

The Roman Catholic Clergy, the Byzantine Slavonic Rite and Polish National Identity: The Case of Grabowiec, 1931–34¹

KONRAD SADKOWSKI

In November 1918 Poland returned to the map of Europe as an independent state. After its borders were finalised in 1921–22 Poland was a distinctly multinational state, with approximately one-third of its population being ethnic Poles. Two of the largest minority groups were the Ukrainians and Belarusians, who resided in Poland's eastern and south-eastern *kresy* (borderlands).² Until the First World War, however, the territory these groups lived on was part of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires. Indeed, the Ukrainians lived divided between the two empires. At the chaotic conclusion of the First World War both the Ukrainians and Belarusians made unsuccessful bids for independence. For the former this included a bloody war with the Poles in 1918–19.

Prior to the partitioning of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth by Russia, Prussia and Austria in the late eighteenth century, the majority of the Ukrainians and Belarusians of this state adhered to the Greek Catholic (Uniate) rite in the Roman Church. The Uniate Church was created through the Union of Brest of 1596, engineered to bring the Commonwealth's Christian Orthodox believers under Rome's jurisdiction. In Russia the Uniate Church did not survive the partition years; it was abolished in the Western Provinces in 1839 and in the Kingdom of Poland in 1875. The Uniates were forced to adopt Russian Orthodoxy, though some resisted. In Galicia (the territory acquired by Austria in the partitions), however, the Uniate Church continued to thrive. Indeed, it was in Galicia that the Ukrainian national movement matured during the nineteenth century, with Uniate clerics playing an important role in this process.³ By the time of the Polish–Ukrainian war in 1918–19 religious lines strongly reinforced, if not wholly defined for many people, their national identity: Poles were Catholic and Ukrainians were Uniate. On the other hand, because of Russia's religious-nationality policies of the last century, many Ukrainians (and most Belarusians) were also Orthodox.

As the First World War created a new, exhilarating reality (i.e. independence) for the Polish nation, so it created new opportunities for one of its leading advocates, the Catholic Church. The church was in the forefront of the struggle for Polish independence in the nineteenth century. In 1918 it finally acquired the opportunity to shape Polish society according to a Catholic vision. It encountered, however, a Poland whose population included many non-Poles and non-Catholics. One of the greatest challenges the Catholic Church faced after 1918–21 was how to deal with the

Ukrainian and Belarusian minorities. In the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth after 1596 most of these minorities were under Rome’s jurisdiction. But during the partition period the Ukrainians and Belarusians in the Russian Empire were forced to adopt Orthodoxy. Moreover, in Galicia, Ukrainian nationalism eliminated the Polish Church’s influence over the Uniate Church and consequently any influence Poles could have had over the Ukrainian national community through this church. After 1918–21, then, the very nationally-minded Polish Catholic Church faced the enormous task of trying to regain for Rome the Orthodox in the *kresy*. At the same time Polish church leaders, state officials and the Vatican agreed that the Uniate Church could not be used for this task and would have to be confined to (former Austrian) Galicia, because of its strong propensity to promote Ukrainian nationalism and separatism, as well as the ‘latinisation’ it had undergone since 1596.⁴

By 1923 a solution had apparently been found for reclaiming the Orthodox in the *kresy* for Rome while avoiding the use of the Uniate Church to accomplish this task. The solution was the Byzantine Slavonic rite or, as it came to be known in Poland, the ‘neo-union’. While its adherents would be loyal to Rome, they would retain Orthodox practices and traditions and their languages. In December 1923 the Vatican’s Congregation of the Eastern Church issued the instruction *Zelum amplitudinis* to the bishop of Siedlce, Henryk Przeździecki, on the methods of conducting union work in his diocese. In January 1924 a Vatican decree extended to Bishop Przeździecki the legal right to establish Byzantine Slavonic-rite parishes in his diocese; and soon afterwards the authorisation was extended to the bishops of Poland’s other eastern borderland dioceses.⁵ These were the first steps toward bringing Poland’s Orthodox believers under Rome’s care.

