

HISTORY



NORBERT MORAWIEC

Jan Długosz University in Czestochowa

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5025-5528> * n.morawiec@ajd.czest.pl

Received: 21 Oct 2021; Reviewed: 25 Nov 2021; Accepted: 20 Dec 2021

(DE) CONSTRUCTING SANCTITY. JOZAPHAT KUNTSEVYCH AND THE “REVERSED” HISTORIOGRAPHY OF JOSIF SEMASHKO

Abstract

The article presents the phenomenon of “reversed” interpretation of Jozaphat Kuntsevych’s martyrdom in the writings of a Uniate hierarch, Iosif Semashko. The article conducts an analysis of epistemologically understood metaphors created by him before and after his conversion to Orthodoxy.

Keywords: Iosif Semashko, Josaphat Kuntsevych, Uniate Church, Orthodox Church, historiography

(DE)KONSTRUKCJE ŚWIĘTOŚCI. JOZAFAT KUNCEWICZ A „ODWRÓCONA” HISTORIOGRAFIA JÓZEFA SIEMASZKI

Abstrakt

Artykuł ukazuje zjawisko „odwrócenia” interpretacji męczeńskiej śmierci Jozafata Kuncewicza w dziejopisarstwie unickiego hierarchy Józefa Siemaszki. Analizie poddane zostały kreowane przez niego epistemologicznie rozumiane metafory (przed i po jego przejściu na prawosławie).

Słowa kluczowe: Józef Siemaszko, Jozafat Kuncewicz, Kościół unicki, Cerkiew prawosławna, historiografia

INTRODUCTION

The topic of this article results from the authors interest related to the historiographic images of the life and martyrdom of St Josaphat Kuntsevych (1580-1623) (Żychiewicz 1986). For the Uniate (Greek Catholic) community he became the model of religious heroism, as researchers stressed that his martyr’s death in 1623 defined the identity of the Uniates, separating them from both the Orthodox and the

Russians, or “Muscovites” (Kołbuk 2013; Kempa 2005). Basilian monks in particular became advocates of his cult (Wereda 2009), proclaimed him a patron of the Rus’, took care of his relics, wrote scholarly treatises about him (Susza 1665), above all else strove for his beatification (1642) and canonization, which came 225 years later. No wonder then that, over the subsequent centuries, the cult of the martyr became inconvenient to the Russian-Orthodox state and church decision makers. Already during the Great Northern War, the destruction of his relics was announced by Peter I. Throughout the subsequent decades, persecution intensified in everything related to the cult of the saint (in particular after the partition of Poland, when the need for political and religious unification of the Russian state arose) (Himka 1999). What is interesting to a historian of historiography is the Russian-Orthodox anti-Kuntsevych historiography created in that period. While analysing the works of historians related to the Chief Procurator’s office, the so-called scholarly monks and secular academics from theological schools, it seemed a necessity to describe the topic of Kuntsevych in the works of the scholars gathered around the so-called “west Russian” idea (Tichomirow 2009), particularly its main architect Iosif Semashko (Morawiec 2018). It will be shown in the article that the phenomenon – can be found in his narrations – of the “reversed” historiographic interpretation. To do so, studies of the – epistemologically understood – historical metaphor will be referred to. An interest will be taken in isolating the cultural matrix – related to the environment of Semashko’s activities – as well as the individual “view of the world and man” founding the specific categories metaphorising his writings (more in: Pomorski 2004). A search will be made for a broader macro-metaphor delineating all his reflections, as well as operational metaphors pertaining to the process of history “taking place” (object metaphor) and the “agents of change”, or the creators, actors of history (subject metaphor) (more in: Stobiecki 1998). Understanding this “view of the world and man” of Semashko was made considerably more difficult by interpretative discrepancies found in the academic literature about him.

1. SEMASHKO: A HIERARCH

To begin with considerations will be made by outlining some of the most important facts regarding the hierarch’s life and activities. Iosif Semashko (1798-1868) was born into the family of a Uniate priest. In 1822 he became an assistant at the 2nd department of the Roman Catholic College in Petersburg and already in 1827 created the “Memorandum...”, submitted to Nicholas I, containing a plan for the Uniate Church’s transition into the fold of the Orthodox Church. Many years later it was published in the *Notes of Yosyf, Metropolitan of Lithuania...* along with other meticulously collected materials pertaining to Semashko’s “unification” activities (writings, instructions, decrees of the Lithuanian Spiritual Consistory, and confidential letters). Among them the treatise “An essay on Orthodoxy in Eastern Churches...” (Семашко 1883) can be found, an expanded and more scholarly version of the “Memorandum...”, attesting to

a broader research carried out by the hierarch (Шеретюк 2016). The “Memorandum...”, to the contrary, gave decision-makers an outline of specific unification activities, which was endorsed and implemented. Already in 1829 Semashko was consecrated bishop of Mstsislaw and in April 1833 he took over the diocese of Lithuania. In February 1839 he formed a synod in Polotsk, where the “act of consignment” was presented explaining the unification of the Uniates with the Russian Orthodox Church. A month later in Petersburg, the so-called “Act of Unification” was adopted. Semashko was appointed Orthodox archbishop of Lithuania in Vilnius, promoted to a metropolitan and, until the end of his life, promoted his “unification” work striving to “purify” – then former – uniates from Latin influences (Киприанович 1897).

