A CINEMATIC CHURCHMAN: METROPOLITAN ANDREY SHEPTYTSKY IN OLES YANCHUK'S *VLADYKA ANDREY*[1]

John-Paul Himka

Oles Yanchuk is a unique phenomenon in Ukrainian cinema. He has directed five feature films in the Ukrainian language, infused with a Ukrainian nationalist worldview. Except for the film to be discussed in this paper, he has worked independently of the niggardly government funding for the Ukrainian film industry. Instead, he has raised money, particularly in the overseas Ukrainian diaspora, by making films that respond to the ideological sympathies of his donors. Even though the American dollar goes far in Ukraine—and this was especially true for the early years of Yanchuk's career, his films are necessarily low budget with corresponding production values. Still, in spite of their amateurish moments, shortfalls, and heavy ideological hand, his films stand out in the Ukrainian "kino-landscape" as a coherent body of work by a director who has a vision and considerable energy.

His first feature film was *Holod-33* (*Famine-33*). It came out in 1991, long before President Viktor Yushchenko came to power and implemented his campaign to have the world recognize the manmade famine of 1932–33 as genocide against the Ukrainian people. Yanchuk's film was a powerful indictment of the criminality of the Soviet regime as responsible for the death by starvation of millions of the rural population in what was once an unusually productive agricultural region. The film toured North America and introduced Ukrainian communities there to a new and youngish director (born in 1956), who was sensitive to the same issues as they were.

This was followed in 1995 by a film about the wartime and postwar leader of the most violent faction of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, Stepan Bandera—*Atentat: Osinne vbyvstvo u Myunkheni* (*Assassination: An Autumn Murder in Munich*). The intended audience for this film was Ukrainian nationalists, concentrated in both the overseas diaspora and in

[1] I have benefited tremendously from discussions with Chrystia Chomiak, Liliana Hentosh, Andrij Hornjatkevyč, Father Athanasius McVay, Sister Sophia Senyk, and Oleh Turii. This does not mean that they would agree with me on all points.

one region of the homeland, namely Western Ukraine, where Bandera and his movement made their greatest impact (Yanchuk himself was born in Fastiv, near Kyiv, outside Western Ukraine). Only in early 2010 did outgoing Ukrainian president Yushchenko posthumously make Bandera a Hero of Ukraine, a decision that was controversial within Ukraine and abroad.[2] With *Atentat*, even more than with *Holod-33*, Yanchuk put himself in the nationalist vanguard in Ukrainian cinema.

In 2000 he released a film about another leader of the Bandera movement, Roman Shukhevych, who became the supreme commander of the nationalist armed forces, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, late in 1943. The film was called *Neskorenyi* (*The Undefeated*). This glorification of Shukhevych preceded by seven years President Yushchenko's posthumous award of Hero of Ukraine to the nationalist military leader. However, the president appreciated Yanchuk's work and created an atmosphere in which it could reach a larger audience. On Ukrainian Independence Day (24 August) in 2007, a few months after Yushchenko made Shukhevych a Hero of Ukraine, three of Yanchuk's film were shown on the Ukrainian-language TV channel *1+1*: *Atentat*, *Neskorenyi*, and *Zalizna sotnya*.[3]

Zalizna sotnya (entitled *The Company of Heroes* in English; the literal translation of the Ukrainian title is *Iron Company*) came out in 2004. It was sponsored and produced by an Australian Ukrainian, who had written a memoir on which the film is based. The action takes place in 1944–47 in Ukrainian-inhabited regions of Poland. In the end, the company of heroes fights its way into Bavaria and surrenders to the Americans.

Yanchuk's fifth feature film, the subject of this chapter, concerned the head of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in the first half of the twentieth century, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky. The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church is one of the Byzantine-rite churches in union with Rome. It retains many features in common with Eastern Orthodoxy, particularly in liturgical matters, while also displaying some hybridity with Roman (Latin) Catholic practices. In Sheptytsky's time, the church was limited to the territory of Galicia in Western Ukraine as well as to the diaspora in North and South America. The historical and geographical congruence between the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and Ukrainian nationalism remains strong to this day.

[2] Amar, Balynsky, and Hrytsak, *Strasti za Banderoyu*. Himka, "The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists."

[3] Yanchuk, "Yakby."

