

In compliance with the
Canadian Privacy Legislation
some supporting forms
may have been removed from
this dissertation.

While these forms may be included
in the document page count,
their removal does not represent
any loss of content from the dissertation.

University of Alberta

FRAMING THE UKRAINIAN PEASANTRY IN
HABSBURG GALICIA: 1846-1914 (WITH
FOCUS ON THE SAMBIR AREA)

by

Andriy Zayarnyuk



A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in History

Department of History and Classics

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2003



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitons et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

ISBN: 0-612-88073-7

Our file *Notre référence*

ISBN: 0-612-88073-7

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Andriy Zayarnyuk

Title of Thesis: Framing the Ukrainian Peasantry in Habsburg Galicia: 1846-1914 (With Focus on the Sambir Area)

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 2003

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

20 May 2003

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommended to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **“Framing the Ukrainian Peasantry in Habsburg Galicia: 1846-1914 (With Focus on the Sambir Area)”** submitted by **Andriy Zayarnyuk** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in History**.

Dr. John-Paul Himka

Dr. David C. Johnson

Dr. Dennis Sweeney

Dr. Franz A. J. Szabo

Dr. Derek Sayer

Dr. Andriy Nahachewsky

Dr. Mark L. von Hagen

16.05.2003

Пам'яті Антона Мандюка та Марії з Курилків,
їх правнукові Антосику і коханій Мартусі

Abstract

This thesis presents the history of the identity projects targeting the Ruthenian peasantry of Habsburg Galicia in the nineteenth century. It covers political, social and cultural development in the Sambir area, compares various national discourses and movements, their cultural production and networks of agents, trying to investigate their impact on and response to them from among the local peasants. It is also the study of rural radicalism in Galicia, of local politics, of the social relationships in Galician villages and of these relationships' connections with the vicissitudes of the Ruthenian/Ukrainian national movement in the province. On the basis of many case-studies this thesis argues that by the beginning of the twentieth century nation and class were merging in the public self-representations of the Ukrainian peasantry. Working through the highly efficient and disciplining public sphere created by the affiliated organizations, nation and class became facts of everyday life for the majority of the area's Ruthenian peasants, shaping peasants' experience, system of knowledge and, ultimately, actions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is the product of more than ten years of engagement with Galician history, and is influenced by my contacts with many people from different institutions and places. First of all I wish to thank Iaroslav Hrytsak, who introduced me to nineteenth century Galicia in L'viv in 1990 and maintained interest in my work during all the consecutive years. Another person from the L'viv academic environment to whom this thesis owes a lot is Ostap Sereda. His friendship, moral support, familiarity with the topic, and willingness to share his scholarly discoveries greatly facilitated my work on this project, especially in its final stage. The research itself was helped greatly by the staff of the State Archive in Przemyśl, by the staff of the Manuscript Division of the Stefanyk Library in L'viv and by Myroslava Diachuk from the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in L'viv.

Much of the work on it was done on the other side of the Atlantic. My ideas about western historiography to a great extent were shaped by the graduate seminars at York University with Susan Houston, Janet Neesen, Nicholas Rogers, and Orest Subtelny. The way the thesis was written owes a lot to the seminars at the University of Alberta with Andrew Gow, Markus Reisenleitner, Derek Sayer, Dennis Sweeney, and graduate students from the department of History and Classics. Among the latter I owe special gratitude to Srdja Pavlovic for both stimulating discussions and the immense help he was providing throughout all the years of our friendship.

The very project would be impossible without generous financial support from the University of Alberta which I was privileged to have been receiving throughout all the five years of my Ph. D program there.

For reading parts of the manuscript and help in preparation of its final version I am grateful to Mark Baker, Susan Ingram, and William Risch, all of whom had commented on various versions of different chapters. But my greatest debt is to John-Paul Himka, whose work on Galician history made projects like this possible, who was supporting this project at every stage, read the manuscript several times, discussed it with me and helped to edit the final version. Sometimes I think that this work is merely one prolonged debate with John-Paul and his work.

Finally, without Marta and Antin, without their love, understanding and help I would never have written this thesis the way I did.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume 1

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: <i>Dobrivliany Affair (A Case of What?)</i>	20
Two Villages Found Reading Clubs to Enlighten Themselves.....	22
Splits and More Conflicts	35
The Sambir Trial or Hidden Crimes of The Activists	50
Aftermath	61
Conclusions.....	75
Chapter 2: <i>1846: Not Just Bloody</i>	78
The Story of Józef Boberski	83
The Story of Bazyli Wysoczański.....	87
Clandestine Meeting	92
In the Priest's House	95
An Assault on the Circle Capital.....	97
Case from Matkiv.....	99
Interpretation.....	106
Chapter 3: <i>1848: Languages of Emancipation</i>	119
National	120
Legacy of Absolutism.....	131
Social	148
Sambir Ruthenians.....	179
Chapter 4: <i>The Politics of Property</i>	194
Representations of the Servitudes' Problematic	194
The Case of Bilyna Velyka	213
The Case of Lanovychi.....	217
The Morozovychi Case.....	222
The Case of Nedił'na.....	232
The Galician Diet and the Issue of Servitudes.....	234
Servitudes and Ruthenians	250
Chapter 5: <i>The Politics of Paternalist Populism,</i> <i>or on Priests, Peasants and Texts</i>	270
A Vagabond from Hrushiv	270
Hrushiv: Background.....	274
The Party of St. George.....	283
Good Books Reach Galician Villages	291
A Local Version of Enlightenment.....	333
From Peasants to Students	342
Temperance	350

Being Ruthenian in Sambir	364
Politics.....	382

Volume 2

Chapter 6: <i>Correspondents</i>	398
New Generation.....	398
Peasant Correspondent.....	401
Reading Clubs.....	409
Petty Gentry.....	419
The Community of Morozovychi.....	423
Politics.....	435
Capitalism.....	448
Interregnum	452
Stories of Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi.....	456
In the Tenets of Racial Discourse	469
Chapter 7: <i>Stories of Ivan Mykbas</i>	499
Morozovychi, <i>Prosvita</i> , and Mykhas' Revolt.....	499
<i>Prosvita</i> Without Mykhas and Mykhas' Opposition Politics.....	519
Elections of 1897.....	542
Bobers'kyi's Victory in Morozovychi.....	552
Moving to Berehy	591
Chapter 8: <i>Sustaining the Nation's Body</i>	639
Reading Clubs in the 1890-1900s: Maintaining the Public Sphere.....	640
The Peasant Class	680
Dealing with Petty Gentry.....	714
Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi's Work	724
Conclusions	759
Bibliography.....	772

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5-1 "Development of Galician Elementary Schools in the Nineteenth Century" v.1, page 345.

Table 5-2 "Distribution of the Peasant Votes for the Candidates According to Social Position of the Latter in 1876 and 1883 Elections." v.1., page 386.

Table 6-1 "Illiteracy Rates for the Galician Population Older Than Six in 1880-1900," v.2, page 427.

Table 6-2 "Distribution of the Communities of Sambir and Stare Misto districts According to the Population's Size," v.2, page 435.

Table 8-1 "Development of *Prosvita* in 1890-1912," v.2, page 641.

Table 8-2 "Development of the *Prosvita* reading clubs in Sambir and Saryi Sambir districts in 1900-1904," v.2, page 647.

Table 8-3 "Reading Clubs of the Sambir *Prosvita's* Branch as of 1909," v.2, page 659.

Table 8-4 "Reading Clubs of the Saryi Sambir *Prosvita-s* Branch as of 1910," v.2, page 666.

Table 8-5 "Percentage of Land under Selected Cultures in Galicia in 1873-1893," v.2, page 700.

Table 8-6 "Cattle Hold by Peasants and Large Estates in 1907 in the Sambir, Luka and Saryi Sambir court districts," v.2, page 701.

Table 8-7 "Distribution of the Emergency Aid among the villages in Mshanets' area in 1890," v.2, page 732.

Table 8-7 "Voting in the Fourth Curia of the Sambir-Stare Misto-Turka-Rudky electoral district in 1897," v.2, page 740.

Table 8-8 "Voting from the Fourth Curia in 1900 Diet Elections in the Sambir-Rudky-Turka-Saryi Sambir Electoral District.," v.2, page 742.

Introduction

I would therefore propose, as a very first definition of critique, this general characterization: the art of not being governed so much.

Michel Foucault, "What is Critique?"

What Proust began so playfully became awesomely serious. He who has once begun to open the fan of memory never comes to the end of its segments; no image satisfies him, for he has seen that it can be unfolded, and only in its folds does the truth reside; that image, that taste, that touch for whose sake all this has been unfurled and dissected; and now remembrance advances from small to smallest details, from the smallest to the infinitesimal, while that which it encounters in these microcosms grows even mightier. Such is the deadly game that Proust began so dilettantishly, in which he will hardly find more successors than he needed companions.

Walter Benjamin, "A Berlin Chronicle."

There is no simple way to define the object and scope of the investigation presented in this thesis. Despite the fact that both peasantry and Sambir region figure in the thesis' title, it is neither the history of this region nor the history of Ukrainian peasants, and not even the history of the representations of these peasants and this area. This thesis is rather about the construction of social abstractions and very material consequences of this process. It is about "Ukrainian peasantry," as both discursive construction and experienced reality. As such it is neither history "from below" nor "history from above." Although written in the tradition of critical social history, this thesis travels across the fields of the social, economic, cultural and political as easily as the images and people it describes. The thesis tries to trace the images and networks either claimed or constructed by the Ukrainian (Ruthenian) national movement in Galicia, and related to the local peasants; to find about these networks' and images' mutations and metamorphoses.

The metaphor "framing" is used in this thesis to indicate a key difference between the chosen one and other possible approaches to the same themes, region and period. It also betrays several assumptions the author of this thesis had while working on it. These assumptions were: the constructed character of

nations as well as any other social reality; the discursive nature of these constructions and of “experience” itself; that there is uneven distribution of power among people and places; that power relationships, different regimes of domination and modes of resistance are not simply reflected in but constituted by the discourses; that some of the discourses can be effectively described by the concept “modernity” and are still shaping our “present.”

Having these theoretical assumption the author was working with very concrete texts, places and people. The following were the larger questions with which the author was concerned while writing the thesis:

- How did identity-construction look in the case of the Galician countryside? How was Ukrainian identity constructed in Galicia and how did it win in the competition with other identity-projects? What were the relationships between national and social identity in this case?
- How was the “peasantry” conceptualized and negotiated by conflicting identity-movements, various political forces within them, provincial authorities and state structures? What was the relationship between these conceptualizations and “modernity”? How was the connection between “peasant” and “Ukrainian” symbolically constructed and why did it become so important?
- How did the social matrix, configurations of power relationships, multiple vectors of domination and resistance shift and change in the process of symbolic construction of the national and social?

The period, with which this thesis deals, is defined as 1846-1914, but just as any other chronological boundaries, these are very conventional. Spatially, this thesis deals with the former Austrian province of Galicia and the Ukrainian movement there. While quite often using sources that pertain to the whole of Galicia I tried to limit my case-studies of concrete encounters between the intellectual projects and peasants to the single Sambir region. The choices made in regard to this investigation’s chronological and spatial boundaries were not accidental but grounded in the contemporary contexts. These contexts are especially important since this thesis attempts to be Foucault’s “effective history,” one that tries to engage critically pretended continuities and the seeming obviousness of the narratives legitimizing present institutions and policies.¹

This thesis is an engagement with and a product of the current Ukrainian context, with all its multiple dimensions ranging from the ways history has been done in L’viv since the 1980s, to the ways the Ukrainian state’s institutions have been imagining their legacy and implementing their politics. But this thesis, as well as the current Ukrainian context, is also the product of the post-Soviet world. The thesis has been written in several cities and several countries, has

¹ Michel Foucault, “Nietzsche, genealogy, history,” in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), 154.

become part of the new post-Soviet geography undermining certainties of the Self and social entities, with which the Self has been customarily associated. This new geography has changed the way we see the narratives that used to present themselves as familiar and at the same time particular stories, and made apparent their strange and global dimensions. This new geography has also confronted us with different policies and problems that have become an integral part of our thinking. Of these two, the Ukrainian context would be the one easier to describe.

Since the creation of the Ukrainian state in 1991, the second half of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century have become of crucial importance to Ukrainian history. The period in which Soviet historiography was allowed to discern only the growth of class antagonism and the appearance of political and intellectual forces destined to solve this antagonism by establishing a new social formation all of a sudden turned into the period of the appearance of political and intellectual forces destined to solve the national problem, to establish the Ukrainian state and create a Ukrainian nation. This is the period in which the newly established Ukrainian state has been seeking its own legacy.² But the period which is seen as the cradle of the Ukrainian nation was also the context for the appearance of the major problems the Ukrainian nation as an intellectual construction would face. I would say that the most important question for the Ukrainian nation and, correspondingly, for Ukrainian historiography has been the correlation of the “social” and “national.”

The major intellectual framework, a system of coordinates with two axes, social and national, was established in the nineteenth century. The problem is that historians writing in the two paradigms, Marxist and nationalist, were unwilling or unable to leave this nineteenth century bipolarity while writing their histories.³ This intellectual continuity between contemporary historians and their “sources” largely remains unexposed in contemporary Ukrainian historiography. The deadlock of the social and national which has been haunting Ukrainian intellectuals for more than 100 years still remains intact. Many attempts have been made to deal with these two categories that serve as transcendental properties in

² Compare the book co-authored by the former Chair of the Presidential Administration – Vasyl' Kremin', Dmytro Tabachnyk, Vasyl' Tkachenko, *Ukraina: al'ternatyvy postupu: krytyka istorychnoho dosvidu* (Kyiv: Firma “Arc-Ukraine,” 1996) with one by the leading nineteenth century historian, Vitalii Sarbei, *Do vyroblennia kontseptsii bahatotomnoi “Istorii ukrains'koho narodu”: rozdumy i propozytsii* (Kyiv: I-t istorii Ukrainy AN Ukrainy, 1994). For a scholarly attempt to bridge the contingencies of the twentieth century and link the contemporary Ukrainian state with the nineteenth century national revival see Vladyslav Verstiuk, “Conceptual Issues in Studying the History of the Ukrainian Revolution,” *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, v. 24, 2000, 3-20.

³ For a discussion of these two paradigms in relationship to the historiography of the Ukrainian revolution see John-Paul Himka, “The National and the Social in the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1920: The Historiographical Agenda,” *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, v.34, 1994, 95-110.

the interpretations of the period under consideration. These attempts range from thorough separation of national and social, through tracing causal relationships between the two, to blending them together in an all-explaining synthesis.

In these schemas of Ukrainian history Galicia played a special role. Galicia was the only major region of contemporary Ukraine where the Ukrainian movement was developing “normally,” although a bit belatedly, and where on the eve of the First World War a majority of the Ukrainian population was nationally self-conscious.⁴ Seen as a Ukrainian Piedmont, Galicia has served as an example of what Ukrainian nationalism should be. Less haunted by the acute problems Ukrainian nationalism had to face in “greater Ukraine,” Galicia served as a legitimization of that movement, as an example of what that movement could have become under “normal” circumstances.⁵

Being the example of a normal national revival, Galicia served as a perfect object for studies employing Miroslav Hroch’s scheme of the national revivals among non-historic peoples of Europe.⁶ The works employing explanations of nationalism as a modern phenomenon made a major breakthrough in Ukrainian history, showing the nation as a constructed entity that was the result of social change and of the organized national movement’s interventions.⁷ Being charmed

⁴ For the best account of the development of the Ukrainian national movement in Habsburg Galicia that set the pattern for contemporary “conventional” representations of Ukrainian history see Ivan Lysiak-Rudnyts’kyi, “The Ukrainians in Galicia under Austrian Rule,” in his, Essays in Modern Ukrainian History (Cambridge, MA: Distributed by Harvard University Press for the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1987), 315-352.

⁵ For this interpretation of the Galician experience see the first short surveys of the history of the Galician Ukrainians – Volodymyr Hnatiuk, Natsional’ne vidrodzhennia avstrouhors’kykh ukraïntsiiv, 1772-1880 rr. (Viden’: Soiuz Vyzvolennia Ukraïny, 1916); Mykhailo Lozyns’kyi, Halychyna v zhyttii Ukraïny (Viden’: Soiuz Vyzvolennia Ukraïny, 1916), Mykhailo Vozniak, Iak probudylosia ukraïns’ke zhyttia v Halychyni za Avstriï (L’viv: “Dilo”, 1924).

⁶ Miroslav Hroch, Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of The Social Composition of Patriotic Groups Among The Smaller European Nations (New York-Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

⁷ This can be traced back to the work of Ivan Lysiak-Rudnyts’kyi, who had been differentiating between the “people” and “modern nation” and saw the “Ukrainian national revival” of the nineteenth century as a process of the formation of a “modern nation.” See his “Formuvannia ukraïns’koho narodu i natsii,” in Ivan Lysiak-Rudnyts’kyi Istorychni ese, t.1 (Kyïv: Osnovy, 1994), 11-40. As an example of a study based on such an approach we can take John-Paul Himka, Galician Villagers and The Ukrainian National Movement in The Nineteenth Century (Edmonton: CIUS Press, 1988), where the countryside is presented as being penetrated by both the “money economy” and the “national movement.” This led to the transformation of the traditional peasant society into a modern nation. For the attempt to revise this picture through diminishing the importance of the organized national movement and looking for peasant agency embodied in the community’s interaction, see Stella Hryniuk, Peasants with Promise: Ukrainians in Southeastern Galicia, 1880-1900 (Edmonton: CIUS Press, 1991). In fact, John-Paul Himka was also concerned with peasant agency, which he saw as a class struggle channeled by the national movement. For the general problems which any project about recovering the collective peasant agency would face, see Gyan Prakash, “Subaltern Studies as Postcolonial Criticism,” American Historical Review, 99, (1994),

by Gellner's powerful explanation of nationalism, these studies tended to essentialize social experience. Satisfied with the social mechanics of the national, they did not bother to look closer at the categories on which these mechanics functioned.⁸ Satisfied with finding a social explanation for the rise of the nation, these studies did not pay particular attention to how national and social denotations functioned as categories of identity. This question, of identity-formation, could not be satisfactorily explained in terms of social systems and structures and should be analyzed as occurring in a larger cultural field.⁹ Concentration on larger structures hindered closer analysis of texts that appeared in the period under consideration.

Recent works in the field challenge and revise the idea about the socially determined development of the Ukrainian nation. They try to show the normality of Ukrainian nation-building, implicitly rejecting the division between historical and non-historical nations as being of no heuristic value. But in attempts to overcome the narrowness of previous approaches, they fall into the trap of reducing the process to the sphere of politics or of ideas. Presenting the nation as an intellectual construction (which it, of course, was) historians in the Ukrainian case simplify the discursive character of this construction and forget about the social space in which the construction was taking place.¹⁰ The constructed nature of both the social and national categories does not cut off their connections with other fields of human experience; indeed, it makes these connections stronger.

This preoccupation with ideas and with the political cannot be excused by the predominantly social-economic direction of historical research in the Soviet period. The supposed social-economic orientation of Soviet Ukrainian historiography as well as its Marxist analytical framework were fake.¹¹ The social

1475-1490. For an interesting approach to collective agency based on the "sliding" character of signification see Homi K. Bhabha "Postcolonial and the Postmodern: The Question of Agency" and "By Bread Alone: Signs of Violence in the Mid-Nineteenth Century", in Homi K. Bhabha, The Location of Culture (New York, London: Routledge, 1994).

⁸ Nicholas B. Dirk, Geoff Eley, Sherry B. Ortner, "Introduction" in Nicholas B. Dirk, Geoff Eley, Sherry B. Ortner (eds.), Culture/Power/History: A Reader In Contemporary Social Theory (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

⁹ For the general shift in the study of nationalism see Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny (eds.), Becoming National: A Reader (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996). I use "cultural field" as distinct from the modernist notion of "culture." I imagine "cultural field" as generating discursive regimes in which certain social systems or structures are adjudicated. The notion of "field" assumes the existence of multiple spaces and levels in which culture works and rejects the idea about "culture" as occupying a fixed place.

¹⁰ As examples look at Roman Szporluk, "Ukraine: From an Imperial Periphery to a Sovereign State," Daedalus, 126 (3), 1997, 85-119; and John-Paul Himka, "The Construction of Nationality in Galician Rus': Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions," in Ronald Grigor Suny and Michael D. Kennedy (eds.), Intellectuals and Articulation of the Nation (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 109-164.

¹¹ The best example of Marxist social analysis in the case of Galician history was actually applied not by a professional historian but a Polish literary critic. This is Kazimierz Wyka, Teka Stańczyka na tle historii

context of Soviet historiography was not deduced from sources but assumed in accordance with the prevailing ideology. This kind of Marxism was not an analytical tool, rather a necessary requirement of presentation. What historians were looking for were largely new events and facts, which could be shared within that form of presentation.¹² Therefore the absence of social context is in fact well grounded in the tradition of contemporary Ukrainian historiography.

Even in the few works that were written as social history, the peasantry was presented as a social class too unproblematically.¹³ That attitude influenced the approach to peasant action and even to social memory, which were viewed in their supposed transition from those of the traditional peasant society to national ones.¹⁴ The metamorphoses of the Galician peasantry which made it different from any other, including its counterpart in Greater Ukraine, were presented only as the development of national consciousness. Questions about disciplining (in the Foucauldian sense), about entering a bourgeois polity and public sphere,

Galicji w latach 1848-1869 (Instytut Badań Literackich. Studia historyczno-literackie, 4) (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich, 1951).

¹² As an example we can take the series Z istorii Zakhidnoukrains'kykh zemel' (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Akademii Nauk URSR, 1957-1960). Works openly concentrating on the history of ideas and politics include Semen Trusevych, Suspil'no-politychnyi rukh v Skhidnii Halychyni v 50-70kh rokakh XIX st. (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1978), Ivan Kompaniets', Stanovyshche i borot'ba trudiashchykh mas Halychyny (1960), Hryhorii Herbil's'kyi, Rozvytok prohresyvykh idei v Halychyni (L'viv: Vydavnytstvo L'vivs'koho Universytetu, 1964), Evdokiia Kosachevskaia, Vostochnaia Galitsiia nakanune i v period revoliutsii 1848 goda (L'viv: Izdatel'stvo L'vovskogo Universiteta, 1965).

