

# Transnational and Trans-Denominational Aspects of the Veneration of Josaphat Kuntsevych

*Kerstin S. Jobst*

The veneration of saints is a widespread phenomenon. However, study of the transnational and trans-denominational aspects of such veneration is still in its preliminary stage, and not only in Eastern Europe. One of the most famous examples is the veneration of Elizabeth of Thuringia: Roman Catholics have celebrated her throughout the world, especially in Germany and Hungary, and Protestants have also revered her as a symbol of active charity.<sup>1</sup> Another example is that of the early Czech bishop and martyr Adalbert of Prague, the patron saint of Bohemia, Poland, Hungary, and Prussia. Even in Eastern Europe, where religious and denominational variety has had a far longer tradition than, for example, in the territories that once constituted the Holy Roman Empire, the trans-religious veneration of Christian saints was not unknown.<sup>2</sup> Very recently, however, historians have begun paying much more attention to the revival of national patron saints in Eastern and East-Central Europe and their role in shaping collective identities.<sup>3</sup> To get a deeper insight into the politics of religion and religious practices there, one has also to enquire into the trans-denominational, trans-ethnic, trans-territorial, and trans-epochal aspects of the veneration of saints. The veneration of Josaphat (Yosafat) Kuntsevych (1580–1623), the Uniate archbishop of Polatsk, Vitsebsk, and Mstislau in Belarus, is an excellent example for studying these patterns of communi-

---

<sup>1</sup> See Stefan Gerber, “Die Heiligen der Katholiken und Protestanten: Die heilige Elisabeth in konfessioneller Wahrnehmung während des ‘langen’ 19. Jahrhundert, in *Elisabeth von Thüringen - eine europäische Heilige*, vol. 3, *Thüringer Landesausstellung “Elisabeth von Thüringen: Eine Europäische Heilige”*, Wartburg – Eisenach, 7. Juli bis 19. November 2007, (Petersberg, 2007), 499–509.

<sup>2</sup> Mathias Niendorf, in *Das Großfürstentum Litauen: Studien zur Nationsbildung in der Frühen Neuzeit, 1569–1795* (Wiesbaden, 2006), 154–55, points to the Lithuanians’ and Tatars’ active Marian devotion in the early modern period.

<sup>3</sup> See Stefan Samerski, ed., *Die Renaissance der Nationalpatrone: Erinnerungskulturen in Ostmitteleuropa im 20./21. Jahrhundert* (Cologne, 2007); Dieter R. Bauer, Klaus Herbers, and Gabriela Signori, eds., *Patriotische Heilige: Beiträge zur Konstruktion religiöser und politischer Identitäten in der Vormoderne* (Stuttgart, 2007); Frithjof Benjamin Schenk, *Aleksandr Nevskij: Heiliger – Fürst – Nationalheld: Eine Erinnerungsfigur im russischen kulturellen Gedächtnis (1263–2000)* (Cologne, 2004); and Stefan Laube, “Nationaler Heiligenkult in Polen und Deutschland: Ein erinnerungspolitischer Vergleich aus dem 19. Jahrhundert,” in *Nationalisierung der Religion und Sakralisierung der Nation im östlichen Europa*, ed. Martin Schulze-Wessel (Stuttgart, 2006), 31–50.

cation for a variety of reasons: the Josaphat cult arose in the seventeenth century and has been developed in continuous practices ever since. It has therefore proven to be a trans-epochal phenomenon. The veneration of St. Josaphat has been visible not only among Greek Catholic Ukrainians (and, to a much more limited extent, among Greek Catholic Belarusians), but also among Roman Catholic Poles both in Poland and the Polish diaspora. This circumstance constitutes the trans-denominational and trans-national importance of his cult from the early modern era to the present. His cult became not only an expression of practiced piety but also a resource for different religious, cultural, political, and ethno-national agents. In view of Ukraine's historically grounded denominational fragmentation, however, he cannot be considered that country's national saint.

In this contribution I shall discuss some aspects of the trans-denominational and trans-national worship of St. Josaphat Kuntsevych, with an emphasis on his canonization during the "long" nineteenth century. But first I shall give a brief account of his life, martyrdom, and the beginnings of his veneration. As I shall argue, from the outset his cult had a clearly inclusive, trans-denominational content that fostered cohabitation between the Roman and Greek Catholics in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the one hand, but excluded the Orthodox—the so-called schismatics—on the other.<sup>4</sup> It is precisely this pattern—the successful use of St. Josaphat the martyr as an anti-Orthodox, anti-Russian, and (after the revolutions of 1917) anti-Soviet symbol—that became characteristic of his cult for the *longue durée*.<sup>5</sup> Thus the veneration of St. Josaphat can be taken as an important element in the competition between Roman Catholics and Uniates, typical in the context of confessionalization.<sup>6</sup>

### ***The Life and Death of Josaphat Kuntsevych***

When he was canonized in 1867, Josaphat Kuntsevych became the first canonical saint and martyr of the Uniate/Greek Catholic Church since the 1596 Union of Brest with Rome.<sup>7</sup> For that reason alone his role in the history of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church has been outstanding. Apart from that he is a "typical"

<sup>4</sup> I shall concentrate on the Roman Catholics and the Greek Catholics, or Uniates (a term that became current at the end of the eighteenth century). The Uniate/Greek Catholic Church has been in full communion with the bishop of Rome since 1596.

<sup>5</sup> This paper is a part of my larger research project about St. Josaphat, in which I examine the Orthodox, Russian, and Soviet perspectives about him as symbolic of the rejection of the church union, Catholicism, Polishness, and religion in general (the latter during the Soviet period).

<sup>6</sup> On trans-denominational "competition," see Etienne François, *Protestants et catholiques en Allemagne: Identités et pluralism* (Augsburg, 1648–1806; Paris, 1999).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Mikhail M. Dmitriev, B. N. Floria, and S. G. Iakovenko, eds., *Brestskaia uniiia 1596 g. i obshchestvenno-politicheskaia bor'ba na Ukraine i Belorussii v kontse XVI – nachale XVII v.*, part 1, *Brestskaia uniiia 1596: Istoricheskie sobytia* (Moscow, 1996); Mikhail M. Dmitriev, *Mezhdru Rimom i Konstantinopolem: Genezis Brestskoi tserkovnoi unii 1595–1596 godov* (Moscow, 2003); Bert Groen and Wil van den Bercken, eds., *400 Years: Union of Brest (1596–1996): A Critical Re-evaluation* (Leuven, 1998); and Hans-Joachim Torke, ed., *400 Jahre Kirchenunion von Brest, 1596–1996* (Berlin, 1998).

saint: hagiographic accounts about his life<sup>8</sup> present a picture of an ideal, model saint with his elemental components, such as his “designation” at a young age, his “will for knowledge,” and his “renunciation” of everything that ordinary people consider “living a good life,” including the joy of marriage and the striving to own extensive property.<sup>9</sup> He was born Ioan Kuntsevych in 1580 into an Orthodox, perhaps petty noble, family in Volodymyr (now Volodymyr-Volynskiy) in north-western Ukraine. It is worth mentioning that his early intellectual milieu was entirely Eastern Christian and that already as a small boy he showed a deep religiosity and a zeal for education. Kuntsevych was trained as a merchant, but he refused to marry his master’s daughter and therefore also the appointment to be his heir. Instead, in 1604 he became a member of the then still Orthodox monks of St. Basil the Great in Vilnius and took the monastic name Josaphat. There he studied Latin and Church Slavonic sources, was exposed to religious and denominational differences, and came into contact with Jesuits.<sup>10</sup> Under their influence and especially through his acquaintance with Yosyf Veliamyn Rutsky (1574–1637), later the Uniate metropolitan bishop of Kyiv, Kuntsevych became a devoted follower and fierce advocate of the church union with Rome. In 1609 he was ordained a Uniate priest. Later he served as the superior of several monasteries, and from 1618 he was the Uniate archbishop of Polatsk, Vitsebsk, and Mstyslaŭ. Kuntsevych’s life ended in Vitsebsk on 12 November 1623 during a visitation of his archeparchy. An Orthodox mob there murdered him in a typical “martyrlike” manner, i.e., with an axe blow to his head and a bullet fired by someone. Thus Josaphat the “*dushokhvat*” (soul snatcher), who was hated not only by the Orthodox citizens of Vitsebsk but also throughout the archeparchy, was reborn as a Catholic martyr.