Andrey Sheptytsky was born Roman Szeptycki to an aristocratic Polish family that had Ukrainian origins. In the past, the Sheptytsky family had produced three Greek Catholic bishops. But by the time the future metropolitan was born in 1865, his family had changed from the Greek Catholic to the Roman Catholic rite and was thoroughly polonized. Young Roman, however, decided to return to the church of his ancestors. It was a radical step at the time, taken in the context of a Polish-Ukrainian political conflict that had been underway since 1848. He entered the Greek Catholic Basilian monastery in Dobromyl in 1888, taking the name Andrey. Given his aristocratic and Polish-Ukrainian origins, as well as his intelligence and charismatic personality, he rose rapidly in the clerical hierarchy. In 1900 he was appointed to the highest post in the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, namely metropolitan of Halych and Archbishop of Lviv. He served in that capacity until his death on 1 November 1944.[4]

During his tenure as metropolitan, regimes changed frequently. Lviv (also known as Lemberg, Lwów, and Lvov) was part of the Habsburg monarchy when Sheptytsky was appointed its Greek Catholic archbishop. The city also had a Roman Catholic and an Armenian Catholic archbishop. In 1914 the Russians conquered the city but did not hold it for long. In 1918, when Austria-Hungary collapsed, the West Ukrainian National Republic was proclaimed in Lviv, but it only maintained power there for a few weeks. From late November 1918 until September 1939, Lviv lay within Poland. When Poland was split between the Germans and the Soviets, Lviv fell to the Soviet Union and was incorporated into the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. In June 1941, the Germans occupied Lviv. An attempt by the Bandera movement to proclaim a Ukrainian state in Lviv was not successful. In July 1944, Lviv was retaken by the Soviets. Several months later, Sheptytsky passed away. The period in which he served as metropolitan, as even this brief outline indicates, was tumultuous and violent, a perfect setting for a historical drama.

Yanchuk had been interested in making a film about Sheptytsky since 2001, when he began working on the screenplay with Mykhaylo Shayevych,[5] but he was also busy with other projects. When he did finally return to the Sheptytsky film, he applied for and received significant government funding for it; this was the first time he had received a government

[4] On Sheptytsky, see Magocsi, *Morality and Reality*. For a brief nationalist treatment of the churchman, see Zagrebelny, "Vladyka Andrey—Kniaz tserkvy i narodu." On the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, see Himka, *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine*.

[5] Yanchuk, "Yakby."

subsidy. In 2004 the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture promised to subsidize *Vladyka Andrey* (*Metropolitan Andrey*) to the amount of ten million hryvnyas (then about two million USD). Ironically, funding for the film was interrupted as a result of the government shake-up following the Orange Revolution of late 2004. Although the street demonstrations in Kyiv brought to power a president, Yushchenko, who would embrace the nationalist heritage and make heroes of the same historical figures as Yanchuk had, the disruption of the bureaucracy and malfunction of the government under Yushchenko delayed the funding. By the end of 2006, the government had only signed over eighty-three thousand hryvnyas.[6] The filming was able to carry on thanks to funds received from two West Ukrainian oblast administrations: three hundred thousand from Lviv Oblast and one hundred thousand from Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast. There was also funding from the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which had previously funded *Atentat* and *Neskorenyi*, but the amount the Committee allotted for *Vladyka Andrey* has not been specified. In the end, the government provided eight million hryvnyas for the film.[7] Total expenditures came to eleven million hryvnyas.[8]

The film gives the impression that the shooting proceeded on a shoestring budget until the very end, and that the bulk of the government money must have arrived too late to be used effectively. This can be discerned from how different locations figured in the film. *Vladyka Andrey* was mainly shot in Lviv. For example, the office of the mayor of Lviv, originally built in Austrian times, served as the office of Emperor Franz Joseph in the film. Some scenes were shot in Kyiv and Ivano-Frankivsk as well. But at the end Yanchuk also filmed in Crimea, the Vatican, and Austria.[9] The two short scenes in Crimea both show the metropolitan taking the sea cure. (He suffered from a debilitating illness that eventually put him in a wheelchair.) But the star of the film, Serhy Romanyuk, as well as the director and some of the crew, must have had a pleasant time at the resort on the Black Sea at the Ukrainian government's expense. As to the Vatican, there are only typical tourist shots incorporated into the film. The meeting between Pope Leo XIII and Sheptytsky and his mother was shot elsewhere, in a very un-Vaticanly gothic setting. The shooting in Austria also consisted only of typical tourist shots. Thus the late arrival of the

[6] Cherednychenko, "Interview with Oles Yanchuk."
[7] Pluhator, "Todi rezhyser."
[8] Yanchuk, "Khochu."
[9] Yanchuk, "Yakby." Yanchuk, "Khochu."

