

The Calendar Question in the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, 1900–1930

Oleh Pavlyshyn

Calendar reform is still a controversial and unresolved issue confronting Ukrainian Byzantine-rite Christians. Whereas some in the Ukrainian diaspora in Europe and on the American continent have long observed religious holy days according to the Gregorian New Style calendar, many emphatically insist on preserving the Julian Old Style calendar. Overall, the calendar issue in the Ukrainian church pertains to various aspects of national life, social circumstances, and even political realities. This paper will focus on the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (hereafter UGCC) in the context of the general calendar discourse, including by Orthodox Ukrainians.

Ideas about calendar reform and attempts to implement it in the Ukrainian church have a long history. As far back as 1583, a year after Rome's introduction of the Gregorian calendar, Patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople ordered the Orthodox clergy and laity to reject the New Style (hereafter NS) calendar. Attempts at imposing it in ecclesiastical practice among Orthodox Ruthenians in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were unsuccessful. After the 1596 Church Union of Brest, the Ukrainian church retained not only its Byzantine rite but also the corresponding order of holy days according to the Julian calendar.¹

The simultaneous existence of two calendar systems in the Western Ukrainian territories constituted not only a religious problem, but also an economic one. The ecclesiastical calendar defined the order and number of working days and holy days. Whereas before the introduction of the NS calendar most of the holy days observed in the Byzantine and Latin rites coincided, after the Roman Catholic Church adopted the Gregorian calendar a chronological disparity between the main holy days of both rites occurred and the number of non-working days in Western Ukraine increased considerably. It was largely for economic reasons that after the incorporation of Galicia into the Austrian Empire the authorities demanded that Greek Catholic hierarchs implement the calendar reform. These demands came to naught, however, because of the active opposition of Metropolitans Lev Sheptytsky, Antin Anhelovych, Mykhailo Levytsky, and Hryhorii Yakhymovych. It should be noted that the Apostolic See adopted a rather non-committal stance regarding this matter.

In Galicia socio-economic status emerged as a factor that differentiated positions towards the calendar issue. The Ukrainian spiritual and secular intelligentsia saw the question in the context of interdenominational relations and in terms of

¹ See my article "Kalendarna reforma u Kyivs'kii Tserkvi: Istorychnyi aspekt," *Patriarkhat* (Lviv), 2004, no. 3.

cultural and political orientation. In the mid-nineteenth century the church calendar also became one of the core elements defining the national identity of Galician Ukrainians. For peasants, given their traditional lifestyle, the church calendar provided a universal system of temporal co-ordinates. They understood the attempts at introducing the NS calendar, if somewhat simplistically, as an assault on Byzantine-rite holy days.²

It is notable that the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church closely followed calendar-related discussions taking place in the Orthodox world. In the Russian Empire, where the Julian calendar applied to both ecclesiastic and secular life (with the exception of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Finland), late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars repeatedly recommended that the tsarist government introduce the more astronomically accurate Gregorian calendar. Implied clearly herein were simultaneous calendar reforms in both the secular and ecclesiastical realms. Particularly noteworthy was the proposal of the German mathematician and astronomer Johann Heinrich von Mädler (1794–1874) of Dorpat (Tartu) University, who in 1864 published a project of calendar reforms that he considered more acceptable to the Orthodox Church. He suggested, within cycles of 128 years, the creation of 31 leap years (rather than 32). The error in such a calendar would amount to one day every 100,000 years. At the initiative of Dmitrii Mendeleev, the Commission on Calendric Reform of the Russian Astronomical Society recommended the adoption of this calendar in the Russia Empire.

This reform was never carried out, however, because the Russian Holy Synod was staunchly opposed to calendric innovations. It was only in 1902, in response to Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III's appeal to all autocephalous churches, that the synod agreed to the introduction of the NS calendar for Russian secular affairs, with the proviso that the Paschalia remain unchanged and holy days not be moved.³

In late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Galicia, the question of the church calendar was viewed in the context of the economic, social, and cultural transformations experienced by the Ukrainian community, which was then undergoing modernization and faced a changing social structure. Galician Ukrainians were progressively moving from the countryside into the cities and towns and forming an ever-greater proportion of workers, officials, and household servants there. The observance of feast days according to the Julian calendar in an urban environment dominated by Roman Catholics caused material and psychological discomfort. The celebration of holy days according to the Old Style (hereafter OS) calendar hindered the adaptation of Ukrainians as a viable community in the cities and caused their assimilation into the Polish environment. It is not surprising, therefore, that around this time the idea of changing the church calendar steadily began gaining more adherents among the secular intelligentsia and church leaders.

² See my article "Z istorii vprovadzhennia hryhorians'koho kalendaria v tserkovne zhyttia Ukraïntsiiv: Kalendarna reforma iepyskopa Hryhoriia Khomyshyna," *Ukraïna moderna* (Lviv), no. 7 (2002): 7–68.

³ See Iu. R-ii, "K voprosu o reforme kalendaria," *Voskresnoe chtenie* (Warsaw), 1924, no. 14 (27 April): 221. The reform was never carried out.

In 1903 Rev. Yosyp Milnytsky, a prelate close to the UGCC hierarchy, published a scholarly monograph that contained, in addition to an exhaustive mathematical calculations relating to the appropriate date for observing Easter in accordance with the OS calendar, a proposal for calendar reform.⁴ Based on calculations that took into account solar and lunar cycles in the OS calendar, he concluded that one could modernize the church calendar without violating the fundamental principles of the church and its rite.⁵

The purpose of calendar reform in the life of the UGCC became a topic of the First Ukrainian Educational Economic Congress held in Lviv on 1–2 February 1909. Stepan Tomashivsky, representing the Prosvita Society's executive board, proposed to include calendar reform in church life on the agenda of the educational-organizational working group. The close to two hundred attendees accepted his proposal without any discussion.⁶ At the conclusion of their deliberations, the working group adopted the following resolution: "We appeal to the executive board of Prosvita, in co-operation with our spiritual authorities and educational-scholarly and ecumenical institutions, to develop a questionnaire addressing issues relating to the change from the Julian to the Gregorian calendar."⁷ Tomashivsky later stated that Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky (a congress participant) had commented on the proposed resolution, stating that he "would not hesitate for a moment to introduce the Gregorian calendar if the secular realm would so desire."⁸

Tomashivsky earnestly continued to propagate the calendar reform in his articles and public appearances. At the beginning of 1914 at the National Education Congress focusing on national private schools, he made public his wish that New Year's Day of 1915 would be celebrated by the Ukrainians in Galicia on 1 January in accordance with the NS calendar rather than on 14 January (i.e., January 1 OS).⁹