The reasons for Kuntsevych’s murder were numerous. The higher Orthodox Ruthenian clergy initiated the church union of 1596 in order to overcome the Great Schism and improve their then less privileged position vis-à-vis the Roman

<sup>8</sup> The first paradigmatic *vita* of Josaphat is *Cursus vitae et certamen martyrii B. Josaphat Kunczevicii Archiepisc., Polocensis, Episc. Vitebscensis et Mstislaviensis ordinis S. Basilii Magni calamo Jacobi Susza Episc. Chelmensis et Belzensis, cum S.R.E. uniti, ordinis ejusdem adumbratum. Curante Joanne Martinov S.J.* (1665, Paris, 1865). Yakiv Susza (1610–87) was the Uniate eparch of Kholm (Polish: Chelm) and his church’s envoy (1664–66) in Rome. The first efforts to get Josaphat canonized were based on a handwritten hagiographic account first printed in 1665; although they were unsuccessful, they did lead to his beatification in 1643. Cf. Ievhen Kozanevych, *Zhyttia Sviatoho Velykomuchenika Iosafata Chyna Sviatoho Vasylia Velykoho, arkhyiepyskopa polots'koho* (Lviv, 1994); Johann Looshorn, *Der heilige Martyrer Josaphat Kuncewycz: Erzbischof von Polock. Nach dem Lateinischen des unierten Bischofs Jakob Susza* (Munich, 1898); and Domicyan Mieczkowski, *Żywot błogostawionego Jozafata Kuncewicza, Arcybiskupa Polockiego* (Cracow, 1865).

<sup>9</sup> For the literary conventions of this genre, see Thomas J. Heffernan, *Sacred Biography: Saints and Their Biographers in the Middle Ages* (New York and Oxford, 1988); and Dieter von der Nahmer, *Die lateinische Heiligenvita: Eine Einführung in die lateinische Hagiographie* (Darmstadt, 1994).

<sup>10</sup> For Josaphat’s connections with the Society of Jesus, see J. Krajcar, SJ, “Saint Josaphat and the Jesuits of Lithuania,” in *Miscellanea in honorem S. Josaphat Kuncewycz = Analecta OSBM*, section 2, vol. 6 (1967): 75–84.

Catholic clergy in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.<sup>11</sup> The union was supported by the king of Poland and grand duke of Lithuania, Sigismund III Vasa, but opposed by some Orthodox bishops, prominent nobles of Ruthenian origin, and the Cossacks, who were so important for the shaping of an Orthodox identity in the Ukrainian context.<sup>12</sup> The union was therefore the result of a movement from above and not from below: the Ruthenian Orthodox masses did not request it.<sup>13</sup> For a long time this was a kind of “congenital defect.”

In the early seventeenth-century Belarusian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Ukrainian territories of the Kingdom of Poland, the church union was rejected by the majority of Orthodox believers. This was no threat to the denominational cohabitation of ordinary folk in Polatsk, Vitsebsk, and Mstyslaŭ as long as religious and secular authorities did not try to force the union upon them. However, as soon as Josaphat became the archbishop there, he tried to revoke this public consensus: he dismissed priests who did not accept the union, had church possessions in pro-Orthodox hands confiscated, and took legal action against insubordinate municipalities such as Mahilioŭ, where the majority were Orthodox.<sup>14</sup> While he was still not unpopular in Polatsk because of his ascetic lifestyle and because he was a gifted preacher, in other parts of his archeparchy his conflict with anti-union Orthodox groups grew steadily. Without a doubt, Josaphat was a “hard-liner.”<sup>15</sup> His assassination marked the final point of this process of alienation between Uniate and Orthodox believers in the Commonwealth.

### ***The Beginning of a Trans-Denominational Cult***

As already mentioned, the cult of Josaphat arose immediately after his death. But, as Stefan Rohdewald has shown, at that time it had a limited influence on shaping the rather weak Uniate identity.<sup>16</sup> Whether the church union was strength-

<sup>11</sup> In Ukrainian accounts this initiative step is often explained as a measure to avoid the domination of the newly established Patriarchate of Moscow. According to Frank Sysyn, this modern explanation lacks documentary evidence. See his article “The Union of Brest and the Question of National Identity,” in *400 Jahre Kirchenunion von Brest*, ed. Hans-Joachim Torke, no. 1 (1998) of *Arbeitspapiere des Osteuropa-Instituts, Freie Universität Berlin*, 10–11.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Serhii Ploky, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (Oxford, 2010).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Ihor Ševčenko, “The Rebirth of the Rus' Faith,” in his *Ukraine between East and West: Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century* (Edmonton and Toronto, 1996), 131–48, here 134.

<sup>14</sup> About these acts and for Josaphat's politics in general, see Stefan Rohdewald, “Vom Polacker Venedig”: *Kollektives Handeln sozialer Gruppen einer Stadt zwischen Ost- und Mitteleuropa (Mittelalter, frühe Neuzeit, 19. Jahrhundert bis 1914)* (Stuttgart, 2005), 254–62; and Tomasz Kempa, “Prawosławie i unia w wschodnich województwach WKL w końcu XVII wieku,” *Białoruskie Zeszyty Historyczne* 22 (2004): 5–41, here 16–17.

<sup>15</sup> Alfons Brüning, *Unio non est unitas: Polen-Litauens Weg im konfessionellen Zeitalter (1569–1648)* (Wiesbaden, 2008), 306.

<sup>16</sup> Stefan Rohdewald, “Medium unierter konfessioneller Identität oder polnisch-ruthenischer Einigung? Religiöse und politische Funktionen der Verehrung von Josafat Kuncevyč in Polen-Litauen im 17. Jahrhundert,” in *Kommunikation durch symbolische Akte: Religiöse Heterogenität*

ened outside Polatsk because of Josaphat's death or not has been disputed.<sup>17</sup> But there is no doubt that his murder—which soon came to be called a martyrdom—changed the attitude of the Roman Catholic clergy and nobility towards the realm's Byzantine-rite Catholics, whom until then they had regarded as inferior.<sup>18</sup> The explanation for these apparently contradictory findings is that from its very beginning the cult of Josaphat developed into a useful tool of Roman Catholic and Uniate trans-denominational cohabitation in the Commonwealth.<sup>19</sup> Hagiographic accounts, especially where Josaphat the Miraculous is depicted, support this argument. In order to be canonized, a martyred Catholic does not need to have performed a miracle. What is striking in Josaphat's case is not only the large number of miracles he was attested to have performed,<sup>20</sup> but also the denominational, ethnic, and social range of the witnesses who presented these claims to the Sacred Congregation of Rites. That Josaphat's sponsor and pro-union comrade, Metropolitan Rutsky, attested on several occasions that “whenever he had found himself in great need spiritually or materially, he had always received help from St. Josaphat”<sup>21</sup> is no surprise. Neither is the great number of ordinary believers from Polatsk and other parts of the Grand Duchy who claimed that their severe illnesses were cured after praying to Josaphat. More interesting—and an indication of the trans-denominational and trans-ethnic potential of veneration—is the impressive number of Roman Catholic religious and secular dignitaries who testified that Josaphat was a chosen one. To stress his importance as a symbol of the unity of the Catholic Church, a provincial of the Dominican Order confirmed to the Sacred Congregation that Josaphat had performed a miracle,<sup>22</sup> and the rector of the Jesuit order in Polatsk testified about Josaphat's help in two cases: in 1626 the martyr helped to extinguish a fire in the Jesuit collegium there, and he later saved the rector from drowning in the river Dvina.<sup>23</sup> Prince Grzegorz Czartoryski (a Roman Catholic?) testified that he had recovered from a long illness when he, seeing a picture of Josaphat, promised to visit his grave.<sup>24</sup> The famous Mikołaj Potocki

---

*und politische Herrschaft in Polen-Litauen*, ed. Yvonne Kleinmann (Stuttgart, 2010), 271–90, here 290.