¹³ See the description of the peasantry in Steven Lan Guthier, The Roots of Popular Ukrainian Nationalism: A Demographic, Social and Political Study of the Ukrainian Nationality to 1917 (Ph. D Dissertation: University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1990); compare it with the Soviet approaches to the Ukrainian peasantry in Mykhailo Herasymenko, Ahrarni vidnosyny v Halychyni v period kryzy panshchynnoho hospodarstva (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Akademii Nauk URSR, 1959), Dmitrii Poida, Krest'ianskoe dvizhenie na Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainie v poreformennyi period: 1866-1900 (Dnepropetrovsk, 1960), Feodosii Steblii, Borot'ba selian Skhidnoi Halychyny proty feodal'noho hnitu (L'viv, 1961), Feodosii Steblii, (ed.), Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny: 1772-1849 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1974). It is interesting that works dealing with peasant classes had nothing to say about this class' consciousness. For the definition of class with which they operate (based on the relationships to the means of production) the petty Galician gentry is of particular interest. For this see the relevant chapter in John-Paul Himka, Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century. An interesting social profile of the petty gentry appears in Krzysztof Ślusarek, Drobna szlachta w Galicji, 1772-1848 (Kraków, 1994). The author is good in "measuring" social parameters and explaining the legal framework in which the petty gentry was placed by the Austrian government, but his attempt to explain the gentry's consciousness is unconvincing – look at his contribution to Jerzy Chłopecki, and Helena Madurowicz-Urbańska, (eds.), Galicja i jej dziedzictwo. Tom 2. Społeczeństwo i gospodarka (Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Rzeszowie, 1995).

¹⁴ John-Paul Himka, Galician Villagers and The Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century, (Edmonton: CIUS Press, 1988); -- I see that this has been cited in full three times in the intro. compare with Walentyna Najdus, Szkice z historii Galicji, 2vs. (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1958).

languages of class that transformed “monarch’s and landlords’ subjects” into citizens and “peasantry” have never been asked.

It is not an accident that the new Ukrainian history of the nineteenth century that has been flourishing in the last decade, largely in L’viv, has been preoccupied with political history. The conjuncture between the heritage of Soviet Marxist scholarship, the interests of the new state and the genuine interest of historians in the history of the national movement (much simplified during the Soviet period) produced an explosion of works on nineteenth century Galicia in Ukrainian historiography.¹⁵ But the same conjuncture determined the focus of all these works on political orientations, events, and biographies.

The set of problems mentioned above is not limited to Ukrainian history. Polish history (despite, or actually because of, “belonging” one of the few “historical” nations in the region) was the one to develop a powerful trend of analysis of peasant testimonies with a search for the changes in national consciousness. Starting with the classical work by Thomas and Znaniecki¹⁶ and letters of immigrants, scholars went through peasants’ letters to editors, letters from the

¹⁵ I’ll list here only some of the more important works that appeared in this context in the last decade. Olena Arkusha, Halyts’kyi seim: vyborchi kampanii 1889 i 1895 rr. (L’viv, 1996); Olena Arkusha, “Ukrains’kyi natsional’nyi rukh u Halychyni naprykintsi 80-kh rr. XIX st.,” in Ukraina: kul’turna spadshchyna, natsional’na svidomist’, derzhavnist’, vyp.3-4 (L’viv, 1997), 119-140; Olena Arkusha, “Mikhal Bobzhyns’kyi ta ukrains’ke pytannia v Halychyni,” Visnyk L’vivs’koho universytetu. Seriiia istorychna, vyp.35-36 (L’viv, 2000), 168-206; Olena Arkusha, Mar’ian Mudryi, “Rusofil’stvo v Halychyni v seredyni XIX – na pochatku XX st.: heneza, etapy rozvytku, svitohliad,” Visnyk L’vivs’koho universytetu. Seriiia istorychna, vyp.34 (L’viv, 1999), 231-268; Ihor Chornovol, Ukrains’ko-pol’s’ka uhoda 1890-1894 rr. (L’viv: L’vivs’ka akademiia mystetstv, 2000); Ihor Chornovol, Ukrains’ka fraktsiia Halyts’koho kraiovoho seimu 1861-1901 rr. (Narys z istorii ukrains’koho parlamentaryzmu) (L’viv, 2002); Mar’ian Mudryi, “Problema avtonomii Halychyny v diial’nosti Halyts’koho Kraiovoho seimu (kinets’ 60-kh – pochatok 70-kh rr. XIX st.),” in Visnyk L’vivs’koho universytetu. Seriiia istorychna, vyp.30 (L’viv, 1995), 47-56; Mar’ian Mudryi, “Mistseve samovriaduvannia Halychyny v konteksti ukrains’ko-pol’s’kykh vzaiemyn (druga polovyna XIX stolittia),” Ukraina v mynulomu, vyp.9 (Kyiv-L’viv, 1996), 77-102; Mar’ian Mudryi, “Sproby pol’s’ko-ukrains’koho porozuminnia v Halychyni (60-70-i roky XIX st.),” Ukraina: kul’turna spadshchyna, natsional’na svidomist’, derzhavnist’, vyp.3-4 (L’viv, 1997), 87-101; Mar’ian Mudryi “Halyts’ka avtonomiia v 70-80-kh rokakh XIX stolittia: ukrains’ke ta pol’s’ke bachennia,” Ukraina: kul’turna spadshchyna, natsional’na svidomist’, derzhavnist’, vyp.7 (L’viv, 2000), 166-190; Iurii Mykhal’s’kyi, Pol’s’ka supil’nist’ ta ukrains’ke pytannia v Halychyni v period seimovykh vyboriv 1908 r. (L’viv, 1997); Vasyl’ Rasevych, “Vynyknennia ta orhanizatsiini osnovy Ukrains’koï Natsional’no-Demokratychnoi Partii,” Visnyk L’vivs’koho universytetu. Seriiia istorychna, vyp.32 (L’viv, 1997); Vasyl’ Rasevych, “Zasady politychnoi nezalezhnosti Ukrainy u prohrami Ukrains’koï Natsional’no-Demokratychnoi Partii,” Ukraina: kul’turna spadshchyna, natsional’na svidomist’, derzhavnist’, vyp.7 (L’viv, 2000), 229-242; Ostap Sereda, “Natsional’na svidomist’ i politychna prohrama rannikh narodovtsiv u Skhidnii Halychyni (1861-1867),” Visnyk L’vivs’koho universytetu. Seriiia istorychna, vyp.34 (L’viv, 1999), 199-214; Ostap Sereda, “*Aenigma ambulans*: o. Volodymyr (Ipolyt) Terlets’kyi i “ruska narodna ideia” v Halychyni,” Ukraina moderna, ch.4-5 (L’viv, 2000), 81-104; Oleksii Sukhyi, “Evoliutsiia natsional’noi prohramy Rus’ko-Ukrains’koï Radykal’noi Partii,” Ukraina: kul’turna spadshchyna, natsional’na svidomist’, derzhavnist’, vyp.7 (L’viv, 2000), 243-249;

¹⁶ William Thomas, Florian Znaniecki, The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. Monograph of an Immigrant Group (New York: The Knopf, 1927, the second edition).

front and letters to organizations trying to find how abstract notions of Poland, Poles and Polishness figured or were reflected in these letters. These notions were then related to certain processes in the peasant communities, to changes in the traditional ways of life, mobility, army service experience, national and social conflicts, etc.¹⁷ I think that it is even more important to correlate these testimonies with other texts which appeared in the same setting and were not authored by the peasantry; the very transition from readers into authors requires more detailed examination.¹⁸ I propose to look at “peasant testimonies” not as texts reflecting modernization, but as texts in which identity formation was at work, as a process in which the national context was created through upholding certain representations and rejecting others.¹⁹

Well developed in other parts of Europe, “history from below” can claim only a glance into rural Galicia in the 1880s.²⁰ Despite a large number of works on the political history of the province, especially in Polish, many problems, namely politics in the districts and small towns, the history of the ill-famed Galician elections, the politicization of the social, are untouched.²¹ Social history is limited

¹⁷ For interwar Poland see the materials collected by Józef Chałasiński and his analysis of them, Józef Chałasiński, *Młode pokolenie chłopów: procesy i zagadnienia kształtowania się warstwy chłopskiej w Polsce* (Warszawa: Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza “Pomoc Oświatowa”, 1938). An overview of this trend can be found in Jan Molenda, “The Formation of the National Consciousness of the Polish Peasants and the Part They Played in the Regaining of Independence by Poland”, *Acta Poloniae Historica*, (63-64), 1991, 121-148.

¹⁸ For the stress not on the peasant contributions but on the editors’ projects and larger political framework see Krzysztof Dunin-Wąsowicz, *Czasopiśmiennictwo ludowe w Galicji* (Wrocław, 1952). For a discussion of the representatives of peasants in nineteenth century Russian literature see Cathy A. Frierson, *Peasant Icons: Representations of Rural People in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

¹⁹ The traditional approach to peasant testimonies is locating agency outside of the media, diminishing the media’s significance to purely communicative tasks. This conflicts with Benedict Anderson’s approach to nationalisms which stresses the significance of media, especially that of newspapers, and shows that media do something more than just mediate. For the theoretization of the new possible approach to media see Lawrence Grossberg, “Globalization, Media and Agency,” (3-rd version, manuscript).

²⁰ Himka, *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement*. The pervasive influence of the “nationalist” discourse obvious in that case and causing grave doubts about the nature of “peasant voices” heard in the “peasant testimonies” was noticed by Christine D. Worobec, “Galicians into Ukrainians: Ukrainian Nationalism Penetrates Nineteenth-Century Rural Austrian Galicia,” *Peasant Studies*, v.16, No.3, 1989.

²¹ The best survey of Ukrainian politics in Galicia still remains Kost’ Levyts’kyi, *Istoria politychnoi dumky halyts’kykh ukraïntsiiv, 1848-1914. Na pidstavi vlasnykh spomyniv* (L’viv: Nakladom vlasnym, 1926). In the Polish case it is Wilhelm Feldman, *Stronnictwa i programy polityczne w Galicji, 1848-1906*, 2 vs. (Kraków: “Książka”, 1907). Since that time some interesting work has been done on the socialist parties and on Polish “democrats.” On the evolution of socialist politics see John-Paul Himka, *Socialism in Galicia: The Emergence of Polish Social-Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism (1860-1890)* (Cambridge, MA: Distributed by Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute, 1983); Iaroslav Hrytsak, “Molodi radykaly v suspil’no-politychnomu zhytti Halychyny,” *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni*

to general works on the Galician nobility, the Krakow intelligentsia, and the small towns of Western Galicia.²² The social history of the Galician village stopped in the 1930s, and the post-Second World War period was characterized by the dogmatic Soviet approach with emphasis on class struggle and social differentiation in the village.²³ The economic history of Eastern Galicia ceased to be written after World War II as well, except for some sporadic and not always successful attempts to write it in North America.²⁴ The same can be said about Ukrainian intellectual and cultural history. Therefore many works with a limited source base claim to have insights, which are not justified; working within a

Shevchenka (further on – ZNTSh), t.222, 1991, 71-110. On Polish “democrats” and their evolution see Zbigniew Fras, Florian Ziemiałkowski: 1817-1900. Biografia polityczna (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, 1991) and Maciej Janowski, Inteligencja wobec wyzwań nowoczesności: dylematy ideowe polskiej demokracji liberalnej w Galicji w latach 1889-1914 (Warszawa: Instytut historii PAN, 1996). Recent interest in the political history of Galicia is limited to the analysis of explicit political statements, fully articulated programs and institutionalized political activity (i. e. parliamentary, electionary, political parties). Józef Buszko, Polacy w parlamencie wiedeńskim 1848-1918 (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1996), Stanisław Grodziski, Sejm krajowy galicyjski: 1861-1914 (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowy, 1993).

²² On nobility see Irena Rychlikowa, “Galicyjski odłam narodu szlacheckiego w latach 1772-1815,” Kwartalnik Historyczny, 1989, t.45, z.2, 83-119, and Irena Rychlikowa, “Losy fortun magnackich w Galicji 1772-1815,” Kwartalnik Historyczny, 1989, t.45, z.3, 127-171. Works on Krakow include Józef Demel, Stosunki gospodarcze i społeczne Krakowa w latach 1846-1853 (Kraków, 1951); Józef Demel, Stosunki gospodarcze i społeczne Krakowa w latach 1853-1866 (Kraków, 1958); Józef Demel, Życie gospodarcze i społeczne ziemi krakowskiej (1848-1867) (Kraków, 1967); Irena Homola, “Kwiat społeczeństwa...” (Struktura społeczna i zarz. położenia inteligencji Krakowskiej w latach 1860-1914) (Kraków-Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1984); the only author who works on small Galician towns is Jadwiga Hoff, whose major work is Spółeczność małego miasta galicyjskiego w dobie autonomii (Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Rzeszowie, 1992).

²³ An example of social history is Wincenty Styś, Rozdrobnienie gruntów chłopskich w byłym zaborze austriackim w latach 1787-1931 (Lwów: Gebelthner i Wolf, 1934). Compare with Soviet historiography as represented by Mykola Kravets’, Seliansтво Skhidnoi Halychyny i Pivnichnoi Bukovyny u druhii polovyni XIX st. (L’viv: V-vo L’vivs’koho universytetu, 1964); Pavlo Sviezhyns’kyi, Ahrarni vidnosyny na Zakhidni Ukraini v kintsii XIX – na pochatku XX st. (L’viv: V-vo L’vivs’koho universytetu, 1966); Mykola Kravets’, “Selians’kyi rukh v Skhidni Halychyni v 50-80kh rokakh XIX st.,” in Z istorii Ukrain’s’koi RSR, vyp. 7 (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo AN URSSR, 1962); Mykola Kravets’, “Masovi selians’ki vystupy v Skhidni Halychyni v 90-kh rokakh XIX st.,” in Z istorii Ukrain’s’koi RSR, vyp. 8 (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo AN URSSR, 1963).

²⁴ The classical work remains Franciszek Bujak, Rozwój gospodarczy Galicji (1772-1914) (Lwów, 1917), as well as Franciszek Bujak, Galicja, 2 vs. (Lwów, 1908). Many good studies were published in the 1930s in L’viv in the series Social and Economic Studies. One of the best post-World War II works on Galicia came from that inter-war school of social-economic history – Roman Rozdolski, Stosunki poddańcze w dawnej Galicji (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962). The examples of North-American studies are Stella Hryniuk, “Peasant Agriculture in East Galicia in the Late Nineteenth Century,” Slavic and Eastern European Review, v.63(2), 1985, 228-243; and Richard Rudolf, “The East European Peasant Household and the Beginning of Industry: East Galicia, 1786-1914,” in Ihor Koropets’kyi (ed.), Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretive Essays (Cambridge, MA: Distributed by Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute, 1991), 339-382.

narrow time frame they make generalizations about larger periods.²⁵ The analyses of the identity and “national orientation” of Galician Ukrainians are limited to the classical texts that had already attracted scholars’ attention in the second half of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century. The links between these and many other texts of various genres, constituting the same discursive field are cut off in the contemporary analyses. This resulted in the formation of a canon of historical sources, which serve as landmarks of the conventional narrative; this canon resists reinterpretation of the texts it includes and seriously inflates the historical interpretations referring to them.²⁶

Nonetheless, especially in the last several years, some works appeared that try to go against this general trend and to some extent share the agenda and concerns of the present thesis. Among Ukrainian authors Iaroslav Hrytsak and Ostap Sereda try to go beyond the usual political history. The former tried to measure the growth of the influence of the nationalist project through the analysis of the changes in naming practices in Galicia, and the latter showed how political mechanisms (Diet elections, for example) contributed to the integration of peasants into the larger society.²⁷ Oleh Turii has been working on the role of the Church in the social-political life of Galician Ukrainians and in connection with this did very interesting work on national identities among Galician Ukrainians in

²⁵ The best example of an extremely narrow source base is Czesław Partacz, Od Badeniego do Potockiego: stosunki polsko-ukraińskie w Galicji w latach 1888-1908 (Toruń: Wydawnictwo A. Marszałek, 1996). In his analysis of Ukrainian-Polish relationships the author reproduces uncritically the discourse of the newspaper Czas and does not bother with examining the categories used by that newspaper. This can be seen as a reaction to the dogmatic Marxist works of previous Polish historiography and the taboo imposed by the political regime on the discussion of the Ukrainian-Polish conflict. An example of the dogmatic Marxist approach looking for the cooperation between the Polish and Ukrainian bourgeoisie is Józef Buszko, Sejmowa reforma wyborcza w Galicji, 1880-1914 (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1956). Concentration on the 1880s and conclusions about larger period are characteristic of Himka’s Galician Villagers.

²⁶ Obvious examples of these canonical texts are declarations about the “identity” of Galician Ukrainians from 1848 and 1866. Another example is fact that sources and key figures for the analysis of the Galician Russophiles were established by Mykola Andrusiak, Geneza i charakter halyts’koho russofil’stva v XIX-XX st. (Praha: Proboiem, 1941); an attempt to expand the scope of the sources and to pay attention to the social aspects was made by Paul Robert Magocsi, “The Kachkovs’kyi Society and the National Revival in Nineteenth Century East Galicia”, Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 15, 1991, 48-87. In the Ukrainian case a similar framework of the declarations and events was established by Kost’ Levyts’kyi in the already mentioned book. An example of the blind repetition of the canonical interpretations, which cannot be changed even by the formal declaration of a new framework, is Oleksii Sukhyi, Halychyna: mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom: narysy istorii, XIX – poch. XX st. (L’viv : L’vivs’kyi derzh. universytet, In-t ukraїnoznavstva im. I. Kryp’iakevycha NAN, 1997).

²⁷ Iaroslav Hrytsak, “Iakykh-to kniaziv buly stolytsi v Kyievi?..’: do konstruiuvannia istorychnoi pam’iati halyts’kykh ukraїntsiiv u 1830-1930-ti roky,” Ukraїna Moderna, ch.6 (L’viv, 2001), 77-95; Ostap Sereda, “My tu ne pryishly na smikh’: uchast’ skhidno-halyts’kykh selian u seimovykh vyborakh ta zasidanniakh u L’vovi (60-ti roky XIX st.), in Lwów: społeczeństwo, miasto, kultura, t.4 (Kraków, 2002), 165-186.

the mid-nineteenth century.²⁸ In the historiography of Polish Galicia a remarkable book on the peasants and Polish national movement was written by Keely Stauter-Halsted.²⁹ Sharing to large extent themes and concerns of this thesis Stauter-Halsted's book was written from a different theoretical and methodological perspective, which I have tried to criticize elsewhere.³⁰

Galician historiography also belongs to the shadowy zone of "Eastern Central Europe" and shares in the particularities of the historiography of that space. The lack of social history seems to be a characteristic feature not only of Galicia but of the whole "Eastern Central Europe," the space between, on the one hand the "classical West," and on the other hand – Russia. While on the other side of this zone – in the history of nineteenth century peasants in Russian Empire, one will find concerns mentioned in Eric Hobsbawm's famous essay on social history,³¹ as well as examples of the transformation of this social history in connection with the new "cultural turn,"³² it would be hard to find something similar in the works done on "Eastern Central Europe." In the case of the latter a particular obsession with politics and with nationalism seems to set the rules.³³ No wonder that a

²⁸ Oleh Turii, Hreko-katolyts'ka tserkva v suspil'no-politychnomu zhytti Halychyny, 1848-1867, (rukopys kandydats'koï dysertatsii, L'viv, 1994); Oleh Turii, "Konfessino-obriadovi chynnyk u natsional'niï samoidentyfikatsii ukraïntsiiv Halychyny v seredyni XIX st.," ZNTSh. Pratsi istorychno-filosofs'koï sektiï, t.233, 69-99; Oleh Turii, "Natsional'ne i politychne polonofil'stvo sered hreko-katolyts'koho dukhovenstva Halychyny pid chas revoliutsii 1848-1849 rokiv," ZNTS, t.228, 183-206. It is interesting that another work which places the political in the larger context is also concerned with the Greek Catholic Church – John-Paul Himka, Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine: The Greek Catholic Church and The Ruthenian National Movement in Galicia, 1867-1900 (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999).

²⁹ Keely Stauter-Halsted, The Nation in The Village: The Genesis of Peasant National Identity in Austrian Poland, 1848-1914 (Cornell University Press, 2001).

³⁰ Andriy Zayarnyuk, "Selo i liudy" ("Village and People"), Krytyka, 2002, issue 3(53), 21-25.

³¹ Eric J. Hobsbawm, "From Social History to the History of Society", Daedalus, 100, 1971, 20-45. Arguably, the social history of the Russian Empire developed hand-in-hand with Western social history, even if belatedly, borrowing from the latter themes and approaches, and reflecting changes in the latter. See Esther Kingstom-Mann, "Breaking the Silence: An Introduction," in Esther Kingstom-Mann and Timothy Mixer (eds.), Peasant Economy, Culture, and Politics of European Russia, 1800-1921 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 3-19. As an example see collections Wayne Vucinic, (ed.), The Peasant in Nineteenth Century Russia (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968), Beatrice Farnsworth and Lynne Viola (eds.), Russian Peasant Woman (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992). And works of individual historians, for example, Christine D. Worobec, "Horse Thieves and Peasant Justice in Post-Emancipation Imperial Russia," Journal of Social History, v.21, 1987, 281-292. Christine D. Worobec, Peasant Russia: Family and Community in the Postemancipation Period (Princeton: 1991).

³² See, for example, the collection Stephen Frank and Mark D. Steinberg (ed.), Cultures in Flux. Lower-Class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia (Princeton University Press, 1994) or individual historians. For example, Cathy A. Frierson, Peasant Icons. Representations of Rural People in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

historian doing the social history of peasants in Russian Empire was puzzled with a work on the nineteenth century Galician countryside: instead of chapbooks this work dealt with nationalist newspaper for peasants, made very little use of the anthropology of “traditional peasant society,” was preoccupied with political structures and changes, and some original peasant “voice” in it was allegedly not heard.³⁴

These differences between the kinds of social history produced were especially stimulating for the present investigation in the light of more recent developments in scholarship. There were growing concerns with ethnicity and identity among social historians, brought into mainstream sociology from cultural studies. The postcolonial context brought in discussions of the subaltern and the (im)possibility of hearing their voice, opened new dimensions in the debates on nationalism, rescuing them from collapsing into endless primordial vs. modern and cultural vs. political debates. Work on popular culture departed from the idea of its relative autonomy and indisputable opposition to higher culture. Peasants appeared as able to make sense of the structures and institutions exploiting and incorporating them, to read the symbolic structures of domination, and even put them to their own use. In this context particularities of the East-European history-writing start to make more sense and more intersections between them and either Western or non-Western histories appear.