During the First World War, a number of European countries that had previously used the OS calendar in the secular realm switched to the NS calendar. In 1916, in the absence of Metropolitan Sheptytsky, who had been deported by the Russians, Bishop Hryhorii Khomyshyn of Stanyslaviv implemented the calendar reform in his eparchy. Despite his attempts to present the introduction of the NS calendar as strictly a church affair, this deed was viewed as having an unequivocally political character within the context of the war. It served to demonstrate the loyalty of the Western Ukrainian faithful to the Austrian authorities and to point out their foreign-policy choice during the conflict between empires. A number of

⁴ See Iosyf Mil'nyts'kyi, *Ob ustroistvi i reformi kalendaria Hreko-Rus'koï Tserkvy* (Lviv, 1903), 36–37.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ See *Pershyy ukrains'kyi prosvitn'o-ekonomichnyi kongres uladzhenyi tovarystvom "Prosvita" v soroklitie zasnovania u L'vovi v dniakh 1. i 2. liutoho 1910 roku*, ed. Ivan Bryk and Mykhailo Kotsiuba (Lviv, 1910), 57, 63, and 208.

⁷ Ibid., 208.

⁸ S. Tomashivskyi, "Reforma kalendaria i Tserkvy: Slovo do prykhyl'nykiv i protyvykiv hryhoriians'koho chyslennia chasu," *Dilo*, 1916, no. 120 (13 May).

⁹ See Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky halyts'kykh ukrainsiv, 1848–1914 (na pidstavi spomyniv)* (Lviv, 1926), 684.

Ukrainian church and political figures were very opposed to the reform; their main argument was the illegitimacy of the independent decision of the bishop of Stanyslaviv. Calendar reform did not become widespread in Halych Metropolitanate, and in 1918 Khomyshyn himself cancelled it in Stanyslaviv Eparchy.

At about the same time, the Russian Orthodox Church had a chance to implement the calendar reform. The Moscow Council of 1917 recognized the need to change the calendar “following the unanimous decision of all the patriarchs.”¹⁰ However, after the Bolsheviks’ introduction (24 January 1918) of the calendar reform in secular life, the Russian Orthodox Church refused to introduce the NS calendar, citing the provisions of the Decree on the Separation of Church and State. Yet this decree also made it possible for Catholics in Russia to reinstate the previous calendar of holy days that Tsar Paul I had originally prohibited.¹¹

The geopolitical changes and modernizing factors affecting Europe because of the First World War encouraged the Orthodox Church to revisit the calendar issue. On the initiative of Ecumenical Patriarch Meletius IV, a General Orthodox Congress took place in Constantinople in 1923 with delegates from the Greek, Russian, Romanian, and Serbian churches. The congress adopted a decision stipulating that it was necessary to co-ordinate the church calendar with the NS calendar recently introduced in those countries and to cancel the thirteen-day difference between the two calendars. The date of 1 October 1923 was determined to be the day that the calendric unification would take effect. In order to avoid adopting the Gregorian calendar, it was decided to adopt a “new Julian calendar.” In the autumn of the same year, the calendar reform received the blessing of the Russian patriarch, Tikhon. However, the faithful (including Orthodox Ukrainians) did not accept this innovation in spite of the fact that the GPU compelled priests to offer liturgical services according to the NS calendar.

Overall the introduction of the NS calendar into the life of the Orthodox world would prove rather problematic. Greek ecclesiastical circles witnessed tempestuous polemics. In Romania the NS calendar was introduced on 1 October 1924. There the Ukrainians of Bukovyna, who were forced to celebrate according to that calendar, were generally opposed to this change. At the same time, initial reforms only concerned immovable feasts. Only in 1929 did the Synod of the Romanian Orthodox Church approve the celebration of Easter according to the NS calendar.

In 1924 many factors contributed to the implementation of the NS calendar by the Orthodox Church in Poland. The switch by Orthodox European countries to that calendar in the secular realm during and after the First World War made such a reform in church life inevitable. Accordingly, the patriarch of Constantinople, in accordance with an agreement with other Orthodox hierarchs, urged the implementation of these reforms by the Orthodox churches of East-Central Europe, including the Orthodox Church in Poland. The Polish government was interested in the calendar reform because it saw it as a means of consolidating the reborn multi-ethnic Polish state.

¹⁰ Iu. R–ii, “K voprosu o reforme kalendara.”

¹¹ See N. T., “Po povodu prazdnovaniia Paskhy,” *Slovo istiny* (Petrograd), nos. 64 and 65 (April–May 1918): 747–48.

The newly enthroned Metropolitan Dionisii (Valedinsky) of Warsaw thought that the calendar reform would promote good relations with the Polish government. On 12 April 1924 the Council of the Orthodox Metropolitanate in Poland adopted a decision to introduce the NS calendar into church usage beginning on All Saints' Sunday. The simultaneous use of two calendar styles in the church had created serious difficulties for the Ukrainian Orthodox faithful of Poland, whose parishes constituted seventy per cent of all Orthodox communities there. The laity largely rejected the reform and refused to attend church services celebrated according to the NS calendar. Two practices were thus current within the metropolitanate during the interwar years: the church hierarchs celebrated according to the NS calendar, while the faithful and the lower clergy celebrated according to the OS calendar.¹²

It is significant to consider the context in which the implementation of the calendar reform in the Orthodox Church of Poland took place—without adequate preparation of the laity and in violation of canon law. The Orthodox faithful, mainly comprised of Ukrainian peasants, were consequently reluctant to accept the reform, perceiving it as an attack on their holy days and on their rite as a whole. The Ukrainian intelligentsia also opposed the change. In practice, therefore, although the church hierarchy accepted the Gregorian calendar, it was not adopted by the broad majority of Orthodox Ukrainians during the interwar years.

The fact that the church hierarchy had initiated the calendar reform testifies to their perception that that change neither constituted a loss of religious identity among the faithful nor impinged on the separateness of the Byzantine rite. Another significant aspect emerged because of the 1924 Polish calendar issue. Discussions relating to the calendar had hitherto involved three groups—the civil administration, the clergy, and the faithful. This time, however, a fourth entity emerged—the local Ukrainian political leadership. Local leaders saw the introduction of the NS calendar in the ecclesiastical realm as a threat to the national identity of the Ukrainians under Polish rule. They also feared that the calendar reform would undermine the existing unity of the Ukrainians in Poland with their compatriots in Soviet Ukraine.

The social context had its own impact. The dualism with respect to the calendar that existed in the territories densely settled by Orthodox faithful seriously impeded socio-economic modernization of the Ukrainian community in Poland.