<sup>17</sup> Tomasz Kempa, “Czy męczeńska śmierć arcybiskupa Jozafata Kuncewicza przyczyniła się do rozwoju unii bzreskiej na obszarze archidiecezji połockiej?” in *Kościół wschodnie w Rzeczpospolitej XVI-XVIII wieku: Zbiór studiów*, ed. Andrzej Gil (Lublin, 2005), 93–105; and idem, “Prawosławie i unia,” 36.

<sup>18</sup> Plokhly, *The Cossacks and Religion*, 93.

<sup>19</sup> That even Jews testified in support of Josaphat's beatification could be seen as an indication of his trans-religious veneration. See Rohdewald, “Medium,” 275–80.

<sup>20</sup> In the Acts of Beatification completed in 1643, eighty-four miracles are mentioned, while Yakiv Sussha's *Cursus vitae et certamen martyrii B. Josaphat* (1865 ed.), 108–40, describes one hundred.

<sup>21</sup> Theodosia Boresky, *Life of St. Josaphat, Martyr of the Union, Archbishop of Polotsk, Member, Order of St. Basil the Great* (Philadelphia, 1955), 271.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 272.

<sup>23</sup> Looshorn, *Der heilige Martyrer Josaphat*, 120.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 134–35; Boresky, *Life of St. Josaphat*, 272–73.

(1595–1661), castellan of Cracow and field crown hetman (1637–46) of the Commonwealth, testified that he had also witnessed a miracle: during his stay in the Carmelite convent in Kamenets (now Kamianets-Podilskyi) he fell ill, but after touching a relic of Josaphat there he recovered immediately.<sup>25</sup> Even two queens of Poland—Cecilia Renata Habsburg (1611–44) and Ludwika Maria (Marie Louise) Gonzages (1611–67)—testified that Josaphat had performed miracles.<sup>26</sup> Their husband, Władysław IV Vasa, and his father, Sigismund III, were engaged advocates for the canonization of Josaphat, but their efforts were not successful.<sup>27</sup>

The zealous efforts to introduce the veneration of Josaphat stemmed from his status as a symbol not only of the unity of the church but also of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. It was evident in his invocation for help during battles.<sup>28</sup> Even before the disastrous Deluge, a series of mid-seventeenth century campaigns in the Commonwealth, the state endured some Swedish and Russian invasions. When in 1627 Swedish troops threatened Polatsk, in hagiographical accounts Josaphat the martyr miraculously rescued the town.<sup>29</sup> And just a couple of years later, in 1633, Polatsk was attacked and devastated by the troops of the Grand Principality of Moscow: “But when they tried to take the castle where Saint Josaphat’s body was kept, they saw armed troops under the command of the martyr on the walls. They immediately fled.”<sup>30</sup> Josaphat was also invoked as a universal weapon of the Commonwealth—united in the Catholic faith—against the Orthodox “schismatics” and against “unbelievers” (e.g., Muslim Tatars).<sup>31</sup> Presumably the most telling argument for the intention to use Josaphat’s sacral capital (with Bourdieu) as a symbol of the Commonwealth’s unity is his proclamation as a “patron of the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania” in 1673, described and repeated in 1832 so effectively in Adam Mickiewicz’s *Books of the Polish People and the Polish Pilgrimage*.<sup>32</sup> Josaphat became the patron saint of the Ruthenians during the less than successful reign of King Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki (1640–73), and thereafter he stood in a row with St. Stanislaus, the patron saint of Poland, and St. Casimir, the patron saint of

<sup>25</sup> Looshorn, *Der heilige Martyrer Josaphat*, 150.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 142 and 147.

<sup>27</sup> See Georg Hofmann, *Der Heilige Josaphat: Quellenschriften in Auswahl* (Rome, n.d.), 176–77.

<sup>28</sup> For the function of saints as helpers in battles (*Schlachtenhelfer*), see Klaus Schreiner, *Martyrer, Schlachtenhelfer, Friedensstifter: Krieg und Frieden im Spiegel mittelalterlicher und frühneuzeitlicher Heiligenverehrung* (Opladen, 2000).

<sup>29</sup> Looshorn, *Der heilige Martyrer Josaphat*, 131–32.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 139.

<sup>31</sup> See, e.g., the description of the wondrous rescue of the Derman monastery in Volhynia from the Orthodox Cossacks and the Tatars with St. Josaphat’s help in Alphonse Guépin’s *Saint Josaphat, archevêque de Polock: Martyr de l’unité catholique et l’Eglise grecque en Pologne*, vol. 2 (Poitiers and Paris, 1874), 228–30.

<sup>32</sup> The *Books* were published for the first time in 1833 in conjunction with the November Insurrection of 1830–31 against Russia. See Adam Mickiewicz, *Księgi narodu polskiego i pielgrzymstwa Polskiego* (Rome, 1946), 96–98, here 96: “Święty Stanisławie, opiekunie Polski, Módl się za nami. / Święty Kazimierzu, opiekunie Litwy, Módl się za nami. / Święty Józafacie, opiekunie Rusi, Módl się za nami.”

Lithuania.<sup>33</sup> One frequently mentioned episode in the hagiographic accounts is the common fate of St. Josaphat's and St. Casimir's relics—and therefore of the Commonwealth's Catholics of both rites—in 1655: Havryil (Hauryla) Kolenda (1606–74), one of Josaphat's successors to the seat of the archbishop of Polatsk and from 1665 the Uniate metropolitan of Kyiv, was captured by invading Swedish troops when he was trying to rescue the relics of both saints, “but with God's help he was happily delivered out of their hands,”<sup>34</sup> and with him the saints' remains. “Rescuing the saint's body from enemies” developed into a frequently used motif, especially in connection with an alleged or real Orthodox or Russian threat.

### ***The Cult of Josaphat after His Beatification***

In 1628 Pope Urban VIII appointed a commission to investigate the life and death of Josaphat Kuntsevych. The commission examined the great number of miracles that witnesses had sworn they had witnessed, and it discovered that five years after his death Josaphat's body was still intact—an unmistakable sign of his holiness.<sup>35</sup> Nonetheless, in 1637 a second commission was appointed to reinvestigate the bishop's life. Finally in 1643, twenty years after his death, Josaphat was beatified. After the concerted campaign for his canonization by Polish kings, aristocrats, and Catholic bishops of both confessions,<sup>36</sup> this was a very disappointing result. In subsequent decades and in the context of the afore-mentioned Deluge, dignitaries of the Commonwealth addressed again, and in vain, a number of new applications for Josaphat's canonization to Rome.<sup>37</sup> As far as I can ascertain, from the end of the seventeenth century until the middle of the nineteenth there were no further canonization efforts on his behalf. Why Rome did not affirm Josaphat's holiness in the seventeenth century cannot be determined. One reason might be that Pope Urban VIII (1623–44) had deferred to Orthodox sensibilities.<sup>38</sup> In the Commonwealth such forbearance was not necessary, however, and without further ado Blessed Josaphat became a medium of anti-Orthodox communication. Josaphat's relics—his physical remains (first-class relics), items he wore (second-class relics), and objects he touched (third-class relics)—were located throughout Poland-Lithuania.<sup>39</sup> But what became most important was his grave in Polatsk, which developed

<sup>33</sup> The circumstances are described in detail in Guépin, *Saint Josaphat*, 2: 417–19.

<sup>34</sup> Here I follow the account in Kozanevych, *Zhyttia Sviatoho Velykomuchenyka Iosafata*, 148–49.