All these changes were shaped by the shift in social sciences and humanities linked to the work of post-structuralist thinkers. This shift made many older schemata lose their plausibility and many debates their sense. But it also opened ways to revisit and revise some of the old concerns and narratives trying to salvage events and texts from their hold. It made it possible not to “apply” some ready-made theory to any context, but to rethink this context keeping in mind all the new questions and concerns it brought. It made it possible for this thesis to challenge the narrative, well established and quite familiar to the scholars and students of Ukrainian history, of the “development” of the Ukrainian national movement and national consciousness in nineteenth century Galicia.

Against this background the investigations this thesis pursues make more sense. One of them is connected with its regional focus. Concentrating on the Sambir area I hoped to be able to trace networks and changes in these networks through a longer period of time. On the other hand this regional focus, I hope, helped to

³³ See, for example, John D. Bell, Peasants in Power. Alexander Stamboliski and the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union, 1899-1923 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), Tamás Hofer, “The Creation of Ethnic Symbols from the Elements of Peasant Culture,” in Peter F. Sugar (ed.) Ethnic Diversity and Conflict in Eastern Europe (Santa Barbara, Oxford: ABC-Clio, 1980), 101-45, 463-72, Jan Molenda, Chłopi naród, niepodległość: kształtowanie się podstaw narodowych i obywatelskich chłopów w Galicji i Królestwie Polskim w przededniu odrodzenia Polski (Warszawa: Neriton, Instytut Historii PAN, 1999).

³⁴ Christine D. Worobec, “Galicians into Ukrainians: Ukrainian Nationalism Penetrates Nineteenth-Century Rural Austrian Galicia,” Peasant Studies, v.16, No.3, 1989, 201.

avoid obsession with the centre, the capital, networks and politics based there, and to give to the readers a taste of the Galician province. I was searching for the texts either created in the region or referring to the region, and, as a matter of course, found more on some villages and less or nothing at all on the others. Not trying to recreate the life in these villages, I tried to weave my stories on the basis of these texts, tracing connections between them, regularities and the system of references that appear there. Therefore much of this thesis is written from inference or appears as complete guesswork.

It started as an attempt to correlate three large group of texts: 1) representations and conceptualizations of the peasantry in works of intellectuals targeting the intelligentsia as an audience; 2) popular press, popular books, brochures and declarations targeting the peasantry; 3) peasant testimonies (i. e. letters to private individuals and organizations, protocols of interrogations). The assumption is that these three sets of texts were not created independently from each other, and therefore connections between them can be established. I wished to trace correspondences (if any) between theoretical conceptualizations, the practical work of political activists, plots and images of popular publications, statements made by the peasantry and about the peasantry. Distinguishing these three groups of texts proved to be useful for the period ending at around 1900, when a common national field of discourse was firmly established.

While my thesis will make claims about the whole of eastern Galicia, closer attention will be paid to two districts: Sambir and Staryi Sambir. While drawing on the larger body of texts I would like to limit my discussion of how things worked in the villages to the material related to these two districts. These two districts were selected because of their marginal position, because they included both mountains and plain terrain, because the district capital Sambir was a significant urban center (having a prison, gymnasium and printing press), and because of the larger number of petty gentry of Greek Catholic faith, claimed by the Ukrainian movement but often in conflict with the local Ukrainian peasants. While representations of peasants by intellectuals will not be limited to these two districts most of the “peasant testimonies” and ethnographic material will be from there.

Besides such a “narrow” focus on these two districts I would like to concentrate on two authors: Ivan Mykhas and Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi, respectively from Sambir and Staryi Sambir districts. Ivan Mykhas was a peasant, village mayor and son of a mayor, the most prolific peasant contributor to popular newspapers from Sambir district. Being a member of the Radical party he was in the center of local peasant politics, was involved in a prolonged struggle with his parish priest, and never became a deputy either to the Diet or to the Parliament, although he tried several times to get there. Eventually, he lost his struggle to the priest but left a strong legacy of radical politics (which was felt even in the interwar period) at his new place of residency in the same district.

Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was of petty gentry origin. He attended gymnasium together with Ivan Franko and was almost drowned by him once during the break between classes. Eventually he became a parish priest in Mshanets', Staryi Sambir district. He was an ethnographer and a National-Democrat. Because of him Mshanets' provided a lot of field material for many renowned Ukrainian ethnographers (anthropologists). He transformed Mshanets' into a stronghold of Ukrainian nationalism. Just like Mykhas in Sambir district, Zubryts'kyi was the most prolific correspondent to the Ukrainian press from Staryi Sambir district and, being several times a candidate, never became a deputy to the Diet or to the Parliament.

Without trying to write their biographies I would like to take these two figures of the nationalist discourse, two agents in the countryside, who were working in close proximity to each other. These two figures were complementary for the national movement and for my task they represent two moving points in the framework of the social and national. They reflect the binary system of Ukrainian politics in Galicia, National-Democracy and Radical Party; they stand as figures for the educated and peasant correspondent, for two types of agent at work in the countryside. Even the entry and later disappearance of Ivan Mykhas from public discourse coincides with the influx and disappearance of articles written by peasants to popular newspapers. Because of this these two figures are important for the description of the mechanics of nationalist discourse.

Reading my sources I will try to avoid analyzing them in the terms imposed on the past by the historiography and instead I will try to uncover mechanisms that made these terms plausible. I will try to look into power as present in and configured by the texts, not external to them. I am especially interested in how the cognitive frameworks destined to absorb the peasantry were constituted, how they created the peasantry through making it "unpeasant,"³⁵ how these frameworks were sustained, how they moved, and what kind of space existed inside of them.

While on one level this thesis is the analysis of the archive of texts representing the peasants and the attempt to find in this archive certain "discursive formations," on another level this is a collage of petty cases-stories constructed from texts of different kinds. The significance of these petty case-studies is twofold. On one hand they will provide us with the threads in terms of people and images we could trace throughout our archive of texts. On the other hand

³⁵ I am pointing to the connotations of the word "peasant" (comparable to those of "feminine") and the role it played in the discourse of modernity as shown in Sandra Harding, "Gender, Development and Post-Enlightenment Philosophies of Science," in Linda J. Nicholson, (ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism* (New York, 1990), 83-106; also see Michael Kearney, *Reconceptualizing the Peasantry: Anthropology in the Global Perspective* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996). Representative of the "modernist" approaches to the peasantry and containing a good discussion of the problems this approach faces is Eric J. Hobsbawm, "Peasant and Politics," the opening article of *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, v.1, No.1, 1973.

they will provide us with some glimpses into how the discourses worked as well as into the sphere not covered by them.

Chapter I is one such study of a case already mentioned in the historiography. This case will largely deal with the 1880s and will introduce us to a number of themes, questions and people. Links spanning from this case in time will determine the chronological boundaries of the thesis while frustration with the already existing explanations of this case will show the need to revisit and reinterpret all the major landmarks in the history of nineteenth century Galicia.

Chapter II will deal with one such landmark – the Polish revolution of 1846 and slaughter of Polish nobility by the Galician peasants. Criticizing the existing historiography of the event with the help of smaller case-studies, this chapter will provide a different reading of 1846 and emphasize its significance for the formation of social and national identities in Galicia.

Chapter III will deal with another major event from the narratives about nineteenth century Galicia, namely the revolution of 1848, and its social and national aspects. The chapter will analyze the discourse of the Ruthenian national movement in 1848, the place of peasants in that discourse, as well as trace connections between this discourse and state politics and institutions. This discourse, arguably, is key for the understanding of interaction between the peasants and Ruthenian national movement in 1848 and its immediate aftermath.

Chapter IV will revisit the struggle for common pastures and forests, much-discussed in the historiography; the enclosure of these was one of the consequences of emancipation. The chapter will analyze it on two levels: of the separate cases taken from the Sambir area and of the Diet discussion. Finally, it will end with the analysis of the relationship between the Ruthenian movement and the issue of enclosures.

Chapter V will deal with the local Ruthenian activists in the 1860s-1870s and their relationships and attitudes towards peasants, as well as at the founding of the first Ruthenian societies created for the enlightenment of “simple people” and these societies’ activities in the 1870s. It will deal with the changes in Ruthenian politics and society, with the appearance of the new mode to approach peasants, which is designated here as “paternalist populism.”

Chapter VI will discuss the “turn to the social” occurring in the Ruthenian movement in the 1880s as well as generational change backing this turn. It will deal with the appearance of the successful popular newspaper *Bat'kivshchyna* and correspondents to this newspaper, with the new discourse about peasantry based on conceptualizations of the social absent in the texts from preceding decades.

Chapter VII will describe texts and events connected with the most prolific peasant correspondent and best known peasant activist from the Sambir area, Ivan Mykhas. Mykhas’ exploits connected with his activism, concepts and images with which he operates as well as networks in which he was involved will allow us

to rethink the history of the Ukrainian movement in Galicia in the 1890 and 1900s.

Chapter VIII will try to offer an alternative conceptualization of the developments in the Ukrainian movement in the countryside in the 1890s and 1900s. The movement will be considered as a field of social and political action formed and sustained by the two poles – national public sphere and peasant class. It will end with the description of how it worked in the very concrete case of one of its activists, Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi.

One of the most important difficulties in writing regional history of Galicia is the fact that there are almost no regional archives preserved for the eastern part of this province, now part of the Ukrainian state. There are no collections created from the documents of district administration, Sambir court, prosecutor's office in Sambir and so on. Some collections pertaining to the Sambir region seem to have been destroyed quite recently in the L'viv Oblast' State Archive. Some others deal with the eighteenth century or interwar period of the twentieth century. Mostly, I had to rely on the centralized collections of either province-wide institutions or of the institutions and organizations of the national movement, and on personal archives of its activists. These are largely located in the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in L'viv (*Tsentral'nyi Derzhavnyi Arkhiv Ukrainy u L'vovi*, referred to in the footnotes as TsDIAuL) and in the Manuscript Division of the Stefanyk Library in L'viv (*Viddil Rukopysiv L'vivs'koi Natsional'noi Biblioteky imeni Vasylia Stefanyka Natsiona'noi Akademii Nauk Ukrainy*, referred to in the footnotes as VR LNB). The archive of the Greek Catholic Bishopric in Przemyśl now in the State Archive in Przemyśl (*Archiwum Państwowe w Przemyślu, Archiwum Biskupstwa Grecko-Katolickiego*, referred to in the footnotes as APP, ABGK) was of great value as well because the region was in this Bishopric's jurisdiction. Ivan Franko's collection from the Manuscript Division of the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature in Kiev (*Viddil Rukopysiv Instytutu Literatury imeni Tarasa Shevchenka*, referred to in the text as VR IL) was also used extensively. Some other, less important sources were used from the L'viv Oblast' State Archive (*L'vivs'kyi Oblasnyi Derzhavnyi Arkhiv*, referred to in the footnotes as LODA), the Manuscript Division of the Jagellonian Library in Krakow (*Oddział Rękopiśm Biblioteki Jagiellońskiej*, referred to in the footnotes as BJ), the State Archive in Krakow (*Archiwum Państwowe w Krakowie*, referred to in the footnotes as APK) and the Main Archive of Ancient Records in Warsaw (*Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych*, referred to in the footnotes as AGAD).

The area from which the case-studies come throughout the first half of the nineteenth century was part of the Sambir circle, the population of which in 1848 included around 300,000 Ruthenian peasants and 8,000 Polish peasants.³⁶ In 1850, the Sambir circle had seven cities, four market places and 346 villages. The

³⁶ This was the calculation of Ruthenian movement – See *Zoria Halytska*, 1849, No.9.

city of Sambir had a population of 10,000 and Staryi Sambir - 3,000. The total population of the Sambir circle was 325,827.³⁷ In 1868 this circle was divided into five “political” districts – Rudky, Drohobych, Sambir, Staryi Sambir and Turka. Most of the material here pertains to the Sambir and Staryi Sambir political districts, sometimes to the Drohobych and Turka districts as well.

In 1869 Sambir political district consisted of 90 communities with a population of 79,181 and of 59 estates with a population of 2078. Staryi Sambir district consisted of 54 communities and 23 estates with populations of 41,021 and 941 respectively.³⁸ In 1900 the population of Sambir and Staryi Sambir districts was 96,215 and 56,859 and in 1910 – 107,322 and 59,509 respectively.³⁹ Sambir political district consisted of two court districts – Luka (eastern part of the district) and Sambir proper (western part of the district). Staryi Sambir district was also divided into two court districts – Stara Sil’ (northwestern, lowland part) and Staryi Sambir proper (southeastern, mountainous). According to the 1900 census the demographic and ethnic profile of these districts appears as follows:⁴⁰

Luka court district – 20 communities, no cities or market towns, total population of 20,424. According to religion: 3,395 were Roman-Catholic; 16,058 Greek-Catholic; 948 Judaic; 23 others. According to language: 545 were German speakers (in this census German includes Yiddish as well and most of the “German-speakers” in Galicia were in fact Yiddish-speakers), 2,813 were Polish, 17,066 – Ruthenian speakers.

Sambir court district – 67 communities, one city (Sambir), no market towns, total population of 75,791. According to religion: 23,712 Roman Catholic; 44,625 Greek-Catholic; 7,104 Judaic; 350 others. According to language: 2,449 German speakers, 28,831 Polish speakers, 44,403 Ruthenian speakers, 20 others.

Stara Sil’ court district – 19 communities, one city (Stara Sil’), two market towns (Fel’shtyn and Khyriv), total population of 20,305. According to religion: 5,083 Roman Catholic; 12,464 Greek Catholic, 2,748 – Judaic, 10 others. According to language: 1,115 – German, 6,792 – Polish, 12,268 – Ruthenian, two – others.

Staryi Sambir court district – 37 communities, one city (Staryi Sambir), no market towns, total population of 36,554. According to religion: 1,755 Roman

³⁷ Hipolit Stupnicki, *Das Königreich Galizien und Lodomerien, sammt dem Grossherzogthume Krakau und denn Herzogthume Bukovina, in geographisch-historisch-statistischer Beziehung* (Lemberg, 1853), 62-65.

³⁸ *Orts-Repertorium des Königreiches Galizien und Lodomerian mit dem Grossherzogthume Krakau. Auf Grundlage der Volkszählung vom Jahre 1869 bearbeitet* (Wien, 1874), 188-191.

³⁹ Zenon Kuzelia, “Halychyna i Bukovyna v svitli perezpys z 31 hrudnia 1910,” *Literaturno-Naukovyi Visnyk*, v.65, kn.1, 1914, 101-116.

⁴⁰ *Gemeindlexikon von Galizien bearbeitet auf Grund der Ergebnisse der Volkszählung vom 31 Dezember 1900. Herausgegeben von der k. k. Statistischen Zentralkommission* (Wien: Druck und Verlag der k. k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1907).

Catholic; 31,418 Greek Catholic; 3,363 Judaic; 18 others. According to language: 2,068 German, 2,263 Polish, 32,141 Ruthenian, and 56 – others.

The largest city in the region was the city of Sambir with a population of 17,039 in 1900. That year the confessional composition of the city looked as follows: Roman-Catholic – 8,882; Greek Catholic – 3,128; and Judaic – 4,900. According to language the census of 1900 divided the city into German-speakers – 1,267; Polish-speakers – 13,494; and Ruthenian-speakers – 2,197.⁴¹

The community of Morozovychi, quite often mentioned in this thesis, according to the census of 1900 looked as follows. There were 160 men and 193 women, 335 Greek Catholics and 18 Roman-Catholics, 17 Polish-speakers, and 336 Ruthenian-speakers. These villagers lived in 66 houses, held 60 horses, 159 cattle, and 108 pigs. They owned 310 ha., of which 282 were used in agriculture. 199 ha. were plowed, 4.84 used as pasture, 5.02 as gardens, and 73 as meadows.⁴² Another community often mentioned in this thesis, that of Mshanets', in 1900 had 621 men and 547 women, together 1168. According to religion, there were 1 Roman-Catholic, 28 of Judaic religion, 1134 Greek Catholics and five "others." According to language one person was Polish, while 1,167 were Ruthenian. The cadastral community had 2,147 ha., of which 2063 were used in agriculture: 1345 ha. – plowed land, 133 ha. – pastures, 3.18 ha. – gardens, 541 ha. – meadows, and 41 ha. – forest. For comparison, in 1830 the population of Morozovychi was 397, in 1835 – 352, in 1879 – 440. In the mountainous village of Mshanets' the demographic dynamic was a bit different: 1830 – 1129, 1835 – 1078, 1879 – 1101.⁴³

This data hopefully gives some general idea about the villages, towns, and districts we are talking about. Other information, if necessary, will be introduced in the text of the thesis. All the geographical names are transcribed from Ukrainian if located on the territory of contemporary Ukraine (for example, L'viv), and in Polish if located on the territory of contemporary Poland (for example Przemyśl). Some of the places changed their names during the period considered in this thesis – the district capital Stare Misto became Staryi Sambir. In general I will use the later names, but in citations – whatever name was used there. For places renamed after 1914 old names are used. Names that have established themselves in English in a certain form will be used in that form (for example – Vienna). In the footnotes place of publication is given as it was used in the publication (therefore Wien and not Vienna, L'vov, L'viv, Lwów and Lemberg). Names of the many villages had different spellings even in the same language and in the texts of the same author; and some villages had two names

⁴¹ *Gemeindlexikon von Galizien*, 572.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 572-3.

⁴³ Volodymyr Hurkevych, "Boiky za 100 lit u chyslakh," *Litopys Boikivshchyny*, 1931, No.1, 113-145.

used interchangeably and equally officially throughout the nineteenth century. For example, Vaniiovychi, but also Vanevychi; Mshanets' but also Pshonets', Groziova, but also Hroziova and Gronziova, Rolliv, but also Roliv and Rolliov, Kaiserdorf, but also Kalyniv. It is difficult to list all the cases here, but usually I tried to use one version of the name throughout the whole thesis. This choice in many cases was arbitrary just as was the choice made in transcribing people's names – whether to use the Russian or Ukrainian or Polish version of them (for example, Mikhail, Mykhailo, Mykhail or Michał). In these cases I tried to consider preferences as well as the national and political orientation of the person but it does not mean that all the Mykhailo-s mentioned in this thesis were Ukrainians or all the Mikhail-s – Russians.

Chapter 1

DOBRIVLIANY AFFIAR (A CASE OF WHAT?)*

Where the love rules, there is no envy,
no harm to the body, health, honor,
freedom and property, there is nothing
evil.¹

There are not too many studies trying to penetrate the Galician countryside in the nineteenth century, and even fewer case-studies describing in some detail concrete events in concrete villages. Therefore, although the acquisition of national consciousness by Ukrainian peasants in Galicia has been a recurring theme in the historical and political narratives, there have been no descriptions of how this acquisition took place in concrete places and with concrete people. One of the rare exceptions is a “conspiracy” in the village of Dobrivliany. Significantly this case originally appeared in history as a socialist conspiracy, although later on it became clear that it involved the penetration of the national ideology as well.² The publicity this case obtained was due to the fact that a number of famous educated people were involved, and to its connection with, perhaps, the only island of socialist agitation in Galicia outside of the province’s two largest cities (L’viv and Krakow) – Drohobych and its oil basin.

The main problem with this Dobrivliany case as well as with other similar stories about acquisition of the consciousness (either national or social), has been their teleological and heroic character corresponding neatly to the larger narratives of which these stories constituted an organic part. This teleology was

* I am grateful to Slavko Hrytsak for discussing with me the events described in this chapter and help in finding the Accusation Act of 1886 Sambir trial, as well as answers of Volia Iakubova and Dobrivliany reading clubs to the Pavlyk’s questionnaire.

¹ [Hryhorii Rymar], “Liubov do blyzhnioho. Pam’iatka po bl. p. Hryhoriiu Rymari,” *Khliborob*, 1893, No.19.

² For the first and fullest description of this case in the scholarly literature see John-Paul Himka, *Polish and Ukrainian Socialism: Austria, 1867-1890* (manuscript of Ph.D dissertation: University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1976), 409-420; for the same heroes in the context of Ukrainian national movement see his *Galician Villagers*, 137-40, 186, 292-3.

based on the assumption that the peasantry necessarily had to get certain national identity and/or class consciousness. At first it was believed that the peasants, being Ukrainian by virtue of their ethnic “traits,” simply had to realize this belonging and become conscious members of the nation: “the thing in itself” would become “the thing for itself.”³

A more sophisticated approach would state that the moving force of this process was not ethnic affiliation of the peasants but certain experiences, which would have determined the outcome. In the case of Galician Ukrainians such a profound experience allegedly was social conflict between Ukrainian peasants and Polish landlords – this social conflict reinforced ethnic distinction and fostered creation of a separate nation.⁴ Currently in Ukrainian historiography a new revisionist trend appears, when social structures are no longer seen as determining the outcome of the construction of nation. A nation is seen as never actually “made,” not so much a “construction” but rather a constellation appearing almost accidentally because of multiple factors interacting.⁵ In this explanation political combinations play much greater role than barely mentioned social conflicts.

At the same time, these revisionist approaches, represent retreat from the attempts to look onto the practices of identity-construction. Retreating from the social structures and conflicts they retreat from practice altogether, concentrating on ideas and plans they forget about “social practice of imagination.”⁶ Such a retreat from practices means inherent inability to describe something Benedict Anderson defines as different styles, in which nations are imagined. By concentrating on reformulations and reconceptualizations, on the elaboration of their models, revisionist scholars become unable to plunge again into the maze of

³ This is the approach of all the early accounts of “Ukrainian Revival” in Galicia. See, for example, Volodymyr Hnatiuk, Natsional'ne vidrodzhennia avstrouhors'kykh ukraïntsiiv, 1772-1880 rr.; Mykhailo Vozniak, Iak probudylosia ukraïns'ke zhyttia v Halychyni za Avstrii; but also of some recently published books. See Mykhailo Kuhutiak, Halychyna: storinky istorii. Narys suspil'no-politychnoho rukhu (XIXst.-1939r.) (Ivano-Frankiv'sk, 1993).