Proposals for a Universal Calendar

At the beginning of 1920s, the calendar issue became an international problem as scholars, politicians, and bureaucrats began actively criticizing the Gregorian calendar. They focused on the fact that the disproportionately high number of monthly, quarterly, and semi-annual workdays had become an impediment to calculating salaries, profits, and taxes. Discrepancies relating to the dates of movable holy days, especially Easter, complicated the scheduling of educational programs and school

¹² See O. Pawłyszyn [Oleh Pavlyshyn], "Wprowadzenie kalendarza gregoriańskiego do praktyki liturgicznej Kościoła prawosławnego w Polsce w 1924 r.," *Biuletyn Ukrainoznawczy* (Przemysł), no. 8 (2002): 105–13.

vacations, the planning of theatre seasons, annual trade schedules, and deliveries of products, and so on.¹³

Accordingly, in 1922 the League of Nations formed a special commission to resolve the issue of calendar reform and to promote calendric unification. The commission, consisting of representatives of the patriarch of Constantinople, the pope, and the bishop of Canterbury, examined a series of proposals for a new calendar. Most favoured was the proposal of the English scholar Moses B. Cotsworth, according to which the year would be divided into thirteen months, each consisting of twenty-eight days, with one additional day being New Year's Day.¹⁴ An array of prominent persons and representatives of various professions gave this proposal a positive assessment, and the pope appointed a special commission to undertake a thorough study of the scheme.¹⁵ Many believed that the introduction of a universal calendar would compel all Christian denominations to unify their liturgical cycles. However, protracted discussions between church authorities and state institutions, and ultimately the Second World War, prevented the introduction of a universal calendar.

Calendar Discussions in the Greek Catholic Metropolitanate of Halych

Social problems relating to calendar dualism confronting the Ukrainians under Polish rule, particularly the negative experience of the Orthodox Church in adopting the NS calendar, were discussed in the Western Ukrainian press at the beginning of the 1930s.¹⁶ The negative experiences of Bishop Khomyshyn's calendar reform, as well of the Russian, Polish, and Romanian Orthodox Churches on ethnic Ukrainian territories, did not encourage the laity of Halych Metropolitanate to view the reforms favourably.

In 1927 Rev. Volodymyr Sadovsky critically examined the experience of the reforms. He noted that calendar reform was not simply a mechanical introduction of the New Style, but rather an act reflecting the concordance of the church calendar with liturgical books and the canons of the UGCC.¹⁷ He pointed out the need for proper public information, stating that it was important "to show the faithful that the Eastern Church still retains its church calendar, [and] its liturgical

¹³ See Rev. V. D. Sadovs'kyi, "Tserkovnyi kaliendar i ioho reforma," *Nyva*, 1927, no. 12 (December): 442; and Iu. R-ii, "K voprosu o reforme kalendara," 221.

¹⁴ See V. Kucher, "Kaliendar i ioho reformy," *Narodnii iliustrovanyi kaliendar tovarystva "Prosvita" na zvychainyi rik 1931* (Lviv), viii-xiii.

¹⁵ See "Dovkola reformy kaliendaria," *Nyva* (Lviv), 1931, no. 6 (June): 236-37; "Pered vyrishenniam reformy kaliendaria," *Nyva*, 1931, no. 9 (September): 358; and "Istoriia kaliendaria," *Kaliendar dlia vsikh na perestupnyi 1936 rik* (Lviv), 61.

¹⁶ See Rev. V. D. Sadovs'kyi, "Tserkovnyi kaliendar i ioho reforma," *Nyva*, 1927, nos. 10 (October): 267-74 and 11 (November): 303-11; and Kucher, "Kaliendar i ioho reformy."

¹⁷ See Sadovs'kyi, "Tserkovnyi kaliendar i ioho reforma." Rev. Volodymyr Sadovsky (pseud. Domet, 18 August 1865-1940) served as a priest in Vienna, Przemyśl, and Lviv, wrote works on musical theory and practice and on choral singing, and taught liturgics at the Lviv Greek Catholic Theological Seminary. He advocated a return to Byzantine-rite rituals in the UGCC.

books and institutions, merely rendering constant the Old Style calendar with the astronomical one by recognizing the vernal equinox to be the astronomical date of 21 March, as originally decreed by the Nicene Council.”¹⁸

Discussions relating to the calendar intensified notably during the 1930s. An author using the pseudonym Simplis developed this topic on the pages of the Lviv daily *Dilo*. He cited the following advantages of the Gregorian calendar in the ecclesiastical realm.

1. National prestige—in towns where Ukrainians comprise a minority of the population, observance of their holy days lacks dignity (“respect”), a factor that contributes to “feelings of inferiority.” Among those who are not steadfast morally and those lacking in national awareness, it occasions capitulation. Simplis noted the significant difference in outward appearance between Lviv and other cities situated in the ethnic Ukrainian territories of Poland during Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic holy days: “It is a fact that the outward appearance of Galician cities during holy days provides the Poles with one of their strongest arguments for foreigners, who tend to assess the strength of a nation by the strength of its cities and not of its villages!”¹⁹

2. The separate celebration of holy days is inconvenient for all urban and some peasant working masses. All Ukrainian workers (Greek Catholic and Orthodox) employed at factories, enterprises, and studios must work on Ukrainian holy days, yet they have days off on Latin-rite holy days. Therefore religious practice declines, and the faithful distance themselves from the church.

3. Ukrainian enterprises suffer the most from the double celebration of feasts. Some stores with a solely Ukrainian clientele remain closed on both Polish and Ukrainian holy days. The resulting loss of business presents the owners with a dilemma—either lose income and celebrate, or do not celebrate.

According to Simplis, the church hierarchy and national leaders should co-operate in preparing for the reform by conducting awareness sessions among the population so as to avoid misunderstandings. He was convinced that due to the peasant masses’ high level of national consciousness, political experience, and sense of healthy realism, a wisely explained calendar reform would not precipitate a “national cataclysm.”²⁰ Simplis’s article evoked great interest among *Dilo*’s readers, and the paper published numerous responses from a wide cross-section of the Ukrainian population in Poland.

For example, Rev. Onufrii Hadzevych of Drohobych recalled his fifteen-year experience as a priest in Nowy Sącz, noting that when the holy days of both rites fell on the same day his church was full, “but when they were celebrated separately the church was empty.” He thought that unwarranted conservatism on the calendar issue was pushing “our working class, craftsmen, servants, and even the intellectuals to the foreign [Polish] side.” He claimed that “due to the outdated calendar,

¹⁸ Ibid., 307.

¹⁹ Simplis, “Spil'ni chy okremi sviata? ‘Ieretychni’ dumky u sviatochnyi chas na temu perekhodu na hryhoriians'kyi kaliendar,” *Dilo*, 1932, no. 6 (7 January).

²⁰ Ibid.