<sup>35</sup> Cf., in general, Arnold Angenendt, “Corpus incorruptum: Eine Leitidee der mittelalterlichen Reliquienverehrung,” *Saeculum* 42 (1991): 320–48. For the official inspections of Josaphat's body in 1628 and again in 1637, cf. Hofmann, *Der Heilige Josaphat*, 224–28.

<sup>36</sup> On Kuntsevych's beatification and canonization, cf. Athanasius G. Welykyj, ed., *S. Josaphat —hieromartyr: Documenta Romana beatificationis et canonizationis*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1952–67); and on his beatification, Hofmann, *Der Heilige Josaphat*, 173–83.

<sup>37</sup> In 1662 Yakiv Sussha, Josaphat's hagiographer, was one of the applicants. Cf. Welykyj, *S. Josaphat*, 3: 143–44; and Guépin, *Saint Josaphat*, 2: 407.

<sup>38</sup> For this interpretation, see Niendorf, *Das Großfürstentum Litauen*, 167.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Albin Sroka, “Relikwie Świętego Jozafata Kuncewicza w Kościele Franciszkanów-Reformatów w Przemyślu,” in *Polska – Ukraina: 1000 lat sąsiedztwa. Studia z dziejów chrześcijaństwa na pograniczu kulturowych i etniczym*, vol. 2, ed. Stanisław Stępień (Przemyśl, 1994), 109–18.

into one of the places that pilgrims most frequently visited in the seventeenth-century Commonwealth.<sup>40</sup> His remains were kept there in a silver reliquary donated by the magnate Kazimierz Leon Sapieha (1609–56) in 1650.<sup>41</sup> By that time the life and legend of Josaphat had become “completely integrated in the context of the state”<sup>42</sup> and an important element in the discourse of unity for its Catholic noble and ecclesiastical elites.

To a certain extent this proved to be true even in the following decades, when Josaphat’s relics were transferred many times. Therefore he became not only a holy man for the town of Polatsk and for all of Rus', but also a symbol for the entire Commonwealth.<sup>43</sup> His hallowed remains were moved from Polatsk to Supraśl in Podlachia in 1652, and back again to Polatsk via Vilnius in 1667. From there they were transferred to the Uniate Church of SS Boris and Hleb near Hrodna in 1685, and again back to Polatsk to the Church of St. Sophia in 1687. According to hagiographical accounts, each time Polatsk’s Uniates celebrated the return of Josaphat’s bones enthusiastically: “It is hardly necessary to mention with what great rejoicing the townsfolk welcomed the relic’s return. As if to prove that it was the same and no other holy relic, new miracles were performed so that pilgrims from the farthest points came to visit and venerate the relic, give thanks for old favours granted, and receive new graces.”<sup>44</sup> As for the reaction of Polatsk’s Orthodox inhabitants, nothing was reported.

During that time all of the above *translationes* (transfers of saintly relics) were explained as measures circumventing the threat that foreign invaders, foremost the “schismatic” Muscovites, were to the bones of blessed Josaphat. Here is not the place to discuss whether such often mentioned threats were true or not or if the Muscovite invaders intended to destroy “everything that pertained to the veneration of St. Josaphat.”<sup>45</sup> However, this theme is an essential component of all narrations about him. One of the most telling stories is connected to the *translatio* of his bones during the Great Northern War from Polatsk to Biała (now Biała Podlaska) in 1705, namely to the estate of the Radziwiłł magnate family, where Josaphat’s relics were kept until 1763. During his military campaign of July 1705, Tsar Peter I invaded Polatsk. According to Polish historian Franciszek Henryk Duchiński, Peter entered the town’s Church of St. Sophia, where Josaphat’s bones were kept. Seeing an icon of the venerated archbishop, the drunken emperor asked the Basilian monks conducting vespers whom the icon depicted. The monks replied: “St. Josaphat.” Peter then asked: “What kind of saint [was he]?” The vicar replied: “A holy martyr.” When Peter asked

<sup>40</sup> Boresky, *Life of St. Josaphat*, 273.

<sup>41</sup> Guépin, *Saint Josaphat*, 2: 367–68.

<sup>42</sup> Rohdewald, “*Vom Polacker Venedig*,” 289–290.

<sup>43</sup> For the concept of the permanent saint, see Stefanie Rütter, “Heilige im Krieg – zur Sakralisierung von Kriegsschauplätzen im Mittelalter,” in *Heilige – Liturgie – Raum*, ed. Dieter R. Bauer et al (Stuttgart, 2010), 247–68.

<sup>44</sup> Boresky, *Life of St. Josaphat*, 291. For the ceremonies in 1667, see Guépin, *Saint Josaphat*, 2: 410–13.

<sup>45</sup> Boresky, *Life of St. Josaphat*, 292, in the context of the Russian campaign during the Great Northern War.

“Who killed him?” the vicar replied: “The people of Vitsebsk.” Then Peter asked: “What sort of people?” The vicar replied: “Members of the nobility and citizens.” “Of what faith?” Peter asked. An unpleasant silence ensued, and then the vicar finally replied: “Of your faith, your Majesty.”<sup>46</sup> Upon hearing that statement the tsar had five Basilian monks tortured to death and their corpses dumped in the river Dvina.<sup>47</sup> However, Peter’s evil plan to have Josaphat’s bones destroyed did not succeed because they were rescued in time and taken to Biała.<sup>48</sup>

After the Great Northern War ended, Josaphat’s relics remained at the Radziwiłł family’s estate in Biała. This gave rise to a dispute between the Radziwiłłs and the Basilian Fathers, who demanded the return of the archbishop’s bones. After more than two decades, in 1743, the conflict was resolved after the Vatican interceded. As a result, a Basilian monastery funded by the Radziwiłł family was established in Biała, and in 1767 Josaphat’s relics were transferred there except for some bones of the martyr’s left hand, which were given to the Basilian Fathers in Polatsk. Obviously both the Uniate Basilians and the Roman Catholic prince Karol Stanisław Radziwiłł (1734–90) and other members of his family—one of the most powerful and richest in the Commonwealth—esteemed Josaphat’s high symbolic capital. Soon after this last *translatio*, new miracles were reported.<sup>49</sup> But in the following decades, especially after the partitions of Poland, the veneration of Josaphat became limited to the Biała and Polatsk regions. Elsewhere in the lands of the former Commonwealth, veneration of the martyr vanished.

### ***The Cult of Josaphat in the Nineteenth Century***

In the course of the nineteenth century, the symbolic value of Josaphat as a militant anti-Orthodox combatant for the unity of the Catholic faith acquired a more clearly nationalistic and anti-Russian character.<sup>50</sup> As a result of the Polish partitions

<sup>46</sup> Franciszek Henryk Duchński, *Historia o pozabianiu bazilianów w połockiej cerkwi przez cara moskiewskiego etc. w roku 1705tym, dnia 30 Junia starego* (Paris, 1863), 8. This Parisian edition popularized the incident in Vitsebsk. In the second half of the nineteenth century, Paris was still an important Polish émigré centre, and the account of the exiled historian and ethnographer Duchński (1816–93) should be seen in the context of the failed Polish Insurrection of 1863–64 against the Russian Empire and of his own political and scientific views. It was just one of the Polish diaspora’s efforts to keep alive the notion of Russian Orthodoxy as the eternal enemy not only of the Polish people, but also of the Catholic faith in general. In his time Duchński, who dreamed of the rebirth of a Polish-Lithuanian-Ruthenian state, became notorious for his controversial theory about the Russians’ non-Slavic origin. For variants of the Vitsebsk incident he described, cf. Boresky, *Life of St. Josaphat*, 93; and Adolf Innerkofler, *Der erschlagene Heilige zu St. Barbara in der Postgasse: Skizze* (Vienna, 1933), 46. Presumably the version that Peter wanted to burn Josaphat’s relics is based on the August 1705 account of Metropolitan Lev Zalensky to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda; cf. V. I. Petrushko, “Mitropolit Lev Zalenskii i Uniatskaia Tserkov’ v Rechi Pospolitoi v period ego pravleniia (kommentarii v svete very)” <[www.sedmitza.ru/text/415691.html](http://www.sedmitza.ru/text/415691.html)>.