government money meant that a disproportionate amount of it was spent on pleasurable, but cinematically superfluous travel. (The film not only suffered from the delay in funding, but it also encountered Ukrainian-style bureaucratic obstacles that delayed production).[10]

Vladyka Andrey was supposedly first shown at Cannes in May 2008,[11] although this information could not be confirmed on the Cannes festival's official website. Its national premiere was on the eve of Independence Day, that is, 23 August, 2008. President Yushchenko was in attendance.[12] The head of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church at that time, Lyubomyr Huzar, was also invited to the premiere. The film was released for general distribution to Ukrainian theaters on 4 September 2008.[13] Like all of Yanchuk's films, it is available on DVD with English subtitles.

Vladyka Andrey is a historical film that raises important questions about generic conventions. Robert A. Rosenstone argues that good historical film must be more than costume drama, but also that accuracy in historical material culture is an important feature of the genre:

> The major way we experience—or imagine we experience—the past on the screen is obviously through our eye. We see bodies, faces, landscapes, buildings, animals, tools, implements, weapons, clothing, furniture, all the material objects that belong to a culture at a given historical period, objects that are used and misused, ignored and cherished, objects that sometimes can help to define livelihoods, identities, and destinies. Such objects, which the camera demands in order to make a scene look "real," and which written history can easily, and usually does, ignore, are part of the texture and the factuality of the world on film.[14]

Yanchuk took pride in how accurately he displayed the material culture of the past in this film. This was possible because so many historic buildings and artifacts were still preserved in Lviv. Yanchuk did not have to build any sets at all—everything he needed could be found. The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church let him use the grounds of the metropolitan palace at St. George's Cathedral. The church also lent him the genuine chair and genuine hand cross Sheptytsky used. Care was taken to duplicate his clothing as captured in photographs. To film a scene at a ball, Yanchuk

---

10 Cherednychenko, "Interview with Oles Yanchuk." Yanchuk, "Yakby."
11 Pluhator, "Todi rezhyser."
12 "*Vladyka Andrey* Olesia Yanchuka pobachyly v Donetsku."
13 Zhyla, "*Vladyka Andrey*—film-podiya." Pluhator, "Todi rezhyser."
14 Rosenstone, *History on Film/Film on History*, 16.

used the hall of mirrors in the Lviv opera house and invited the more chic Lviv elite to act as the guests.[15]

While he made use of genuine articles, Yanchuk did not have much knowledge of the past and milieu in which his film was set. For example, when the young Roman Szeptycki and his mother visit the Holy Father in the Vatican, they genuflect on their left knees instead of on their right knees. This is an error obvious to anyone brought up in a Catholic environment. Also, the scenes that are supposedly set in a Basilian monastery were actually shot in a Studite monastery. But these are monasteries with completely different sacral esthetics, leaning toward Latin Catholicism in the case of the Basilians and toward Eastern Orthodoxy in the case of the Studites. This dissonance is particularly jarring when Sheptytsky is shown entering the monastery at Dobromyl, at that time in fact run by the Jesuits:[16] above the entrance is a very Eastern icon of the visage of Christ as imprinted on a towel in Edessa, Syria. The Jesuit and Basilian equivalent would have been the Veil of Veronica. The film also gets the name of one of the eighteenth-century Sheptytsky bishops wrong—Anastasius instead of Athanasius (Atanasy).

Inattention to the sensibilities of the era also comes through in the way the film handles language. Almost the entire film is in Ukrainian, with two exceptions. A scene with a Russian Orthodox bishop is conducted in Russian. One of Josef Piłsudski's officials speaks the only words in Polish in the entire film. Russian and, in Western Ukraine, also Polish are well understood by contemporary viewers in Ukraine. German is not, but entire scenes are in that language. Sheptytsky's audience with Emperor Franz Joseph is in German, as is a scene in which SS men want to search the metropolitan's residence. The actor who plays Sheptytsky speaks Russian much better than German, while for the historical personage he plays, it was the other way around. Most remarkable is that the Sheptytsky family speaks Ukrainian throughout the film, when in reality the main languages of the aristocratic Sheptytsky household were Polish and French. This choice on the part of the director retroactively ukrainianizes the linguistic practices of the Sheptytsky family, thus intensifying the Ukrainianness of the metropolitan. It has also been noted that the Ukrainian dialogue

[15] Yanchuk, "Yakby."