2. ORTHODOX OR UNIATE?

Considering Semashko’s achievements, the fact that all of his biographies were written in the context of his “unification” work is not surprising. It has a sizeable, yet interpretatively diverse scholarly literature, which is largely because its authors viewed Semashko in the context of their own national and denominational allegiances. Therefore, they saw him as the “liberator of the Russian-Orthodox people from lordly and Jesuit bondage” or a renegade convert, a shepherd forcing a foreign faith on lay people to attain material benefits and Church positions (Власюк 2014, 35). While the newest historiography also shows some interest in the hierarch, his biographers wished to reject the earlier interpretative patterns, imposed by their predecessors. Reading these studies reveals Semashko as a certain cultural construct. Discussing his youth, authors mentioned his Orthodox spiritual guide (Ivan Bochkovskij), the hierarch’s conceiving of converting to Orthodoxy (1824) or taking Orthodox monastic vows after entering the Alexander Nevsky Lavra (1827), yet they also wrote about his fascination with “Western” culture, particularly its literature. Jarosław Charkiewicz stressed the fact that Semashko received an excellent education, spoke several languages, whereas examining his character traits, Charkiewicz saw in him as a peculiar symbiosis of Eastern and Western elements, with a predominance of the latter. “On the one hand,” he wrote, “he was characterised by punctuality, thoroughness, and consistency in carrying out his goals. On the other, he believed that Russian culture was not worse than Western culture, playing a significant role in Europe” (Charkiewicz 2013, 122). We shall not find this attitude unusual if we analyse the early period of Semashko’s life, the Vilnius period, during which the future hierarch was steeped in the multi-cultural peculiarity of the region, but also when we realise the culture clash he had to experience when he arrived in Petersburg. This “symbiosis” clearly involved the denominational context as well. Still as a student of the Latin-Uniate Main Seminar in Vilnius, he absorbed the anti-papal and Josephine spirit that was propagated by some lecturers (Rev. Andrzej Kłagiewicz, Ludwik A. Capelli). After all, the discussion about Febronianism and Gallicanism, the need to create national Churches and the subordination of all religious life to the state

was still very much alive. These questions were crucial to the Uniate clergy who, after the Partition of Poland, suddenly found itself within a state which was hostile to them. Dorota Wereda used the example of the Metropolitan Herakliusz Lisowski (1734-1801) to show how much interested the Uniate clergy were in finding a way out of the difficult situation. They also hoped to demonstrate their usefulness to the Russian state (e.g., in education), thought about proposing an Orthodox – this time – act of union (the reverse of the Union of Brest), but they did not reject the plans of directly converting to the Orthodoxy either. Supposedly Semashko borrowed his “unification” plan from the notes he found in the collegiate archives, authored by Lisowski in the early 19th century. However, Charkiewicz wrote that Semashko preferred action rather than theoretical deliberations (Charkiewicz 2013, 122).

Historians also discussed Semashko’s involvement in the origin of the so-called “act of unification” (1839) in Polotsk (Łatyszczek 1994, 81; broader in Романчук 2018). The works of modern day researchers make it possible to notice a “hidden mechanism” – still being studied and discovered – which governed the Russian state and its denominational policy. The Uniate question resulted from the changing directives coming from a number of Russian decision-makers: the ruler as well as the officials of the Ministry of Public Education (Department of Foreign Denominations), the Chief Procurator and members of the Holy Synod, Church hierarchy, and local governor-generals. All this needs to be combined with the relations between the above-mentioned entities and the Catholics: Uniate hierarchs, Latin clergy, Rome and its dignitaries, but also the landed nobility as protectors of churches. The conflict among the Uniates themselves, between the lay clergy and Basilian monks, was an important factor (Коломийцев 2010, 163-164), the understanding of which seems crucial when considered.

3. “UNIFICATION”

Before it is presented, however, it is worth mentioning one more issue. Semashko’s “unification” plan was not the only one: each of the above entities had its own version of it. It could take the form of an act of conversion – endorsed and inspired by the Orthodox hierarchs carrying out a mission to the Uniates – or an official decree, which was to be enforced by the army. A sample of the latter can be seen in the “unification” by Catherine II, carried out in 1794 through an official decree (with the acceptance and yet scarcely any involvement of the Orthodox hierarchs). Only in 1794-1795 more than 200.000 Uniates were incorporated into the Orthodox Church (Боярчук 2012, 267). The unification itself entailed incorporating the laity into the Orthodoxy, while the Uniate priest in the parish was replaced with an esteemed Russian one. Note that the Uniate priest lost both his parish and his only source of income. It is known that the unification work continued with even greater impetus during the reign of Nicholas I. In 1833-1835, the “Orthodox unification” was led by the Bishop of Polotsk Smaragd (Kryzhanovskij)