Contrary to the Vatican’s and Polish bishops’ expectations, the Byzantine Slavonic rite never took deep root in Poland.⁶ Opposition to the rite came from successive Polish governments, Catholic Polish society and the Orthodox themselves, including their clergy. One final source of opposition was the Catholic clergy.⁷ The attitude of the Catholic clergy toward the Byzantine Slavonic rite was central to the manner in which the rite evolved, yet has received little scholarly attention. Had the Catholic clergy been more supportive of the neo-union Catholic Poles would have been more willing to accept it, and Orthodox believers would have more readily transferred their loyalties to it. In addition, more Latin-rite priests would have joined the neo-union, ameliorating the problem of low neo-union priest recruitment. Having said this, I do not mean that greater Catholic clergy support of the Byzantine Slavonic rite would have made it an unmitigated success; rather, its chances of success would have been greater.

Focusing on the town of Grabowiec (Hrubieszów district) in the Polish–Ukrainian borderland Chełm region of the Lublin diocese, I will show that the Catholic clergy strenuously opposed the Byzantine Slavonic rite because of their intense opposition to the Orthodox Church, and convinced local Catholics to do the same. The Polish clergy associated Orthodoxy with the Russian oppression of Polish society prior to the First World War, and few priests could view Orthodoxy except through this prism. Furthermore, after 1918 some Orthodox priests in Poland incited Ukrainian and Belarusian nationalism, adding another cause for the Catholic clergy’s opposition to the neo-union.⁸ In sum, the association between religious affiliation and national identity – i.e. Latin-rite Catholicism with Polish identity, Orthodoxy and Greek Catholicism with Ukrainian identity and Orthodoxy with Belarusian identity – was too powerful by the early twentieth century for the Vatican to override with an overly theorised vision of a new religious harmony under its canopy.⁹

The Lublin bishop Maryan Leon Fulman opposed the introduction of the Byzantine Slavonic rite into his diocese from 1925 to 1930. During this period Bishop Fulman was a firm proponent of converting the Orthodox in the Chełm region to the Latin rite. This was based on his conviction that the pre-1975 Uniates and their offspring should return to the Catholic fold (since Orthodoxy had been brutally imposed on this population). Only the Latin rite could now suffice because clerics from the Uniate Church in Galicia would surely work as nation-builders against Polish interests among this heavily Ukrainian (but often nationally ‘unconscious’) population. Bishop Fulman also opposed the Byzantine Slavonic rite because its liturgy helped to preserve Ukrainian language and distinctiveness; that is, the rite inhibited the assimilation of the Ukrainians into the Polish nation.¹⁰

By 1930, however, Bishop Fulman had accepted the Byzantine Slavonic rite as a viable option for ‘dealing with’ the Orthodox in the Lublin diocese. It is not clear what produced this change of heart. However, a 1929 questionnaire about the Orthodox Church in the Lublin diocese submitted by Włodzimierz Dworzaczek, a Poznań publicist, provides an interesting clue. Asked in the questionnaire ‘What are the prospects for spreading Catholic propaganda among the Orthodox?’ Bishop Fulman responded: ‘Quite weak’.¹¹ Bishop Fulman thus admitted that the conversion of the Orthodox in his diocese directly into the Latin rite was now practically impossible. Reflecting his change of heart about the neo-union, on 31 December 1930 Bishop Fulman wrote to the abbot primate of the Basilian order in Lwów (L’viv): ‘The current state of mind of the Orthodox population of our diocese is appropriate for missionary work in order to bring it back to the Catholic Church in the Byzantine Slavonic rite. ... In this work I cannot use overbearing Orthodox priests because of their low morality.’¹² He warned that under no conditions could the Basilians engage in any political activities, and went on to explain that missionary work could begin in Horodło (Hrubieszów district) and then spread further into the Chełm and Tomaszów Lubelski districts. By late January 1931 Fr Mikołaj Łysko, a Basilian, was working among the Orthodox in Horodło.¹³