⁴ Ivan Lysiak-Rudnyts'kyi, distinguishing clearly between “modern nation” and pre-modern “people” was also saying that “for the Ukrainians struggle for national and social liberation was one.” – See his “Ukraiñtsi v Halychyni pid avstriis'kym panuvanniam,” in Ivan Lysiak-Rudnyts'kyi, Istorychni ese (Kyiv: Osnovy, 1994), 424. This explanation was finalized in John-Paul Himka, Galician Villagers and remains common in the historical work on Habsburg Galicia. For an example, see Kai Struve, “Social Emancipation and National Identity. Polish and Ruthenian Peasants in Galicia Compared,” paper given on the Congress of International Association of Ukrainian Studies, Chernivtsi, 26-29 August, 2002.

⁵ John-Paul Himka, “The Construction of Nationality in Galician Rus': Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions,” in Ronald Grigor Suny and Michael D. Kennedy (eds.), Intellectuals and Articulation of the Nation (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 109-164.

⁶ I borrow this term from Arjun Appadurai, Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization (Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 5, despite the fact that he applies it to the particular conditions of contemporary globalized world.

concrete facts and texts, and to compose a persuasive mosaic correlating to their models.

In terms of theory Ukrainian historians seem to be unable to liberate themselves from the charms of Ernest Gellner. They concentrate on the causes, try to explain *why* this and not that identity was accepted. Scholars do not try to show *how* this or that identity looked, and even more importantly, how this or that identity worked. Answering *how* question entails reexamination of the already used categories, “thick” description of concrete cases, and attention to the details, all of which have been considered unimportant and unneeded for constructing the hierarchies of causes.

In this chapter I shall try to look into the Dobrivliany affair, saving it from the meta-narratives that monopolized the case. By going in much detail through this story I shall try to show how much in this case cannot be encompassed by already existing narratives of Ukrainian Galician history. This case will also provide us with the links to be examined in other chapters. I’ll try to pay the maximum possible attention to the words of peasants, words that as a rule were marginalized and never privileged. Doing all this I shall keep in mind another question: is the construction of national and social identities in the case of Ukrainian peasants simply the acquisition of these identities by the peasants (either through the diffusion, elaborate “sowing,” or other patterns of cultural transfer) or, perhaps, this story entails something else that masks itself behind the categories of national and social?

Two Villages Found Reading Clubs to Enlighten Themselves

Two neighboring villages, Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova are situated on the road from Drohobych to Sambir. In the 1880s these villages belonged to the Drohobych political district. The alleged “socialist conspiracy” that developed there is mentioned in the memories of Ukrainian and Polish socialists. This case’s proximity to Drohobych, the only Galician industrial center, provides a classic setting for the descriptions of the development of socialist agitation in the countryside, connected with industrialization, and growth of the working class. The fact that some peasants active in this affair ended in prison made this case easy for the adoption by the heroic narratives of political movements about their pioneers and ice-breakers.⁷

⁷ This started in the 1920s when Ukrainian Socialist Radical Party was constructing its own heroic history, and the “memoirs” of Petro Berehuliak written down by Ivan Kobylets’kyi, fitted this history very well – Ivan Franko (L’viv: Knyhospilka, 1926). In the interwar period the event was also used for the history of the socialist movement in Galicia see Ignacy Daszyński, Pamiętniki, t.1 (Kraków: Proletariat, 1925), 25-26. Then, in the Soviet period the case was used in connection with the creation of the image of Ivan Franko as a revolutionary democrat and socialist. The first time this case was brought in this context in the article

Due to the involvement of many intellectuals: Polish democrat Edmund Solecki, Polish socialist Ignacy Daszyński and Ukrainian radical Ivan Franko, who were supplying peasants with literature and advices, the case got wide publicity and left abundant documentation. The presence of these intellectuals also shows that the case was far from being just a peasant affair: it was rather an encounter between peasants and intellectuals, in which the latter targeted the former with their projects. The hero of my thesis, Ivan Mykhas, was allegedly one of those attending clandestine meetings in Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova.⁸ One of the Mykhas' articles shows that he knew about the fate of Dobrivliany peasant activists and had to refute his connection to the group after the trial of 1886, when the conspiracy was denounced. Mykhas was defending himself against the suspicions of being involved in the socialist agitation, and brought up his membership in the Kachkovskii society as a proof of being far away from the socialist ideas.⁹

The “radical” background of two villages involved in this case was already mentioned in the historiography: Dobrivliany community’s “independence” from the government during the first years of Galician autonomy as well as Volia Iakubova’s seizure of the manorial pasture in 1819 and refusal to pay tax in 1843.¹⁰ It seems that certain villages had a tradition of radical action and engaged in social conflicts easier and more frequently than others. In the Sambir district such a village was Kornalovychi: conflicts from *robot* times were followed by violent struggles in connection with servitudes’ disputes, and these, in turn were followed by radical agitation, and conflicts with state administration.

Besides this tradition of rural protest and conflict another important moment in two villages’ background was that both Dobrivliany and Iakubova Volia had schools. Dobrivliany had a non-state parish school, while Iakubova Volia had a state-funded “trivial” one (*trivialschule*). Dobrivliany belonged to the Drohobych Greek Catholic deanery while Iakubova Volia – to the Mokriany deanery, which in the 1860s and 1870s was chaired by Rev. Ivan Korostens’kyi, parish priest of

Z. Huzar, “Ivan Franko v Dobrivlianakh,” *Radians’ke slovo*, 20.11.1955. After this heroic context was firmly established, it was impossible to approach the case differently in the Soviet scholarship.

⁸ Mykhas’ participation is indicated in the memoirs of Petro Berehuliak, a nephew of the conspiracy’s member Hryhorii Berehuliak, who at that time was used as a messenger by his uncle. Petro Berehuliak speaks about bringing some messages to and from Mykhas and about Mykhas’ visits to Dobrivliany. See [Ivan Franko u spohadakh suchasnykiv](#), knyha 2 (L’viv: Kameniar, 1972), 43-44. In fact, Berehuliak speaks about N. Mikhas, this first name would fit Ivan Mykhas’ father Mykola (another version – Nykolai), but it is quite probable that Petro Berehuliak simply made a mistake in his unreliable memoirs.

⁹ [Ivan Mykhas] Naddnistriany, “Pys’mo z Samborshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1886, No.38. Ironically, this reference to the Kachkovskii society outside of the Ruthenian society could have an effect opposite to the intended; in early 1880s both Russophiles’ and socialists’ loyalty to the monarchy was questioned and both were considered to be unreliable.

¹⁰ Himka, [Polish and Ukrainian Socialism](#), 409-410.

Hrushiv, and Ruthenian patriot of the 1848 generation. Rev. Korostens'kyi was a patron of Iosyf Markov, peasant son from Hrushiv, who entered the Drohobych gymnasium with his support, and later would become one of the leading Russophiles. The first list of Kachkovskii society's members includes one peasant from Dobrivliany area, a certain Ivan Mashturiak.¹¹ Rev. Naumovych's newspaper Nauka also had a peasant subscriber in Dobrivliany.¹² This connection between the popular movement of the 1870s (sobriety campaign, popular publications and newspapers) and later radical movement in the villages is visible in case of other radical peasant activists as well.¹³ Mykhailo Pavlyk himself came to radicalism from the Kachkovskii society, and even under the influence of Franko and Mykhailo Drahomanov did not stop to revere Rev. Naumovych as the initiator of 1870s movement. In Dobrivliany this connection with the 1870s is also visible in the personality of a local parson, Rev. Antin Chapel's'kyi, who was one of the four "hard" Ruthenian priests forming a stronghold of the ritualistic movement in the Mokriany deanery.¹⁴

Another interesting thing is that Iakubova Volia, just like Morozovychi – the village of Ivan Mykhas belonged to the Royal estates in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, while the landlord of Dobrivliany was the Roman Catholic parish in Drohobych. Thus both of them lacked a classic figure of the landlord-gentleman against whom peasant struggle was directed. Only later, in the second half of the nineteenth century the government sold Volia Iakubova estates to private owner, but this happened after the abolition of *robot*. On one hand, this supports the thesis that peasants living on state estates were "more progressive" and "more dignified" than those on private estates, the thesis we often meet in nineteenth century descriptions of the state villages in Galicia.¹⁵ On the other

¹¹ See the list of the Kachkovskii's society members in Ivan Naumovich, S Bohom, (Izdaniï Obshchestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho v Kolomyi chyslo 1) (Kolomyia, 1875).

¹² In 1873 it went there to certain Ivan Petrov, see VR LNB, f. (fond) Mykhailo Pavlykiv (in the respect of collections hold here I shall use name of the collection and not its number, since numbers change and are not that important for ordering documents in this library, numbers of all the collections cited can be found in bibliography), spr. (sprava) 154, p. (papka) 6. However, Dobivliany in this case could mean not the vilage but postal office, as it was the case with Mashturiak. Although in Kachkovskii society's list his residency is put as Dobrivliany, we meet Ivan Mishhuriak in the village of Rolliv that belonged to the postal office in Dobrivliany, born in 1839 literate and a community scribe in 1865. He was, most probably, the person figuring in the Kachkovskii society list as Mashturiak and assigned to Dobrivliany. The same could be the case with Ivan Petrov.

¹³ The detailed discussion of this can be found in Chapter 5.

¹⁴ For the description of the ritualistic movement which was concerned with the cleansing of eastern rite from the Latin "innovations" see Iaroslav Hordyns'kyi, Do istorii kul'turnoho i politychnoho zhyttia v Halychyni u 60-tykh rr. XIX v., (Zbirnyk filiiologichnoi sektiï Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Shevchenka (further on – NTSh), t.16) (L'viv, 1917), 63-89.

¹⁵ For the description of the differences between the peasants from state and privately owned villages see [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Pys'mo z Staromiskoho," Bar'kivshchyna, 1887, No.9.

hand it shows that the first peasant radicals did not grow up on the stories about landlords' injustice, which injustice is often presented as one of the most important causes of "grass-root radicalism."

While Volia Iakubova was a state village, the village of Dobrivliany had a postal office and a railway station. There, in the family of railway worker, Ukrainian socialist politician Semen Vityk was born, but in the early 1880s he was still a child. The railway made communication of both villages with urban world faster, and hooked them up with Sambir and Drohobych. Dobrivliany were a large community consisting in 1880 of 1,602 people, who lived in 350 households. Ten households had more than 10 Joch, a hundred had from five to 10, and the rest – less than five Joch. Because of the large group of landless or almost landless people and lack of fodder for cattle, all the Dobrivliany men also worked as weavers.¹⁶ We know that some of the first activists of the Polish peasant party came from such proto-industrial communities and were village weavers themselves as well.¹⁷

The person who founded the reading club in Dobrivliany was Hryhorii Rymar. Rymar's education started under the patronage of the local priest, Rev. Antin Chapel's'kyi, whose favorite he was.¹⁸ Thus, the beginning of his career was very similar to that of Iosyf Markov in the neighboring Hrushiv, being a favorite of Rev. Korostens'kyi, and many other peasant adolescents, who having grown up either became prominent in the national politics or quite influential on the local level.¹⁹ In his memoirs Hryhorii Rymar says:

Rev. A. Chapel's'kyi, who baptized me in Dobrivliany in 1852, since the time of my childhood until his death in January 1885 was my greatest benefactor in the world. He had always loved me as if I were his own child, and wished me all the possible good, just as for his own child.²⁰

Just like Rev. Korostens'kyi in Hrushiv, Rev. Chapel's'kyi became a local Ruthenian celebrity during the "ritualistic movement" that developed among

¹⁶ VR IL, fond (further on f.) 3, sprava (further on spr.) 3113, *arkush* (further on - a.) 251.

¹⁷ Franciszek Magryś is an obvious example, see his *Żywot chłopca-działacza* (Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1987).

¹⁸ Bezstoronnyi, "Pys'mo z Drohobychchyny," *Bar'kivshchyna*, 1886, No. 36 and 37.

¹⁹ We can say that raising such a peasant, who would become an ideal community leader was on agenda of publicly conscious and active Ruthenian priests. For Markov and Rev. Korostens'kyi see their correspondence in VR LNB, Osyp Markov, spr. 335, p.9. For the example of successful community leader raised by the priest see memoirs of Rev. Pavlo Matkovs'kyi in APP, ABGK, sygnatura (further on – sygn.) 9447. Nikolai Vasylyshyn from Horozhanna Velyka, raised by him, did not go astray like Rymar and did not leave for the city as Markov. Later we shall try to find when and how patriotic Ruthenian priests arrived at this idea.

²⁰ [Hryhorii Rymar], "Liubov do blyzhnioho. Pam'iatka po bl. P. Hryhoriiu Rymari," *Khliborob*, 1893, No.20.

Greek Catholic clergy in the 1860s and 1870s. He was one of few priests who did not shave their beards despite all the reprimands and investigations from clerical as well as state authorities, and wore his beard until death. (These beards signified belonging to the eastern rite and were the practice of Orthodox Church, lost by the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia). Unlike Rev. Korostens'kyi, Rev. Chapel's'kyi was not that well educated, and in 1848 remained on the periphery of political events. Back in the 1840s, being a parish priest in the mountainous village of Rybnyk in the southern part of the Drohobych district, he became a famous figure among peasants by catching alone a band of horse thieves. Revenging this the thieves after being released from prison set his household afire. This arson had allegedly changed Rev. Chapel's'kyi's character, and by the time he arrived to Dobrivliany very little was left from the wild mountainous priest.²¹

Born in 1851, and having started his education in the village, Hryhorii Rymar entered the third grade of the normal school of Basilian Fathers in Drohobych when he was 18 year old. He studied there together with Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi in his memoirs describes Rymar as the best student whose second position in his grade was due to the fact that corrupted social relationships required the first position to be reserved for the son of local financial commissar, certain Kozłowski. Rymar in his grade was the so-called *ensor* and took care of the discipline. Among his duties was to hold pupils, while they were flogged, and to write down the names of those misbehaving. He was the only one in his grade to avoid corporal punishment in two years of study.²²

He entered the school much later than other students and had to leave it after the second year being drafted to the army in 1871. After the three year service in Vienna, in artillery with fireworkers, he became a sergeant. In 1874 he joined the fifth command of gendarmerie in L'viv and served for five years in Ternopil', Lopatyn and Brody (close to Russian border). At first he served as a private, but after six months sergeants' course he advanced to the rank of *postenführer*, and became a commander of the outpost in his native village of Dobrivliany.²³ Because of the illness he left the service, and with 150 Gulden of yearly pension, settled down in Dobrivliany in 1879. In 1880 he got an office of the community scribe and hold this position till the 3d of May, 1886.²⁴ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi in his autobiography says that Rymar:

²¹ Volodymyr Chapel's'kyi, *Ia liubyv ikh usikh. Z mynuloho Drohobychchyny* (Drohobych: vydavnycha filia "Vidrodzhennia," 1997), 130.

²² VR LNB, f. Vasyi' Shchurat, spr.922, papka (further on – p.) 27, a.8.

²³ VR LNB, f.Ivan Levyts'kyi, opys (further on – op.2), spr.2702, p.80.

²⁴ Ibid.

knew all our legal decrees better than many graduates of the law school. This man, with his talents, could contribute significantly to the progress of peasantry in his area if only there was someone who could show him the way to this and was working together with him.²⁵

This is an interesting statement because we know that Ivan Franko was in touch with Rymar, also knowing him from the school, supplying with literature and ideas. When Rymar settled down in Dobrivliany Franko also lived for three years in his own native village Nahuievychi thinking about settling down in the village permanently. Zubryts'kyi must have known this as well, but was obviously thinking about someone else: a priest, or school teacher, about someone residing in the village, and working with peasants “organically,” instead of accidental meetings and supply of an inadequate literature, producing confusion in peasant minds. Actually, it appears that Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi in 1879-1881 must have been in touch with Rymar as well.²⁶

Rev. Chapel's'kyi was one of the altruist priests inviting peasants to his own house for holiday parties, chatting with them and fulfilling all the church rituals for the parishioners almost for free. He was unhappy in his personal life: in Dobrivliany he had buried 18 of his relatives. Besides Rymar, Hryhorii Berehuliak was also one of his pupils. Rymar was corresponding with Rev. Chapel's'kyi while serving in the army, and Rev. Chapel's'kyi was glad that Rymar decided to come back to his native village.²⁷ Perhaps, Rev. Chapel's'kyi thought that Rymar would be able to continue and develop his own work in the community. Hryhorii Rymar in his turn saw himself as some kind of successor to Rev. Chapel's'kyi. We know that Dobrivliany was not a singular example of peasants taking enlightenment in their own hands, after their pastor-Ruthenian patriot was getting old. For example, in the village of Turyнка, when the local priest Rev. Ivan Drymalyk, who organized sobriety movement in the village and brought first printed texts to the village, got old and ill, peasants themselves founded a reading club and conducted it.²⁸ The example is interesting because Rev. Drymalyk, just like Rev. Chapel's'kyi, was active in the “ritualistic movement.”

Besides Hryhorii Rymar, there were two other sources of enlightenment in Dobrivliany. Rev. Antin Chapel's'kyi's son, Ivan, was studying together with Ivan Franko in Drohobych gymnasium, and became his friend. Starting with 1878, Ivan Franko was spending his vacations in Dobrivliany at Chapel's'kyi's place, and often discussed with Rev. Antin Chapel's'kyi contemporary political topics.

²⁵ VR LNB, f.Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.8.

²⁶ This can be deduced from the fact that he was one of the godfathers of Volia Iakubova reading club and gave one of the first talks in the Dobrivliany reading club. See more on this later in this chapter.

²⁷ Bezstoronnyi, “Pys'mo z Drohobych's'koho,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.36 and 37.

²⁸ *Chytal'nia*, 1895, No.7, 66.

Franko introduced to Dobrivliany Mykhailo Pavlyk and the village sometimes served as a sanctuary for both of them.²⁹

In his first report to the popular national-populist newspaper Bar'kivshchyna (which started in 1879), Rymar describes the situation in Dobrivliany as bad and in Volia Iakubova as even worse. There is certain Chaim Ruderfer, a Jew, who controls everything together with the affluent Atanasii Z.[ubryts'kyi]. While in many other reports to Bar'kivshchyna activists were accusing mayors, this report stresses that Zubryts'kyi manipulates the community even without being a mayor. Atanasii Zubryts'kyi served as an agitator for the Poles during elections and was well known to the landlords of this area. Atanasii Zubryts'kyi was the main "enemy" of the sobriety and reading clubs.³⁰ We should remember that Rymar was a community scribe and from this office had great influence on the community government. The community of Dobrivliany in his first reports is bad not because of the corrupted government but because of the community's own disorderly living. Both villages are described negatively, the peasants in them are said to have little consciousness and allow people like Zubryts'kyi to use them for their own ends. Atanasii Zubryts'kyi's influence is presented as based not so much on his wealth as on the connections he had with district administration.

This was the context against which the founding of the reading clubs is described in Bar'kivshchyna. While reading clubs quite were often represented as founded against the will of the community government, this was not the case in Dobrivliany. This one was actually founded by people who despite not being in the full control of the village government could influence its decisions even prior to the establishment of the reading club. Hryhorii Rymar himself being in position of power was one of reading club's co-founders. Among other co-founders we meet Hryhorii Berehuliak, who although not a member of the community council, was the son of the current mayor and prospectively one of the richest people in the community, and Ivan Stupak, a cantor.³¹

On 21 August 1881, the reading club in Dobrivliany was opened. At the opening ceremony many peasants from Volia Iakubova were present as well. Hryhorii Rymar opened the meeting with the speech on reading clubs, and Atanasii Mel'nyk, a peasant from Volia Iakubova, followed with another speech – on farming. Peasant choir which consisted of both men and women, was singing "*Myr vam brattia*" (Peace to you brothers), semi-anthem from 1848, and "*Shchast' Vam Bozhe*" (God, send you a good luck), another popular song from 1848, together with the modern Ukrainian anthem "*Shche ne vmerla Ukraina*" (Ukraine has not died yet). The local teacher and, perhaps, another driving force beyond

²⁹ Volodymyr Chapel's'kyi, *Ia liubvy ikh usikh*, 143-146.

³⁰ [Hryhorii Rymar] H. V., "Pys'mo z-pid Drohobycha", Bar'kivshchyna, 1881, No.16.

³¹ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.64/3, a.88.

the founding of the reading club, Ol'ha Bilins'ka was reciting the poem “*Topolia*” by Taras Shevchenko, and Matvii Manastrys'kyi was reciting a poem “Love to the motherland” by Antin Mohyl'nyts'kyi, while certain Shcherbak was reciting poem “*Prosvita* [Enlightenment]”³² Matvii Manastrys'kyi was one of the early peasant members of the *Prosvita* society joining it in September 1879.³³ The founding of the reading club took place in the year after Ivan Franko's first visit to Dobrivliany. According to one source this Dobrivliany reading club was the first one in the Drohobych district.³⁴ In the Sambir district the first reading club was founded in 1881 as well. We shall come back to these dates in our discussion of the reading clubs from the 1870s, which seem to be rather informal institutions, in most cases not officially registered (this actually was the case with Volia Iakubova reading club).

On this opening of Dobrivliany reading club we meet for the first time Atanasii (Panas) Mel'nyk, the activist from Volia Iakubova. Atanasii Mel'nyk, born in 1860 (other sources indicate 1857), was personal friend of Edmund Solecki, residing in Drohobych, and of Ivan Franko. Solecki characterized Mel'nyk as a peasant “having unusual intellect and higher talent.” Solecki also says that gaps in Mel'nyk's school education were compensated by individual reading.³⁵ He does not speak about total absence of schooling and we can guess that Mel'nyk attended trivial school in his home village. We meet several Mel'nyks in its registers although these registers do not cover the years when Atanasii Mel'nyk was supposed to be its pupil. The school was well-established, had proper instruction, and in 1870 counted 35 pupils.³⁶ Later, Atanasii Mel'nyk graduated from the Institute for cantors-teachers in Przemyśl, and became one of the several cantors in his native village.³⁷

Following the example of Dobrivliany, the reading club in Volia Iakubova was founded the same year and started its own struggle against Atanasii Zubryts'kyi, a man whose powers crossed communities' boundaries. Although in the newspapers the event was represented as founding of the reading club from scratch, the answer to Pavlyk's questionnaire by reading club's members from Volia Iakubova speaks about a “provisional” reading club that had existed in the village since 1877. On the very day of the opening ceremony in Dobrivliany, the statutes of the reading club were signed by 13 founders and it became an official

³² Tam., “Pys'mo vid Drohobycha”, *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1881, No.19.