[16] The reform of the Basilians by the Jesuits began in 1882 and was regarded by the Ukrainian intelligentsia of Galicia as a Polish plot to polonize and latinize the Greek Catholic Church. The existence of the plot seemed to be confirmed when the young Polish Count Sheptytsky entered the novitiate at Dobromyl monastery.

is in modern standard Ukrainian rather than the Galician version used in Sheptytsky's environment during his lifetime.[17] The language choices made in *Vladyka Andrey* correspond to the nationalist ideal of a Ukraine in which modern Ukrainian is the predominant language and projects it into the past.

The director had difficulties understanding the religious aspects of his subject, which is a serious handicap when composing a portrait of a churchman. There is almost nothing about Metropolitan Andrey's pastoral activities, for example. The only scene where we see him acting like a bishop is when he makes an official visitation to a parish in the Carpathian Mountains. Improbably, Sheptytsky is shown making the visitation alone on horseback. He is greeted by Hutsuls, a Ukrainian mountain people, in their colorful costumes and a priest in vestments embroidered with traditional Ukrainian designs. Coming out of the scene, we see Sheptytsky riding through picturesque Carpathian landscapes and listen to a voiceover reading from a beautiful and moving pastoral letter that Sheptytsky wrote, in language almost erotic, expressing his love for those under his care. It is a scene that works for the film, but not one that illuminates the issues that preoccupied the prelate.

The neglect of Sheptytsky's activities in his episcopal office was a missed opportunity. A historical film is not a scholarly monograph, but it can be an effective means of conveying what happened in the past; in some respects, cinematic treatment of history can be superior to treatment in scholarly texts. Films are also often more influential than scholarly texts as shapers of collective memory. Thus historical films bear some responsibility to engage in an informed and intelligent manner with the history that is being presented. The choice of illuminating episodes, the metanarratives around the film narrative (in this case a nationalist metanarrative), and many other factors elucidated in a growing literature[18] have a bearing on how we evaluate a historical film. Yanchuk's film on Sheptytsky could have been enriched by including the metropolitan's delicate negotiations with the other bishops he had to deal with. Greek Catholic Bishop Hryhorii Khomyshyn of Stanyslaviv was consumed by envy of the great metropolitan and made life difficult for him. Relations with the Polish bishops were also very tense at times. The other Greek Catholic bishops

[17] Filevych, "Pafos zamist svyatosti."

[18] In addition to Rosenstone's central text, see also Hughes-Warrington, *The History on Film Reader*.

and the Vatican wanted Sheptytsky to impose celibacy on the priests of his archeparchy, but he would not do it. Sheptytsky had to deal with rivalries among his most influential clergy as well, notably the enmity between his most trusted lieutenant and eventual successor, Iosyf Slipy, and a brilliant but erratic favorite who was eventually to betray the church, Havryil Kostelnyk. In the absence of a Ukrainian state, Sheptytsky took upon himself and his church many infrastructural tasks that would have naturally fallen to a Ukrainian government, such as establishing in Lviv a national museum, a Ukrainian hospital, and an institution of postsecondary education. With almost a million and a half faithful to care for, Sheptytsky had his hands full as a bishop. None of this comes out in *Vladyka Andrey*.

Yanchuk and his screenwriter were only partly successful in exploring the religious themes so central to Sheptytsky's concerns. They exhibited a healthy instinct in dealing with Sheptytsky's preaching. The film quotes powerful passages from Sheptytsky's pastoral letters, in which he emphasizes the importance of love, which indeed lay at the core of Sheptytsky's thinking. But generally, the director shows little understanding of Christian teachings or the Greek Catholic Church. It is characteristic of the director's superficial, gestural approach that to familiarize the actors who played the young and mature Sheptytsky with the religious life, he made arrangements for them to spend a few days at the Basilian monastery in Krekhiv.