The movement for a Byzantine Slavonic-rite parish in Grabowiec was initiated on 9 February 1931 when 136 Orthodox residents of Grabowiec and its surrounding villages petitioned Bishop Fulman to accept them into the Catholic Church, send them an ‘eastern-rite priest’ and turn over to them the former St Kajetan’s Greek Catholic church in Grabowiec.¹⁴ Bishop Fulman then requested the Hrubieszów dean, Fr Melchior Juściński, to assess the potential for the neo-union in Grabowiec.¹⁵ Fr Juściński responded that the neo-union would spread throughout the entire deanery. ‘It is impossible’, he wrote, ‘to oppose this expansion. We must only ensure that the new converts receive good priests, that is, not Uniate priests from Małopolska [i.e. western Galicia] nor converted Orthodox priests.’¹⁶ On 26 March 1931 an additional 22 Orthodox from the villages of Tuczępy and Wola Tuczępska asked Bishop Fulman for permission to join the Grabowiec parish.¹⁷ Bishop Fulman then authorised Fr Antoni Niemancewicz, a Jesuit of the neo-union rite, to travel to Grabowiec to conduct several masses in the Catholic parish church and St Kajetan’s in an effort to determine further whether a neo-union parish would succeed in Grabowiec. He also asked the Catholic priest in Grabowiec, Fr Wojciech Bojarczuk, to assist Fr Niemancewicz in his mission.¹⁸ Four days later, on 6 April, the Catholic parishioners of Grabowiec responded to Bishop Fulman with a stinging critique.

Like a lightning bolt we received the news that a Uniate [neo-union] cleric was coming to Grabowiec to take our church ... those petition signatures

were a fraud – it is a hodgepodge of who knows who ... the saying of mass in Old Slavonic is an affront to us Poles. As locals [*tutejsi*] we know from the [Orthodox] themselves that the union is only an instrument to get a church. It is the beginning of ukrainianisation, the facilitation of the development of anti-Catholic and anti-state work, the beginning of ‘Ridna Chata’. For us Polish-Catholics it is a dagger in our backs and the poisoning of our lives. It is the ruin of [our] Catholic parish. ... The people who are starting the [neo-] union here are wolves in sheep hides. A handful of old women from Świdniki, Cieszyń and Bereście and several from Grabowiec will have a [neo-] union parish in the heart of what’s Polish. We cannot allow this. There is a church in Świdniki and a foundation for creating the [neo-] union there. Here in Grabowiec there is no place for Ukraine – and this we can expect on the tracks of the [neo-] union. ... The people [*naród*] are upset and so is the Catholic parish. Things can happen that will destroy everything and threaten to ruin Grabowiec as a bastion of the holy faith and unity. We declare that we will not allow Grabowiec to become a Ukraine and will not give up our churches. So help us God.¹⁹

Unmoved and sensing Fr Bojarczuk’s interference, Bishop Fulman explained to Fr Bojarczuk that it was not certain that a neo-union parish would be established in Grabowiec, that it might end up in Miączyn, Świdniki or Horyszów Ruski. For now, the potential for the neo-union was being examined. He also instructed Fr Bojarczuk to express good will toward Fr Niemancewicz and assist him. Finally, he told Fr Bojarczuk to

attempt to explain to the faithful the thinking of the Holy See, which has no political goals but is only interested in the saving of souls. ... Individuals from the local intelligentsia who have begun agitating against union work do not understand the state of affairs. By inciting the people they are only hurting the Fatherland.²⁰

In his response to Bishop Fulman, Fr Bojarczuk reviewed the past three years he had spent in Grabowiec, indicating how he had transformed a decaying parish into a thriving one. Though he would try to control his parishioners, he warned Bishop Fulman that the neo-union was creating much turmoil in Grabowiec and that he could not be held responsible for any consequences to Fr Niemancewicz.²¹

In the ensuing two to three years the situation in Grabowiec became more aggravated. Neo-union priests were replaced by new ones (Fr Andrzej Truch by Fr Mitrofan Hryniewicz by Fr Jozafat Fedoryk) and Fr Bojarczuk was himself replaced by Fr Józef Czarnecki.²² The neo-unionist and Catholic parishioners petitioned Bishop Fulman several more times, respectively, to establish a neo-union parish in Grabowiec officially (and separate St Kajetan’s from the Catholic parish) and to do away with the neo-union altogether.²³ Several minor altercations occurred between neo-unionists and Catholics, initiated by the Catholics.²⁴ In general, opposition was centred on a small group of individuals. However, most striking is that it originated with the Catholic priests Frs Bojarczuk and Czarnecki, who also wrote critical if not scathing reports about the neo-union priests.²⁵