<sup>47</sup> According to Guépin, *Saint Josaphat*, 2: 430, only four monks were killed.

<sup>48</sup> For a more pro-Orthodox but academic description of the Polatsk incident, see Igor Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche*, vol. 2 (Berlin and Wiesbaden, 1991), 351.

<sup>49</sup> See Guépin, *Saint Josaphat*, 2: 462–65.

<sup>50</sup> This was not uncommon in the nineteenth century: cf. Martin Schulze-Wessel, “Einleitung: Die Nationalisierung der Religion und Sakralisierung der Nation im östlichen Europa,” in *Nation-*

and the different religious politics of the Russian and Austrian empires in their annexed former territories of the Commonwealth, an extreme difference in accepting Josaphat as a sacral resource became evident. In retrospect it is astonishing that the cult of Josaphat was strongly rejected by the majority of the Uniate population in the nineteenth-century Austrian “Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria.” Nowadays in those western Ukrainian regions, Ukrainian nationalism and the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church doubtlessly play an important role, but the cult of St. Josaphat is not a dominant component in either of them.<sup>51</sup> In Josaphat’s former archeparchy and the Biala region, where his relics were kept, one can observe a fundamentally different development. While in the nineteenth century St. Josaphat became an essential propaganda tool in the Ukrainian and Belarusian political struggle against Russian occupation and domination, today he has been practically forgotten.<sup>52</sup>

After the partitions of the Commonwealth, the reasons for acceptance (in Russian-occupied territories) or refusal (in Austrian-occupied lands) of the cult of Josaphat as both sacral and political capital were, first, the already mentioned different politics against the Catholic Church in general. For St. Petersburg the appeal to Josaphat automatically had an oppositional impact, because after the Polish Insurrections of 1830–31 and 1863–64 everything even remotely connected with the Union of Brest and the Uniate Church was part of the Polish question.<sup>53</sup> The

---

*alisierung der Religion und Sakralisierung der Nation im östlichen Europa*, ed. Martin Schulze-Wessel (Stuttgart, 2006), 7–14.

<sup>51</sup> See Chris Hann, “The Limits of Galician Syncretism: Pluralism, Multiculturalism, and the Two Catholicisms,” in *Galicia: A Multicultural Land*, ed. Chris Hann and Paul Robert Magocsi (Toronto, 2005), 211–237, here 237, n. 37. Several Greek Catholic churches in Galicia, among them St. George’s Cathedral in Lviv, have icons of St. Josaphat. Since the 1990s the Priestly Brotherhood of the Holy Martyr Josaphat, led by the excommunicated (in 2007) Ukrainian Greek Catholic priest Vasyl Kovpak, has been active in Western Ukraine. This group has strong ties to the traditionalist Society of St. Pius X, rejects the de-Latinization of the liturgy, and promotes missionary activity among the Orthodox, but remains loyal to the pope. See “Ukrainian Priest Excommunicated,” *Catholic World News*, 23 November 2007 <[www.catholicculture.org/news/features/index.cfm?recnum=54919](http://www.catholicculture.org/news/features/index.cfm?recnum=54919)>. Today even in Galicia modern Ukrainian identity is based on the assumption that the nation is composed of both Greek Catholics and Orthodox.

<sup>52</sup> This is the case especially in Polatsk, where the patron saint of Belarus, Euphrosyne (Eufrosinija) of Polatsk (1110–73), the only East Slavic virgin saint, dominates the sacral public sphere. She founded a convent, which, since its revival in the 1990s, has not encountered recruitment problems. See my article “Im Kontext von Hagiographie und nationalen Diskursen: Die Vita der Evfrosinija von Polack,” *Historische Zeitschrift*, 2007, no. 2: 311–44. After two centuries of anti-Uniate politics, Russification, and Soviet anti-religious propaganda, in Belarusian society St. Josaphat is definitely not considered *nash* (“one of ours”). For example, in the Belarusian *Wikipedia* article “Iasafat Kuntsevich” he is deemed a “Grand Lithuanian church and political activist” (<[be.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%86%D0%B0%D1%81%D0%B0%D1%84%D0%B0%D1%82\\_%D0%9A%D1%83%D0%BD%D1%86%D1%8D%D0%B2%D1%96%D1%87](http://be.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%86%D0%B0%D1%81%D0%B0%D1%84%D0%B0%D1%82_%D0%9A%D1%83%D0%BD%D1%86%D1%8D%D0%B2%D1%96%D1%87)>).

<sup>53</sup> See Theodore R. Weeks, “Between Rome and Tsargrad: The Uniate Church in Imperial Russia,” in *Of Religion and Empire: Missions, Conversion, and Tolerance in Tsarist Russia*, ed. Robert P. Geraci and Michael Khodarkovsky (Ithaca, NY, 2001), 70–91. Nevertheless, in spite of all the restrictions, the juridical status of the Roman Catholic Church did not change, as Smolitsch states in *Geschichte der russischen Kirche*, 2: 362.

“liberation” of the Ukrainian and Belarusian Uniates from the “harmful influence” of the Poles and Rome and their “reunion” (*vozsoedinenie*) with the Russian Orthodox Church became a central aim of Russian domestic policy.<sup>54</sup> At the same time the abolition of the Uniate Church in 1839 in the Russian-annexed territories—with the exception of Kholm (Chełm) Gubernia but including the so-called Western Land with the former Archeparchy of Polatsk, Vitsebsk, and Mstislaŭ—was also an element of the Russian imperial politics of structural adjustment and co-optation of new elites. Meanwhile, in Galicia the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church was used as an object of Habsburgian *divide et impera* politics and hence promoted at the expense of the Polish-dominated Roman Catholic Church in this crownland during the first years after the partitions. Later Vienna granted equality to both confessions.<sup>55</sup>

In the Habsburg Empire the veneration of Josaphat the Martyr had no anti-Austrian component and was rather unknown. When the Holy See finally approved the canonization of Josaphat in 1867, parts of the Ruthenian Greek Catholic hierarchy and the majority of their church’s believers in Galicia rejected it.<sup>56</sup>

Josaphat’s “unpopularity as a saint”<sup>57</sup> had two reasons. First, until the end of the nineteenth century the debate between the Galician Russophiles (culturally or both culturally and politically pro-Russian) and Ukrainophiles on their people’s future national orientation had not yet reached a conclusion.<sup>58</sup> Indeed, the Russophile *Slovo* (Lviv), the most widely circulated newspaper among Western Ukrainians in the 1860s, published several anti-Josaphat articles in which the martyr was called an enemy of the Byzantine rite.<sup>59</sup> Second, to many Ruthenians in Galicia the campaign for the canonization of Josaphat appeared as pro-Polish “Latin” propaganda. They viewed it thus for good reason: in the second half of the nineteenth century the revived memory of Josaphat was connected to the Poles’ failed January Insur-

<sup>54</sup> See Theodore R. Weeks, “The ‘End’ of the Uniate Church in Russia: The *Vozsoedinenie* of 1875,” *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 44 (1996): 28–40.

<sup>55</sup> See, among others, Oleh Turij, “Die griechisch-katholische Kirche und die ukrainische nationale Identität in Galizien,” in *Konfessionelle Identität und Nationsbildung: Die griechisch-katholischen Kirchen in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Hans-Christian Maner and Norbert Spannenberger (Stuttgart 2007), 41–50.

<sup>56</sup> Attitudes toward Josaphat began changing with the death of Metropolitan Hryhorii Yakhy-movych in 1863. He had pursued a *laissez faire* policy towards the virulent anti-Union tendencies of Greek Catholic priests. His successor, Spyrydon Lytvynovych, “strictly followed the instruction” of the Vatican: see Anna Veronika Wendland, *Die Russophilen in Galizien: Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Rußland 1848–1915* (Vienna, 2001), 128 and, for Lytvynovych’s policy in general, 128–31. In August 1865, together with his Roman Catholic and Armenian counterparts, Lytvynovych signed a petition to the pope in support of the canonization of Kuntsevych. The document is reproduced in Welykyj, *S. Josaphat*, 3: 277–78.