(1796-1863). The hierarch was accused, however, that the action of “immediate” conversion of the Uniates that he undertook led to an increase of social unrest in the territories under his control, he also supposedly acted wilfully, without the approval of the Holy Synod (that is, state officials) (Кедров 1887, 46; Федоров 1996, 64). Only thanks to the diplomatic action by Semashko did the state decision-makers allow the Uniate version of “unification” to begin. It was meant as a voluntary “return” of the Uniate clergy to the Orthodoxy, carried out by the inspiration of the higher Uniate hierarchs, and preceded by a long-term period of “purification”, i.e. elimination of all Latin elements from the Uniate Church (Skinner 2016, 257-258). As observed by Irena Matus, Semashko, who understood the peculiarities of the “West Russian” territories, strove to avoid inter-denominational tension and violence, and asked the same of the spiritual and secular authorities. He knew how important was the secret nature of the work (due to the expected reaction of the pope and landed nobility) and winning over Uniate priests, for he viewed the “Orthodoxy of the nation” as dependent on the “Orthodoxy of its shepherds” (Matus 2015, 44). This level was difficult to attain in a short period of time. The Russian decision-makers of the time who observed the Uniate clergy realised that: 1) due to Latinisation, both the clergy and the laity were not necessarily familiar with the specifics of the Eastern rite; 2) the clergy was dependent on land-owning nobility, which simultaneously undermined their authority. Furthermore, Uniate priests – to make them easier to control – were often purposefully deprived of education; 3) there was a strong “Polish and Latin” spirit in these territories, borne by the nobility and Catholic clergy (Романчук 2021). While point two involved the clergy acting too submissively towards the Polish nobility, points one and three allegedly resulted from the conscious policy of the Basilian monks, who were contaminated with Latinism. Therefore, they were declared the main obstacle to “unification” and, due to their special protection from Rome, were perceived as a foreign force, dangerous to the Orthodoxy and Russia. Often recruited from Roman Catholic Poles, Basilians allegedly sought the Latinisation and Polonisation of the Uniate Church, simultaneously – as they held the monopoly on Church positions – striving to decrease the importance of the “white”, parish clergy. They knew the latter had to be guaranteed parish income, but not necessarily education.

4. BASILIAN MONKS

Examining the denominational situation of the so-called “Western Russian” territories at the time makes it easy to understand the concerns of Orthodox Russians over the still numerous Basilian monks. In the 18th century they still enjoyed considerable prestige – in spite of the fact that hierarchs originating from among them could not join the Senate, as shown by Wereda (2013) – but most of all a certain charisma, based on historiosophical reflection. It is worth examining this reflection closer. It arose on the pages of works involved in the Catholic–Orthodox

religious polemics following the establishment of the Act of Brest (Сінкевич 2013). In the works by Hipacy Pociiej, Leon Kreuzu-Rzewuski (d. 1639), Joachim Morochoowski, Ignacy Kulczyński, and Ignacy Stebelski, the Union of Brest was not a single act established by state and church decision-makers, but rather a return of the Ruthenian Church to its “sources”, to the original church unity, which was also present in Vladimir’s act of baptism, the unity cyclically recalled in the acts of union, including the Union of Florence and the Union of Brest (Шевченко 2018, 227-237). For the Basilian scholars, the denominational conflict which ensued after 1596 took place not between the Orthodox and the Uniates, but rather between informed Catholics (i.e., Latins and Uniates) and uninformed ones (i.e., Orthodox). Those who remained Orthodox were mostly victims of insufficient information, while a theologically founded historical reflection was expected to help eliminate all “divisions” and “differences” from thinking. The view of history conveyed an easily understood message: there was one Church; the “schism” has always sought to pull the unity apart (metaphor of Orthodoxisation). Despite “schismatic propaganda”, Ruthenians cultivated their Latin, Catholic roots throughout the centuries (which was perfectly illustrated by the adoption of the acts of Florence and Brest) (metaphor of the Catholic Ruthenians), the state of the original church unity was the set goal which could only be achieved by the universalisation of the Church (i.e., Latinisation of the Eastern Rite) (macro-metaphor of unity) (Старостенко 2014, 429). These views were also meant to convey a certain message to the decision-makers of the Polish-Lithuanian state. According to monks-historians, the two-rite Catholic unity guaranteed religious peace in the Commonwealth. The Uniates – unlike the Orthodox schismatics-Disuniates, with their eyes fixed on Moscow, constantly inciting social uprisings – contributed to the stabilisation of the state. Whereas the Basilians were meant to be the proponents and guardians of this unity. We can therefore outline a certain metaphorological resource to illustrate the scholarly narrations of the Basilians, namely: the macro-metaphor of “unity” and operational metaphors: the metaphor of “Orthodoxisation” related to the “taking place” of history (object metaphor) and the metaphor of “Catholic Ruthenians” pertaining to “agents of change”, or creators, actors of history (subject metaphor).