³³ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk., spr.46, p.2, a.59.

³⁴ Bezstoronnyi, “Pys'mo z Dorhobyts'koho,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.36 and 37.

³⁵ EL [Edmund Solecki], “Wojna o ‘jura stolac’,” *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1886, No.12.

³⁶ APP, ABGK, sygnatura (further on – sygn.) 8733.

³⁷ Petro Kulyniak, “Polkovnyk Andrii Mel'nyk,” in Luka Lutsiv (ed.), *Drohobychchyna – zemlia Ivana Franka* (Niu Iork-Paryzh-Sydnei-Toronto, 1973), 673.

organization.³⁸ The reading club had 20 members in 1881 (although the newspaper report speaks of 30). Atanasii Zubryts'kyi, at that time a member of the district council and former controller of the local church, “declared war” against Mel'nyk and reading club, spreading rumors that for having reading club peasants would have to pay additional tax.³⁹ The reading club in Volia was quite successful. According to Bat'kivshchyna in a year it doubled its membership reaching sixty.⁴⁰ The answer to Pavlyk's questionnaire provide us a bit different but nevertheless impressive numbers: 1882 – 15 new members, 1883 – 10, and 1884 – 15.⁴¹

The reading club had also entered both *Prosvita* and Kachkovskii societies. As *Prosvita* presidium's protocols show, at first the reading club in Volia did not intend to become society's member. The reading club sent two Gulden and 50 Kreuzer to *Prosvita*'s executive board to get some books. Answering this request, *Prosvita* offered the reading club to enter the society: the entering fee would be 1 Gulden and 1 Gulden 50 Kreuzer will be left for the purchase of books. But as a *Prosvita* member, the reading club would receive one copy of all the unsold popular publications and this amounted to 40 titles. The reading club agreed to the offer and on the 17 December 1881 Volia Iakubova reading club became a *Prosvita* member.⁴² It can be guessed that membership in the Kachkovskii society was the result of the same pragmatic reasoning: society's membership automatically meant receiving the series of regularly published popular books.

At first the reading club was cooperating quite successfully with the local priest, Rev. Mykola Harbins'kyi, who subscribed to Bat'kivshchyna for the reading club, without any charge. Atanasii Mel'nyk became a cantor, and new church brotherhood was organized from the reading club members. The reading club also had newspaper Hospodar' i Promyshlennyk,⁴³ to which Atanasii Mel'nyk subscribed and from which, perhaps, he borrowed the information on how to improve peasants' farming methods for his speech on the opening ceremony in Dobrivliany. It is interesting that this reading club, most probably did not have fixed membership dues and, therefore, could not subscribe to the newspapers itself. To cover reading club's membership dues for *Prosvita* and Kachkovskii societies the reading club was raising funds by caroling on Christmas.⁴⁴

³⁸ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.64/3, a.59.

³⁹ Pryiatel' hromady, “Pys'mo vid Drohobycha,” Bat'kivshchyna, 1881, No.23.

⁴⁰ Bat'kivshchyna, 1882, No.2, a.8.

⁴¹ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.64/3, a.59.

⁴² VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.46, p.2, a.66.

⁴³ Although this newspaper was published by the activists of Old Ruthenian and Russophile camps, it was also distributed by *Prosvita* society among its members. See TsDIAuL, f.348, op. (opys) 1, spr.3890, a.36.

⁴⁴ Himka, Op. cit., 411.

In cooperation with the priest, the reading club's group managed to enforce its candidate for the position of the community scribe. The new community scribe became certain Andrii Nalyvaiko, who was a friend of Atanasii Mel'nyk and a secretary of the reading club. The community council abolished an old custom of bringing payments in kind to local Jews during village celebrations.⁴⁵ In January 1882, the reading club was reported to have 104 volumes in its library. It was fighting superstitions by requesting during the typhus epidemic in February 1882 professional doctor from the district captaincy, despite the opposition of the Zubryts'kyi's party in the village. The reading club uncovered the fraud committed by the previous community's government and lobbied successfully the village council. The story of the reading club in Volia Iakubova in 1882-1885 has already been reconstructed on the basis of Mel'nyk's newspaper reports.⁴⁶

However, it is worth to note that Atanasii Mel'nyk, who figures so prominently in the reading club and in the village history, was not included among the founders of the reading club as listed in reading club's response to Pavlyk's questionnaire. This response speaks about three students from Drohobych gymnasium: Pavlo Harbins'kyi (perhaps, son of the local parish priest), Danylo Lepkyi (who would become a priest and figure of district importance for the Ruthenian movement in Staryi Sambir), and Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi. Among "locals," Ivan Kuziv and Mykhailyna Strusevych, are mentioned. The latter could be a teacher and neither of them seem to be "peasant" because despite being local in the text they are separated from the community proper. It is said that they founded this reading club "in an alliance with our youth (*з нашыми молодими*)."⁴⁷ Atanasii Mel'nyk, most probably, was among this "youth," he was born in either 1857 or 1860 and the "provisional" reading club was founded in 1877.

It is interesting that Atanasii Mel'nyk does not figure among reading club's leaders in 1881-1882 as well. During that period the chair of the reading club was certain Hryn' Dorozhivs'kyi, an accountant – Il'ko Panchuk, a librarian – Tymko Prus'kyi, and a secretary – Andrii Nalyvaiko. Atanasii Mel'nyk becomes a chair of the reading club only in 1883 and this could be connected with the change of his village status from "youth" to "farmers."⁴⁸ We do not have registers of births and marriages for Volia Iakubova in that period and therefore can only guess. All the meetings of the reading club in that period took place in the school building, and this supports indirectly my guess that Mykhailyna Strusevych, one of the founders and supporters of the reading club, was a teacher.

⁴⁵ Pryiatel' hromady, "Pys'mo vid Drohobycha," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1882, No.3, 21.

⁴⁶ Himka, Op. cit., 411-413.

⁴⁷ VR LNB, Pavl., 64/3, a.59.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

In contrast to Volia Iakubova's reading club, one in Dobrovliany had more problems with its activities. Hryhorii Rymar in his reports speaks about two urgent tasks on the reading club's agenda: fighting the frauds of the old community leadership, and reform of the villagers' habits. Hryhorii Rymar was complaining that despite the fact there had been a school for 18 years in Dobrovliany there were no literate peasants precisely because of these "bad habits (customs)." According to Rymar, one of the worst habits was the old wedding custom. Traditional weddings lasted for seven to eight days, each of these days had special purpose and separate name in the ritual. Such a wedding required 100 or more liters of vodka and 50 liters of beer. It meant losses for those organizing the wedding as well as for the guests, who were neglecting their own farms while participating in the wedding.⁴⁹ This kind of discourse on temperance in the Ruthenian context went back to the 1860s and 1870s. Similar reasoning could be found in numerous priests' writings for people, preceding and following the abstinence campaign officially backed by the Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych in 1874.

Just like in the Ruthenian discourse of the 1860s and 1870s, in Rymar's case the struggle for sobriety was seen as a way to improve the well-being of the peasant communities. To prove his point Rymar uses economic arguments that Dobrovliany, having 340 houses and population of 1600, remain very poor community only because of drunkenness. He was complaining that the community leadership did not obey the decree from 19 July 1877 (the so-called anti-alcohol law) regulating public consumption of alcohol. Just as in many other communities, the mayor in Dobrovliany was living up to the proverb "there is no life without vodka, either you drink or you die" – *bez horivky ne mozh zhyty, treba vmerty abo pyty*. Only Rev. Chapel's'kyi was fighting for sobriety but without visible success.⁵⁰ The pastor was old and seriously ill, and Rymar's own attempts to introduce sobriety were not that successful.

Rymar was not the only one among future radicals to work within the framework of the sobriety movement. Even a younger one, Ivan Mykhas, saw abstinence as a part and condition of something defined as awareness or consciousness (*svidomist'*), precondition of taking active position in public and political matters. The activists from his village of Morozovychi did not drink, despite the fact that they did not formally belong to the Sobriety Brotherhoods.⁵¹ Many other peasant radical activists entering the public discourse in the 1880s were directly influenced by the abstinence campaign of the 1870s (for example Pavlo Dumka and Ivan Sanduliak). The abstinence campaign launched by priests

⁴⁹ [Hryhorii Rymar], "Pys'mo z-pid Drohobycha," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1882, No.7, 54.

⁵⁰ [Hryhorii Rymar], "Pys'mo vid Drohobycha," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1883, No.37, 225.

⁵¹ Blyz'kii, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.28.

apparently had a resonance and response among peasants. We know that peasant activists from the more distant past also saw abstinence as warrant for an intervention into politics and public life; this attitude can be discerned in the medieval millenarian movements, and early modern peasant wars.⁵² But in the 1860s and 1870s the traditional temperance of some peasants, who considered vodka to be evil, met with the sobriety campaign of the Ruthenian movement conducted under the slogans of bourgeois ethics and moral reform.⁵³

Among other “bad customs,” mentioned by Rymar, there was a tradition of bringing wedding bread for the Jew. (One would wonder if this was not the “payment in kind” abolished by the council in Volia Iakubova under the pressure from the local reading club.) Rymar says that earlier, when people were richer they could afford it, but now it became an unaffordable luxury.⁵⁴

After a year of existence the reading club in Dobrivliany had only 15 members.⁵⁵ The answer to Pavlyk’s questionnaire provides following numbers of total membership: 1881 – 12, 1882-4 – 16, 1885 – 20.⁵⁶ According to Rymar, even those who did not spend all the time in the tavern were not eager to join “the enlightenment.”⁵⁷ Just like Mel’nyk, Rymar was complaining that during the human or cattle epidemic people go to the fortune-teller rather than to a doctor. Peasants had to give up superstitions. One of the most important arguments advanced against superstitions by Rymar was the fact that they were causing conflicts between neighbors because fortune-tellers usually indicated evil spirit somewhere in the household as a cause of the disease or talked about malicious people.⁵⁸ Rymar’s reasoning resonates with the discourse of the national movement, which had condemned all the petty quarrels – they had to be settled

⁵² German peasant war is especially close to the Galician case because in that case peasant chiliastic asceticism crisscrossed with new puritan asceticism. The first one to note this conjuncture was Frederick Engels who saw “ascetic austerity of morals” as “a necessary transitional stage, without which the lowest strata of society can never set itself into motion.” According to him “*plebeian and proletarian asceticism* differs, both in its wild fanatical form and in its essence from the bourgeois asceticism of the Lutheran burgher morality and of the English puritans... .” Later on in Engels’ texts some connection nevertheless appears and peasant asceticism with time either disappears or “degenerates” into the bourgeois parsimony and virtuousness. Frederick Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1956), 79. Members of the secret society “White Lotus” in China were not allowed to drink alcohol and smoke tobacco or opium as well. See Eric R. Wolf, *Peasant Wars of The Twentieth Century* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), 57.

⁵³ For the detailed discussion of this issue see Chapter 5 of this thesis.

⁵⁴ [Hryhorii Rymar] R., “Pys’mo z-pid Drohobycha,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1882, No.8, 61.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*.

⁵⁶ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 64/3, a.59.

⁵⁷ [Hryhorii Rymar] R., “Pys’mo z-pid Drohobycha,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1882, No.8, 61.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 144.

inside of the community, so that to the outside world it would appear as a united body. The community had to become the site of the ideal cooperation and solidarity, while the conflict was delegated to larger entities such as nation and class.

Rev. Chapel's'kyi was trying to reform local church brotherhood,⁵⁹ but only few peasants volunteered for that, the rest

started to provoke those who signed for the priest, saying: 'this is for some treachery, for the serfdom, for the pension for priest's children.' They did not trust either the priest or enlightened peasants and thought that this would be an additional burden for the community. Il'ko Berehuliak, a mayor, gathered farmers to compose a complaint against the priest and new brotherhood. One peasant said: 'I would take an oath not to drink vodka even now and would take an oath for that, but I will not sign for the priest, even if someone was forcing me. I have heard that every priest has to leave a bank for [his] children when he dies, and our priest is already old but does not have a bank yet; they will not allow him to die until he deposits a bank. That is why he inclines the community to sign now so that community would have to raise a bank for him.

Four plenipotentiaries were elected to represent the community in its complaint against the new brotherhood in the court, but one of them did not want to go to the court. He was proposing to murder Ivan Nyzhnyk, and Ivan Stupak, a cantor, (both active in the reading club) saying that the community was large enough, so no one would ever find who actually did it.⁶⁰ It is interesting that Rymar here ridicules the distrust of priests by the villagers, based on the fact that priests were charging money for the ritual services provided. While later the radicals, including Rymar himself, would use this attitude in their anti-clerical struggle.

Opposed to this "ignorant mass" of villagers, the reading club was conducting its own work. In 1885, among the reading club members there were nine farmers, 10 lads, and one unmarried woman (very probable guess is that this woman was local teacher Ol'ha Bilins'ka). Up to 1883 the meetings of the reading club took place in the school and only after that moved into the community building which housed the community chancellery. In 1881-1884 the reading club was chaired by Hryhorii Berehuliak, and after this by certain Berezins'kyi. Hryhorii Rymar during the whole period held position of an accountant. Between 1881 and 1885, there were following talks held in Dobrivliany reading club: "How were people getting freedom" (Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi), "The importance of home industry" (Berezins'kyi), "On electricity and magnetism," "On farming" (Atanasii Mel'nyk),

⁵⁹ These brotherhoods united more prosperous farmers, who were supposed to help the parson to take care of the local church. In the 1870s, the sobriety movement tried to transform these brotherhoods into the foci of the movement and to turn them into more formal structure.

⁶⁰ R. [Hryhorii Rymar], "Pys'mo vid Drohobycha," *Bar'kivshchyna*, 1883, No.39, 237.

“Geographic discoveries” (Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi).⁶¹ Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi at that time was a student at Drohobych gymnasium, and his talks in the reading club could be seen as yet another link between these two reading clubs and the city of Drohobych.

Splits and More Conflicts

As far as now (1884) the most important conflict was between peasant “reformers” and communities’ former leadership, characterized by the reformers as loyal servicemen of “Polish rulers.” However, it is important to stress similarities between Atanasii Zubryts’kyi’s and Rymar’s groups. Both had connections beyond the boundaries of their community, both groups had some power in the community, and both found allies in the city. The only difference was that the latter had postulated necessity of the reform in the community and hooked up with the oppositional politicians in the cities, while the former were satisfied with the situation in the village and used the links established between district administration and communities in the 1860s. Similar conflicts were quite common back in the 1860s and 1870s: back then the reformers grouped around local priest, while their enemies were resorting to the help of state administration.⁶² The significant difference between peasant activists from the 1860-1870s and the 1880s lay in the fact that their patrons were not just and not so much local priests, as urban intellectuals and Ruthenian national movement reserving the space of the popular newspaper for the discussion of their agenda.⁶³

Although this influence of the intellectuals and of the city has been usually represented in historiography as socialist, we must note that the periodicals, to which these peasants contributed were not socialist, but national(ist); that Ivan Franko (the most important among “socialist” spiritual fathers of the peasants from Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova) in his letter from Nahuievychi, dated by 1882, was also locating himself in the camp of national-populists, albeit on its left wing and had always emphasized that he was a socialist of a certain kind.⁶⁴ Many of Franko’s ideas were shared by his generation of Ukrainian national-populists. Ukrainian socialist brochures published abroad appealed to young national-populists (many of them never became members of either Radical Party or of

⁶¹ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 64/3, a.88.

⁶² This will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5 of this thesis.

⁶³ The only popular newspaper of Ukrainian national-populists for that period is *Bat’kivshchyna*, the newspaper is unique in respect of the number of peasant correspondencies published there. This newspaper for the years 1884-1885 became the basis for Himka’s *Galician Villagers*.

⁶⁴ Franko to Partyts’kyi in Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.48 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 335.

Social Democracy) and made for them perfect sense revealing injustice done to people. In the gymnasium, future national-populists could not understand why these ideas were considered as dangerous and criminal.⁶⁵ All the conflicts discussed below seem to be closely connected with this particular generation of both intellectuals and peasant activists born in the 1850s and 1860s.⁶⁶

In 1884, the conflict between Atanasii Mel'nyk and local parson, Rev. Harbins'kyi, erupted in Volia Iakubova. In his reports Mel'nyk was explaining this confrontation with the priest as the defense of community's interests. The priest was renting a pasture, part of the parish landholding, to the local Jew, Chaim, for 90-110 Gulden, and Chaim was subletting it to the community adding to his charge another 100 Gulden. The community approached the priest and asked for the direct rental contract but the priest charged 200 Gulden. Allegedly, this was the most important cause of the conflict. On the other hand we know that the priest, on his part, was outraged by the spread of radical agitation. Rev. Harbins'kyi discovered that peasants in the churchyard were reading about peasant sectarians (*Stundists*) in the Russian Ukraine, so he tried to sue them in Drohobych and when he failed, sent one of the youngsters participating in the reading to the army, changing some information in his birth record.⁶⁷ Perhaps the split that took place in Volia Iakubova reading club in 1884, when seven members were expelled, was also connected with this conflict with the priest.⁶⁸ These events coincided with Atanasii Mel'nyk becoming chair of the reading club.

The source from which peasants got publication about *Stundism* is easy to find. Ivan Franko at that time lived with his father-in-law in his native village of Nahuievychi, in the Drohobych district. He was in contact with Mykhailo Drahomanov, an exiled Ukrainian intellectual from Russian Empire, and one of Drahomanov's favorite projects was propaganda of Protestantism among Ukrainian peasantry. This was supposed to liberate peasants from clerical influence, power of the official Church and dogmas of the official religion.

One of the events that happened between 1882 and 1884 was also the appearance of Ivan Franko's book *Rozmowy v Dobrovil's'kii chytal'ni. Rozmova pro broshi i skarby. Z peredmovoju o zalozhenniu dobrovil's'koi chytal'ni* (the long title is translated as "Talks in *Dobra volia* (Good Will) reading club. Talk about money and hoards. With an introduction on the founding of *Dobra volia* reading club"). It is interesting that in this title Franko plays with words *Dobrivliany* and *Dobra volia*. My guess is that this was done for those knowing the case of the Dobrivliany

⁶⁵ Evhen Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky z mohu zhyttia*, ch.I (L'viv: Vydavnycha Spilka „Dilo”, 1935), 94.

⁶⁶ For the discussion of this in more detail see Chapter 5 of this thesis.

⁶⁷ John-Paul Himka, *Polish and Ukrainian Socialism: Austria, 1867-1890*, 412. It is interesting that priests could also save young men from the army, what was the case of Rev. Pavlo Matkovs'kyi's protégée Mykola Vasylyshyn - APP, ABGK, sygn.9447.

⁶⁸ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 64/3, a.59.

reading club, while those who did not know would perceive the reading club from the book as just another one invention of popular publications whose distinguishing between “good” and “bad” fictional villages as a rule was reflected in these villages’ names.⁶⁹

The person who contributes most to the founding of the reading club in Franko’s book is Ivan Koval’ (Smith). “Smith” was the occupation of Franko’s father and this image figures prominently in many Franko’s work with the connotations of creative useful labor and positive attitude. This Ivan comes back to the village after getting education in the city, something Franko actually contemplated and attempted but never realized.⁷⁰ In January, 1886, on the eve of the Sambir trial, Atanasii Mel’nyk was still looking for the property in countryside for Ivan Franko to buy. And he actually found one, in the village of Rolliv: 100 Joch, of which 24 was forest and 15 a common. The price was 12,000 Gulden, the area was allegedly beautiful as well, and there was some nice neighbor whom Franko would like.⁷¹ Franko was thinking about founding a commune of intellectuals in the countryside, about settling down in the village together with Pavlyk, and finally with his own family. As late as 1904 in yet another Franko’s fiction, the positive hero, “Khoma with heart” also decides to go back to the village:

I became a peasant and slowly grew into my role. From schools I had many things that could help the village. I became a community scribe having smoked out older scribe, a bankrupt clerk, unscrupulous exploiter and cheater. I organized reading club, put on its feet the whole younger party in the village, helped it to elect new community council and new mayor. In one word, a usual story.⁷²

Ivan Franko himself did spend 1881-1883 in the village and was in position very close to the position of Ivan Koval’ from his book. In the book people at first were laughing at how the urban gentleman went around the daily village chores but later started to appreciate his innovations. They were gathering regularly at his place to listen to the newspaper he read and one day Ivan decided to found a reading club. Community granary and loan department had been founded in this

⁶⁹ [Ivan Franko] Rozmovy v Dobrovil’skii chytal’ni. Rozmova pro hroshi i skarby. Z peredmovoju o zalozeniu dobrovil’skoi chytal’ni (L’viv: z drukarni NTSh, 1883).

⁷⁰ The same idea had Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi who finally made a different decision and became a parish priest. Some others actually came back to the village, among them Hryhorii Rymar being the most obvious example. Although, of course there was a significant difference, both Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi and Ivan Franko graduated from the gymnasium and Rymar did not.

⁷¹ VR IL, f.3, spr.1615, a.594.

⁷² Ivan Franko, “Khoma z sertsem i khoma bez sertsia,” in Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh, t.22 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1979), 21.

village even earlier. Ivan gave one room in his house to the reading club, 50 farmers and 100 youngsters came for the reading club's opening ceremony.

