism... Their positive contribution to Christianity lies in cleaning the rotten atmosphere created by the Roman Church in the Middle Ages" (Kostelnyk, 1935). However, like all revolutionaries, the reformers could not avoid making some critical mistakes. For Kostelnyk, such a mistake by Protestant reformers was a misunderstanding of the nature of the Church and the inability to distinguish the content of faith from the methods and forms of its expression. Therefore, Protestantism also cannot claim to unite and rejuvenate the entire Christian world.

The protopresbyter then turns to Orthodoxy. Despite the persecutions by the Bolsheviks and its difficult situation in the Soviet Union, Kostelnyk calls the Orthodox Church the only hope for the revival of Christianity and religion in general. "If it does not lead to the revival of the Church, then in our time it is not worth waiting for" (Kostelnyk, 1935), Kostelnyk believed.

Unlike Catholicism or Protestantism, the Orthodox Church has always been impeccable in doctrine and "has no historical falsehood" (Kostelnyk, 1935) and "it has the richest and most beautifully developed and articulated worship" (Kostelnyk, 1935). However, the contemporary European person has no idea about Orthodox purity, as they are "blinded by their proud clergy, who are prejudiced against all schismatism" (Kostelnyk, 1935). Therefore, to rejuvenate Christianity, it is necessary to bring Orthodoxy to the West. But Father Gavryil is not particularly optimistic – he is convinced that the Catholic Church will not fully reunite with Orthodoxy. First, a new schism will occur within the RCC, and after that, some part of the Roman Church will unite with the Orthodox Church.

Kostelnyk cannot be accused of favoritism – Orthodoxy is subject to his criticism just as much as other confessions. He considers the cultural backwardness of the nations that confess Eastern Christianity a weak point, which occurred due to their difficult political situation.

Concluding his article, Protopresbyter Gavryil Kostelnyk writes something very important. He asserts that for the revival of the Orthodox Church, the Galician Metropolitanate must also join, provided it renounces heretical Roman dogmas. "At the right time, it (the Uniate Church – Ed.) must reach such spiritual maturity as to shake off the shackles of the terrible Roman falsehood and captivity" (Kostelnyk, 1935). Such a union must reject the dogma of the primacy of the Roman Pope and his infallibility, the Filioque, the Latin doctrine of the Eucharist and related feasts, celibacy, and everything that ties Greek Catholicism to Rome. In other words, the state of the union should correspond to the state of Christianity before its division into Eastern and Western. That is, to become equivalent to Orthodoxy. Kostelnyk calls on everyone to

participate in this process of purifying the union from all things Catholic and says, "In the spiritual revival, I wish to take an active part, which is why I have written some studies on this topic" (Kostelnyk, 1935). However, he still considers it premature to engage in public activity, as "under the circumstances of the time, I could not do anything for this great goal or even might harm this cause" (Kostelnyk, 1935).

#### Discussion and conclusions

Thus, Gavryil Kostelnyk's criticism of Catholicism was a tool in the search for subjectivity for Greek Catholicism. He sought to transform Greek Catholicism in such a way that the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church would stop being just another division of the Roman Church but would begin to fulfill its initial function – uniting Eastern and Western Christianity. For this purpose, Father Gavryil began a systematic review of Roman Catholic doctrine to isolate what he considered true, undivided Christianity. Later, in the 1930s and especially the 1940s, this theoretical impulse changed somewhat – Kostelnyk became disillusioned with the idea of uniting all branches of Christianity here and now. Instead, he concluded that true Christianity remained in the form of Orthodoxy, and he became the initiator and main participant in the process of uniting the Galician Metropolitanate with the Orthodox Church. These two issues – how Kostelnyk transitioned from the idea of internal change in the UGCC to the idea of unification with Orthodoxy, and how this unification took place – are the next directions for research that organically continue the theme of this scholarly article.