The fall of the Commonwealth gave rise to a peculiar situation. Even though the local administration, created according to Russian norms, was strictly subordinated to the central government, the local nobility retained all its previous rights and privileges, as long as they did not contradict the Russian ones (Lithuanian Statute) (Оржеховский and Теплова 2001, 80). Thus, the nobility defended its rights and, having the right of patronage over Uniate churches, interfered with the status of the laity and the clergy. Basilian monks still had many schools and, owing to the state-of-the-art education programme at the time – additionally supported by the metaphorological resource shown above – held a great deal of influence over the Catholic (of both rites) and Orthodox youth (Кривошея 2009, 177; Шкраб’юк 2007, 18; Pidłypczak-Majerowicz 2012). The wealth of the Basilian monks must have been

particularly irritating to the Russian state and Church decision-makers, even more so that the Orthodox clergy was divested of it already during the reign of Catherine II. The order (its 600 members) had at their disposal 11,435 serf “souls” in Lithuania and a wealth of almost 858.152 roubles (Кедров 1887, 33). Thus, the decision-makers sought the best solution to the problem. Already the late reign of Alexander I was marked by the conflict between the pro-Catholic and pro-Orthodox “parties” of officials, the Basilians and lay clergy, Archbishop of Polotsk Jan Krassowski and Metropolitan Josafat Bulhak. It was during the church trial of the pro-Moscow and pro-Orthodox Krassowski, opponent of the Basilian influence – at the end of which the archbishop was removed from his position – Semashko gained a lot of attention with his fierce enmity towards the Uniate monks who, in the understanding of the Russian decision-makers were a conservative, pro-Catholic, and pro-Polish element (СМОЛИЧ 1996, 334). This enmity was also clear in the “Memorandum”; what is more, the decision-makers were instructed on specific actions leading to a crackdown on the Basilians. Semashko proposed acting in secret, without haste, first of all leading to the closure of the Basilian monasteries, then theological schools should move in and be endowed with monastery means. The monks should be constantly moved to various monasteries, subordinated to a bishop, above all young men must be forbidden from joining the order (Кедров 1887, 33). At Semashko’s insistence, the position of a procurator permanently residing in Rome, who tied the order to the Holy See, was abolished (Павлюк 2011, 154). After the November Uprising, the Basilians were accused of anti-Russian activities. A large number of their monasteries were closed or handed over to the Orthodox for having supported the insurgents, whereas a Greek–Uniate college was given control over the education of the monks. Basilian schools were closed, the use of liturgical books which were not printed in Russia was forbidden, the Catholic feasts were abolished: Corpus Christi and – above all – of Josaphat Kuntsevych (Павлюк 2011, 155). The struggle against the heritage related to the Basilian–martyr as an icon of the Union became the main “unification” task.

5. THE FACES OF KUNTSEVYCH

It was not simple, however, due to the strong position of Kuntsevych in the Uniate cultural memory. Upon the martyr’s death, the Basilians started working on spreading his cult, cared for the safety of his relics, and obtained in Rome the change of his feast day from 12 November (deep in autumn) to 26 September. They initiated pilgrimages, processions carrying his images, indulgence feasts (there was a month-long feast in Biała Radziwiłłowska), where small medallions and pictures of Kuntsevych were given out (more in: Sęczyk 2016). At the same time, the Basilians meticulously recorded all healings and traces of miracles, developed the hagiography of Kuntsevych, and historiography to match their scholarly ambitions (Susza 1665; among others). Therefore, Josaphat became an important element of cultural memory, a certain site of memory (Pierre Nora). Not only was he meant to

be the patron saint of the Uniate Church but also the symbol of Catholic unity of two equal Rites in the Commonwealth. Inasmuch as Saints Adalbertus and Stanislaus were perceived as patrons of the ethnic Poland, Kuntsevych was promoted as the patron saint of the multi-ethnic Commonwealth (the anniversaries of the Unions of Horodło and Lublin were celebrated in Biała) (Dydycz 1997, 214). The Basilians strove for the cult of the martyr to be inherently linked with their charism, while simultaneously connecting Catholicism with Orthodoxy, and Polishness and Lithuanianness with Ruthenianness. These activities increased the social prestige of the monks as well as showed to state decision-makers their usefulness in the Eastern territories of the Commonwealth. The Basilians cultivated this view even after the fall of the Commonwealth, especially in their schools. The brutally massacred Uman martyrs were also included in the Uniate martyrology (Tretiak 1911, 35).

It is clear that, seeking the solution to the Uniate question, Russian decision-makers had to reorganise the cultural memory of the Uniates, particularly as it related to Kuntsevych. They could achieve it by preventing the exercise of his cult, e.g., by burying his relics (for instance, to protect them from desecration), and also by disproving all of the miraculous events related to him (Sęczyk 2016, 61). On the other hand, they needed to deal with the hagiography, as well as the Basilian historiography about Kuntsevych. The majority of analyses dedicated to the person of the saint, written in the 1st half of the 19th century were modelled upon the treatise by Nikojaj Bantysh-Kamenskij (1737-1814) entitled *Historical information about the union* (Бантыш-Каменский 1805), which was an abundant collection of both source and interpretative material. The scholar wrote about the particular zeal of the Uniate hierarchy (Basilians) in the Latinisation and persecution of Orthodoxy. He did not analyse Kuntsevych's death in the context of public outburst but rather a single objection of the "people" instigated by Meletius Smotrytskij.