Ukrainians, in practice, ignore their holy days and slowly lose their national consciousness,” and he urged spiritual leaders to complete the calendar reform for the sake of the church and the nation.²¹ Another priest focused on mixed marriages in which the wives were Ukrainian and did not have an opportunity to attend church services on their holy days or even to fast. Similarly, he also noted another important ritual tied to calendar traditions. While Roman Catholics observed two fast days, Greek Catholics had four—the former fasted one day per week, while the latter fasted two days per week. Accordingly, the scheduling of dances, celebrations, or weddings on certain days could be problematic.²²

The supporters of calendar reform often emphasized the social aspects of the liturgical cycle. Oleksander Baryliak, a co-operative official, pointed out that, in contrast to the practice under Austrian rule (which did not forbid working and commercial activity on holy days, except on Sunday afternoon), Latin-rite feasts were official holy days in Poland. Thus on those days, as well as on Polish Constitution Day (3 May), sowing fields, chopping down trees, engaging in crafts, and selling merchandise in shops were forbidden and constituted a punishable offence.²³ This law resulted in a situation where Ukrainian artisans or business owners worked neither on official holidays nor on Byzantine-rite holy days, and this negatively affected their ability to compete economically. Baryliak therefore called on Greek Catholic bishops, as early as September 1932, to consider the interests of both the public at large and the clergy and to change the church calendar.²⁴

Another reader, worker Stefan Mitkevych, noted that Polish business owners did not give their Ukrainian employees days off on Byzantine-rite OS holy days. He also described how Ukrainian workers in mixed marriages treated feast days, observing that they usually celebrated according to the NS calendar: “Sometimes for the money ... sometimes for peace in the family. Rarely does he celebrate Greek Catholic feasts, but, rather, more frequently both of them.” Mitkevych ended thus: “We are now perhaps the only ones in Europe who cling to this ancient anachronism! Is this calendar perhaps our ‘fate’ and the cause of the eternal failures of ‘johnny-come-lately?’”²⁵

The umbrella organization Audit Union of Ukrainian Co-operatives felt that the biggest losses resulting from the use of the Julian calendar were borne by Ukrainian co-operatives under Polish rule. It published data in support of this claim. To wit: annually Ukrainian co-operatives that had their own retail outlets celebrated seventy-four holy days (local and Polish official ones) in addition to thirteen Latin-rite feast

²¹ Rev. O. Hadzevych, “Spil'ni chy okremi sviata? (Holos u diskusii),” *Dilo*, 1932, no. 36 (19 February).

²² See Rev. T. Ya., “Spil'ni chy okremi sviata? (Holos u diskusii),” *Dilo*, 1932, no. 37 (20 February).

²³ See “Kara za pratsiu v latyns'ke sviato,” *Dilo*, 1932, no. 62 (22 March).

²⁴ See O. Baryliak, “Spil'ni chy okremi sviata? (Holos kooperatyvnoho sluzhbovnyka),” *Dilo*, 1932, no. 45 (1 March).

²⁵ S. Mitkevych, “Spil'ni chy okremi sviata? (Slovo robitnyka),” *Dilo*, 1932, no. 39 (23 February).

days, for a total of eighty-seven days. Meanwhile their Polish competitors celebrated only sixty-five days, not counting official Polish holidays. If one multiplied this difference of twenty-two days by fifty zlotys (the average daily income), the result was: 2,500 Ukrainian co-operatives had been losing some 2.5 million zlotys of potential sales income annually. Besides Sundays, because of calendar differences Ukrainians in Poland did not work twenty-two days a year on average, while ethnic Poles did not work thirteen days. Local Ukrainian Catholic churches often held celebrations lasting several days because the residents of neighbouring villages visited one another. Meanwhile the Orthodox Ukrainians of Volhynia observed even more feast days.²⁶

Galician Ukrainian newspapers urged the Ukrainian community in Poland to follow the lead of other nations that had moved their holy days from weekdays to Sundays for economic reasons during the interwar period. They demanded the introduction of substantive changes in the traditions of Ukrainians and, in the light of difficult economic conditions, alternatives of some sort, particularly of time. The fact that Ukrainians celebrated Christmas for three days, Easter for three days, and Pentecost for days was not to be interpreted as evidence of their greater religiosity, but simply a distancing from the West with its “intense pulse of activity and work.”²⁷

Owing to the compulsory observance of Latin-rite holy days in addition to their own, Ukrainian schools also experienced reductions in the total number of teaching hours.²⁸ Stepan Mochulsky described a number of problems confronting Ukrainian students. Dispersed among various universities that followed the NS calendar, they were compelled to attend classes or work on Ukrainian OS holy days. If the NS Easter break occurred before OS Easter, students had to spend the latter away from their families. Mochulsky cited the need to carry out a carefully planned and well-organized strategy for calendar reform at all Ukrainian institutions, including student organizations.²⁹

Senator Yaroslav Olesnytsky, citing his experience of interacting with peasants, concluded that the Ukrainian population would not oppose calendar reform but, on the contrary, would actually welcome it.³⁰ Stepan Hodovany, another contributor to *Dilo*, considered the matter of calendar reform resolved in theory. He stressed that the consciousness of the Ukrainian population was high enough that the observance of holy days concurrently would not be a detrimental factor. Hodovany also warned against ascribing patriotism solely to the UGCC, stating that many Ukrainians attended Roman Catholic churches. For example, in the last census there were

²⁶ See “Pora stupyty krok vpered,” *Kooperatyvna respublika* (Lviv), 1932, no. 2 (February): 44–45; and *Sluzhbovyk* (Lviv), 1932, no. 2 (February): 7 (reprint).

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ See S. Mochul's'kyi, “Shche pro zminu kaliendaria (Holos u diskusii),” *Dilo*, 1932, no. 63 (30 March).

³⁰ See Ia. Olesnyts'kyi, “Za novyi kaliendar (Holos u diskusii z pryvodu statti ‘Spil'ni chy okremi sviata’),” *Dilo*, 1932, no. 8 (13 January).

instances where Roman Catholic peasants noted that they followed the Latin rite but were Ukrainian.³¹

Opponents of calendar reform essentially emphasized the close links between the OS calendar and Ukrainian national identity. Volodymyr Ostrovsky noted that calendar reform could only occur if two critical conditions were met: (1) overwhelming agreement on the part of the laity with church hierarchs; and (2) agreement between the Orthodox and UGCC hierarchs. He articulated a commonly expressed viewpoint: do not attempt to erase differences between neighbouring nations; instead, try to emphasize them even more sharply in culture, language, dress, style, traditions, legends, architecture, rituals, and the celebration of holy days.³² Mariia Redkova deemed the opponents' social arguments unconvincing. Her contention was that there had to be a decade-long awareness-building campaign throughout the territories Ukrainians inhabited if they were not to lose their sense of national uniqueness.³³ The renowned writer and lawyer Andrii Chaikovsky warned of the emergence in the Ukrainian community of one more division—over the calendar—besides that of parties and sects. He advised against abandoning the OS until there was a worldwide unified calendar system.³⁴