When we compare the ideal image of himself in the village setting that Franko creates in the book with his real life in Nahuievychi we discover some important disjunctions. The ceremony Franko describes in the book would fit Dobrivliany, but not his native village of Nahuievychi, where the reading club was founded much later. In his native village, Franko antagonized local priest with publications against him back in 1877, and two never made any amends.⁷³

Moreover, while Ivan Koval' in the book is not only well educated but also a good farmer, Franko himself was writing from Nahuievychi the following:

Man, my life here is quite ugly, work all the time, [work] that kills my thoughts and tires me so much, that I cannot get together for some spiritual work. I feel as my "literary energy" disappears, how more difficult it gets every time to write anything, in how less things I succeed. I have many things I started and even more I thought of, but have neither time nor powers to finish. I lack here some live company, lack everything that wakes thoughts in a man and gives some sensation, [this is a] monotonous and truly animal life.⁷⁴

Franko did some farming work only because his stepfather insisted on it, and finally suggested Pavlyk to look for some provincial town where both of them could settle down, and not for the village.⁷⁵ His contact with peasants was limited as well. Although being in contact with reading clubs in Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova for quite a while, he knew only two of five defendants in 1886 trial on Dobrivliany "conspiracy," although other defendants were reading club's prominent members as well.⁷⁶ Between 1881 and 1883 he did not give a single talk in the Dobrivliany reading club. Despite all this, he was advising his many more or less educated friends of peasant origin to come back to the village and start farming.⁷⁷ Serhii Podolyns'kyi also argued in favor of settling among

⁷³ *Hromads'kyi Druh*, 1878, 253.

⁷⁴ Franko to Belci (summer 1882) in Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.48 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 316-17.

⁷⁵ Franko to Pavlyk, 12.11.1882 in Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.48 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 324-25.

⁷⁶ Franko to Drahomanov, 7.07.1886, in Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.49 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 69.

⁷⁷ This was his advice to Ivan Maksymiak, *Lystuvannia I. Franka i M. Drahomanova. Materialy dlia kul'turnoi i hromads'koi istorii Zakhidnoi Ukrainy*, t.1 (Kyiv: komisiiia Zakhidnoi Ukrainy Vseukrains'koi Akademii Nauk) (Kyiv, 1928), 43.

peasants, which would be more effective than “two or three months travels along Volga or even temporary work on factory.”⁷⁸

In the introduction to Franko’s book on *Dobra volia* reading club we also find the propaganda of reading clubs (according to Franko there were around 200 of them in Galicia, along with around 1,200 of the sobriety brotherhoods)⁷⁹:

Everywhere among our people the movement becomes visible, an opinion that if they want to do something good, something lasting and useful for themselves and their children, poor village people need to gather together and to unite into brotherhoods, unions, societies, we should mount together our weak forces and thus make them stronger

Then, there is a short national history pointing towards the “glorious past” of the general meetings (*viche*) and self-governing communities in ancient Ukraine, followed by the account on Polish oppression, of which the theft of forests and pastures was a continuation (here Franko refers to the servitudes’ regulations, which I shall discuss in the separate chapter).⁸⁰ According to Franko, reading clubs were necessary for several important reasons, which can be summed as following – the reading clubs would provide an organizational framework for sustaining both reformist local communities’ initiatives and villagers’ self-education.

The story of an ideal village fits nicely into the rhetoric of clerical populism from the 1860s and 1870s. But the second part, “The talk about money and hoards,” was very different. Money itself was also the usual theme in the literature for people starting with the 1860s. These popular publications from the 1860s and 1870s often included stories about people getting rich, provided recipes on how to make money and let them multiply. In the very popular *Farmazonny* by Iurii Fed’kovych peasants are lured into the temperance movement and enlightenment by the promise to get rich, and through reading, abstinence and diligence actually become prosperous farmers.

Franko’s brochure, was different from these. Structured as a catechism with questions and answers, it provided history and theory of money. The brochure was a popular account of the labor theory of value. Showing where does capital come from, showing the difference between the hoard, money and capital, the brochure ends with the conclusion that capital becomes an almighty lord of today’s world. While usually popular books were trying to persuade peasants to

⁷⁸ Serhii Podolyns’kyi, “Lysty do V. Smirnova,” in Serhii Podolyns’kyi, Roman Serbyn (ed.) *Vybrani tvory* (Ukrains’ke istorychne tovarystvo, 1990), 63.

⁷⁹ [Ivan Franko] *Rozmovy v Dobrovil’skii chytal’ni*, 11. The so-called “sobriety brotherhoods” were the outcome of the attempt to reform village morals undertaken by Greek Catholic parish clergy in Galicia in the 1870s. In detail this will be discussed in Chapter 5.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 12-14.

save and invest, to make money, Franko's book was uncovering the complexity of the processes entailed in the system of capitalist production. The system was unjust and there was no "honest" way to make capital. In this respect this popular political economy was more like socialist brochures written and published by Podolyns'kyi and Drahomanov and smuggled into Galicia from abroad in the late 1870s, except of call for mass rising. In the early 1880s Franko was spreading them among local peasants, perhaps, handling them to Rymar and Mel'nyk as well. In his letter to Pavlyk he mentions "On wealth and poverty," "On farming," and Drahomanov's publication of "Maria" by Shevchenko with Drahomanov's foreword: these were publication distributed by Franko among local peasants.⁸¹

Franko never continued this project of popularization of political economy among peasants, and there were no further "talks" written. However, there was another project which Franko shared with Drahomanov and with which the publication of "Maria" was connected. This was "anti-clericalism." The project was based on the exploitation of existing tensions between priests and peasants, which would be transformed into ideologically motivated anti-clericalism. This would have undermined the power of individual priests as well as power of the Church. In connection with this project Franko was popularizing rationalist critiques of the Bible, hoping to feed peasant skepticism towards Holy Scripture and religion in general.⁸² This project was conceived as a project of modernization, changing the last of the relationships tying peasants with the old order. Franko says explicitly that his anti-clericalism is not about alleged exploitation of peasants by priests:

The real cause [of tensions between priests and peasants], in my opinion, lies deeper. Having felt slowly constitutional freedom our people shook off landlords [in the original by mistake priests: "*popiv*" instead of "*paniv*"], *mandator*-s, stewards, old *bezirk*-s; they have little business to the district captaincy; and only to the priest they continue to stay in the same relation.⁸³

While clerical activists of the 1870s were eagerly using communities' relative autonomy to fight the influence of political authorities, Franko was going to push this further and liberate peasants from priests' patronage. But again, this was not only about priests and peasants, it was about "rationalism" and the end of the "old order" in general. In 1883 Franko recalled that when in 1880 young Polish and Ukrainian socialists were discussing questions related to the cooperation and common work,

⁸¹ Franko to Pavlyk, Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.48 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 358.

⁸² *Lystuvannia I. Franka i M. Drahomanova*, 99.

⁸³ *Hromads'kyi Druh*, 1878, 260.

One of the more important subjects of the discussion was the question: should we spread among people pure socialism, or together with rationalism and positivism? Socialists from Ukrainians were supporting the second, wider program, encountering the resistance or rather lack of understanding of the need for such a wider work from socialists-Poles.⁸⁴

This citation proves that Franko's project, from the very beginning was more than just socialist, he following Mykhailo Drahomanov felt the need to change the larger representational framework, in which peasants lived, their mental map of the world. According to him, socialist agitation without such a change of setting could not be successful. Franko's version of populism entailed "rationalism" and "enlightenment" among its objectives and in this he differed significantly from the ideology of Russian *narodniki*, although there is not doubt that the latter influenced him heavily and the whole idea of "love to people" and "work with people" was borrowed from them, but the mode of this work was very different.

We must say that Franko himself, at the beginning of the 1880s, was the object of Drahomanov's project to forge at least one "European" from Galician Ruthenian intelligentsia.⁸⁵ Both Franko and Drahomanov saw their task as to make peasantry "European", and their methods indeed were "European." As Eric Hobsbawm has noticed:

'Progress', emancipation from tradition – both for society and for individuals – therefore seemed to imply a militant break with ancient beliefs which found passionate expression in the behavior of the militants of popular movements, as well as of middle-class intellectuals. A book named *Moses or Darwin* was to be more widely read in the libraries of German social democratic workers than the writings of Marx himself.⁸⁶

Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova were the first and obvious result of the implementation of Franko's anti-religious project and showed that his second project was far more successful than the first one, concerned with the popularization of political economy. The implementation of these two projects coincided with Franko's idea to modify socialist theory so it would fit "our agrarian and smallholding conditions better than Marx's factory socialism." The beginning of both projects can be dated by 1883.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ Ivan Franko, "Popy i ekonomichne polozhennia ukrains'koho narodu v Halychyni," in Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.44, kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 155-56, ft.1.

⁸⁵ Antin Krushel'nyts'kyi, *Ivan Franko (poeziia)* (Kolomyia: Halyts'ka nakladnia Iakova Orenshtaina), 64-5.

⁸⁶ Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Capital: 1848-1875* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976), 273.

⁸⁷ *Lystuvannia I. Franka i M. Drahomanova*, 42, 99, 112. In 1881 Ivan Franko in his "Program of Galician socialists" was saying that "socialism has among us the same conditions of existence as in the West..." and

Atanasii Mel'nyk in his other reports discloses that the change in the attitude towards priests is not caused by the conflict over ritual fees or priest's exploitation of the community. Mel'nyk is obviously at pains to justify his own stand against priest through the priest's little involvement into community's life and unjust behavior towards peasants. For example, Mel'nyk complains that Volia Iakubova during one year with the administrator of this parish, Rev. Ropyts'kyi (must be in mid 1860s) raised 200 Gulden for the parish church treasury. In contrast to that, Rev. Harbins'kyi being in Volia for 18 years did not raise a Kreuzer and even already collected 200 Gulden disappeared, being stolen by unknown thieves. It is interesting that such a behavior of the priest had become a problem only in 1884. Only then, did the priest appear as an enemy of enlightenment in the village, while before he is described as helping peasant reading club.

In 1884 the picture of the village itself gets bleaker in Mel'nyk's reports. Reports speak about the ill fame Volia Iakubova enjoys as the village of murderers and thieves. It is said that since 1881, when after the elections ten of eighteen councilors of new community council belonged to the supporters of reading club, there had been an open war going on in the village. Church controller Atanasii Zubryts'kyi gathered 42 signatures for his complaint against the reading club. There were Pavlo Horuts'kyi, a "*knysb-eater*," and vice-teacher, as well as two petty gentrymen among those who signed the petition. The petition was composed by priest's son, Illiarii Harbins'kyi, who having spent some time in Sambir, L'viv and Moldavia, came to Volia Iakubova to give with his behavior a bad example to peasants. The reasons of priest's recent enmity to the reading club are explained as following:

We do not know what the reason is for that: perhaps, priest's wife instigate the priest against the reading club because, in fact, she is conducting everything except of the Liturgy.

Atanasii Mel'nyk was using the stereotype of weak priest commanded by the evil-willed wife to legitimate its own claims to the control over village life, reserving for the priest only religious rites. The priest is represented as a weakling having no reason to claim, all of sudden, some influence on the community politics. It seems that the conflict over the pasture was not the cause of the conflict; it was brought by Mel'nyk to prove priest's misbehavior when the conflict was well on its own. The case with pasture is not central for Mel'nyk's description of the conflict, and was brought together with other complaints, like one that described

opposed those, who argued about impossibility of socialism in Galicia because of the latter's backwardness. According to him agricultural production in Galicia was "already totally capitalist – just as in the West." Ivan Franko, "Prohrama halyts'kykh sotsialistiv," in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.45 (Kyiv, 1986), 459, 457.

Rev. Harbins'kyi as the priest who teaching peasants not to drink himself requested a shot-glass of vodka from peasants during christenings and weddings.⁸⁸ Most of Mel'nyk's complaints are not about exploitation but about "order" in the community, which the priest does not help to establish.

It is interesting that radicalization of Ivan Franko and his turn to propaganda among peasants is doubled by certain developments in Church hierarchy – the hierarchy ordered priests to pay more attention to the developments in reading clubs. On 30 October 1885 a pastoral letter from the L'viv Metropolitan was issued. It included the letter of the Austrian bishops from the Second of March, 1885 with comments by Metropolitan himself. The letter was directed against atheism, "practical materialism," freemasonry, "and other sects," tackling the issue of nationalism as well. The letter appeared as a reaction to the crisis that shattered Greek Catholic Church in the early 1880s, and was a proof of new Metropolitan's more active position in social and national questions.

Comments of Galician Metropolitan dealt with publications, reading and diffusion of various modern ideas among his flock. He says that in the age of steam and progress, printed press is "a smith-house in which both spiritual rays and deadly swords are being made." That is why priests should not encourage any kind of peasant reading, and should not rely too much on state censorship, but instead look into peasant reading themselves. According to the letter, the state law was giving too much freedom to the press. With the issue of press and reading the problem of reading clubs was tightly connected. The Metropolitan writes that they could be very useful if only adequately led. The letter envisioned functions of the reading clubs as limited to talks, singing and music, which could be very pleasant entertainment to merry minds pressed by the hard work:

But to accomplish this noble goal, a reading club should be under direct and exclusive observation of the local Pastor, his holy duty connected with his responsibility is to check that reading club's library does not contain newspapers, brochures and other writings with the content contradicting holy catholic Faith and our legal holy Church ritual, loyalty due to the most August Austrian Monarch, duty of obedience to his government, and twisting the idea about our real Little-Russian nationality.⁸⁹

As we see from this passage the letter was directed against both Russophilism and radicalism. In the same year (1885) when conflict with the priest in Volia Iakubova must have advanced far, Atanasii Mel'nyk for the first time mentions payments to the parson for religious rites (so-called *jura stolae*), saying that it would be a shame for the community, if the priest was paid more than five to ten Gulden for one burial. The shame would also be if the community did not elect

⁸⁸ "Pys'mo z-pid Drohobycha," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.31, 294.

⁸⁹ APP, ABGK, sygn.9524.

new mayor. Thus the grievances around *jura stolae* appear to be not the reason of this conflict with a priest but its consequence. 1885 was also the year when Atanasii Mel'nyk lost elections for the position of community mayor, albeit by margin of one vote. Mel'nyk speaks about his own work with a messianic ardor and describes his own struggle as informed by the example of Jesus Christ:

We, however, following the example of Jesus Christ must to certain time everything bear, and the end will crown the work, we still put our hope in, and stand strong for it, that the truth must be, and through the enlightenment we shall get everything, and it is not difficult for this enlightenment because, thanks God, we have reading club which is sanctioned by k. k. Vice-Roy's office and club's enemies will not be able to harm it, thus we shall attend it and to abandon a tavern, and if we do right it must be good for us.⁹⁰

Whatever the influence of anti-clerical agitation on Mel'nyk was, Holy Scripture remained for him an important text to draw on. Ironically, Ivan Franko himself was drawing parallels between socialists and early Christians calling in the late 1870s and early 1880s himself and his colleagues "Christians" as well.⁹¹ Atanasii Mel'nyk was the leader of the party which in the village was known as *chytal'nyky* (readers) or *sviati* (saints). He was fighting sorcerers-healers and magic, which they employed during every epidemic. Against the will of the community's majority he and his party brought to the village doctor Mykola Antonevych (1840-1919), famous Ruthenian activist and Diet deputy in the 1870s. Mel'nyk praised his skills and said that peasants were waiting for doctor as "for God." Mel'nyk does not realize that in the proverb he is using: "to wait for someone as for god," "god" means sorcerer and not "God."⁹² The doctor was distributing medicine and food free of charge. Those who signed the letter from community with thanks to Dr. Antonevych were Atanasii, Maria, Anna and Fylyp Mel'nyk.⁹³ Anna was Atanasii's wife and the rest, perhaps also were his relatives or inhabitants of the village part known as "*Mel'nyky*."

The most serious test for the party of "readers" or "saints" was elections to the community council in 1885. The enemies prepared an intrigue trying to organize community's wood stocking (perhaps, taking wood from the community forest was arranged only on certain days), and to conduct elections on the day when most peasants would prefer to get some wood to participation in elections. The

⁹⁰ [Atanasii Mel'nyk] M., "Z Voli Iakubovoi," *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1885, No.3.

⁹¹ Although I believe that in this case connotations extended to the word for peasants used in Russian -- *krest'iane*.

⁹² For this meaning of word "God" see Ivan Franko, *Halyts'ko-rus'ki narodni pryppovidky*, t.1 (L'viv, 1901), 83.

⁹³ [Atanasii Mel'nyk] A. M., "Volia Iakubova," *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1885, No.10.

“readers” managed to change the date of the elections. Describing this episode Mel’nyk cites words from Shevchenko’s poem: “Then will the meek in judgement sit, // All your fine wisdom to outwit”⁹⁴ (*Ta i zasiadut, ta i premudrykh nemudri oduriat*). This proves that Mel’nyk knew Shevchenko’s works, and not just “Maria” published by Drahomanov. This citation is from one of the most famous Shevchenko’s poems in which he addresses the imagined community of Ukrainian nation: “To the dead, to the living and to those yet unborn, my countrymen all who live in Ukraine and outside Ukraine, my friendly epistle.” The poem is important because according to the widespread interpretation it calls nation’s leadership, intelligentsia, to take care of the “youngest brother” – the peasants.

Perhaps when Ivan Franko in one of his letters to Drahomanov mentioned that „our peasants understand all the poems of Shevchenko,” he referred to Atanasii Mel’nyk. Although in yet another letter he said that peasants did not understand Shevchenko’s “Maria,” preferring to read Drahomanov’s “foreword” to this publication.⁹⁵ We know that Shevchenko came to the Ruthenian students of Galician gymnasia in the 1860s. We do not know when peasants first got Shevchenko’s texts, but it seems that early 1880s would be the right guess. At least in the vicinity of Sambir and Drohobych the propaganda of Shevchenko dates back to the first half of the 1880s and is connected to Franko’s activity.⁹⁶

But let’s go back to Volia Iakubova in 1885. Mel’nyk was very happy with his own smartness: “thus the readers knew about everything but turned it into their own way so that they earned fuel and at the same time did not loose the elections.”⁹⁷ Despite this smart move Mel’nyk lost mayor’s elections. And this was not the last of Mel’nyk’s disappointments: in 1885 Mel’nyk’s party had split. The new enemy of Mel’nyk and the leader of the party supported by the priest became Andrii Nalyvaiko. At first among Mel’nyk supporters he turned against him and joined the priest.

Nalyvaiko also was an example of the successful career made by peasant in a native village. In 1881 he worked as a daily laborer, and went to earn some money on railway construction. There, for some crime that we do not know much about,

⁹⁴ The translation is taken from Taras Shevchenko, *The Poetical Works of Taras Shevchenko. The Kobzar*, (translated by C. M. Andrusyshen and Watson Kivkonnell) (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), 251.

⁹⁵ *Lystuvannia I. Franka i M. Drahomanova*, 37, 58.

⁹⁶ Near Sambir Shevchenko’s poems were read to peasants by Ivan Maksym’iak. See his letter in VR IL, f.3, spr. 1618, a.357.

⁹⁷ [Atanasii Mel'nyk] Vyborets', "Volia Iakubova," *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1885, No.16.

he was arrested and sent to prison in Sambir, where he spent two months.⁹⁸ In Sambir he learnt how to write and after release received the position of community scribe in Volia Iakubova. Here he became a good friend of local teacher and both of them allegedly stole money raised for school renovation. Their joint debauchery – learning how to shoot at teacher’s place, which was in the school building, had caused fire in the school. Nalyvaiko allegedly spent five Gulden for his birthday party in the tavern, and for Mel’nyk this was intolerable waste of money as well as great demoralization of the village – all the villagers, present on this party, got drunk.⁹⁹ Nalyvaiko entered into an alliance with Rev. Harbins’kyi, while Atanasii Mel’nyk had lost his position of the community cantor.¹⁰⁰ It is interesting that Nalyvaiko’s union with local anti-radical forces can be explained by his family connections as well. His mother’s maiden name was Zubryts’ka and she could be a relative of the “wicked” Atanasii Zubryts’kyi.¹⁰¹

In the meantime there was also an important change in Dobrivliany. Rev. Antin Chapel’s’kyi died there on 22 January 1885, being 69 year old and after 45 years of pastoral work. In the necrology, Gazeta Naddniestrzańska, although not agreeing with his political views, had to acknowledge deceased’s positive attitude towards his parishioners: “limiting his own income almost exclusively to the income from farming and tiny salary, he was fulfilling his priestly and pastoral duties totally for free.”¹⁰²

The moment when “good” long-time parson was dying and new one arriving to take over old priest’s parish as a rule was characterized by tension and uncertainty. It required certain time for the priest to gain authority among parishioners and some priests never succeeded. Even when the new priest was not charging much for the religious rites, peasants could accuse him of not talking to them enough; or even when the priest was attending the reading club, peasants could complain that no one knew his real intention.¹⁰³

Before the permanent parish priest was appointed, the duties of Dobrivliany pastor were fulfilled by Rev. Iosyf Iavors’kyi, Rev. Chapel’s’kyi’s son in law, well-known in the village since the time when he had courted Chapel’s’kyi’s

⁹⁸ Criminal prison in Sambir prepared cadres of prison-educated peasants for the whole *Boiko* mountains and Dnister river valley down to the Dolyna district, the territory which was under the jurisdiction of Sambir criminal court.

⁹⁹ [Atanasii Mel'nyk] Hrishnyk, “Volia Iakubova. Hruden' 1886,” Gazeta Naddniestrzańska, 1887, No.1.

¹⁰⁰ See the report of Rev. Korostens’kyi on community cantors, Rev. Korostens’kyi was praising Volia Iakubova’s community “there is a good church singing in Iakubova Volia because there is a number of self-educated cantors and people take active part in the church singing.” APP, ABGK, sygn.4238.

¹⁰¹ TsDIAuL, f.201, op.4a, spr.6111, a.107.

¹⁰² Gazeta Naddniestrzańska, 1885, No.4.

¹⁰³ Hromadianyn, “Strilkiv,” Gazeta Naddniestrzańska, 1885, No.5.

daughter. After the marriage he lived in the village as an assistant of Rev. Chapel's'kyi. After the conflict acquired dramatic overtones one of the radicalized peasants described Rev. Iavors'kyi as following: "In regard to superiors, like a Jesuit, submissive to those above him, but very proud with those lower than he, just like a petty gentryman."¹⁰⁴ It is interesting that for Dobrivliany as well as for Volia Iakubova peasant correspondents "petty gentryman" meant a negative specimen with no need for further elaboration.