An interviewer congratulated Yanchuk that in *Vladyka Andrey* he "managed to avoid too much religiosity." The director replied: "I wanted, in the first place, to show the person. I did not want to erect a monument or shoot a film exclusively for the church."[19] Yanchuk tried to get at "the person" by showing Sheptytsky as an extraordinary man who could have become successful at whatever he turned his hand to. He could have made a military or government career, he was attractive to women, he was wealthy, yet he chose to devote himself to God's work. He was destined for this from the opening scene, in which he is in a church with his mother and experiences a strange sensation. His mother explains to him: "God held you in His hand." Later in the film, while Roman Szeptycki is serving in the cavalry, he tries to dissuade a friend from fighting a duel with another officer, since this is an offense to God. His friend tells him: "You're strange, not of this world." Yanchuk leaves Sheptytsky's religious passion on this level, as something mystical, beyond comprehension. Thereby he

[19] Yanchuk, "Khochu."

excuses himself from having to explore this subject in any depth. Yet it is an interesting question that Yanchuk avoids: how a man in Sheptytsky's troubled time and place chooses God and what he does with that choice. Instead, Yanchuk fills his film with three principal themes: Sheptytsky's interaction with the regimes that changed so rapidly and starkly in this particular borderland; Sheptytsky's relations with his family; and the story of a monk who betrays him.

Sheptytsky and Secular Powers

The first theme, the theme of the regimes, is initially engaged in a scene in which Sheptytsky has an audience with Emperor Franz Joseph. This is based on an actual event, Sheptytsky's audience with the emperor in 1902. Both in the scene and in the historical event, Sheptytsky is there to plead with the emperor to establish a Ukrainian university in Lviv. The film offers no background on this issue, but a bit of research could have given the director something interesting to work with. In the previous year, 1901, Ukrainian students collectively withdrew from the polonized University of Lviv to study elsewhere. Sheptytsky was drawn into the issue when his own seminarians joined the boycott. Initially upset by their behavior, he soon embraced the cause of the university as his own and emerged as its most important champion. He sent his seminarians to study at Catholic universities across Europe and often paid their expenses with his own money. In Yanchuk's presentation, however, the issue, and as a result also the scene, is reduced to bare bones. Sheptytsky tells the emperor that the Ukrainians in Galicia are being oppressed by the Poles, and the emperor responds that he tries to do what is best for the empire but it is too much for him to manage. The gorgeous interior of the mayor's office (cast here as the emperor's reception hall) is lovingly photographed, but in this scene Yanchuk's oversimplification of the education issue prevents the film from transcending the genre of costume drama.

Sheptytsky next encounters the Russian occupation regime of 1914, which arrests him, deports him to the interior of Russia, and keeps him under surveillance and house arrest in a monastic cell. After his release, a voiceover informs us, the Polish authorities do not allow Sheptytsky to return to Lviv for several years. In 1921 he is granted an audience with Marshall Piłsudski (the Polish leader is played by Yanchuk himself), but shadowy, unidentified Polish security agents prevent the audience from happening. The scene is so ambiguous that it is contentless. The lack of

content is underscored by the leap in the narrative from 1921 to 1939, when the Polish regime is replaced by the Soviet regime.

Yanchuk is more interested in the first period of Soviet rule in Galicia (1939–41) than in the earlier regimes. He has Sheptytsky tell his closest circle in 1939 that Stalin and Hitler are a warning to humanity, that a terrible time is about to descend. Yanchuk depicts the Soviet secret police, the NKVD, as absolutely ruthless and murderous. They execute Sheptytsky's younger brother Leon and his wife, as well as a priest who just happened to be with them. They recruit a young monk to spy on Sheptytsky, a subplot to be discussed below. As a general outline of the first period of Soviet rule in Galicia, 1939–41, Yanchuk's characterization is apt.

The portrayal of the Nazis and their attitude to Sheptytsky is well done, and it is likely that the director and screenwriter worked from genuine historical documentation. In the film, the SS comes to St. George's Cathedral to search the metropolitan's complex. Metropolitan Andrey emerges in full regalia in his wheelchair, saying that he is not engaged in politics; they can search the grounds if they want to, but only on one condition—over his dead body. The SS men leave, but they argue among themselves. One objects that he is hiding three hundred Jews, but the other points out that Sheptytsky is a person of influence and that influence can be useful to the Reich—hiding a few hundred Jews is just a petty matter. The story of the attempted search is a dramatization of the historical situation, not of an actual event, but it conveys the correct historical messages: Sheptytsky's revulsion at the Nazi regime, his protection of its victims, and his readiness to lay down his life. As to the disagreement between the SS men, it is very similar in content to a memorandum on Sheptytsky written by the governor of Distrikt Galizien, Otto von Wächter, in May 1944.[20] The chronology is tampered with in the Nazi-occupation sequences, but this results from the kind of compression in historical film that does no harm and is often useful.