The discussion that began on the pages of *Dilo* and in other economic publications was supported in the 1930s by the Lviv newspapers *Novyi chas*, *Svoboda*,³⁵ and *Pravda*³⁶ and by the Peremyshl paper *Ukrain's'kyi Beskyd*. An author in the latter noted:

It is enough that we are being denationalized by foreigners in every possible way, yet, unfortunately, through our backward obstinacy we even assist them in this. Some regard the Old Style calendar an element of our separateness. Well, if this is to be the argument for retaining an outdated, inaccurate calendar, then all discussion is pointless. It seems that we have not yet matured as a nation. Every four years together with the whole world, we celebrate Easter and the moveable holy days. What advantage would it be for us and for our entire church, social and economic life, if we—CATHOLICS—celebrated all the feasts with all the Catholics? How beautiful it would be if—simultaneously—all Catholics would praise God in various languages and in various rites! Yes, we are waiting for an even newer calendar and we will then adopt it with great fanfare. Yet before that new calendar ar-

³¹ See S. Hodovanyi, "Sviatkuvaty razom chy okremo? (Holos u dyskusii)," *Dilo*, 1932, no. 15 (23 January).

³² See V. Ostrovs'kyi, "Spil'ni chy okremi sviata? (Z pryvodu statti Simplisa ('Dilo', no. 6)," *Dilo*, 1932, no. 13 (21 January). Ostrovsky (1881–1944) was a journalist, educator, and community activist in the Kholm region. He edited the Ukrainian Orthodox newspaper *Dukhovna besida* (Warsaw) and its appendix "Tserkovni kazannia" (1924–25).

³³ See M. Red'kova, "Shche v spravi kalendara (Holos u dyskusii)," *Dilo*, 1932, no. 62 (30 March).

³⁴ See A. Chaikovs'kyi, "Chy nam razom sviatkuvaty?" *Dilo*, 1932, no. 25 (4 February).

³⁵ See "Kolys' a teper: Iak pysaly kolys', a yak pyshut' teper pro zminu tserkovnoho kaliendaria," *Pravda* (Lviv), 1932, no. 10 (13 March).

³⁶ See I., "Zmina kaliendaria (Nadislana stattia)," *Pravda*, 1932, no. 13 (3 April).

rives, the old one will have already “eaten us up” and we will find ourselves—if not entirely, then to a substantial degree—in a foreign sea.”³⁷

Metropolitan Sheptytsky and the UGCC episcopate did not openly interfere in the calendar discussion. One can surmise that they feared that attempts at church-calendar reform in the midst of interwar Poland’s difficult social and political realities might lead not only to a deterioration in interdenominational relations but also to a worsening of the internal situation of the UGCC and the Ukrainian movement. Possibly, one more reason that the UGCC hierarchs kept silent during the debate was the on-going international universal-calendar projects.

In 1930 the Basilian Order introduced calendar reform in Warsaw, which was formally not under the administrative rule of Halych Metropolitanate, and with the approval of the Roman Catholic cardinal of Cracow the Congregation for Oriental Churches initiated the transition to the NS calendar for Greek Catholic laypersons living in the Polish capital.³⁸

Calendar Revisions in the Ukrainian Diaspora

In 1932 a Ukrainian worker in France raised a voice of despair regarding the calendar issue: “Our people are dispersed throughout France, and some of them do not even realize that today is Easter in their homeland. And even if they knew, then more than one would wipe away a tear and cry bitterly that he had to work on that day—since, not being in one’s own country but in a foreign one, one does as one is told.”³⁹

The calendar issue resounded most acutely in Ukrainian immigrant communities in North and South America, where the idea of calendar reform had been discussed since the end of the nineteenth century. Ukrainians in Canada, Brazil, and Argentina were engaged mostly in farming, so they did not experience great difficulty in choosing when to celebrate holy days. But Ukrainians who had settled in the United States were mostly industrial workers and had to observe their enterprises’ work schedules, which allowed little possibility for the observance of Byzantine-rite OC holy days.

The dual church-calendar issue was raised for the first time in 1899 by the Ukrainian-American newspaper *Svoboda* on the tenth anniversary of Ukrainian settlement in the United States.⁴⁰ Ten years later the newspaper focused on the same issue again, but this time in more depth:

Those who know our circumstances understand how much our [Ukrainian] workers have had and continue to bear ridicule, teasing, and insults because they cele-

³⁷ Katolyk, “Sprava zminy kalendara,” *Ukraïns'kyi beskyd* (Przemyśl), 1937, no. 2 (17 January).

³⁸ See “Hryhoriïans'kyi kaliendar dlia uniiativ Varshavy,” *Nyva*, 1930, nos. 7–8 (July–August): 310.

³⁹ Petro Kharko, “Velykden' nashykh emigrantiv u Frantsii ta deiaki dumky pro zminu kalendara,” *Pravda* (Lviv), 1932, no. 17 (1 May).

⁴⁰ See A. Dragan, “Kalendarna sprava,” *Kalendar “Svobody” na zvychainyi rik 1957* (New York), 25.

brate according to the Old Style, which is not known or understood by anyone [else] here. Most of our fellow compatriots have to go to work on the days of their greatest holy days instead of being able to go where all their brethren go—to church. Therefore how much misery and trouble could our people be spared if the church accepted the new calendar? If anyone would bother to count how many jobs our compatriots lost just because on a given day they decided to attend to their spiritual needs instead of [their] employment, they would recognize what a burden and harm it inflicts upon us.⁴¹

Svoboda simultaneously declared that the deciding voice in resolving this issue belonged to the church authorities.⁴²

In the 1920s the profile of the Ukrainian diaspora in North America changed. A new generation, the first born outside Ukraine, had matured, and for many of its members retaining the OS calendar seemed an anachronism. In 1928 a representative of the Ukrainian community in Shamokin, Pennsylvania, revived discussion of the calendar issue on *Svoboda*'s pages. His reasons for switching to the NS calendar were the following: in Anglo-dominated North American society, celebrating holy days according to the OS calendar caused economic losses; schoolchildren who did not attend classes on such days were ridiculed by their non-Ukrainian peers; and workers who took unpaid time off to celebrate such days suffered psychological damage as a result.⁴³ Therefore, at a general community meeting, Ukrainians living in the vicinity of Shamokin voted to observe holy days according to the NS calendar; however, they voiced their respect for the parishes that chose to retain the OS calendar.⁴⁴

The reaction of *Svoboda*'s readers was split on the calendar issue. The promoters of the NS calendar cited concrete reasons, including job losses by Ukrainians who celebrated according to the OS calendar, stating that this caused children to be embarrassed by their parents.⁴⁵ They pointed out the need to adapt to Western traditions.⁴⁶ A reader from Elizabethport, New Jersey, stated: "Christ was not born twice and was not resurrected twice."⁴⁷

The opponents of calendar change—most of *Svoboda*'s readers—saw the calendar conflict largely as an "invented" one.⁴⁸ For them child rearing, the organization of community schools and institutions,⁴⁹ and the danger of growing animosity

⁴¹ "Reforma kalendara," *Svoboda* (New York), 1909, no. 16 (29 April).