<sup>57</sup> John-Paul Himka, *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine: The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement* (Montreal and Kingston, 1999), 30.

<sup>58</sup> For the Russophiles’ impact on Ukrainian nation building in general, see Wendland, *Die Russophilen*.

<sup>59</sup> Himka, *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine*, 29.

rection of 1863–64. During that period his veneration can well be described as trans-denominational and trans-national, but in the East-Central European sense with its, at that time, fluid national identities.<sup>60</sup>

Indeed, in the case of the worship of Josaphat the agents changed. In particular the impact of Greek Catholic and Ruthenian agency clearly decreased in favour of the Roman Catholic and Polish one despite the influence of the Basilian Order.<sup>61</sup> As already mentioned in the context of Duchiniński's Parisian booklet of 1863, both émigré and native Polish patriot elites had tried to use the ineffective public outcry inside the Russian Empire in support of the Poles, and the cult of Josaphat became part of this effort to build a "Catholic International." Several months before the beginning of the January Insurrection, some future Polish insurgents gave a decisive impetus to the revival of the cult by making a pilgrimage to Josaphat's grave in Biała. There, accompanied by an impressive painting of the martyr, they declared him their patron saint.<sup>62</sup> They intended, as the Ukrainian Basilian monk Yevhen Kozanevych aptly remarked in 1902, "to awaken [*pobudyty*] the Ukrainians for their foolish [*sic!*] uprising."<sup>63</sup> For Kozanevych the spectacle at Josaphat's grave (a symbolic repetition of his proclamation as a "patron of the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania" in 1673) gave the Russians the opportunity to complete their "diabolical work" against the Uniate "poor Ukrainians." The Orthodox "schismatics" had been waiting for this for such a long time: four of the five remaining Basilian monasteries, including the one in Biała, were abolished, and "the blood of the Uniates poured forth above the earth."<sup>64</sup> In following years the

<sup>60</sup> Changes in ethnic identity were widespread not only among the Jewish population. The extended family of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky is a frequently mentioned example. As an example of a "national outsider" because of the fluidity of his self-identification as both Ukrainian and Polish, see my article "'Ein Ukrainer polnischer Kultur': Mykola Hankevych (1869–1931) und die Sozialdemokratie Galiziens vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg. Zur Problematik des 'nationalen Außenseiters,'" in *Identitätenwandel und nationale Mobilisierung in Regionen ethnischer Diversität: Ein regionaler Vergleich zwischen Westpreußen und Galizien am Ende des 19. und Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Michael Müller and Ralph Schattkowsky (Marburg, 2004), 89–111.

<sup>61</sup> After the Basilian Order was placed under Jesuit tutelage in 1882 and reformed, the cult of St. Josaphat might have grown. In the second half of the nineteenth century the Galician Ukrainian public discussed the allegedly too great Jesuit (and therefore also Polish) influence on the Basilians. Even the later bishop and metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky, who entered the Basilian monastery in Dobromyl in 1888 and graduated from the Jesuit seminary in Cracow, was considered too Polish for a long time. See John-Paul Himka, "Sheptytsky and the Ukrainian National Movement before 1914," in *The Life and Times of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky*, ed. Paul Robert Magocsi (Edmonton, 1989), 29–34.

<sup>62</sup> Demetrius E. Wysochansky, *St. Josaphat: Apostle of Church Unity* (Detroit, 1987), 304–305.

<sup>63</sup> Kozanevych, *Zhyttia Sviatoho Velykomuchenyka Iosafata*, 154. Some Ukrainian intellectuals, especially in Right-Bank Ukraine, where the majority of the peasantry had become Uniate only in the eighteenth century but had reconverted to Orthodoxy after the Partitions of Poland, had already supported the earlier Polish Insurrection of 1830–31. See Weeks, "Between Rome and Tsargrad," 73; and Jarosław Hrycak [Yaroslav Hrytsak], *Historia Ukrainy, 1772–1999: Narodziny nowoczesnego narodu*, trans. Katarzyna Kotyńska (Lublin, 2000), 83–84.

<sup>64</sup> Kozanevych, *Zhyttia Sviatoho Velykomuchenyka Iosafata*, 154.

tsarist regime's persecution of the Uniate Church and its faithful was severe,<sup>65</sup> culminating in the abolition of the church's last remaining eparchy in the Russian Empire—Kholm—in 1875.

But these and other measures were not the consequence of deliberate anti-Ukrainian actions. They were more the result of the anti-Polish measures by Russian agents, whose conceptions of identity excluded both Catholic Russians and a distinct Ukrainian nationality. As in many other cases, the Ems Ukase was a “precipitous and unexpected incident ... unplanned and uncoordinated ... combined with brutal repressions, having the final effect of aggravating and alienating all concerned.”<sup>66</sup> On the one hand, from the Russian perspective the contribution of the cult of Josaphat, which Polish aristocrats had so decisively revived, must be judged as rather insignificant. On the other hand, the Poles' energetic use of Josaphat's anti-Orthodox and anti-Russian “qualities” can be interpreted as one of the last attempts to use the Ruthenians' not yet finished nation-building process for their own inclusive national purposes in the sense of *Gente Ruthenus, Nazione Polonus*.<sup>67</sup> However, in the middle of the nineteenth century the pro-Polish option was no longer attractive for most Galician Ruthenians.<sup>68</sup> For one late nineteenth-century Ruthenian activist in Galicia, the popularization of the cult of St. Josaphat was just a means of Polonization; for him, remembering Josaphat went hand in hand with the Polish effort to make Ruthenians “forget about Bohdan Khmelnytsky.”<sup>69</sup>

Polatsk, the city where Josaphat's activities were centred, is a good example of how inner-denominational communication among the Orthodox faithful was strengthened by the trans-confessional and trans-religious competition “between saints.” Polatsk became part of the Russian Empire with the first Partition of Poland in 1772, but until the 1830s Russian authorities showed no interest in strengthening Orthodoxy there. The “Polish problem”—the November Insurrection of 1830–31—was the impetus for the change in tsarist policy that resulted in the

<sup>65</sup> The 1863 Valuev Circular, which prohibited the publication of religious and school literature in Ukrainian, and the 1876 Ems Ukase, which banned all publications in Ukrainian except reprints of historical sources, were the twin apogees of tsarist Russification efforts. See Alexei Miller, *The Ukrainian Question: The Russian Empire and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century* (Budapest and New York, 2003).

<sup>66</sup> Weeks, “The ‘End’ of the Uniate Church in Russia,” 39.

<sup>67</sup> In the case of the Polish peasantry this appropriation was quite successful. In the case of Galicia, see Kai Struve, *Bauern und Nation in Galizien: Über nationale Zugehörigkeit und soziale Emanzipation im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 2005).

<sup>68</sup> The Galician Ruthenians' widespread use of the Latin alphabet until the 1850s is telling about this pro-Polish option. See Alexej Miller and Oksana Ostapčuk, “The Latin and the Cyrillic Alphabets in Ukrainian National Discourse and in the Language Policy of Empires,” in *A Laboratory of Transnational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography*, ed. Georgiy Kasianov and Philipp Ther (Budapest, 2009), 167–210. On Ruthenian nation building in Galicia in this period, see Jan Kozik, *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia, 1815–1849* (Edmonton, 1986).