That the Catholic priests were at the centre of the opposition to the neo-union in Grabowiec is especially clear from the evidence related to Fr Hryniewicz’s stay in Grabowiec. In June 1933 Bishop Mikołaj Czarnecki (Mikola Charnets’ky), the

apostolic visitor for the neo-union in Poland appointed in 1931, wrote to Bishop Fulman regarding Fr Hryniewicz's problems with the Catholic priests:

I do not know whether Fr Hryniewicz ... in Grabowiec worries excessively about the difficult first steps of union work in the Chełm region, or whether these difficulties are indeed large and unfortunately derive from the Catholic side, or even from [Catholic] priests who cannot lift themselves to a supernatural level and delve into the intentions of the Holy See – in any case, at times he sends alarming information.²⁶

Obviously recognising the problem of his priests' opposition to the neo-union, Bishop Fulman wrote to Fr Czarnecki several days after receiving Bishop Czarnecki's report:

The removal of the [neo-] union from Grabowiec cannot and will not take place. ... You must take a positive stand toward the [neo-] union as the Holy See demands. Encouraging or reinforcing some sort of hostile attitude toward the [neo-] union among Catholics is criminal. This must be eliminated. The group of quarrelsome and vile agitators I met personally in Grabowiec must absolutely be removed from any church matters. Through their squabbling and disobedience with regard to the church, they shame the parish [in Grabowiec].²⁷

Fr Hryniewicz himself reported to Bishop Fulman on 23 February 1934 regarding Fr Czarnecki:

For a long time I have suffered and kept quiet, but I can no longer remain silent. [I have found] the same difficulties, the same obstacles toward union work in Grabowiec – and this is from people who should help. I have in mind Fr Czarnecki, whose psychology is consistently anti-unionist. He does not even hide his poor attitude like his predecessor, Fr Bojarczuk. He openly tells me that there is no place for the [neo-] union here and to one teacher he said: 'I must rid Grabowiec of this filth!' Can you imagine a Catholic priest saying something of this sort? Unfortunately, his psychology rubs off on society. Then it is easy to claim that all of society is against the union.²⁸

Ultimately, the Byzantine Slavonic rite did maintain its foothold in Grabowiec; in April 1933 there were about 230 adherents of the neo-union there.²⁹ But overall, despite this modest success, the neo-union hardly thrived in the Lublin diocese. By 1939 there were only four official neo-union parishes in the diocese – in Horodło, Hołubie, Pawłów and Grabowiec.³⁰ The Hrubieszów dean's prediction in 1931 that the expansion of the neo-union in the Hrubieszów deanery would prove unstoppable simply did not come to pass.

Just how representative was Grabowiec of the Polish Catholic clergy's attitude toward the Byzantine Slavonic rite? While it represented one case of strong Catholic clergy opposition to the neo-union, Grabowiec was not that unique. First, we must remember that while the Polish episcopate was expected to support the rite unequivocally, some bishops were less than enthusiastic about it. For example, despite allowing the neo-union to develop in his archdiocese, Archbishop Romuald Jałbrzykowski of Wilno had to defend himself at the Vatican for being a greater proponent of conversion to the Latin rite than the neo-union.³¹ Thus, like Bishop Fulman from the mid- to late-1920s, Archbishop Jałbrzykowski hardly served as a good example

of how parish priests should regard the rite. Second, even Bishop Przeździecki, the staunchest supporter of the neo-union, declared that the 'indifference' of the Catholic clergy in the Siedlce (Podlasie) diocese to the rite was a problem. 'Let us not be surprised', he wrote, 'that among some of our Catholic priests there is indifference to the union. The clergy are the sons of that generation that suffered so much for the faith and Polishness at the hands of the Russians and the Orthodox clergy.'³² Finally, the Vatican was likewise not blind to the problem of clerical opposition to the neo-union. Its 1937 instruction *Pro incenso studio* reminded that 'Under no condition can a priest of the Latin rite oppose through word or deed the [neo-] union.'³³ We can say that the Vatican was motivated to issue this declaration because Latin-rite priests continued to oppose the neo-union. Indeed, after 1935 this opposition probably became more protracted as church-state relations improved and Polish politics grew more nationalistic. In sum, clerical opposition to the Byzantine Slavonic rite clearly transcended diocesan borders.