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ See S. Lev, "Staryi chy novyi kaliendar?" *Svoboda* (Jersey City), 1928, no. 41 (20 February).

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ See M. Kolodii, "Holos za zminoiu kaliendaria," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 45 (25 February).

⁴⁶ See M. Kostiv, "Kaliendar ne polityka," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 59 (13 March).

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ See O. Zapryvoda, "Pro staryi ta novyi kaliendar," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 49 (1 March).

⁴⁹ See A. Nykorchuk, "Kaliendar chy shkola," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 47 (28 February); S. Kryvyts'kyi, "Ne treba zminy kaliendara," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 61 (15 March); "Kaliendar: Vyslid diskusii v spravi zminy kaliendaria: Zmina ne na chasi. Shkola, a ne kaliendar," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 64 (19 March); and S. Korytko, "Cherez kaliendar nashi dity ne stanut' svidomymy Ukraïntsiamy," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 64 (19 March).

amongst communities⁵⁰ were more vital issues. The OS calendar bound the Ukrainian immigrants to their homeland, and consequently upholding this tradition was more important than material comfort or convenience.⁵¹ Others thought that the issue of switching to the NS calendar should first be decided either on ethnic Ukrainian territory⁵² or only after the League of Nations adopted a universal calendar.⁵³

The North American supporters of calendar reform were mainly young people. At the 1936 convention of the League of Ukrainian Catholic Youth (LUCY) held at the Empire Hotel in New York, the two hundred delegates present voted unanimously in favour of the NS calendar.⁵⁴ On 8 February of the same year, two hundred and fifty LUCY members from Philadelphia, Frankford, Chester, and Bridgeport, Pennsylvania, Camden, New Jersey, Chesapeake City, Maryland, and Wilmington, Delaware, who convened at the Ukrainian Citizens' Club in Philadelphia, voted for the adoption of that calendar by the UGCC.⁵⁵ Unofficially the UGCC's apostolic exarch in the United States, Konstantyn Bohachevsky, supported that change.

Bohachevsky had good reason to proceed with caution. Before the First World War many Greek Catholic immigrants from Galicia in North America had converted to the Russian Orthodox Church. In the 1920s many others joined the newly formed Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Enforcement of the NS calendar by the hierarchs would only have increased such defections.

Nevertheless, in the 1930s the NS calendar was partly introduced into Ukrainian church life in the United States and Canada.⁵⁶ There UGCC parishes that voted that voted to celebrate holy days according to that calendar were allowed to do so, subject to approval by their bishop. In 1935, for example, the parish in Hamtramck, Michigan, celebrated NS Christmas for the first time:

One could see great satisfaction during the caroling; people sang with their entire beings. Upon leaving the church, they joyfully greeted each other with "Christ is born!" Oh, good, they said, thank God that we can now finally celebrate together with Americans. Why did we not do this sooner? How nice! Factories are not humming, trucks are not rumbling, everything is quiet—one can hear the bells announcing the great feast of Christ's birth! In addition, when we went caroling our

⁵⁰ See T. Pidlypchak, "Pomalo, shchoby ne peresolyty," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 59 (13 March); and M. Tymchyshyn, "Shche za kaliendar," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 61 (15 March).

⁵¹ See A. Hasiuk, "Nashe Rizdvo – tse nash ridnyi kraj na chuzhyni," and A. Melnyk, "Pershe svoia derzhava, a potim kaliendar," both in *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 50 (2 March).

⁵² See M. Tymchyshyn, "Shche za kaliendar," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 50 (2 March); and V. Stefan-iuk, "Rad'mo nad dopomohoiu straikuiuchym maineram, a ne nad zminoiu kaliendara," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 64 (19 March).

⁵³ See I. Sydorovych, "Zazhdim na druhykh," *Svoboda*, 1928, no. 61 (15 March).

⁵⁴ See "Nasha molod' v Amerytsi: Zibrannia Ligy Ukraïns'koï Katolyts'koï Molodi zaiavlia-iet'sia za zminu kaliendaria," *Pravda* (Lviv), 1936, no. 12 (22 March).

⁵⁵ See "Viche Ukraïns'koï molodi u Filiadel'fii," *Pravda*, 1936, no. 12 (22 March).

⁵⁶ See P. Isaïv, "Ustria Ukraïns'koï Hreko-Katolyts'koï Tserkvy," in *Entsyklopediia Ukraïno-znavstva: Zahal'na chastyna*, vol. 2 (Munich, 1949; repr. Kyiv, 1995), 626.

people welcomed us with joy and treated us with goodies. They also opened up their wallets and donated up to five dollars, saying: "We rejoice in the fact that we can proudly, together with our American neighbors, carol loudly."⁵⁷

Soon after, in Canada the members of the UGCC parish of Borschiw near Vegreville, Alberta, held a special meeting devoted to the calendar issue and forwarded a special appeal to their bishop ordinary in Winnipeg to allow them to observe holy days according to the NS calendar.⁵⁸ By the end of the 1930s many Ukrainian-American parishes of the UGCC in the larger cities had adopted that calendar. According to calculations that Rev. Yustyn Hirniak made at the beginning of 1956, 78 (close to 40 per cent) of the 169 parishes and 26 parish centres in the United States had adopted the NS calendar, "prompted by living circumstances" and "with the understanding of church authorities."⁵⁹ In the 1960s calendar changes in some parishes went hand in hand with the introduction of English-language services.⁶⁰

Transition to the NS calendar generated community clashes whose intensity depended on the activity and energy of both the adherents and opponents of reform. As Antin Dragan noted, in the mid-1950s the calendar debates repeated "old" arguments and introduced "new" ones:

The adherents of the transition to the new style referred to the "practicality" in American circumstances, the complicated issue of school children and youth, and the acute contradiction of living life according to the new calendar but celebrating according to the old one. The opponents of the reform mainly underlined the issue of the "spiritual bond" with the whole Ukrainian people, reminding one that "practicality" did not hinder our pioneers to preserve this tradition and the spiritual bond to the people in the homeland over some six decades and the like.⁶¹

Church authorities did not participate in the discussion, leaving parishioners to decide the calendar issue themselves.⁶²

It seemed that the adherents of the NS calendar would take the lead and that soon the liturgical cycle of all UGCC parishes would follow that calendar. However, with time the style of life of Ukrainian communities in North America changed, with the result that existing arguments for calendar reform started losing their relevance. First of all, the communities' "intelligentsia" was complemented by doctors, lawyers, journalists, and scholars whose work and observance schedules were not strictly determined by the ruling state or private institutions. Secondly, postwar Ukrainian immigrants, who had hitherto regarded their forced emigration as a temporary phenomenon, came to realize that they, their children, and their grandchildren would likely remain in North America forever. Therefore their native

⁵⁷ "Sviata po novomu kaliendariu," *Pravda*, 1936, no. 12 (22 March).