Let us summarise our considerations so far. In the first half of the 19th century, the Uniate clergy geared towards "unification" were a circle whose thinking and acting were determined by a certain cultural matrix. It was founded by the new post-partition reality and the fear of Russian-Orthodox unification. The clergymen reached the conclusion that the best way out of their difficult situation was to adopt Orthodoxy, but on their own conditions (category of unity). It was thus necessary to change the Orthodox Russians' perception of Uniates, to prove their usefulness. It was important to negate the Act of Union and to show that without it, in their cultural basis, they were... Russian and Orthodox (category of Orthodox Uniates). We also can see that this matrix had to include the aversion to everything which could lead to the negation of that unity. In this context the enmity towards the Basilians – subjects of Rome – is hardly surprising, as they appeared as the main advocates of Latinisation (category of Latinisation). Considering Semashko's "unification" work, one can easily notice that this matrix affected the formation of his "view of the world and man". The categories outlined above were the

determinants of his individual “unification” activities. All of them, however, had to negate the already existing Catholic view of the Union, articulated in the Basilian historical writings, including those related to Kuntsevych’s martyrdom.

6. (DE)CONSTRUCTION OF SANCTITY

Armed with the categories of Semashko’s “view of the world and man” (unity, Orthodox Uniates, Latinisation) outlined above, let us focus on how they metaphorised his historical narrations, including those pertaining to the activities and death of Josaphat Kuntsevych. His main duty, the scholar stressed, was to consider the causes of the division of Churches, and of “the separation of a part of the nation from the general Russian body and the rise of the Uniate Church.” He believed that finding these answers would contribute to the reunification of Uniate Ruthenians around the Russian Church. So he argued that there was no Church unity already at the time of Vladimir’s baptism, and the Union of Florence was imposed by the Latins by force. Presenting the origins of the act of union, he characterised the main advocates of the Act of Brest and the Act itself as products of the treasonous manipulation of the Latinised Ruthenian hierarch by the Catholics (Семашко 1883, 331; more in: Morawiec 2010). Semashko put special emphasis on the fact that, at the time of signing the Act, the Orthodox hierarchs were fervent Catholics, accusing some of them of not being duly religious, or outright of immoral conduct. His analyses of the post-union period were still the most important. He argued that – due to the aversion of the “people” who remained Orthodox – the Union survived only with the aid of the king, Jesuits, and pro-Polish nobles. The latter group abandoned the Orthodoxy and assumed Latin Catholicism more often than Uniate. Even more so, the Union compromised the socio-economic basis of the system found in the Orthodox Ruthenian lands. Semashko wrote: “The ties of mutual love, usual between landowners and their serfs, maintained by the unity of faith, have long been broken. For the fervour of faith and personal interest, the landowners oppressed the people, deprived them of their right and property, and the people hated their oppressors and vile foes in their landowners” (Семашко 1883, 331). The very Polish and Catholic “landowners” made the Uniate Church their subjects, particularly the monastic clergy, due to the common practice of Latin nobles entering Uniate monasteries. The next stage of Latinisation would involve – according to the historian – the “transformation of white clergy” whom the Catholics wanted to “enslave by the force of authority” by “taking considerable funds away (...), placing monks among their leaders (...), so the white clergy suffered then not external but internal oppression from their brothers” (Семашко 1883, 333). The author pointed out that the nobles, adopting “Roman” rites, supported the Uniates and Roman Catholics, brought Jesuits and Basilians to their lands. These “monks” were the main force persecuting the Orthodox. What is more, there was no state authority over them, even the complaints of the Polish clergy about their activities did not help. But, with their eyes fixed on Rome, they only obeyed the papal nuncio. A period of persecution began, churches

and monasteries were taken from the Orthodox, and Church property too. Even the bodies of dead Orthodox people were mistreated, burials in consecrated ground were forbidden, “clergymen and monks were being hunted, imprisoned in chains, tortured.” For this reason, a large number of the Ruthenian population abandoned the Orthodoxy (Семашко 1883, 329-330). Semashko was not surprised that it finally resulted in a revolt – a “national uprising”. The bishop listed the murder attempts of Hypatius Pocij, who “almost lost his life from the enraged people.” However, the popular dissent was much more focused against Josaphat Kuntsevych. “The saint of the Uniate Church canonised by the pope” allegedly showed particular zeal in all anti-Orthodox activities. Semashko wrote: “a sympathetic soul cannot read without tears the words with which the lay man, Lithuanian Chancellor Lew Sapieha, albeit a defender of the Union, accuses and opposes that archpriest who went beyond the limits of humanity – shows a shepherd of Christ using violence and seductive means, contrary to the spirit of religion, contrary to politics, contrary to the benefit of the state ravaged by murderous revolts. Whoever read the letter of this chancellor to this archpriest cannot deny that Sapieha acted as a shepherd, Kuntsevych as a persecutor” (Семашко 1883, 330). Kuntsevych appeared as the main antagonist, persecutor, oppressor of the Orthodoxy, who closed churches, persecuted the community of believers for any traces of rites and liturgy performed by clergymen outside of the Uniate hierarchy. It is therefore not surprising that social discontent towards his actions was growing. The archbishop’s death was the epitome of this discontent, and the Basilian only got his just deserts for persecuting the Orthodox. The “popular uprising” was followed by a “Cossack uprising”. Kosiński and Nalyvajko “took revenge on Poles, starting a terrifying war”, yet their “bloody” and often rash actions did not deliver the expected result: the Union was already so strong that they could not stop its development (Семашко 1883, 330).