To conclude, the Byzantine Slavonic rite was one of the most complex and controversial institutions of interwar Poland, yet has received little scholarly attention. The rite raised to another level the debate over the place of Catholicism, and religion generally, in Polish identity. It provoked such questions as: Is Catholicism irrevocably tied with Polish identity and if so, does it have to be of the Latin rite? In establishing the rite, the Vatican asked Poland's Catholics, especially bishops and priests, to refrain from politicising Latin-rite Catholicism as an element of Polish ethnic identity. The rite, then, represented an ambitious attempt by the church to overcome modern national conflict based on the East-West religious divide; on a grander scale it was a new attempt by the Vatican to stand above nations and to unite them under its canopy.

A number of fundamental problems, however, plagued the neo-union and inhibited its spread. Each of them was linked to the greater problematic of religion in modern nation-building, exactly what the rite was intended to overcome. Successive Polish governments opposed the rite as a 'russifying' agent (and because it had not been agreed to in the 1925 Concordat); so did most of Catholic Polish society. Furthermore, these negative reactions only discouraged Orthodox bishops, priests and parishioners from the rite in that they confirmed that Polish Catholics could not treat it on an equal footing with the Latin rite. In other words, general Polish opposition to the rite strengthened Ukrainian and Belarusian loyalties to Orthodoxy on both the religious and the national planes. Likewise for the Ukrainian Uniates, the poor reception of the Byzantine Slavonic rite by Catholic Poles solidified the connection between Greek Catholicism and Ukrainian identity. Indeed, the Vatican recognised the immense difficulty of rewriting religious loyalties based on national affiliation. 'All workers in the matter of union', it wrote in 1937, 'will resolutely omit everything that can instigate nationality or political misunderstandings.'³⁴

While promoting the rite, then, the Vatican recognised not only the problem of Latin-rite clerics' opposition to the Byzantine Slavonic rite, but also the fundamental cause of the opposition – the politicisation of religion in nationality relations. The Grabowiec case clearly reveals these concerns and issues. Ultimately, it shows that the opposition of the Catholic parish clergy was a considerably more important factor in how the Byzantine Slavonic rite developed in Poland after 1923 than has been recognised. Because parish priests were the church's footsoldiers, they had the greatest influence on individual Catholics and most shaped the beliefs of Catholic society. It was priests who had most internalised the mythology of the struggle of the church and the Polish nation against Russia and the Orthodox Church in the nine-

teenth century. And it was this mythology – indeed, a ‘martyrology’ – that they communicated back to their parishioners. This was especially potent in the Chełm region because of the destruction of the Uniate Church there after 1875, though it was a thoroughly national phenomenon. The Grabowiec case shows how Latin-rite clerical opposition to the neo-union promoted the hostility of Catholics to the neo-union, consequently helped to encourage Orthodox – that is, Ukrainian and Belarussian – opposition to the rite (by further coupling Polish nationalism with Catholicism) and very likely inhibited Latin-rite priests from becoming neo-union clerics.

Clearly, then, the opposition of the Catholic parish clergy stymied the development of the neo-union. On the other hand, it might be that the Polish Latin-rite clergy’s opposition was a negligible factor in the overall development of the Byzantine Slavonic rite: the combined hostility of successive Polish governments and of Orthodox bishops, priests and parishioners may have been enough essentially to ‘doom’ the rite from the beginning. Without acknowledging Latin-rite priests’ broad opposition to the neo-union, however, we are left with a less than complete picture of the dynamics of the rite’s development.