#### References

- Kostelnyk, H. (1928). *The dispute on the epiclesis between East and West*. Staropygiy Institute [in Ukrainian]. [Костельник, Г. (1928). *Спір про епikleзу між Заходом і Сходом*. Старопіпійський інститут]. [https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Kostelnyk\\_Havryil/Spir\\_pro\\_epiklezu\\_mizh\\_Skhodom\\_i\\_Zakhodom.pdf](https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Kostelnyk_Havryil/Spir_pro_epiklezu_mizh_Skhodom_i_Zakhodom.pdf)
- Kostelnyk, H. (1926). *The new era of our church*. Niva [in Ukrainian]. [Костельник, Г. (1926). *Нова доба нашої церкви*. Нива]. [https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/e/ec/Костельник\\_Г.\\_Нова\\_доба\\_нашої\\_Церкви\\_%281926%29.pdf](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/e/ec/Костельник_Г._Нова_доба_нашої_Церкви_%281926%29.pdf)
- Kostelnyk, H. (1935). *The revival of the Church*. Dilo [in Ukrainian]. [Костельник, Г. (1935). *Відродження Церкви*. Діло].
- Myrovych, H., Prot. (1958). Memories of a campaigner for holy orthodoxy. *Orthodox Herald*, 5, 144–145 [in Ukrainian]. [Мирович, Г., прот. (1958). Спогади борця за святе православ'я. *Православний Вісник*, 5, 144–145].
- Slipyi, Y. (1991). *Essay on the history of medieval (scholastic) philosophy*. St. Clement Ukrainian Catholic University [in Ukrainian]. [Сліпий, Й. (1991). *Нарис історії середньовічної (схоластичної) філософії*. Український католицький ун-т ім. Св. Климента].
- Slipyi, Y. (2014). *Memoirs* (I. Datsko & M. Horiacha, Eds.). St. Clement Ukrainian Catholic University [in Ukrainian]. [Сліпий, Й. (2014). *Спогади* (І. Дацько, М. Горяча, Ред.). Український католицький ун-т ім. Св. Климента].
- Tamash, Y. (1986). *Havryil Kostelnyk between doctrine and nature*. Ruske Slovo [in Ukrainian]. [Тамаш, Ю. (1986). *Гавриїл Костельник між доктриною і природою*. Руске Слово].
- Hlynka, L., & Chekhovych, K. (1934). *The Theological scientific society in Lviv in the first decade of its existence (1923–1933)*. The Theological Scientific Society in Lviv [in Ukrainian]. [Глінка, Л., & Чехович, К. (1934). *Богословське наукове товариство у Львові в першому десятиріччі свого існування (1923–1933)*. Видавництво Богословського наукового товариства у Львові].
- Zahrebelnyi, I. (2019). *The problem of secularization in the creative heritage of Havryil Kostelnyk* [Dissertation of Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, H. S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine] [in Ukrainian]. [Загребельний, І. В. (2019). *Проблема секуляризації в творчій спадщині Гавриїла Костельника* [Дис. канд. філос. наук, Інститут філософії імені Г. С. Сковороди, НАН України]. [https://www.academia.edu/39335805/Проблема\\_секуляризації\\_у\\_творчій\\_спадщині\\_Гавриїла\\_Костельника\\_критичний\\_аналіз](https://www.academia.edu/39335805/Проблема_секуляризації_у_творчій_спадщині_Гавриїла_Костельника_критичний_аналіз)

Отримано редакцією журналу / Received: 13.04.24

Прорецензовано / Revised: 23.04.24

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 18.05.24

Іоанн СТЕЦЯК, асп.  
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8991-3911  
e-mail: harald098@ukr.net  
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

## ПРИЧИНИ ТА ЗМІСТ КРИТИКИ КАТОЛИЦИЗМУ ПРОТОПРЕСВІТЕРОМ ГАВРІІЛОМ КОСТЕЛЬНИКОМ

**Вступ.** Наголошено, що інтелектуальна спадщина протопресвітера Гавриїла Костельника надзвичайно сильно вплинула на релігійну думку України початку ХХст. Роботи протопресвітера відображають глибоке занурення у низку теологічних і соціальних питань. Зазначено, що ключовий поворот на його творчому шляху відбувся у 1925 р. після візиту до Риму, після чого фокус уваги о. Гавриїла змістився від критики атеїзму та соціалізму до критичного аналізу католицизму, проте навіть до цієї події Костельник висловлював занепокоєння щодо теологічної залежності Української Греко-Католицької Церкви (УГКЦ) від Ватикану. Його опозиція католицизму була остаточно сформована рухом "східників" всередині УГКЦ, які виступали за збереження ортодоксальних традицій. Це дослідження має на меті проаналізувати теологічну трансформацію Костельника, зокрема його заклик до повернення до нерозділеного християнства та його роль на Львівському соборі 1946 р.

**Методи.** Використано комплексний методологічний підхід, що включає як історико-біографічний аналіз, так і текстологічну критику праць Костельника. Основними джерелами є архівні матеріали та опубліковані роботи Костельника, зокрема його відомі праці "Нова ера нашої церкви", "Спір про епіклезу між Заходом і Сходом" та "Відродження Церкви".

**Результати.** Показано, що поїздка Костельника до Риму в 1925 р. глибоко вплинула на його погляди та підштовхнула їх у бік ортодоксального богослів'я. Костельникова критика католицизму посилювалася, і він почав переглядати греко-католицьку догматику. Кінцевим етапом цього процесу стало переконання, що православ'я є істинним втіленням християнства. Розкрито, що у своїх працях Костельник послідовно закликав УГКЦ відмовитися від католицьких інновацій і повернутися до до-схизматичних традицій. Його участь у Львівському соборі 1946 р., що призвела до об'єднання Галицької митрополії з ортодоксією, стала кульмінацією його зусиль. Незважаючи на опір Ватикану, його теологічні праці продовжували формувати релігійний дискурс у регіоні.

**Висновки.** Доведено, що шлях Гавриїла Костельника від реформатора в межах УГКЦ до прихильника православ'я підкреслює його відданість відновленню первісного християнського вчення. Його критичний аналіз католицизму відіграв центральну роль у теологічних дебатах і суттєво сприяв процесам, що призвели до Львівського собору 1946 р. Спадщина Костельника залишається впливовою у дискусіях щодо ідентичності УГКЦ та її місця у ширшій християнській традиції.

**Ключові слова:** християнство, Українська Греко-Католицька Церква, Римо-Католицька Церква, православ'я, релігійна віра, секуляризація, релігія та знання, релігійна безпека.

Автор заявляє про відсутність конфлікту інтересів. Спонсори не брали участі в розробленні дослідження; у зборі, аналізі чи інтерпретації даних; у написанні рукопису; в рішенні про публікацію результатів.

The author declares no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; in the decision to publish the results.