At first, however, peasant activists welcomed Rev. Iavors'kyi as a parish priest. Even though he was indeed a petty gentryman, Rev. Iavors'kyi was active in the national movement and a co-founder of the Stupnytsia reading club, Stupnytsia being the village of his birth. From his memoirs we can see that Rev. Iosyf Iavors'kyi being of petty gentry origin in fact did not carry good impressions about peasants from his childhood. Although of rural origin, and initially taught by village cantor, he was son of the mayor of petty gentry community, who at the same time occupied the office of the scribe in both peasant and petty gentry communities. Rev. Iavors'kyi paints the portrait of peasant mayor in contrast with his own father:

Ivan Bronnyts'kyi, old, moral bankrupt from *robot* times and drunkard, illiterate. This mayor was always wearing across his shoulder wide leather belt with oval shining badge with an Austrian eagle on his shoulders; on the long rope community stamp hanged from his neck, and behind his bootleg the rolls of birch bark were stored. The burning of this bark produced dense smoke and blackened metallic stamp, but only enough for making one stamp, for the second stamp it had to be licked. Once because of that the mayor burnt his tongue.¹⁰⁵

In 1862 he went to schools and in summer, coming back for vacations, was reading Bible to the farmer Sen'ko Berez'kyi, who enjoyed it very much. He also diverted peasant youth pasturing horses from stealing potatoes and vegetables, and instead read to them on pasture history and Shevchenko's poems. In the gymnasium Iosyf Iavors'kyi was a friend of Andrii Chaikovs'kyi and future priest Dmytro Hordyns'kyi: all three were of petty gentry origin and from the Sambir district. In the gymnasium history professor Moraczewski having noticed that Iavors'kyi was asking something in Ukrainian said: "you, a fool, if you study Polish and walk on Polish land – speak in Polish." Iavors'kyi complained to the Greek Catholic catechist, Rev. Pavlo Iasenyts'kyi, and the latter managed to get Moraczewski transferred. Iavors'kyi had very high opinion of Rev. Iasenyts'kyi,

¹⁰⁴ "Protses o bohokhul'stvo i sotsialistychnu vorokhobniu," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.24.

¹⁰⁵ LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.90, a.8

who influenced Ruthenian youth in gymnasium very much. In the gymnasium he was also a member of the student *bromada* in 1876-77.¹⁰⁶

Born in 1857 (the generation of Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi and Ivan Franko) Rev. Iosyf Iavors'kyi married Natalia Chapel's'ka in 1883 being fourth year seminary student in Przemyśl. He claimed to become a priest from vocation and under the influence of one of the priests active in Ruthenian movement since 1848.¹⁰⁷ It is interesting that Natalia Chapel's'ka appears to be Ivan Franko's unknown love, who rejected him in favor of Rev. Iavors'kyi. This was the second time that Franko's beloved, being priest's daughter was marrying a priest and not him. One can wonder if the change in the attitude of peasant activists towards Rev. Iavors'kyi was not connected with this fact.¹⁰⁸

Besides the priest, the village of Dobrivliany had a school teacher, Ol'ha Bilins'ka, "very honest and sincerely sympathizing with the popular enlightenment person."¹⁰⁹ Ol'ha Bilins'ka, a cofounder and the only female member of the Dobrivliany reading club, also was in love with Ivan Franko. She was one of the first "emancipated" Ukrainian women in Galicia, studying in 1877-1881 in L'viv teachers' seminary together with the well known poet Julia Schneider (literary pseudonym Uliana Kravchenko), who was also in love with Ivan Franko. Ivan Franko must have come to Dobrivliany for the first time in the 1870s to spend vacations with his gymnasium friend Ivan Chapel's'kyi, son of the local priest, and was visiting the place regularly since then. It seems that he finally broke off with Ol'ha Bilins'ka in 1884, after he left Nahuievychi and returned to the urban scene. His last visit to Ol'ha Bilins'ka in Dobrivliany is dated by summer 1885.¹¹⁰ Even when events took a tragic turn, and there was a trial of 1886, he does not come to the village but is occupied with marrying Ol'ha Khoruzhnys'ka, a woman from the Russian Ukraine. Franko's presence in Dobrivliany is documented again only in 1892, when he visits Hryhorii Rymar.

After this break and after Franko left the area, the conflict between Bilins'ka and some peasant activists erupted in Dobrivliany. Franko seems to be a mediating figure between the village intelligentsia and peasant activists. In the early 1880s he (perhaps, having learnt this from his personal experience) no longer advocated open fight against priests. When in 1884 Klymentyna Popovych wrote him on her own struggle with local parson over reading club in the village of Zhovtantsi, he answered:

¹⁰⁶ LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.90, a.9-14.

¹⁰⁷ LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.94.

¹⁰⁸ Chapel's'kyi, Volodymyr, *Ia liubyy jikh usikh*, 153-159.

¹⁰⁹ Bezstoronnyi, "Pys'mo z Drohobys'koho," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.36 and 37.

¹¹⁰ Mariia Bilets'ka, "Kartyna z zhyttia Ivana Franka," in O. I. Dei and N. P. Korniienko (eds.), *Ivan Franko u spohadakh suchasnykyv* (L'viv: knyzhkovo-zhurnal'ne vydavnytstvo, 1956), 153-4.

It would be a great pity if the reading club, to the founding of which you contributed so much work, failed because of those people who reserve honors of representatives, enlighteners and fathers of Rus' exclusively for themselves. However, madam, you did not get me right if you thought that I advised you to stand up to the open fight with them. Get away from them! Would not you find more useful occupation for yourself than this hopeless and fruitless war?¹¹¹

The conflict with Bilins'ka in Dobrivliany started because of Hryhorii Berehuliak, a cantor and close cooperater of Hryhorii Rymar, "an ardent man from rich and very respected [in Dobrivliany] family." He was doing a lot of enlightening work but, as anonymous Bat'kivshchyna observer put it, "without a clear understanding." At first the conflict occurred between Berehuliak and the teacher:

Berehuliak, a man irritable and passionate, was as if hurt by certain "lordliness" (*pans'kist'*) of the teacher, although this "lordliness" was without any contempt or disregard to simple people.

After unspecified misunderstandings with the teacher, the conflict had spread to involve the priest as well. When Rev. Iavors'kyi on the request of local possessor went to bless the manorial field, Berehuliak refused to fulfill his cantor's duties and did not join the church procession. In turn, Rev. Iavors'kyi replaced him in the office of parish cantor.¹¹²

This misunderstanding with the teacher must have been the conflict over school attendance. Hryhorii Rymar in his memoirs said that he had broken with Rev. Iavors'kyi because the latter was punishing parents who had not been sending their children to school. He also had problems with the priest because of the obligatory money raising (so-called "concourse") for the church renovation and roadwork, but the school incident figures among these misunderstandings most prominently.¹¹³ It is very interesting that the conflict with Rev. Iavors'kyi and, obviously, with Ol'ha Bilyns'ka was over enlightenment. Much later, Hryhorii Rymar tried to explain his views on schools in the article "Community interests and current local school council." He complained that peasants quite often did not have a majority in these councils, which consisted of a priest, a teacher, a manor's representative and two to five peasants.

¹¹¹ Franko to Popovych, in Ivan Franko, Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh, t.48 (Kyiv: „Naukova dumka,” 1986), 413.

¹¹² Bezstoronnyi, "Pys'mo z Drohobyt'skoho," Bat'kivshchyna, 1886, No.36 and 37.

¹¹³ [Hryhorii Rymar], "Liubov do blyzhnioho. Pamiatka po bl. p. Hryhoriuu Rymari," Khliborob, 1893, No.19.

Rymar understands that “the school is a hearth (*obnyshe*) in which dark people are transformed into enlightened, wild into pampered, heartless into sensible, poor into rich etc.” That is why peasants have to spend for schools, but his problem is that these expenses must be commensurable with peasant incomes. While peasants are in minority in the committee controlling school expenses,

Local parish priest and the teacher usually want to have a nice, parade and expensive school; nice, parade and expensive things in school; maybe with this also something for the convenience and pleasure in school or near school – as usually *po pansky, ne po khlopsky* (in the lordly and not peasant way); and all this does not touch their pocket at all ...”¹¹⁴

This fits nicely the rest of Rymar’s discourse on parsimony and diligent industriousness. The school, perhaps, in Rymar’s view was also teaching children redundant things, giving kids “lordly” knowledge which they did not need. But this was outside of the prerogatives of the local school council. The first conflict with Rev. Iavors’kyi did not have some immediate consequences in Dobrivliany; in fact Rev. Iavors’kyi as a temporary administrator of the parish was soon replaced by Rev. Hrabovins’kyi, who became a new parson of the Dobrivliany parish.

The Sambir Trial or Hidden Crimes of The Activists

The arrival of Rev. Ivan Hrabovins’kyi was accompanied by the major conflict between him and the Dobrivliany community, for which Rev. Hrabovins’kyi blamed Hryhorii Rymar. The priest was moving into the village in January 1886. Before moving in he had arrived to the village to serve a Liturgy and afterwards had a meeting with the community leadership. On the meeting he ordered peasants to come with ten carts to his current residence (five Austrian miles from Dobrivliany) so that he could bring to Dobrivliany some of his most needed staff. He also said that peasants would have to provide more service of this kind later on. According to Rymar, the priest demanded this service from the community for free and Dobrivliany mayor decided to consult Hryhorii Rymar (but it is more probably that Rymar, as a community scribe was present at the meeting and gave this idea to the mayor himself). The latter explained that there was no legal basis for such a request and Rev. Hrabovins’kyi moved to Dobrivliany paying the full cost of travel to the cart drivers.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ Hryhorii Rymar, “Interesy hromady u teperishnia mistseva shkil’na rada,” *Khliborob*, 1893, No.8 and 9.

¹¹⁵ [Hryhorii Rymar], “Liubov do blyzhnioho. Pamiatka po bl. p. Hryhoriiu Rymari,” *Khliborob*, 1893, No.19.

According to Rymar, on the Third of March, 1886 an unknown gentleman came to his house and introduced himself as an investigating judge. With the help of a gendarme and two witnesses he conducted a search in Rymar's house but did not find anything forbidden. Then he made search in Berehuliak's and Stupak's houses but also with no success. Later, it appeared however, that Berehuliak had kept some forbidden books, which he handed in voluntary. In his memoirs Rymar explained that Berehuliak was not sure if these books were forbidden. The same investigating judge made searches in Volia Iakubova and in Drohobych (Solecki's place and the office of Gazeta Naddniestrzańska).

Rymar and Mel'nyk were detained on the Fourth of March, and Hryhorii Berehuliak having returned from a journey, joined them several days later. They spent three months in the investigating prison – waiting for the prosecutor's office to investigate the case and prepare the act of accusation. No one of the arrested brought a complaint against the act of accusation composed on the 30th of April – such an appeal would prolong their detention.¹¹⁶ Only once during three months Rymar spent in this preliminary arrest he spoke to the investigating judge.¹¹⁷

On 31 May 1886 the trial started and continued for four days. Defendants were accused of socialist and anti-religious propaganda. According to the law socialism itself was not considered a crime, and peasants were not accused of belonging to the secret organization which had as a goal the overturn of the existing social order – this was a standard accusation in anti-socialist trials of the 1870s. These peasants were accused of the propaganda of revolution and violent overturn of the existing order, while anti-religious propaganda was concretized as blasphemy against God (Berehuliak and Rymar), ridiculing religion and spreading of atheism (also Berehuliak and Rymar). Propaganda of revolution was in the spread of Ukrainian periodicals Molot and Dzvin, edited by Franko and Pavlyk, and published in L'viv. Rymar was also spreading Jarek Brzuzda (Polish revolutionary brochure), while Berehuliak was spreading Ukrainian brochure Pro khliborobstvo ("On farming"), perhaps the last one was the brochure about which Berehuliak was not sure if this was allowed or not. Berehuliak, Mel'nyk and Tymko Prus'kyi were also accused in "shattering the category of private property." During three months that defendants spent in detention only seventeen witnesses were interrogated. The act of accusation shows that the information about this agitation, conducted "not without success" in Volia Iakubova and Dobrivliany, the Drohobych captaincy received at the beginning of the year, partly from

¹¹⁶ [Hryhorii Rymar], "Liubov do blyzhnioho. Pamiatka po bl. p. Hryhoriiu Rymari," Khliborob, 1893, No.19. The same reasoning for making no appeal against the accusation act can be found in the letters of Iura Solomiichuk, radical peasant activist from the beginning of the twentieth century. VR LNB, f.NTSh, op.II, spr. 63/2.

¹¹⁷ VR LNB, f. Ivan Levyts'kyi, spr.2702 p.80.

Przemysł Consistory, partly from Dobrivliany parish priest, and partly from Andrii Nalyvaiko.¹¹⁸

Trial proceedings were closed to public and the jury was called only because of Berehuliak, who among others was also accused in breaking §302 of the Criminal Code (inciting against certain social classes), and the guilt against this paragraph could be decided by jury only. The witnesses in this trial were Revs. Hrabovins'kyi and Iavors'kyi, Ol'ha Bilyns'ka, Antin Dutsiak (Dobrivliany church controller), his son Stefan Dutsiak, Prokip Grenda, Andrei Doshchak and five wood-carvers who were decorating local church. Besides them some other peasants from Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova were called in but according to Rymar their testimonies were not important. The defendants were Hryhorii Rymar, Hryhorii Berehuliak, Ivan Stupak from Dobrivliany, and Atanasii Mel'nyk with certain Tymko Prus'kyi from Volia Iakubova.

We do not have protocols of the court proceedings themselves, only the richly detailed "Reasons for the Act of Accusation" copied by someone for Ivan Franko and preserved in his collection. This document describes following testimonies. First of all, there are testimonies of wood-carvers: of the master Antonii Dol'nyi and his apprentices. According to Dol'nyi's testimony, during several months he spent in Dobrivliany in 1885, Rymar, Berehuliak and Stupak "coming almost daily to my workshop and insinuating conversations with my apprentices were openly ridiculing religion and its rituals." Dol'nyi illustrates this with following examples. Berehuliak several times mentioned that he would never pray, and goes on pilgrimages (*vidpusty*) only to laugh of priests and see how they extort people.¹¹⁹ Onufrii Sen'ko, an apprentice, said that "during the Liturgy when the priest turned to people with the communion cap to bless them, Rymar, who stood on the choir, demonstratively turned to the altar with his back." Another apprentice, Smietana testified that during the services all three (Rymar, Berehuliak and Stupak) would read newspapers and chat, and when the priest had a sermon they were mocking him and repeating his words after him in half voice.¹²⁰ The investigator stated that many others testified that Rymar and Berehuliak were stating on every occasion that whatever priests say was a lie; that they were rejecting the existence of God and said that [hu]man had no soul.

While witnesses testified about the expressions of agitation, investigators were also looking for its sources. There was a note titled "Le Comte," found in possession of Rymar and translated from German book. The note showed

¹¹⁸ VR II., f.3, spr.2322, a.208-212.

¹¹⁹ It is interesting that in one of the memoirs about Ivan Mykhas pilgrimages also figure prominently, and the reason for his pilgrimage trips coincides with Berehuliak's one to one. M. Z., "Ivan Mykhas (U 20-tu richnytsiu smerty)," *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1938, No.45.

¹²⁰ VR II., f.3, spr.2322, a.210-211.

“figuratively” the impotence of God and the exploitation of people by priests.¹²¹ There was also a poem “Confession” found in the possession of Stupak and written down by Rymar, which ridiculed the sacrament of confession. There was also the brochure Jarek Bruzda which Berehuliak got from “the unknown student,” and which he later destroyed (!). Berehuliak acknowledged lending this brochure to the wood-carvers and to the teacher, but said that he “was not lending this writing to peasants to read, being afraid that their blood could rouse [from reading it].”¹²² According to Berehuliak, Rev. Iavors’kyi took notes from this book as well. Berehuliak allegedly had also called the container for the sacraments “dog’s shed.” The rest of the texts found in their possession were perfectly legal.

So much about investigation in Dobrivliany. In Volia Iakubova the main witness was Andrii Nalyvaiko, who was the only one to testify against Atanasii Mel’nyk. According to Nalyvaiko, Mel’nyk on Sundays and holidays had speeches to people about atheist premises, denied the existence of God and eternity of soul. In the reading club Mel’nyk was reading excerpts from Talmud emphasizing contradictions between its description and Catholic dogma on Jesus Christ’s birth from Holy Spirit and Virgin Mary.¹²³ According to Tymko Prus’kyi (reading club’s librarian), Mel’nyk once brought to the reading club a Ruthenian book entitled “Maria” and printed in Latin characters, which Mel’nyk later burned down, “and in which the author proves that God’s Mother was a servant girl of St. Joseph, whom he married, and that she neither from him nor from Holy Spirit but from John the Baptizer became pregnant.” Obviously this edition of “Maria” was read not only in Volia Iakubova but in Dobrivliany as well. In fall 1885, Andrii Doshchak had to respond to the “atheistic arguments of Rymar” saying that “Jesus Christ was God conceived from Virgin Mary by Holy Spirit.” And Rymar’s answer to Doshchak was short and sharp: “a spirit does not crawl in-between legs.”¹²⁴

¹²¹ It is interesting that this book Rymar received from certain priest. Most probably, this was Rev. Ivan Chapel’s’kyi, son of Rev. Antin Chapel’s’kyi. See Franko’s letter to Drahomanov Lystuvannia I. Franka i M. Drahomanova, 195.

¹²² The distinction Berehuliak makes here between himself, woodcarvers and “peasants” is very interesting.

¹²³ Mel’nyk obviously was using Talmud to support his opinion with greater authority. We know that Galician peasants had great respect for the “Jewish knowledge.” Jews in popular imagination were somehow paralleling priests, even popular superstitions in the respect of Jews and priests were very similar. Both for a long time were the only people in the village dealing with books and claiming their knowledge to derive from them. For comparability of the authority priests and Jews enjoyed among Galician peasants see Eugeniusz Chmielowski, Czarownicy, strzygi, mamony czyli wierzenia i zabobony ludu galicyjskiego zebrane przez Eugeniusza Chmielowskiego w pierwszej połowie listopada roku 1890 (Nowy Sącz, 1987), 25-26. It was noted that Galician Jews and Galician Greek Catholic village priests in the countryside had also developed very similar styles of clothing. Vasilii Kel’siev, Galichina i Moldavia. Putevye pis’ma Vasilii Kel’sieva (Sankt-Peterburg, 1868), 140.

¹²⁴ VR II, f.3, spr.2322, a.210-212.

This is an obvious influence of the foreword to “Maria” written by Drahomanov. Franko mentions that not the poem itself but the preface to it influenced peasant most.¹²⁵ Describing various peasant reactions to the publication he speaks about his uncle, “a thoughtful man, well read in church things and little bit in secular,” who was very confused that different evangelists contradict each other, “if so, then where is the truth,” – he allegedly asked. Another example was his stepfather, not caring much about “matters of faith” and simply disliking priests. Franko says that the poem went to the villages in Drohobych, Stryi and Przemyśl districts, and we can guess exactly about whom he was talking. These must have been his personal friends Rymar and Mel’nyk in the first case, Fed’ Derhalo from Zavaliv in the second and brothers Novakovs’kyi from Torky in the third.

According to Rymar, during the court proceedings the most incriminating testimony against him was given by Rev. Hrabovins’kyi. The facts this priest mentioned in his testimony he claimed to know from the words of his parishioners, whom, unfortunately, as being new to the village, he could not name. Hryhorii Rymar was answering Rev. Hrabovins’kyi’s testimony: “I do not know this spiritual father at all, I have never seen him, and never talked to him; and if I talked something bad, let those, to whom I talked to testify.” Rymar recalls that saying this he thought:

To cause a misfortune, men and women, whose names you do not [even] know will be always found, and they will accuse a man to the priest in things he has never thought or dreamt of. Because to overturn order in the state, to conduct civil war, to take landlords’ estates for myself in a violent way etc. – something like this has never crossed my mind, not to speak about inciting someone else to this. I was, I am, and I will be always a loyal subject of my state. I respect law as necessary for the order, security and well-being of the human society, without which no state could exist. If some law turns to be unjust for the state’s citizens, then for this there is legally allowed way to push for change of such a law in legal way.

To incite someone secretly to the overturn of order in the state, to the civil war, to the appropriation of the landlords’ estates, agrees neither with human nor with God’s law, because neither the first nor the second allows for that. According to the human law any change in the order, constitution and borders of the state should be made through the legal procedure if such a change appears to be needed.¹²⁶

Besides Rev. Hrabovins’kyi, Rev. Iavors’kyi had also testified against Rymar but his testimony was much less incriminating. The information Rev. Iavors’kyi was reporting to the court he claimed to receive from Rev. Chapel’s’kyi. This was

¹²⁵ *Lystuvannia I. Franka i M. Drahomanova*, 58.

¹²⁶ [Hryhorii Rymar], “Liubov do blyzhnioho. Pamiatka po bl. p. Hryhoriiu Rymari,” *Khliborob*, 1893, No.20.

strange because, as we know, Rev. Chapel's'kyi maintained good relations with Hryhorii Rymar till his very death, and obviously did not bring any accusations against him either to the church or state authorities. Although it would not be hard to imagine that the old parson became concerned with some dangerous tendencies in Rymar's development and shared his concerns with Rev. Iavors'kyi.

Ol'ha Bilyns'ka also testified that Rymar told her something against religion when there were only two of them, but, according to Rymar, this testimony was not that important for the prosecutor. Unlike hers, Antin Dutsiak's testimony was a serious accusation. Rymar suspected that Dutsiak had memorized the text someone had written for him because his testimony consisted of well-thought of and well-structured blocks. Dutsiak said that Berehuliak and Stupak had been religious people and only Rymar spoiled them after he returned to the village. When asked if other peasants were also demoralized by Rymar, he answered: "I am an old man but I [also] got so confused that I did not know what I should trust: the things our priest was saying or the staff they said." Wood-carvers' testimonies in Rymar's memoirs are explained simply: they depended on the priest who was paying money for their work. However, Rymar acknowledges that Andrii Doshchak's testimony was based on the real encounter with him, during which Rymar "carelessly mentioned something in religious matters".¹²⁷

The court declined all the charges against §58 (propaganda of revolution, violent overturn of the existing order). The court found Hryhorii Rymar guilty against §122 letters a) and d) – "blasphemy against God" and "spreading of atheism," and against §303 "ridiculing religion and its rites." The result was the sentence of two years of heavy prison petrified with one lent day and one day of *carver* every month. Berehuliak was found guilty against §122, letter d), and against §§303, 302 and 305 (ridiculing religion, inciting against certain social classes, agitation against property) and sentenced to a year and half of heavy prison with monthly lent and *carver*. Ivan Stupak was found guilty against §303 (ridiculing religion) and got two months of strict arrest while Atanasii Mel'nyk was found guilty only of the violation of the press law (possession of the illegal books) and sentenced to six days of arrest. Prus'kyi was acquitted of all the charges.¹²⁸ Mel'nyk was lucky that precisely in the 1880s the press law was liberalized, so that the possession of texts forbidden by the censorship was no longer a crime if only the owner was not lending them to other people.¹²⁹ In Hryhorii Rymar's case the sentence was not only harsh but also unexpected: "I did not feel as if I committed any crime and

¹²⁷ [Hryhorii Rymar], "Liubov do blyzhnioho. Pamiatka po bl. p. Hryhoriiu Rymari," *Khliborob*, 1893, No.21, 22 and 23.