Notes and References

- ¹ I would like to thank the Fulbright Program of the International Institute of Education and the East European Studies Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies for funding received between 1992 and 1994 for dissertation research and write-up. This paper is based largely on that research. A version of this paper was presented at the 1995 American Catholic Historical Association Conference in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. I thank Neal Pease for his great assistance and comments on that earlier version, as well as Donald Shepardson for assistance on the final draft.
- ² According to the 1921 census, which measured ethnicity according to ‘nationality’, ethnic Poles comprised 69.2 per cent of Poland’s population, Ukrainians/Ruthenians 14.3 per cent, Belarussians and Locals (*tutejsi*) 3.9 per cent and 0.2 per cent respectively, Jews 7.8 per cent and others 4.6 per cent. According to the 1931 census figures, which measured ethnicity according to ‘native tongue’, Poles comprised 68.9 per cent of Poland’s population, Ukrainians 10.1 per cent, Ruthenians 3.8 per cent, Locals 2.2 per cent, Belarussians 3.1 per cent, Jews 8.6 per cent and others 3.3 per cent. Joseph Rothschild, *East Central Europe Between the Two World Wars* (University of Washington Press, Seattle, 1974), p. 36, provides a summary of the two inter-war Polish censuses. The censuses have been a matter of controversy for decades. Two recent articles on the controversy are Stephen D. Corrsin, ‘Literacy rates and questions of language, faith and ethnic identity in population censuses in the partitioned Polish lands and interwar Poland (1880s–1930s)’, *The Polish Review*, vol. 43, no. 2, 1998, pp. 131–60, and Jerzy Borzęcki, ‘Issues of language and national identity in the population censuses of the Polish–Russian borderlands: reexaminations and comments’, *The Polish Review*, vol. 44, no. 1, 1999, pp. 29–46.
- ³ See, for example, John-Paul Himka, ‘Priests and peasants: the Greek Catholic pastor and the Ukrainian national movement in Austria, 1867–1900’, *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1979, pp. 1–14.
- ⁴ By ‘agreed’ I do not mean that Polish officials and the Vatican negotiated directly over the territorial extent of the Uniate Church in Poland. Rather, in the early years after 1918 the Polish Church and the state authorities were of one mind regarding the expansion of the Uniate Church. It was the Polish hierarchy that lobbied at the Vatican against the expansion of the Uniate Church in Poland. See Konrad Sadkowski, ‘Religious exclusion and state building: the Roman Catholic Church and the attempted revival of Greek Catholicism in the Chełm region, 1918–1924’, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies Special Volume: Cultures and Nations in Central and Eastern Europe: Essays in Honor of Roman Szporluk*, vol. 22,

1998, pp. 509–26. See also Stanisław Wilk, *Episkopat Kościoła katolickiego w Polsce, 1918–1939* (Wydawnictwo Salezjańskie, Warsaw, 1992), pp. 166–69; and Krzysztof Krasowski, *Episkopat katolicki w II Rzeczypospolitej* (Redakcja Naukowa, Warsaw/Poznań, 1992), pp. 179–81.