Yanchuk also shows Sheptytsky talking to a rabbi under his protection as well as arranging the rescue of many Jewish children. The historical Sheptytsky was indeed very concerned over the Holocaust and rescued several hundred Jews,[21] mainly children. Yanchuk's attention to this is

[20] Himka, "Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky and the Holocaust." On Sheptytsky and the Holocaust, see also Redlich, "Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyi, Ukrainians and Jews during and after the Holocaust."

[21] In several interviews, though not in the film, Yanchuk spoke of Sheptytsky saving two *thousand* Jews instead of two hundred, which is what scholars currently estimate.

consistent with his nationalist approach; the nationalists use the example of Sheptytsky to counter accusations that Ukrainians harmed Jews during the Holocaust. Also consistent with Yanchuk's nationalist approach are some omissions in this same regard. Sheptytsky was horrified by the widespread complicity of Ukrainians in the murder of the Jews. Numerous pastoral letters and other texts from 1942 and 1943 lament and condemn the epidemic of murder perpetrated by members of his flock. He was particularly concerned about the participation of the Ukrainian police in the liquidation of ghettos. There is no possibility, however, that such themes would appear in a movie directed by Yanchuk, which proceeds from the nationalist premise that Ukrainians can only be victims, never perpetrators of crimes against humanity.

When the Soviets return to Lviv, the film indicates that they want to kill the metropolitan in order to eliminate a competing authority. The film even hints that they are responsible for his death. There is no historical basis for this particular insinuation, which reflects rather Yanchuk's leanings toward a conspiratorial view of history. Quite rightly, however, Yanchuk shows the ruthless suppression of the Greek Catholic church in the wake of the metropolitan's death.

Sheptytsky and His Family

The second major theme of the film is Sheptytsky's relationship with his family, again underscoring Yanchuk's interest in "the person," the human being intimately connected with others. Sheptytsky's mother, Countess Zofia Fredro Szeptycka, is an important presence in his life. The film's first scene has young Roman and his mother praying together, then riding together. He is with his mother at the papal audience. She is present at the family gatherings at their Prylbychy estate, lovingly evoked in the film. She defends Roman's choice of a vocation and helps to overcome her husband's resistance to it. The film shows the metropolitan visiting his mother shortly before her death in 1904 and then offers sentimental flashbacks of their relationship. After the metropolitan's death, the ghost of the countess visits the prison barracks where another of her sons, also a Greek Catholic churchman, is spending his last days. However, the facts that Andrey Sheptytsky loved his mother and that she loved him are not developed in such a way as to shed light on the metropolitan's character. Indeed, these scenes are banal and sentimental, and the viewer is left wondering why so much footage is devoted to commonplaces in a film

about a historical personage of Sheptytsky's stature—there were many more interesting and significant themes that called for attention.

Truly lamentable, however, is the attention paid in the film to a romantic subplot involving Sheptytsky's younger cousin Zosia Szembek. In the film, Zosia develops a childhood crush on her dashing older cousin, first a cavalryman, later a monk. Whenever Zosia appears, romantic music plays in Mykhailo Hronsky's score until Zosia, her love necessarily unrequited, enters the convent. She still figures in the film thereafter. As Sheptytsky preaches at Christmastime in Nazi-occupied Lviv, we see her in the crowd, listening longingly. Resting in the Crimea shortly before his death, Sheptytsky reads a letter from Zosia which slips from his hands and floats romantically in the wind towards the sea. The very last scene of the movie shows Zosia, who has survived many of the other characters in the film, hoping to reunite with Roman/Andrey in the afterlife. Perhaps in Hollywood no film is complete without a love interest, but in this historical film, it is nothing more than an inappropriate filler. It is, again, banal and sentimental, bearing little relation to Sheptytsky as a historical actor and or to the facts of his biography. (Perhaps so much attention was paid to Zosia, because Zosia as a child was played by Viktoriya Yanchuk.)

A much more relevant relationship depicted to some extent in the film is that between Roman/Andrey and his brother Kazimierz/Klymentii. In the film, we see Kazimierz surprise his family by also donning a monk's robes, and thereafter we see him, now as Klymenty, at Sheptytsky's side in the metropolitan's palace. Near the end of the film, we see Klymenty sharing a bit of bread with a fellow prisoner and then dying in the barracks, presumably of a heart attack. We learn nothing about Klymenty's personality, except that he was a holy man similar to his brother, though of lesser format. What is truly interesting about Klymenty is completely ignored in the film. Although we see him become a monk, we have no idea what kind of monk he became. It would have been an excellent opportunity to explore Sheptytsky's neo-Byzantine policies in the Greek Catholic Church, since Klymenty became a Studite monk, in fact the archimandrite of the Studites. The Studites were brought into being by the Sheptytsky brothers as a revival of Eastern Christian monasticism. The tensions between the Eastern and Western heritages in Greek Catholicism have a long and formative history, and Sheptytsky's way of dealing with them was visionary. It deserved attention.