⁵⁸ See "Zminiaiuť staryi kaliendar," *Pravda*, 1936, no. 13 (26 March).

⁵⁹ A. Dragan, "Kalendarska sprava," *Kalendar "Svobody" na zvychny rik 1957*, 26.

⁶⁰ See Yaryna Turko Bodrock et al, comps., *Christ the King Church: History of the Ukrainian Catholic Community in Boston, 1907–2007* (Boston, 2007), 41.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 26.

Byzantine-rite church with “the old calendar” could be viewed as their strongest bastion in countering assimilation and serve as a guarantor of the preservation of national identity and spiritual ties to Ukraine. Such feelings were especially heightened after Archbishop Major Joseph Cardinal Slipyj was released from a Soviet prison in 1963 and subsequently visited his faithful in America and Canada, thereby greatly elevating and activating the life of the UGCC there.⁶³

In addition, ever-closer relations and joint celebrations with the Ukrainian Orthodox churches in North America, which steadfastly maintained the OS calendar, made some Ukrainian Catholics reluctant to divide the Ukrainian diasporic community by adopting the NS calendar.

These changes in Ukrainian community life explain the preservation of the OS calendar in such major urban centers of Ukrainian life as New York, Toronto, and Montreal. The official decision to adopt the NS calendar in the UGCC’s Eparchy of Chicago and Archeparchy of Philadelphia in the 1960s demonstrated how sensitive the issue remained: part of the laity refused to comply.

During the 1960s and 1970s, the UGCC communities in places such as Chicago, Cleveland, and Philadelphia created “traditional parishes” that have continued to strictly observe the canons of the Byzantine rite and the OS calendar and to use the Ukrainian language in liturgical services. Even a new “old calendar” parish was established in Chicago.⁶⁴

The calendar is no longer the contentious issue it once was among the Ukrainians in North America. “Traditional” and “new calendar” parishes co-exist peacefully and do not threaten the religious or ethnic identity of the Ukrainian diaspora. “Fourth wave” emigrants from Western Ukraine who have arrived there in the past two decades have usually joined parishes that follow the OS calendar, or priests hold special services to accommodate them. Nonetheless, the “calendar fights” of the twentieth century have resulted in a significant defection from the UGCC.

By the end of the 1930s the UGCC parishes in Italy and Brazil also adopted the NS calendar. In Argentina the calendar reform proposed by the local Ukrainian community was officially approved on 27 January 1940 during an official visit by the apostolic visitor, Bishop Ivan Buchko.⁶⁵

The calendar issue had particular significance for Ukrainians living in postwar Poland. According to Father Stefan Dziubyna, the idea of switching to observing NS calendar holy days emerged from within the Ukrainian clergy there in the mid-1970s. The arguments the advocates proffered were similar to those made in North America during the 1930s: during “Ukrainian” OS holy days adults were forced to work and students had to study, which made it impossible for them to attend church services. The church authorities were opposed, and a survey showed that most of the laity did

⁶³ According to Frank E. Sysyn, whom I interviewed in Lviv on 17 February 2011.

⁶⁴ See *Tserkovnyi kalendar-al'manakh na rik Bozhyi 1979* (Chicago), 122–28, 140.

⁶⁵ See A. G. Welykyj, “‘Right Hand’ of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky,” in *Arkhypastyr skytal'nykiv: Preosviashchennyi Kyr Ivan Buchko. Tytuliarnyi epyskop m. Kadi, L'vivs'kyi epyskop pomichnyk, apostol's'kyi vizytator dlia ukraïntsiiv katolykiv u Zakhidnii Evropi, dr. sv. bohoslavia, pochesnyi dr. filosofii ta in.* (Rome, 1949), 36–37.

not want any changes. However, the calendar reform was adopted in certain localities where the parishioners had requested it.⁶⁶ Collisions ensued: “one priest switched to the [NS] calendar contrary to the wishes of our church authorities, and [he] also convinced the laity in one of the communities; however, the rest of the communities where he served did not agree to such a change. This resulted in the priest singing ‘Christ is Risen!’ in one church in the morning and rejoicing at the Resurrection while singing ‘Suffering for us ...’ and genuflecting with great sorrow following Christ’s death at noon and in the afternoon.” Unfortunately, the changes were irrevocable because the “new-calendar followers” did not want to return to following the OS calendar and the priests did not want to oppose their will.⁶⁷

In the mid-1970s such changes in accordance with parishioners’ wishes and in contravention of the decisions of the UGCC synod were undertaken in several parishes in Poland. In Warsaw specifically, both the Orthodox and Greek Catholic parishes celebrate liturgies according to the NS calendar. At the beginning of the 1990s some laypersons argued for the need to revert to the OS calendar. However, in response to this request, a survey of parishioners revealed that most of them indeed supported use of the NS calendar.⁶⁸

The calendar question is still under discussion in post-communist Poland. During the last decade various viewpoints became evident in local parishes. In the winter of 2002 in the Zielona Góra Deaconate, on the initiative of Rev. Deacon Yulian Honiaka, a general survey was undertaken regarding all parishioners’ attitudes to switching calendars. The parishioners of Zielona Góra, Szprotawa, Nowogród and other villages near Zielona Góra answered the following survey questions: “Do you support (1) changing to the New Style calendar; (2) retention of the Old Style calendar; (3) celebrating Christmas according to the New Style calendar and Easter according to the Old Style church calendar?”⁶⁹ More than seventy per cent of the respondents supported switching to the NS calendar; twenty to twenty-five per cent preferred keeping the OS calendar in church life; and only one to seven per cent supported the Christmas and Easter compromise. In fact, the survey did not support the stereotypical view that mostly youth were in favour of change and that older generations opposed it. On the contrary, it demonstrated that most older people felt that adoption of the NS calendar was an imperative. The author noted that the main argument of the opponents of calendar reform—the belief that the NS calendar would hasten assimilation—could not be substantiated. Even during periods where the OS calendar was followed, assimilation did not cease, and many ethnic Ukrainians in Poland had abandoned the UGCC and the Ukrainian community.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ See Rev. S. Dziubyna, *I stverdy dilo ruk nashykh: Spohady* (Warsaw, 1995), 185–86 and 383–84.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 186–87.