- ⁵ There is no unanimity in the existing literature on the origins of the Byzantine Slavonic rite. Krasowski, *op. cit.*, p. 182, claims that it was the Belgian Jesuit Bishop Michel d'Herbigny who initiated the rite, though 'from Bishop Przeździecki's pronouncements, it might appear that it was he ...'. Bożena Łomacz, 'Praca duszpasterska duchowieństwa neounickiego (Diecezja podlaska w latach 1923–1939)', *Novum*, no. 5, May 1980, pp. 81–86, implies that it was Bishop Przeździecki. Serge Keleher, 'Trapped between two churches: Orthodox and Greek Catholics in eastern Poland, *Religion, State and Society*, vol. 23, no. 4, 1995, p. 368, states that it was Bishop d'Herbigny. Wilk, *op. cit.*, pp. 169–70, declares that it was Bishop Przeździecki. Wilk also notes that the authorisation for the other dioceses came in 1924 or 1925; in his pronouncements on the neo-union, Bishop Przeździecki gave both dates. Finally, Hansjakob Stehle, in his extensive discussion of Bishop d'Herbigny but only brief mention of the neo-union, does not provide a concrete answer as to its origin. See his *Eastern Politics of the Vatican, 1917–1979*, trans. Sandra Smith (Ohio University Press, Athens, Ohio, 1979), pp. 79–83, 142–48, 178. To my knowledge, no book-length study on the Byzantine Slavonic rite exists in Polish or English.
- ⁶ In 1939 there were 47 Byzantine Slavonic-rite parishes in Poland organised in one deanery (spread throughout the Wilno, Polesie, Wołyń and Lublin voivodships). In 1937 the neo-union claimed 39 parish priests, 31 monastery priests and one bishop. See Stanisław Stępień, 'Obrządki wschodnie kościoła katolickiego', in Lucjan Adamczuk and Witold Zdaniewicz (eds), *Kościół katolicki w Polsce, 1918–1990: Rocznik statystyczny* (Główny Urząd Statystyczny and Zakład Socjologii Religii SAC, Warsaw, 1991), pp. 70–74. Today, only one Byzantine Slavonic-rite parish exists in Poland, in Kostomłoty near Brześć.
- ⁷ In a speech to Byzantine Slavonic-rite clergy on 10 February 1933 Bishop Przeździecki addressed these problems in the development of the rite. The problems were themselves enumerated to him by the clergy. See Henryk Przeździecki, *Listy pasterskie i przemówienia, 1928–1938* (Siedlce, 1938), p. 496. More specifically, the opposition of Polish governments – because the Byzantine Slavonic rite was not included in the 1925 Concordat and was seen as a 'russifying' instrument – is discussed in Krasowski, *op. cit.*, pp. 180–85, and Wilk, *op. cit.*, pp. 170–85. The opposition within Polish society to the neo-union is also discussed in these sources. However, regarding Polish society's reaction to the neo-union, the publication by Henryk Ignacy Łubieński in 1932 of *Droga na wschód Rzymu* (*Rome's Road to the East*), must be specifically mentioned. Łubieński, a conservative Catholic journalist, attacked the Vatican and claimed that Rome was furthering its eastern policy at the cost of the 'russification' of Catholic Poland. In support of the Vatican, the Warsaw archbishop Aleksander Kakowski forbade Catholics in his archdiocese to read the book. Within a short time (1933), the publicity over the book and the archbishop's action led to the publication of *Dyskusja prasowa wokół książki Droga na wschód Rzymu* (*The Press Response to Rome's Road to the East*).
- ⁸ On this Catholic 'martyrology', see Konrad Sadkowski, 'From ethnic borderland to Catholic fatherland: the church, Christian Orthodox, and state administration in the Chełm Region, 1918–1939', *Slavic Review*, vol. 57, no. 4, 1998, pp. 813–39.
- ⁹ On 20 October 1931 the Ukrainian periodical *Dilo* reported: 'the [neo-] union has more of a theoretical character than one of preparation for future activity'. Quoted in Edward Prus, *Władza świętojurski: Rzecz o arcybiskupie Andrzeju Szeptyckim (1865–1944)* (Instytut Wydawniczy Związków Zawodowych, Warsaw, 1985), p. 143.
- ¹⁰ On Bishop Fulman's interrelated opposition to the Uniate Church, the Orthodox Church and the Byzantine Slavonic rite (between 1925 and about 1930), see my articles 'Religious exclusion and state building ...' and 'From ethnic borderland to Catholic fatherland ...'; as well as my dissertation, *Church, Nation and State in Poland: Catholicism and National*

Identity Formation in the Lublin Region, 1918–1939 (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1995), pp. 236–39. On Bishop Fulman's early attitude toward the Byzantine Slavonic rite, see Wilk, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