Sheptytsky and a Betrayer

The third theme of the film was a subplot that serves most of all to highlight Yanchuk's predilection for ambiguity and conspiracy theory. It takes up an inordinate portion of the film, weaving its way in and out. Partly told through flashbacks, this subplot requires considerable work on the part of the viewer. According to the film, in 1939, when the Soviets occupied Lviv for the first time, the NKVD picked up a young monk named Stefan Pavlyuk and recruited him to inform on Sheptytsky. A villainous NKVD major tortured Stefan by smashing a rubber stamp on his fingers and pressing it down. Perhaps there is some symbolism here. In spite of the precise name of the informer, he is not a historical character. That there were informers in the Greek Catholic Church is, of course, true. As presented in the movie, young Stefan belonged to the metropolitan's innermost circle. We are shown that he tried to placate the NKVD by bringing them the draft of a sermon or pastoral letter, but they demanded items of more significance from him. Whether he provided them or not is a question left to the viewer to answer. Sheptytsky knows that Stefan is an informer and confronts him about it during a chess game. Even so Stefan remains close to the metropolitan.

After the interlude of the Nazi occupation, the NKVD again picks up Stefan. The same major gives Stefan some "medicine," straight from the Kremlin, which supposedly will revive the metropolitan's flagging health. He wants Stefan to slip the medicine into Sheptytsky's milk or coffee once a week. Later we see Stefan struggling with himself over this "medicine." He dumps all of it in a glass of water and considers drinking it down himself. Instead, he throws it on the floor. Still later, we see Stefan giving the metropolitan a drink, and we wonder if it contains the Kremlin "medicine," obtained by a refill of the "prescription." Perhaps, we are led to understand, Sheptytsky was poisoned by the NKVD. After his death, his successor and other church officials are arrested by the NKVD and herded into a truck. Stefan is picked up with the rest of them, but the NKVD major, much to Stefan's dismay, releases him.

Throughout the film, we also see an enigmatic character who is reading archival documents and watching old newsreels and other actuality footage. This character is only identified in the credits, where he is given the name "Syvy"—the grey one. This part of the film is set in the post-Soviet period. From his investigations, "Syvy" learns about Stefan's past and knows that he is still alive. So every day he calls Stefan, now an old man and a grandfather, but Stefan is reluctant to pick up the phone. My

reading of "Syvy" is that he is a veteran of the Security Service of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, reactivated in retirement. He is about the right age. His identification by only a pseudonym in quotation marks is very characteristic of the nationalist underground. On the phone, he tells Stefan that he cannot be indifferent to what he has done, since he—"Syvy"—is "a believer." The idea is that the Organization is still righting wrongs against the church and nation.

We are shown old Stefan wrestling with his past, telling himself that he actually betrayed no one and that his life is the punishment for his wrongdoing. We later see "Syvy" and Stefan meeting on a park bench. Stefan tells "Syvy"—cynically or cryptically, I am not sure—that if he believes that he must destroy Stefan's family in order to compensate for the wrong he has done, so be it; he will carry on. The preference for inventions that push the movie in the direction of a romance or a thriller over historic substance is a recurring problem in Yanchuk's film. Yanchuk's three previous films had glorified the Bandera wing of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, and it is perhaps natural that he avoided depicting the relations between that movement and the metropolitan, because Sheptytsky was an outspoken opponent of its brand of violent nationalism. In fact, the story of Sheptytsky and Ukrainian nationalism more generally would have provided excellent material for high political and moral drama. In the interwar period, which Yanchuk's film barely touched upon, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists successfully organized a number of high-profile assassinations of Polish government officials. The Ukrainian population of Galicia considered the young nationalists to be heroes; Sheptytsky considered them to be murderers.[22] His remonstrances fell on deaf ears or alienated the radical nationalist youth. When the German-Soviet war broke out in 1941, the Bandera nationalists proclaimed a Ukrainian state in Lviv. Misled by their representatives, Sheptytsky endorsed their state, but then drew back in horror as he witnessed the violence that they used against their enemies, which included the older wing of the nationalist movement as well as Jews, Communists, and Poles. The Bandera movement attempted to seize power in each locality and place their own militias in charge. Sheptytsky sought to have the traditional elders of the community as well as the pastors set up the local infrastructure, and he warned against the godlessness and violence of the young nationalists. In 1943 the Bandera wing began the systematic slaughter of the Polish

---

22 Himka, "Christianity and Radical Nationalism."

population in Western Ukraine. Sheptytsky condemned this decisively and called upon the priests and elders in communities to save the Polish population from destruction. What a rich film could have been made of these events, of this clash of perspectives.