⁶⁸ According to information provided by Eugeniusz Misio (Yevhen Mislyo) of Warsaw.

⁶⁹ Ia. Pidlypchak, “Zelenohirshchyna pro kalendar,” *Blahovist’* (Górowo Haweckie), 2002, no. 2.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* The eparchial synod held on 17 March 2002 in Przemyśl did not pass a resolution regarding switching calendars.

Indicative in this connection are the views of the Organizing Commission of the Hierarchical Council of the UGCC in Poland. One commission member noted that within the next ten to fifteen years the issue of a general change in the liturgical calendar of Ukrainians in Poland would not be resolved: "For a long time, this issue will have, in addition to, let us say, an administrative-astronomical aspect, also a prestigious symbolic one. And so it should remain."⁷¹

Rev. Yevhen Popovych stated that Poland's Ukrainian ecclesiastical and secular intellectuals generally regard the Ukrainian church there as part of the church in Ukraine, that the former should therefore preserve the rituals and calendar that exist in the latter, and acceptance of the NS calendar by Ukrainians in Poland would only occur after it is adopted in Ukraine:

Of course, the liturgical calendar issue is somewhat problematic because we live in a country where its laws and rituals, and not others, are obligatory. [Being a]ware of this, we should remember that Jews, for example, although dispersed throughout the world, [have] nevertheless retain[ed] their old calendar and rituals because nothing [has] hinder[ed] them from being who they are. The same is true of the Armenians and members of the Coptic church. I think that if we had a high level of national consciousness, the question of the calendar reform would not even exist.⁷²

In view of the current state of inter-denominational relations in Ukraine as well as that country's political prerogatives internally and in its foreign relations, it is very doubtful that the church hierarchs there will deal with the calendar reform issue any time soon. Yet, in certain circumstances, introduction of the NS calendar in church life could strengthen Ukrainian identity in the former Soviet territories. A survey of Lviv's residents indicates that that city's population is psychologically ready to switch calendars. But this does not mean that most of the inhabitants of Western Ukraine, or of the country as a whole, would regard it favourably.⁷³

The calendar issue in Ukraine is primarily one of religion and ritual, but it also impinges on economics, politics, and national identity. In nineteenth- and twentieth-century texts one can observe shifts in emphasis in the calendar polemics. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, calendar discussions gained momentum in Austrian-ruled Western Ukraine. This was a time of heightened sensitivities regarding the religious and national identity and cultural orientation of Galicia's Ukrainians. After the First World War the calendar question was not an existential threat to the UGCC or national life. For this reason, the stateless Ukrainians' international, social, class, and economic problems became prominent in the debates regarding calendar reform. The failed attempts to introduce the NS calendar into Ukrainian church life during the first half of the twentieth century are best viewed from the perspective of sociology or psychology and bear witness to the quantitative domination of a traditional rural society over a modernized, urban one.

⁷¹ Quoted in I. Shcherba, "Ieparkhial'nyi sobor UHKTs v Pol'shchi: Problemy i pytannia nad iakymy treba zadumatysia," *Nashe slovo* (Warsaw), 2002, no. 2 (13 January).

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ See my article "Kalendarska reforma u Kyïvs'kii Tserkvi."

One can safely predict that the attitude of the Ukrainian Byzantine-rite laity toward the calendar reform will change along with the ongoing process of globalization and the increasing influence of the West, where the celebration of Christmas is a component not only of religious life but also of mass culture. The implementation of calendar reform in Ukraine theoretically remains a question of reaching a consonance between the NS calendar and the liturgical cycle and canons of the Kyivan church.

in *Habsburgerreich* (1996), *Die Perle des Imperiums: Der russische Krim-Diskurs im Zarenreich* (2007), and *Geschichte der Ukraine* (2010).

MICHAEL MOSER is a professor at the University of Vienna's Institute of Slavic Studies, Péter Pázmány Catholic University in Piliscsaba, and the Ukrainian Free University in Munich. He is the author of ten books, including "*Ruthenische*" (*ukrainische*) *Sprach- und Vorstellungswelten in den galizischen Volksschullesebüchern der Jahre 1871 und 1872* (2007), *Taras Ševčenko und die moderne ukrainische Schriftsprache – Versuch einer Würdigung* (2008, Ukrainian trans. 2012), *Prychynky do istorii ukraïns'koï movy*, 3 eds. (2008, 2009, 2011), *Ukraïns'kyi P'iemont? Deshcho pro znachennia Halychyny dlia formuvannia, rozbudovy i zberezhennia ukraïns'koï movy* (2011), and *Language Policy and the Discourse on Languages in Ukraine under President Viktor Yanukovich (25 February 2010–28 October 2012)* (2013).

OLEH PAVLYSHYN is a docent at the Ukrainian Free University in Munich and the Department of the Modern History of Ukraine at Lviv National University, and a research associate of the latter university's Institute for Historical Research. He is the author of *L'vivshchyna v dobu Zakhidno-Ukraïns'koï Narodnoï Respubliky (1918–1919)* (2008) and *Yevhen Petrushevykh (1863–1940): Iliustrovanyi biohrafichnyi narys* (2013), and the coeditor of *Zakhidno-Ukraïns'ka Narodna Respublika, 1918–1923: Iliustrovana istoriia* (2008).

MARTIN SCHULZE WESSEL is the professor of the history of Eastern Europe at Ludwigs-Maximilians University, director of the Collegium Carolinum in Munich, chairman of the Association of Historians of Germany and the German-Czech and German-Slovak Historians' Commission, and head of the History Department at the East European Institute in Regensburg. He is the author of *Russlands Blick auf Preussen: Die polnische Frage in der Diplomatie und der politischen Öffentlichkeit des Zarenreiches und des Sowjetstaates 1697–1947* (1995), *Revolution und religiöser Dissens: Der römisch-katholische und russisch-orthodoxe Klerus als Träger religiösen Wandels in den böhmischen Ländern und in Russland 1848–1922* (2011), and many articles; and the editor of the journals *Bohemia* and *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* and several books.

FRANK E. SYSYN is a professor of history at the University of Alberta, director of the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, and editor-in-chief of the centre's Hrushevsky Translation Project. He is the author of *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–1653* (1985), *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: Historian and National Awakener* (2001), *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine* (2003, with Serhii Plokhly), and numerous studies on the Khmelnytsky Uprising, Ukrainian historiography, and early modern Ukrainian political culture, and editor in chief of Mykhailo Zubrytsky's *Zibrani tvory i materialy u tr'okh tomakh*, vol. 1, *Naukovi pratsi* (2013).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.