- ¹¹ The Dworzaczek questionnaire is in Archiwum Archidiecezjalne Lubelskie (hereafter AAL), Rep. 61.XII.1 (Former Uniate Churches and their Properties, 1918–1938). In addition to Orthodox opposition to conversion to the Latin rite, other reasons why Bishop Fulman finally accepted the Byzantine Slavonic rite for his diocese might be that only the Lublin diocese had not adopted the neo-union by the late 1920s; and the pressure to promote church union as expressed in the encyclical *Rerum orientalium* of 8 September 1928 and other Vatican documents. On the latter, see *Unijna encyklika 'Rerum orientalium' z dnia 8 września 1928 r. oraz Instrukcja 'Pro incenso studio' z dnia 27 maja 1937 r. (O opiece duszpasterskiej nad wiernymi obrządku wschodniego w Polsce (poza Galicję))*, trans. and ed. Michał Niechaj (*Pism Stolicy Apostolskiej*, tom 5) (Lublin, 1938); and Wilk, *op. cit.*, pp. 173–76.
- ¹² AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5 (The Propagation of the Union in the Chelm Region, 1915–1936), letter from Bishop Fulman to the abbot primate of the Basilian Order in Lwów (L'viv), 31 December 1930.
- ¹³ AAL, Rep. 61.XXI.5, letter (no. 1/31) from the Basilian Order in Lwów (L'viv) (signature illegible), 4 January 1931; and letter (no. 295) from Bishop Fulman to the Basilian Order in Lwów (L'viv), 26 January 1931.
- ¹⁴ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, petition from the Orthodox residents of Grabowiec and surrounding villages (138 signatures) to Bishop Fulman, 9 February 1931. On the controversy between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches over pre-1875 Uniate churches in the Chelm region, see Sadkowski, 'From ethnic borderland ...'
- ¹⁵ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, letter (no. 574) from Bishop Fulman to Fr Melchior Juściński. 11 February 1931.
- ¹⁶ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, letter (no. 82) from Fr Melchior Juściński to Bishop Fulman, 20 February 1931.
- ¹⁷ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, petition from residents of Tuczępy and Wola Tuczępska (22 signatures) to Bishop Fulman, 26 March 1931.
- ¹⁸ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, letter (no. 1079) from Bishop Fulman to Fr Wojciech Bojarczuk, 2 April 1931.
- ¹⁹ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, letter from members of the Roman Catholic parish in Grabowiec to Bishop Fulman, 6 April 1931.
- ²⁰ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, letter from Bishop Fulman to Fr Wojciech Bojarczuk, 7 April 1931.
- ²¹ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, letter (no. 45) from Fr Wojciech Bojarczuk to Bishop Fulman, 7 April 1931.
- ²² AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5. Fr Andrzej Truch, a Basilian, took up responsibilities in November 1931. Fr Mitrofan Hrynkiewicz of the same order replaced Fr Truch in May 1932. Fr Hrynkiewicz was to exchange positions in September 1933 with the neo-union priest in Horodło, Fr Jozafat Fedoryk. In 1934, however, Fr Hrynkiewicz was still in Grabowiec. As for the Roman Catholic priests, Fr Józef Czarnecki replaced Fr Bojarczuk in February 1933.
- ²³ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, petition from the Roman Catholic parishioners of Grabowiec to Bishop Fulman, 14 May 1931; petition from Grabowiec neo-unionists to Bishop Fulman, 17 October 1932; letter from three neo-unionists to Bishop Fulman, 28 February 1934.
- ²⁴ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5. On the conflicts in Grabowiec, see two reports on visits to Grabowiec from Fr Antoni Niemancewicz to Bishop Fulman, 23 April 1931.
- ²⁵ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5. For examples of such criticism see letter (no. 73) from Fr Wojciech Bojarczuk to Bishop Fulman, 12 June 1932; letter (no. 26) from Fr Wojciech Bojarczuk to Bishop Fulman, 8 February 1933; letter (no. 100) from Fr Józef Czarnecki to Bishop Fulman (8 April 1933); and letter from Fr Józef Czarnecki to Bishop Fulman, 3 March 1934.
- ²⁶ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, letter from Bishop Mikołaj Czarnecki to Bishop Fulman, 12 June

1933.

²⁷ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, letter (no. 1537) from Bishop Fulman to Fr Józef Czarnecki, 16 June 1933.

²⁸ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, letter from Fr Mitrofan Hryniewicz to Bishop Fulman, 23 February 1934.

²⁹ AAL, Rep. 61.XII.5, letter (no. 1049) from Fr Mitrofan Hryniewicz to Bishop Fulman, 19 April 1933. The neo-union parish in Grabowiec was officially established in 1937. See Stępień, 'Obrządki wschodnie ...', p. 73.

³⁰ Stępień, *loc. cit.* Like the Grabowiec parish, the Horodło and Hołubie parishes were officially established only in 1937 and the Pawłów parish in 1938.

³¹ Fr Walerian Meysztowicz, secretary to the archbishop 1926–31, made these observations. See his *Gawędy o czasach i ludziach*, 3rd edn (Polska Fundacja Kulturalna, London, 1986), pp. 206–12; and Krasowski, *Episkopat katolicki ...*, p. 183.

³² Przeździecki, *Listy pasterskie ...*, p. 500.

³³ See *Unijna encyklika 'Rerum orientalium' ...*, p. 61.

³⁴ See *ibid.*, p. 65.