<sup>69</sup> M. Z. [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi?], “Shanuimo svoiu ridnu movu!” *Dilo*, 1898, no. 219 (2 [14 October]): 1–2.

dissolution of the Uniate Church in the empire in 1839. At that time the majority of Polatsk's inhabitants were not Orthodox.<sup>70</sup> In order to mark their sacral space as Orthodox and with the support of the faithful population, in 1832 the city's local Orthodox clergy requested, for the first time, that the relics of their local saint—*aforementioned Euphrosyne*—be returned from the Kyivan Caves Laura. For decades the tsar, the Russian Most Holy Synod, and the metropolitan bishop of Kyiv rejected that request because most of Polatsk's inhabitants were not Orthodox or not even Christian, so that an Orthodox saint's relics would be out of place there. The elevation of Josaphat in status to a holy martyr of the Catholic Church in 1867 should have changed their minds,<sup>71</sup> but it was only in 1910 that St. Euphrosyne's relics "came home."<sup>72</sup> Now and then, it seems, the empire's periphery could influence political decisions taken in the metropole. In any case, the concerted actions in favour of St. Euphrosyne—and against St. Josaphat—strengthened the shaping of a collective Orthodox identity in Polatsk.

The already mentioned "Catholic International" was a special form of the trans-confessional and transnational use of the admiration of Josaphat, and it should be described briefly in the context of his canonization process. The organization's main agents at that time were Pope Pius IX, the Basilian Santa Maria Monastery in Grottaferrata, Italy, the exiled Polish Basilian monk Michał Dombrowski, and a number of exiled Polish magnates.<sup>73</sup> From the eighteenth century, and especially after 1839, Josaphat had developed into "a personified connecting link" between the Latin-rite and Ruthenian Uniate branches of the Catholic Church and was the accepted martyr for the church union.<sup>74</sup> From the late 1840s the first concrete but still unsuccessful plan for the resumption of his forgotten *causa* circulated among

<sup>70</sup> Rohdewald, "Vom Polacker Venedig," 347–48. In 1820, 43 per cent of the city's population was Jewish, 31 per cent was Orthodox, 16 per cent was Greek Catholic, and 10 per cent was Roman Catholic. By the mid-nineteenth century the majority of the city's inhabitants were Jewish; in 1863, 66 per cent were; and in 1897, 67 per cent. Polatsk's Orthodox population remained a minority: 24 per cent in 1863 and 27.5 per cent in 1897.

<sup>71</sup> The debate is described in detail in *ibid.*, 483–90. Directly after Josaphat's canonization in 1867, the SS. Nicholas and Euphrosyne Orthodox Brotherhood came into being, and it developed into a pressure group for the transfer of the Orthodox saint from Kyiv to Polatsk. See *ibid.*, 411–18.

<sup>72</sup> See Jobst, "Im Kontext von Hagiographie," 336–37. For the scenario of Orthodox power in the predominantly Jewish city, see also the contemporary report "Perenesenie sviatykh moshchei Prepodobnoi Evfrosinii iz Kiieva v Polotsk (po rasskazam ochevidtsev)," in *Prepodobnaia Evfrosiniia: Igumeniia Polotskaia. Zhittie i akafist*, ed. Aleksandr Veinik (Minsk, 2000), 37–124.

<sup>73</sup> The intra-Vatican discussions of Josaphat's *causa* have been best described in Stefan Samerski's "Wie im Himmel, so auf Erden? Selig- und Heiligsprechung in der katholischen Kirche, 1740–1870," *Münchener kirchenhistorische Studien* 10 (2002): 138–56.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 141. Since then the Vatican has repeatedly stressed the role of St. Josaphat as a mediator between the Latin and Byzantine rites. Cf. "On St. Josaphat," Pope Pius XI's encyclical of 12 November 1923 <[papalencyclicals.net/Pius11/P11ECCLE.HTM](http://papalencyclicals.net/Pius11/P11ECCLE.HTM)>. On the occasion of the 1,600th anniversary of St. Basil the Great's death, Pope John Paul II declared Saint Josaphat the "apostle of the union" in his 14 February 1980 address to the Basilian Order; see <[vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_paul\\_ii/speeches/1980/february/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_spe\\_19800214\\_monaci-sangiosafat\\_it.html](http://vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1980/february/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19800214_monaci-sangiosafat_it.html)>.

the Basilian Fathers in Grottaferrata.<sup>75</sup> In 1862 Dombrowski made the next attempt, which in the context of the persecution of the Uniate Church in the Russian Empire and the Polish Insurrection finally gained the pope's ear. In 1864 more important supporters of resuming the *causa*, among them exiled members of the Sapieha, Czartoryski, Zamoyski, and Rzewuski noble families, announced a petition to the pope.<sup>76</sup>

Given the significance that St. Josaphat has in Western Ukraine today, Galicia's Greek Catholics surprisingly played a minor role in his canonization. Apparently Rome was aware of that and therefore appointed the Galician bishop (later metropolitan) Yosyf Sembratovych (1821–1900) the so-called third postulator.<sup>77</sup> In Galicia itself the interest of the Greek Catholic faithful in Josaphat's *causa* was extremely low, and the fundraising efforts necessary to achieve it had little success. After the end of the procedure in July 1867, St. Josaphat was celebrated in Lviv with the participation of the papal nuncio Mariano Falcinelli Antoniacci and "believers of all three rites" (Latin, Greek, and Armenian). In the Russian Empire, however, no official celebrations were allowed.<sup>78</sup>

There were many reasons why Josaphat Kuntsevych's *causa* was an unusually quick process. Among them were the Polish Insurrection of 1863–64 and the victorious Italian Risorgimento, which resulted in a "besieged fortress mentality" within the Vatican.<sup>79</sup> In addition, the pope claimed the leadership of Christendom and presented Josaphat the Holy Martyr as a believer in papal primacy.<sup>80</sup> Finally, for the Ruthenian Greek Catholics St. Josaphat could help to point to their co-religionists' suffering in the Russian Empire. In any case, the "exploitation of Josaphat's martyrdom had many faces."<sup>81</sup> Undoubtedly the anti-Orthodox and anti-Russian ones dominated.<sup>82</sup>

### ***Conclusion and Prospect***

In the decades that followed, the scenario of public "rescues" of St. Josaphat's relics proved to be both a sacral and a secular resource that was used against the Russian "Orthodox schismatics" and—after the dissolution of the Russian Empire—the "godless" of the Soviet Union. The Russian side always recognized the saint's "danger" to its own concept of identity; for example, in 1873, in the run-up to the abolition of the Uniate Church in Kholm Eparchy, his relics were with-

<sup>75</sup> Presumably the Vatican did not want to risk its 1847 concordat with Russia.

<sup>76</sup> Kozanevych stresses that the signatories were "descendants of the former admirers of St. Josaphat" (*Zhyttia Sviatoho Velykomuchenyka Iosafata*, 155).

<sup>77</sup> Samerski, "Wie im Himmel, so auf Erden?" 151–52.

<sup>78</sup> Kozanevych, *Zhyttia Sviatoho Velykomuchenyka Iosafata*, 59. He points out the participation of members of the Armenian Catholic Church, the centre of which had historically been in Galicia.

<sup>79</sup> See Samerski, "Wie im Himmel, so auf Erden?" 154.

<sup>80</sup> For Samerski this is a rather in appropriate attempt. See *ibid.*, 146–47.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 156.

<sup>82</sup> From 1866 until 1894 Russia and the Vatican did not maintain diplomatic relations. See Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche*, 2: 362–63.

drawn so that they could not be publically venerated.<sup>83</sup> Until 1917, when they were “rescued” once more, the relics were immured in the Basilian monastery in Biała Podlaska. When Austro-Hungarian troops occupied the town during that year, Vienna ordered the relics’ *translatio* for “religious and state reasons” to St. Barbara’s Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in the Austrian capital.<sup>84</sup> While the Habsburg government wanted to strengthen its role as protector of all Catholic denominations, it intended to improve its relations—severely disturbed during the Great War—with the empire’s Ukrainian inhabitants.<sup>85</sup> Obviously unaware of St. Josaphat’s low popularity among the Ukrainians of Galicia nearly forty years after his canonization,<sup>86</sup> the Austrian authorities planned to put “these relics into the centre of a politically highly significant Ruthenian Jasna Góra,”<sup>87</sup> following the example of the famous Polish Catholic Jasna Góra Monastery in Częstochowa. The authorities also erred in their supposition that the Polish Catholic majority in Biała had no interest in Josaphat’s relics. Although the *translatio* had been planned in great detail, the town’s Roman Catholic and Jewish inhabitants were opposed to it. A Habsburg diplomat had no other explanation but that the Jewish denizens expected profit “from the development of the town as a place of pilgrimage.”<sup>88</sup> Just as well, however, this could have indicated that Biała’s Jews admired Josaphat—which could have been an example of his trans-religious veneration. What motivated the Roman Catholics to oppose the transfer of Josaphat’s relics? Was it simply an example of a trans-denominational, emotional connection to a local saint, or, rather, an act of resistance to the occupying power?