Reading into Semashko’s deliberations, one can see that he created a “reversal” of the Basilian historiography. What draws attention the most is the statement that at the time of Vladimir’s baptism there was no Church unity, and the Union of Brest act was imposed on the Orthodox community. This community – despite Latinisation and Polonisation – remained Orthodox (metaphor of Orthodox Uniates). The nobility allegedly abandoned the Orthodoxy due to Latinisation, depriving the people/nation of its main protectors (metaphor of Latinisation). Even though the Orthodox were loyal to the Commonwealth, they were betrayed and crushed by the Jesuit–Basilian aggression. After the partitions, the Uniates could become Ruthenian (Russian) and Orthodox again (macro-metaphor of unity). Two foreign forces always stood in the way of this unity, the Basilians and Polish nobles, with Kuntsevych as the epitome of Latin aggressions. It was he who destroyed Ruthenian unity with his actions, Latinised them by force, turned Orthodox Ruthenians into Poles–Catholics. Semashko was thus not surprised that these actions led to the discontent of the community and fuelled a national uprising.

There is a puzzling question of the Cossack in the passage of the work related to Kuntsevych. Semashko firmly separated Cossacks from Ruthenians (Russians,

in his mind). He did not copy the views of historians which adored Cossacks for their defence of the Orthodoxy but instead quoted those speaking about their rash actions, which did not bring about the expected results. It may be worth viewing it from the perspective of the Russian historical policy of the time (more in: Моравец, 2007). If the Uniates were about to join Russia and the Orthodoxy, their familiarity and Russianness had to be shown. It was necessary to prove that, in spite of having a peculiar “West Russian” mentality, which arose under the influence of Latin and Polish cultural elements, they retain their Orthodox and Russian roots. However, this interpretation did not involve the Cossacks. Even though Semashko noticed their attachment to the Orthodoxy, he did not glorify their historical importance, treating them as amorphic, uncontrollable – since it always thought about self-determination – force. Thus, the Cossacks could not support the “people” and are firmly distinguished from it throughout the narration.

It is also puzzling that the narration omitted the claim that the revolt – of which Kuntsevych was a victim – was directed against the Commonwealth and its ruler. Perhaps the aim was not to expose the main subjects of history, i.e., the “people” and white clergy to the allegation of any anti-state activities (which the Russian decision-makers of the time may not have liked). So the “revolt” – since it arose in the defence of being Russian and Orthodox – lost its negative overtone, becoming a general popular “uprising” started in the defence of religion. It was only directed against the initiators of the union, i.e., hierarchs and the Basilians, who represented them later. The death of Kuntsevych was not murder, rather... a just defence of a nation brought to despair.

CONCLUSION

In the first half of the 19th century, the thinking/acting of the Uniate clergy underwent major changes. Its cultural memory had been largely constructed by Basilian historiography and specific sites of memory, among which the person of Josaphat Kuntsevych stood out. In this period, however, the post-partition situation began defining this memory: the Uniates found themselves in the Russian reality, foreign to the Catholic Church. The fear of the so-called Orthodox unification grew strong, as to the parish clergy it meant the loss of all their wealth (i.e., churches and parishes). Some hierarchs started considering adopting the Orthodoxy. It was necessary to find suitable allies in the lay communities, rebuild the denominational policy of the Russian state, as well as change the Russians’ view on the Uniates. The only solution was, purportedly, to negate the legitimacy and historical heritage of the Act of Union and to prove that, in their cultural basis, the Uniates are... Russian and Orthodox. The hostility – revealed at the time – towards the Basilians, subjected to Rome, should not be surprising in this context, as they were allegedly the chief promoters of Polonisation and Latinisation. Thus, in the undertaken analyses of the cultural matrix of the unification, the presence

of specific categories can be noticed, which also determined Semashko's "view of the world and man": "unity", "Orthodox Uniates" and "Latinisation". Before suggesting any specific "unification" project, however, he decided to reconstruct the Uniate thinking-acting, as well as the Uniate cultural memory. For this purpose, he "reversed" the Uniate view of history that he knew. The specific metaphors such as "unity", "Catholicism of Uniates" and "Orthodoxisation" played crucial roles in this view. Whereas Semashko – to oppose the Basilian influence – constructed a different interpretation. He argued that: 1) the Orthodox community had always opposed any Unionisation and Latinisation attempts (a macro-metaphor of unity); 2) even though it was loyal to the Commonwealth, it was betrayed by its hierarchs, Latinised and in favour of the Union (metaphor of Latinisation); 3) the Uniates remained Orthodox, opposed the Jesuit-Basilian aggression and protected the parish (white) clergy from subjugation to the Basilian hierarchs (metaphor of Orthodox Uniates). A crucial role in this view belonged to the character of Josaphat Kuntsevych. The memory about the saint needed to be "reversed": he was no longer shown as a martyr, becoming instead... the persecutor of the Ruthenian (Russian) nation. Therefore, Semashko's narration on Kuntsevych had an important mnemonic meaning. By "reversing" the Basilian and Uniate history, the hierarch wanted to reconstruct both the memory and thinking-acting of the Uniates. It had a certain goal: it led to the so-called "Unification" Act of 1839, in which the Uniates were supposed to return to Russia and the Orthodox Church. Without (de)constructing the image of Kuntsevych and the Basilian historiography, this work could not be completed.