The problems with *Vladyka Andrey* are those of the contemporary intellectual and creative world of Ukrainian nationalism. There are certain topics that nationalist intellectuals, academics, writers, artists, and directors cannot broach because they upset nationalist mythologies. Yanchuk could not work creatively with Sheptytsky's many confrontations with Ukrainian nationalists because saints and heroes must walk hand in hand. He tried to create a combination of a national hero and a national saint. Making that myth was much more important for him than historical accuracy. The material of Ukrainian history, including Sheptytsky's role in it, is filled with tension, drama, conflict, and tragedy. Imprisoned in his nationalist thematics, Yanchuk chose instead to erect a hollow monument to one of the most compelling characters of modern Ukraine.

Filmography

Atentat—Osinnye vbyvstvo u Myunkheni (*Assassination: An Autumn Murder in Munich*; Ukraine 1995, dir.: Oles Yanchuk)
Holod-33 (*Famine-33*; Ukraine 1991, dir.: Oles Yanchuk)
Neskorenyi (*The Undefeated*; Ukraine/USA 2000, dir.: Oles Yanchuk)
Vladyka Andrey (*Metropolitan Andrey*; Ukraine 2008, dir.: Oles Yanchuk)
Zalizna sotnya (*The Company of Heroes*; Ukraine 2004, dir.: Oles Yanchuk)

Bibliography

Amar, Tarik Cyril [Syril], Ihor Balynsky, and Yaroslav Hrytsak, eds. *Strasti za Banderoyu*. Kyiv: Hrani-T, 2010.
Cherednychenko, Olena. "Interview with Oles Yanchuk." *Kino-Kolo*. Last modified December 18, 2006. http://www.kinokolo.ua/interviews/75.
Filevych, Marko. "Pafos zamist svyatosti." *Patriarkhat* 409, no. 6 (2008): 12.
Himka, John-Paul. "Christianity and Radical Nationalism: Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky and the Bandera Movement." In *State Secularism and Lived Religion in Soviet Russia and Ukraine*, edited by Catherine Wanner, 93–116. Washington and New York: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Oxford University Press, 2012.
———. "Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky and the Holocaust." *Polin* 26 (forthcoming).
———. "The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army: Unwelcome Elements of an Identity Project." *Ab Imperio* 4 (2010): 83–101.
———. *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine: The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement in Galicia, 1867–1900*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.
Hughes-Warrington, Marnie. *The History on Film Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Magocsi, Paul Robert, ed. *Morality and Reality: The Life and Times of Andrey Sheptytskyi*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1989.

Pluhator, Halyna. “Todi rezhyser poselyv mene v monastyr.” *Simya i dim*. Last modified March 20, 2010. http://www.simya.com.ua/articles/47/11705/.

Redlich, Shimon. “Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyi, Ukrainians and Jews during and after the Holocaust.” *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 5, no. 1 (1990): 39–51.

Rosenstone, Robert A. *History on Film/Film on History*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education, 2006.

“*Vladyka Andrey* Olesia Yanchuka pobachyly v Donetsku.” *Maidan.org.ua*. Last modified September 8, 2008. http://maidanua.org/static/news/2007/1220883313.html.

Yanchuk, Oles. “Khochu, shchob ukrainske kino ne bulo hostem na ukrainskykh ekranakh.” Interview with the director, conducted by Halyna Huzo. *Vyskoyi zamok*. Last modified August 28, 2008. http://www.wz.Lviv.ua/print/php?atid=67410.

——. “Yakby *Vladyku Andreya* znimaly v SShA . . .” Interview with the director, conducted by Olena Uhryn. *KinoTeatr* 4 (2007). http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=727.

Zagrebelny, Ihor. “*Vladyka Andrey*—Kniaz tserkvy i narodu.” *Banderivets.* Last modified May 13, 2010. http://www.banderivets.org.ua/?page=pages/zmistdo/201002/article 12.

Zhyla, Oksana. “*Vladyka Andrey*—film-podiya.” *Lvivska hazeta*, June 26, 2008.