At present, numerous aspects of the cult of St. Josaphat and its political exploitation after the transfer of his relics to St. Barbara’s Church in Vienna, where they were kept up to their more recent “rescue” (from the Soviet military occupation) and transfer to the Vatican in 1949, have mostly remained uninvestigated. So have other questions. For example, when did formerly unpopular St. Josaphat become a

<sup>83</sup> See Wysochansky, *St. Josaphat*, 305.

<sup>84</sup> See K.u.k. Legationsrath L. Andrian to Foreign Minister Burián, 17 January 1916, in Theophil Hornykiewicz [Teofil’ Hornykevych], ed., *Ereignisse in der Ukraine, 1914–1922, deren Bedeutung und historische Hintergründe*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia, 1967), 396–97.

<sup>85</sup> After the outbreak of the First World War in the late summer of 1914, the Austro-Hungarian imperial authorities arrested many real and alleged Russophiles and deported them to the notorious Thalerhof concentration camp in Styria. These repressions alienated the hitherto great number of pro-Austrian Galician Ukrainians. For a contemporary Russophile account, see *Talerhofskii al'manakh: Propamiatnaia kniga avstriiskikh zhestokostei, izuverstv i nasilii nad karpatorusskim narodom vo vremia vsemirnoi voiny 1914–1917 gg.*, 4 vols. (Lviv, 1924–32).

<sup>86</sup> Conversions of Greek Catholic Ruthenians to Orthodoxy were already a contemporary current phenomenon in the nineteenth-century Galicia. See, e.g., Jarosław Moklak, *Lemkowszczyzna w Drugiej Rzeczypospolitej: Zagadnienia polityczne i wyznaniowe* (Cracow, 1997), 17–44. In 1910 some newly converted Orthodox demanded a new (Orthodox) patron for their church instead of St. Josaphat; see Wendland, *Die Russophilen in Galizien*, 500. Apparently the believers in Sokal County knew perfectly well that this saint had been an enemy of Orthodoxy.

<sup>87</sup> Andrian to Burián, in Hornykiewicz, ed., *Ereignisse in der Ukraine*, 397.

<sup>88</sup> Masirevich to Burián, 6 March, 1916, in *ibid.*, 402–403.

positive hero for the Ukrainians in what had formerly been called Galicia because of his anti-Orthodox shaping or the growing popularity of the Greek Catholic Church after the end the Soviet Union? Or when and to what extent had he “disappeared” in the collective memory of the inhabitants in the former places of his veneration? Likewise, one cannot answer whether the Nazis politically exploited this saint after 1938<sup>89</sup> or how popular his cult was in Galicia during the years of Soviet persecution.

Currently St. Josaphat’s relics are preserved in the altar of St. Basil in St. Peter’s Basilica in the Vatican. This emphatically underlines the saint’s significance as a martyr of the entire Catholic Church. In a parallel process, St. Josaphat was largely “nationalized” in the late twentieth century and became a symbol of the Basilian form of Greek Catholicism.<sup>90</sup> His relevance as a transnational and trans-denominational saint even today is the result of his being a patron saint not only for Ukrainian Catholics in North America or Brazil, but also for a number of Polish Roman Catholic parishes in the United States, most notably the Basilica of St. Josaphat in Milwaukee and St Josaphat’s Parish in Chicago, Illinois. One of his relics is also on display in the “catacombs” of the Holy Trinity Polish Mission in Chicago, and even in Poland today Josaphat is the patron saint of some Roman Catholic churches.<sup>91</sup>

In spite of all the caesurae in his trans-epochal, trans-spatial, trans-denominational, and trans-national veneration and of his varied political exploitation, St. Josaphat continues to play a special and interesting role in the pantheon of Christian saints.

---

<sup>89</sup> For the background to the “kidnapping” of the relics from St. Barbara’s Church in the Viennese district that was administered by all four occupying powers, see Wysochansky, *St. Josaphat*, 312; he assumes that it was a joint action of the Vatican and a U.S. Army chaplain. Attempts by Nazis in Austria to use Josaphat for their purposes are described in Innerkofler, *Der erschlagene Heilige zu St. Barbara*.

<sup>90</sup> An indication of this is Welykyj’s great project, *S. Josaphat – Hieromartyr*, 3 vols. (1952–67).

<sup>91</sup> For example, in Warsaw’s Wola district.

## Contributors

**MARTHA BOHACHEVSKY-CHOMIAK** had a long teaching career at several American universities, notably Manhattanville College (1968–86) and George Washington University (1985–2000), before serving as the first Fulbright Ukraine Program director in Kyiv (1999–2006). She is the author of *The Spring of a Nation: The Ukrainians in Eastern Galicia in 1848* (1967), *Sergei N. Trubetskoi: An Intellectual among the Intelligentsia in Prerevolutionary Russia* (1976), *Feminists Despite Themselves: Women in Ukrainian Community Life, 1884–1939* (1988), *Duma Ukraïny – zhinochoho rodu* (1993), *Political Communities and Gendered Ideologies in Contemporary Ukraine* (1994), and many articles about the history of women, feminism, and the women’s movement in Ukraine. The focus of her current research is the history of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States.

**TOBIAS GRILL** is a research associate of the Graduate School of East and Southeast European Studies of the History Seminar at Ludwigs-Maximilians University in Munich. A specialist on the modern history of East European Jewry, his publications include “Odessa’s German Rabbi: The Paradigmatic Meaning of Simon Leon Schwabacher (1861–1888),” *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts* 2 (2003): 199–222, “The Politicisation of Traditional Polish Jewry: Orthodox German Rabbis and the Founding of *Agudas Ho-Ortodoksim* and *Dos yidishe vort* in Gouvernement-General Warsaw, 1916–18,” *East European Jewish Affairs* 39, no. 2 (2009): 227–47, and *Der Westen im Osten: Deutsches Judentum und jüdische Bildungsreform in Osteuropa (1783–1939)* (2013).

**LILIANA HENTOSH** is a senior research associate of the Institute for Historical Research at Lviv National University. She is the author of *Vatykan ta vyklyky modernosti: Skhidnoievropeis'ka polityka papy Benedykta XV ta ukrains'ko-pol'skyi konflikt v Halychyni v 1914–1923 rr.* (2006) and articles about Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky, the transformations of Lviv’s public space, and inter-denominational and inter-ethnic relations in twentieth-century Lviv.

**LEONID HERETZ** is a professor of history at Bridgewater State College, Massachusetts. He is the author of *Russia on the Eve of Modernity: Popular Religion and Traditional Culture under the Last Tsars* (2008), and the translator of *Mykhailo Hrushevsky’s History of Ukraine-Rus’, vol. 6, Economic, Cultural, and National Life in the Fourteenth to Seventeenth Centuries* (2012).

**KERSTIN S. JOBST** is the professor of societies and cultures of memory at the University of Vienna’s Institute of East European History. She is the author of *Zwischen Internationalismus und Nationalismus: Die polnische und die ukrainische Sozialdemokratie in Galizien von 1890 bis 1914. Ein Beitrag zur Nationalitätenfrage*

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 Narodnoi 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 Plokhyy), 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.