REFERENCES:

- Charkiewicz, Jarosław. 2013. "Powrót unitów diecezji litewskiej i białoruskiej do prawosławia na soborze połockim 1839 roku." *Rocznik Teologiczny* 55, no. 1-2: 119-137.
- Dydycz, Antoni. 1997. "Opisanie odnalezienia relikwii św. Jozafata Kuncewicza na tle jego życia oraz dziejów jego doczesnych szczątków." *Studia Teologiczne Białystok – Drohiczyń – Łomża* 15: 209-224.
- Himka, John-Paul. 1999. *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.
- Kempa, Tomasz. 2005. "Czy męczeńska śmierć arcybiskupa Jozafata Kuncewicza przyczyniła się do rozwoju unii brzeskiej na obszarze archidiecezji połockiej?" In *Kościół wschodnie w Rzeczypospolitej XVI-XVIII wieku. Zbiór studiów*, edited by Andrzej Gil, 94-98. Lublin: Towarzystwo Instytutu Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej – UNESCO.

- Kołbuk, Witold. 2013. "Wokół kwestii tożsamości narodowej unitów podlaskich." *Studia Białorutenistyczne* 7: 11-24.
- Łatyszonek, Oleg. 1994. "Unia a białoruski ruch narodowy od połowy XVIII do połowy XX wieku." In *Metropolita Andrzej Szeptycki. Studia i materiały*, edited by Andrzej A. Zięba, 75-96. Kraków: PAU.
- Matus, Irena. 2015. "Deklarowanie gotowości przejścia na prawosławie duchownych unickich w obwodzie białostockim w latach 1836-1839." *Studia Białorutenistyczne* 9: 41-54.
- Morawiec, Norbert. 2010. "Historiografia jako element kształtowania unickiej tożsamości. Unia i unicy w twórczości historycznej Józefa Siemaszki." In *Болховитиновский щорічник 2009*, edited by Валерій Ластовський, 197-213. Київ: Національний Києво-Печерський історико-культурний заповідник.
- Morawiec, Norbert. 2018. "(De)konstrukcje świętości. Jozafat Kuncewicz w rosyjskiej historiografii synodalnej." *Kultura Słowian. Rocznik Komisji Kultury Słowian PAU* 14: "Heroizm i martyrologia w kulturze Słowian", 79-112.
- Pidłypczak-Majerowicz, Maria. 2012. "Książka i biblioteka bazylikańska w XVII-XVIII w. oraz wpływ kasat na stan ich zachowania i opracowania." *Hereditas Monasteriorum* 1: 85-90.
- Pomorski, Jan. 2004. "Punkt widzenia we współczesnej historiografii." In *Punkt widzenia w języku i kulturze*, edited by Jerzy Bartmiński, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska and Ryszard Nycz, 11-32. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMC.
- Sęczyk, Piotr. 2016. "Kult relikwii Jozafata Kuncewicza w Białej Podlaskiej." *Radzyński Rocznik Humanistyczny* 14: 59-65.
- Skinner, Barbara. 2016. "New Perspectives on Orthodox Clerical Education in Right Bank Ukraine, 1825-1855." In *Шлях у чотири століття: матеріали Міжнародної наукової конференції "Ad fontes – до джерел" до 400-ї річниці заснування Києво-Могилянської академії 12-14 жовтня 2015 року*, edited by Наталя Яковенко, prepared by Наталя Шліхта, 254-266. Київ: НАУКМА.
- Stobiecki, Rafał. 1998. *Bolszewizm a historia: próba rekonstrukcji bolszewickiej filozofii dziejów*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Susza, Jacobi. 1665. *Cursus vitae et certamen marturii B. Josaphat Kuncevicii*. Rome: Typographia Varesij.
- Tichomirow, Andrzej. 2009. "Westrus'ism as a research problem." In *East and West. History and Contemporary State of Eastern Studies*, edited by Jan Malicki and Leszek Zasztowt, 157-168. Warsaw: Studium Europy Wschodniej, Uniwersytet Warszawski.
- Tretiak, Józef. 1911. *Bohdan Zaleski do upadku powstania listopadowego 1802-1831*. Kraków: AU.

- Wereda, Dorota. 2009. "Kult Jozafata Kuncewicza w XVIII wieku." *Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis* 54: 85-97.
- Wereda, Dorota. 2013. *Biskupi unickiej metropolii kijowskiej w XVIII wieku*. Siedlce-Lublin: Wyd. Werset.
- Żychiewicz, Tadeusz. 1986. *Jozafat Kuncewicz*. Kalwaria Zebrzydowska: Wydawnictwo CalVarianum.
- Бантыш-Каменский, Николай Н. 1805. *Историческое известие о возникшей в Польше унии, с показанием начала и важнейших, в продолжении оной чрез два века, приключений паче же о бывшем от римлян и униатов на благочестивых тамошних жителей гонении, по высочайшему, блаженной памяти императрицы Екатерины II, повелению, изхранящихся Государственной коллегии иностранных дел в Московском архиве актов и разных исторических книг, действительным статским советником Николаем Бантышем-Каменским, 1795 года собранное*. Москва: В Синодальной типографии.
- Боярчук, Татьяна Н. 2012. "Влияние исторического прошлого на менталитет Белорусов." *Историчні і політологічні дослідження* 1 (49): 261-272.
- Власюк, Ігор М. 2014. "Православна церква і державна влада на Правобережній Україні та в Білорусі у ХІХ ст." In *Гістарычныя шляхі, узаемадзеянне і ўзаемаўплывы беларускага народа і суседзяў: Зборнік навуковых артыкулаў*, edited by Рыгор Рыгоравіч Лазько, 30-36. Гомель: ГДУ імя Ф. Скарыны.
- Кедров, Николай И. 1887. *Литовский митрополит Иосиф Семашко и его деятельность по воссоединению униатов*. Москва: Университетская типография.
- Киприанович, Григоорий Я. 1897. *Жизнь Иосифа Семашки, митрополита Литовского и Виленского*. Вильно: Типография И. Блюмовича.
- Коломийцев, Алексей А. 2010. "Митрополит Семашко – сановники политический деятель." In *Белорусская политология: многообразие в единстве. Республика Беларусь в глобализирующемся мире: тез. Докл. IV междунар. Науч.-практ. Конф. (Гродно, 13-14 мая 2010 г.)*. В 2 ч., ч. 1, edited by Виктор Николаевич Ватыль et al., 163-164. Гродно: ГрГУ им. Я. Купалы.
- Кривошея, Ігор І. 2009. "Місто Умань у власності графів Потоцьких (друга чверть ХVІІІ – перша третина ХІХ ст.): територія конфлікту, компромісу чи взаємодії?" *Проблеми історії України ХІХ – початку ХХ ст.: Зб. наук. пр.* 16, 173-183.
- Моравец, Норберт. 2007. "Козаки-запорожці в підручниках до історії руської Церкви (1805–1917)." In *Православ'я – наука – суспільство: питання взаємодії. Матеріали Четвертньої Міжнародної наукової конференції (18-19 травня 2006)*, 28-34. Київ: Національний Києво-Печерський історико-культурний заповідник.
- Оржеховский, Игорь В. and Валентина А. Теплова. 2001. "«Польский вопрос» и правительственная политика на территории Беларуси в первой

- половине XIX в.” In *Выбраныя навуковыя працы Беларускага дзяржаўнага ўніверсітэта: у 7 т., vol. 2: Гісторыя. Філалогія. Журналістыка*, edited by Алег Антонавiч Яноўскі, 79-91. Мiнск: БДУ.
- Павлюк, Віктор В. 2011. “Уніатська церква в суспільному житті правобережної України кінця XVIII – першої третини XIX ст.” *Наукові записки Національного університету Острозька академія. Сер.: Історичне релігієзнавство* 5: 150-157.
- Романчук, Александр. 2018. “К вопросу о преследованиях униатского духовенства в ходе общего воссоединения униатов с православными в 1839 году.” *Богословский вестник* 1 (28): 154-177.
- Романчук, Александр (протоиерей). 2021. “Митрополит Иосиф Семашко. Жизнеописание и пастырские труды в 40-е – 60-е годы XIX века.” In *Белорусская Православная Церков. Минская Духовная Семинария*. Accessed: 10.10.2021. <https://minds.by/news/180#.WgRkVFvWzIU> (no pagination).
- (Семашко) Иосиф, митрополит. 1883. “Сочинение о Православии Восточных Церкви, начатое заседателем коллегии Иосифом Семашко в 1827 году но только до половины конченное – а также некоторые оставшиеся к нему заметки.” In *Записки Иосифа митрополита Литовского, изданные Императорскою Академиею Наук по завещанию автора: в 3 т., vol. 1: 308-339*. Санкт-Петербург: Типография императорской Академии Наук.
- Сінкевич, Наталія О. 2013. “Поэтапное Крещение Руси: становление и развитие сюжета в православных сочинениях первой половины XVII в.” *Труды Киевской Духовной Академии* 19: 43-60.
- Смолич, Игор К. 1996. *История Русской Церкви, 1700-1917*, кн. 8, ч. 2. Москва: Изд-во Спасо-Преображен. Валаам. Монастыря.
- Старостенко, Виктор В. 2014. “Проблема Брестской церковной унии в белорусской общественно-философской мысли конца XVI в. – начала XVII в.” In *750 определений религии: история символизаций и интерпретаций*, edited by Евгений И. Аринина, 429-455. Владимир: Изд-во ВлГУ.
- Федоров, Владимир А. 1996. “Присоединение униатов западных губерний России к русской православной церкви в 30-40-х годах XIX в.” *Acta Universitatis Lodzianensis Folia Historica* 55: 61-68.
- Шевченко, Віталій. 2018. *Православно-католицька полеміка та проблеми унійності в житті Русі-України доберестейського періоду; у 2 т., vol. 1*. Київ: Преса України.
- Шеретюк, Руслана М. 2016. “«Записки Иосифа, митрополита Литовского» (1883 р.) як унікальне джерело з історії скасування Греко-уніатської церкви на Правобережній Україні.” *Наукові записки Національного університету Острозька академія Серія: Релігієзнавство* 1: 114-124.
- Шкраб'юк, Петро В. 2007. *Монаший Чин отців василіян у суспільно-культурному житті України: автореф дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня доктора історичних наук*. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України.