¹²⁸ *Gazeta Narodowa*, 1886, No.134.

¹²⁹ Viacheslav Budzynov's'kyi, "Nashi prava," in *Khlopska Polityka*, seryia I, tom II. L'viv, 1903, 63.

therefore did not take this case seriously until I heard the very sentence.” The sentence scared Rymar who, as a former gendarme, knew how harsh it was.¹³⁰

It is interesting that the court dropped all the accusations in socialist agitation against Rymar, and the only one found guilty of the agitation against certain social classes and property was Berehuliak, son of the village strongman (*babats'kyi syn*), who burnt the Polish socialist brochure and was afraid to show it to other peasants. Was there some socialist agitation at all? Images of the well organized underground group can be found in the memoirs of Berehuliak's nephew, who back in the 1880s was of elementary school age. As I have already mentioned his stories fit very well into the heroic history of the Radical movement, which the party was writing in the 1920s. According to his story, the Dobrivliany group was well organized, and printed propaganda leaflets (25 copies each) allegedly written by Franko (although these texts in Berehuliak's description do not look like Franko's, and we do not have a single copy of them preserved), the leaflets were brought from Drohobych and rewritten by Rymar. Group's meetings were attended by people like N. Novakivs'kyi from the village of Torky, the Przemyśl district, and Fed' Derhalo from the village of Zavaliv, the Stryi district. The leaflets were directed against priests, unjust laws and administration. Rev. Chapel's'kyi knew about this activity and his daughter Natalia was receiving the leaflets from peasants.¹³¹

The affair had an impact on the formation of prominent Ukrainian socialist Semen Vityk, the son of the railroad employee in Dobrivliany. The rumors about this conspiracy spread around, and Vityk, back then a teenager, had heard about it. Iliarii Harbins'kyi, Rev. Harbins'kyi's son and a teacher in Volia Iakubova had also joined the group of peasant activists. My guess is that he was the same teacher practicing shooting in the school together with Andrii Nalyvaiko. We know that Mel'nyk suspected him of drafting the petition against the reading club. But later on Iliarii Harbins'kyi defected from his father's camp and joined radicals. He had to have a radical speech, in which he mentioned that some wise man discovered that humans originated from apes. The rumor about Iliarii Harbins'kyi's speech against the rich and priests reached Vityk's family and impressed young Vityk the most. Feeling compassion for Mel'nyk, Rymar, Berehuliak and younger Harbins'kyi, Vityk's family and its neighbors at the same time

felt sorrow that the teacher breaks their foundations of old superstitions, ravages their old unshakeable beliefs in heavenly powers, in human origin from some creator, like Lord God, who created Adam and Eve, it was too sudden to acknowledge that their ancestors were monkeys.

¹³⁰ [Hryhorii Rymar], “Liubov...,” *Khliborob*, 1893, No.22.

¹³¹ *Ivan Franko u spohadakh suchasnykiv*. Knyha druha, 43-46.

They thought about it for a long time, stooped their heads and were sad. They were saying – “everything that they say is truth, everything is holy truth, but we would never believe that people came from monkey.”¹³²

Some peasants from the village of Dorozhiv, who were against their Russophile priest Rev. Maliarkevych, allegedly joined the group of discontented radicals as well. When younger Harbins'kyi had to leave his father's house, he was hiding among Dobrivliany peasants and worked on the railroad construction, where got wounded and had to spend some time in Vityk father's house recovering.¹³³ We know that later he pursued the career of the village teacher and continued to incite peasants against priests in the Drohobych district.¹³⁴ According to Vityk, the agitation in Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova started fear, especially among the “superstitious old women” talking about the end of the world, the fulfillment of the Queen of Sheba's prophesy and the beginning of the civil war, when the brother rises against brother and the son against his father.¹³⁵ Vityk's account proves that anti-religious and anti-clerical aspects of this affair enjoyed the widest resonance.

Most probably, Franko's opinion about the Kosiv affair, when he rejects Pavlyk's claims that some kind of peasant socialism was present there, applies to the Dobrivliany case as well.¹³⁶ As Franko argues, in the Kosiv case, there were brochures and people trying to make sense of them, but this was common all over Galicia. According to Franko, anti-religious and anti-governmental propaganda obviously took place in the Kosiv area “but without clear positive, communalist strivings.”¹³⁷ Franko was not in Galicia when peasants from Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova were arrested and did not follow trial proceedings. Only when the trial ended Franko decided to present the case to the larger world publishing articles in Polish periodicals published in L'viv and in Russian Empire, and in Viennese Neue Freie Zeitung.¹³⁸ Drahomanov, following the events from the articles in Galician press, saw in this trial “the beginning of some kind of *Stundism* (term for the Evangelical movement among Ukrainian

¹³² Ibid., 52.

¹³³ Op. cit., 50-54.

¹³⁴ See the complaint of Rev. Bachyns'kyi and its investigation in TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2503, a.5-7.

¹³⁵ Op. cit., 50-54.

¹³⁶ Lystuvannia I. Franka i M. Drahomanova, 28, 32.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ His correspondences to Kraj, No.26, 1886, s.11 and to Pravda, No.29, 1886, s.338-339 are listed in M. O. Moroz, Ivan Franko. Bibliohrafiia tvoriv, 1874-1964 (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1966). His correspondence to Neue Freie Zeitung is mentioned in his letter to Drahomanov, but not listed in the bibliography of his works.

peasants in Russian Empire) but more radical” and predicted that the process would not end with this affair.¹³⁹

The Dobrivliany trial did not have such a wide resonance as other trials against socialists. Despite the fact that they read socialist brochures these peasants were no socialists and it was clear for everyone. Nevertheless the case was used to launch attacks against peasant reading clubs, Ukrainian movement, socialists, and even secular teachers. Conservative Czas published in Krakow was presenting this case as proving the fact that reading clubs too often became “pivots of the unhealthy agitation.” This newspaper states that multiple crimes, of which the peasants were accused, were all of a piece; all these crimes were connected and caused by the same “socialist-anarchist” background and its popular interpretations.¹⁴⁰ In this case, it is not clear what Czas feared more: socialism or the uncontrollable action of peasant masses misinterpreting socialism.

Czas also used this case to attack the Ukrainian national movement in general. In this attack Ukrainian movement was associated with nihilist and socialist trends. Similar position was taken by the Russophile newspaper Novyi Prolom, in which the Ukrainian movement and its printed production were blamed for the “demoralization” of peasantry and spread of the socialist and anti-clerical agitation. The Ukrainophile press dedicated a lot of space to this case, allowing for different opinions from the national-populist public. Drahomanov, as usually, was despising this reaction, and equaled Dilo’s response with that of Novyi Prolom. However, the difference is obvious: we must remember that new populist politics of national populists developed under the influence of the radicals, like Franko and Pavlyk, who in the 1880s cooperated with the national-populism and contributed significantly to its development.

We may start with more conservative opinion, probably expressed by the priest from the Dobrivliany area. This correspondent to Bat’kivshchyna saw the root of the problem in primary state schools, which after transferred under the supervision of secular authorities did not teach enough respect for religion. National agitators, who cared only about their own politics, got control over them. The correspondent complained about the decline of literacy in the villages, caused by the secular schools that replaced older parish schools, as allegedly was the case in Luzhok Dol’nyi and Bronnytsia. While the villages with “unreformed” schools, such as Lishnia, Stupnytsia, Luzhok, Volia Iakubova allegedly were doing much better.¹⁴¹

The response to this article came very quickly and was written by the teacher, defending secular village schools. The author was also defending the peasants

¹³⁹ Ibid., 194.

¹⁴⁰ Czas, 1886, No.130.

¹⁴¹ Bosniak, “Pys’mo vid Drohobycha,” Bat’kivshchyna, 1886, No.16 and 17.

who were still under the investigation at the time this article was published, saying that Rymar was an excellent student not only in the village school, but also in the Drohobych school of Basilian Fathers (controlled by religious authorities).¹⁴² By and large, Bar'kivshchyna sympathized with the peasants. Articles that appeared there forced Rev. Iosyf Iavors'kyi to send a refutation. He stressed that there was no struggle over *jura stolae* in Dobrivliany, while he was a priest there, and after he left many of his parishioners felt "pity and longing." The misfortune was caused not by *jura stolae*, but by the revolutionary and anti-religious brochures someone gave to peasants.¹⁴³ We must remember that Rev. Iosyf Iavors'kyi was also one of the activists of the Ukrainian movement. This time the editor, Iuliiian Romanchuk neither attacked priests nor condemned peasants, providing newspaper's pages for different opinions inside of the Ruthenian camp, and thus anticipated the politics of Ukrainian National Democracy, which tried to alienate neither of the two social groups so important for the success of Ukrainian national project.

The Ukrainian position was formalized by Dilo, for which the need to answer Polish and Russophile accusation also gave an opportunity to explain the position of national-populists.¹⁴⁴ First of all, Dilo states:

It is an indisputable fact that most of the Ruthenian reading clubs rest on the legal and moral-religious foundation. The Ruthenian intelligentsia as well as our religious, moral, and respecting the law peasants and artisans take care of this.

About the whole affair Dilo had a detailed letter from "certain very respected in that region clerical person." It is interesting that Dilo says:

this case contains so much of the drastic material, that it does not lend itself to the discussion in our paper, because paper's editorial board is sticking as much as possible to the principle of forging an agreement and harmony among all the estates of our [Ruthenian] society. This is the only guarantee of our power.

The newspaper stressed that the investigating judge, Mr. Chiliński from Sambir, did not find any illegal books or brochures in the reading club, only among individual peasants, namely Atanasii Mel'nyk, who was fined for that with 30 Gulden. The accusations in socialist agitation were dropped by jury while blasphemy acknowledged.

¹⁴² D... V... z pid Dorhobycha, uchytel' z V..., "Pys'ma z sela," Bar'kivshchyna, 1886, No.20. This teacher could well be, the son of Rev. Harbins'kyi and teacher in Volia Iakubova.

¹⁴³ [Iosyf Iavors'kyi], "Sprostovanie o. Iosyfa Iavors'koho," Bar'kivshchyna, 1886, No.27.

¹⁴⁴ "Protse selian z Drohobytskoho," Dilo, 1886, No.62, 7(19).06.1886.

From this appears that socialist brochures, which some malicious hand for sure supplied to Volia Iakubova, and, highly probably, to Dobrivliany as well, did not cause such a dangerous influence on public order as blasphemy. And there is nothing strange in it. To understand any social question interpreted by science one would need more intelligence than peasants have.

The newspaper makes a point about differentiating between the imported socialism and home-grown blasphemy which developed inside of the village, probably under the influence of nearby industrial Drohobych and Boryslav. Dilo took a hard stance against the agitators sowing unrest while staying safely outside of the villages:

Even if he [the agitator] had to answer in court, for giving as a gift the forbidden brochure, he would be sentenced only to several days of arrest while peasants who had allegedly “understood deeply (*do gruntu*)” that brochure and on the basis of that “understanding” started talking about how it “should be” in the world, those peasants, farmers, fathers of families, innocent of any sin, judges, according to the law, must sentence for months of prison.

However, Dilo was blaming not only socialist agitators but also those members of intelligentsia, who looked unfavorably at the development of enlightenment among peasants. This passage referred to the parish priests:

They sin when they remain even-hearted and indifferent to the noble attempts of people to enlightenment. And they commit even greater, let us say an inexcusable sin when they accept ignoble role of the extinguishers of the spirit and light.

They would never succeed in bringing down the enlightenment but they will lose credit and respect among the enlightened part of the community. It will push priests to look for the support among its darker part.

And the war starts, sad and nasty for both sides. On the war as on a war: people's drives took over their hearts and reasoning. Both sides can easily cross the boundaries... And the end of such a war can be very sad.

Dilo blamed the pastor of Volia Iakubova for siding with dark people and being the enemy of the reading club. As a counter-example it brings certain Rev. Charnets'kyi, who has founded a dozen of reading clubs himself. According to the newspaper, the duty of village pastor is to prevent dangerous symptoms instead of complaining to the authorities. Przemyśl Consistory was also blamed

for handing the case too easily to state authorities not paying attention to the fact that aside of the scribe, two cantors were accused by the priest.

The newspaper points out recent manifestations of piety from Dobrivliany. Under Rev. Chapel's'kyi, Dobrivliany community raised 8,000 Gulden and built a new church without official "concourse" and legal enforcement. The father of the sentenced Berehuliak and sentenced Rymar contributed a lot to this church-construction. The Sambir case indicates "the need of the live and hearty bond between the priest and the community." The final accord of this article was "Let the Sambir trial to be the first and the last of this kind among us."¹⁴⁵

Aftermath

The most interesting fact is that this story does not end with the court trial contrary to the impression one gets from the existing scholarship. Many memoirists mentioning the affair were trying to bury both Hryhorii Rymar and Atanasii Mel'nyk soon after the Sambir process and prison term.¹⁴⁶ It could be just a mistake, but also a tendency. It seems that even those supporting arrested peasants were trying to forget the affair in the years that followed.

While Atanasii Mel'nyk was under arrest in Sambir the conflict in Volia Iakubova continued. When the peasant Havrylo Petsiukh died, Rev. Mykhailo Harbins'kyi took seven Gulden from the widow for the burial and charged additional two Gulden for the cantor with the standard and cross, otherwise the cantor would not go with the procession. Petsiukh's relatives came to bargain but the priest beat them severely saying: "you scoundrels socialists, I will send you to Sambir, one is already there, I have already written even to the bishop in Przemyśl." One would think that the priest used peasant fear of further prosecutions to charge an exorbitant amount, but in fact, the priest charged quite a reasonable and common fee for the burial with a procession and priest must have been angered that even this fee is resented. The same correspondent from Volia Iakubova, who reported on Petsiukh case, was complaining that Andrii Nalyvaiko had taken over all the possible offices in the village. Being real *surdutovets'* (literally a suit-man, here meaning one mixing up with gentlemen, earlier in the century meaning non-peasant, person of higher social status), Nalyvaiko was manipulating elections at his own will and anyone daring to protest against that, was immediately presented as an atheist and socialist.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Ignacy Daszyński, *Pamiętniki*, t.1, 26. Also Semen Wityk in *Ivan Franko u spohadakh suchasnykiv*. Knyha druga, 52.

¹⁴⁷ Hromadski, "Volia Iakubova v tsvitni 1886," *Gazeta Naddnicstrzańska*, 1886, No.8.

While the activists from Dobrivliany were sent to prison, Atanasii Mel'nyk came back to Volia Iakubova to continue his struggle. Edmund Solecki claimed that Mel'nyk was acquitted of the charges and got such a mild punishment because of his intervention.¹⁴⁸ But, according to Rymar's description of the trial, Rev. Harbins'kyi did not testify on the trial at all. As we know, Rev. Harbins'kyi at first was supportive of the reading club and later had problems with his own son who joined peasant radicals. All this could force him to abstain from being a witness on the trial and the absence of his testimony most probably was of crucial importance for the acquittal of Mel'nyk. Probably, the fact that Atanasii Mel'nyk in Volia Iakubova was more popular than Hryhorii Rymar in Dobrivliany had also played its role. We know that during the trial, to counter the negative certificate of morality issued to Mel'nyk by Nalyvaiko and Rev. Harbins'kyi, the community of Volia Iakubova submitted two positive characteristics of Mel'nyk with almost hundred signatures.¹⁴⁹

The case of Hryhorii Rymar was very different. Even in the very first reports Mel'nyk describes his community in much brighter colors than Rymar his. Perhaps, greater alienation of Rymar from community life (former gendarme and a bachelor) also explains slower progress of Dobrivliany reading club. Rymar's texts show certain bitterness about this estrangement from the community life. In the birth registers from Dobrivliany, which are complete for the 1880s, we do not meet Hryhorii Rymar as a godfather even once. At the same time, Hryhorii Berehuliak figures in this function a dozen of times, including being a godfather of Ivan Stupak's son.¹⁵⁰ And we know that godfather was considered to be an important relative, closer than one's cousins. Among his duties was to take care of the christened son.¹⁵¹ Hryhorii Rymar did not have wife or children and lived with his brother Antin Rymar, they built a house together in 1883, and had a joint farm.¹⁵²

In 1887, Atanasii Mel'nyk for the first time accused Andrii Nalyvaiko in the national treachery. As a community scribe Nalyvaiko was covering mayor and vice-mayor who stole community's funds.¹⁵³ These were usual misdeeds of community's administration but now they were connected with the service to Polish national camp. In Mel'nyk's after-trial newspaper reports an exemplary

¹⁴⁸ El. [Edmund Solecki], "Wojna o 'jura stolac'," *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1886, No.12.

¹⁴⁹ Himka, *Socialism in Galicia*, 137.

¹⁵⁰ TsDIAuL, f.201, op.4a, spr.6531.

¹⁵¹ Jan Świątek, *Brzozowa i okolica Zakliczyna nad Dunajcem. Obraz etnograficzny – zbiór z lat 1897-1906*, cz.III, (Archiwum etnograficzne, t.36-III, ed. by Edward Pietraszko) (Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, 1999), 52.

¹⁵² VR LNB, f. Ivan Levyts'kyi, spr.2702 p.80.

¹⁵³ [Atanasii Mel'nyk] Hrishnyk, "Volia Iakubova. Hruden' 1886," *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1887, No.1.

village which once had great prospects because of its reading club, transforms into the most neglected place in the Galicia. It is full of drunkards, fights and thefts. There are daily suits for the abuse of honor, for which precious time and money were spent. Again, “socialist” Mel’nyk complains that the priest does not fulfill his duties. As for Mel’nyk, the priest is too old to fulfill his duties – “when he does not eat he sleeps,” the priest rarely gives a sermon, and when he does – it turns into nonsense. The priest was trying to check the books in the reading clubs undermining club’s authority and not trusting peasants who “have only good books.” According to Mel’nyk, these books are the only means to change current conditions, he concludes: “read useful books, learn and do not allow anyone to cheat you. This is what God’s and human law says.”¹⁵⁴

Community council had its sessions in Nalyvaiko’s house, with the sign on its chimney: *Uzjad gmine* (“community council,” in Polish and with gross misspellings). The mayor, Iurko Lekhusa in past had spent some time in the prison for the fraud of community’s money. Iliarii Harbins’kyi, a local teacher, now was among Mel’nyk’s allies. Mel’nyk reports that because of Iliarii’s stance against the community leaders, he was declared mentally ill by his father and Andrii Nalyvaiko (one would wonder if his speech on the origin of human did not contribute to this more than anything else). They sent Iliarii to the hospital for mentally sick in L’viv (*Kul’parkiv*), from where he escaped and neither gendarmes nor peasants – supporters of Rev. Harbins’kyi, could find him. Rev. Harbins’kyi appointed an award of 50 Gulden for finding him but it did not help.¹⁵⁵ And from Vityk’s memoir we know that Iliarii was hiding in Dobrivliany.

The fact that the situation in Volia Iakubova remained tense and the conflict was not about to resolve was well-known. In 1887, when the instruction of religion in elementary schools was regulated, there was an examination of the situation with the lessons of religion, conducted by Church deans. Such an examination in Volia Iakubova showed that local school with 56 pupils had this instruction done by Rev. Harbins’kyi “but without any success.” This was in striking contrast to other schools of the Mokriany deanery, where religious instruction was quite successful.¹⁵⁶ There are no documents of such an examination in the Drohobych deanery to compare this situation with one in Dobrivliany.

On 26 May 1889 Rev. Harbins’kyi, wrote a letter to the bishop’s Consistory in Przemyśl. The letter says that Atanasii Mel’nyk accomplished a “devilish cunning against clerical vocation.” The priest guesses that Mel’nyk did it being instigated by someone more educated. This devilish crime against the clergy was in

¹⁵⁴ [Atanasii Mel’nyk] Bohomolets', „Volia Iakubova v lypniu,” *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1887, No.14.

¹⁵⁵ [Atanasii Mel’nyk] Jeden z wielu, „Wola Jakubowa w grudniu 1887,” *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1888, No.1.

¹⁵⁶ APP, ABGK, sygn. 5390.

following. Mel'nyk "told parish priest Rudavs'kyi from Bronnytsia that our Pastor during the confession was instigating my spouse Anna, not to live with me, and that the priest smoked a pipe before the liturgy." Rev. Rudavs'kyi immediately informed Rev. Harbins'kyi on this. Then, Rev. Harbins'kyi approached Andrii Nalyvaiko, asking him to invite Anna Mel'nyk for a glass of beer during the market day in Drohobych, and to tell her that he was writing a complaint against the priest and heard that the priest was instigating her to leave Atanasii. Anna allegedly rejected this and swore, beating her breast, that this was a lie. With such a testimony at hand, Rev. Harbins'kyi sued Mel'nyk in Drohobych and on 26 March 1889 Mel'nyk got 15 days of arrest.¹⁵⁷ An interesting moment in this affair is the fact that Anna could believe that Nalyvaiko was about to compose a complaint against the parish priest.

Probably with this case the note that appeared in Kurjer Drohobycki can be connected. This newspaper was reporting that "a sowing of Drohobych anarchists, who uphold immanent contact with local village people under the pretext of spreading education" brought its fruits. Now it came to the active resistance to the gendarmes, who were sent there to fulfill the order of the authorities. We cannot be sure of which order but it could be connected with Mel'nyk's arrest.¹⁵⁸ Soon after this, Atanasii's son, famous Andrii Mel'nyk was born. One of Andrii Mel'nyk's biographies says that his mother's name was Maryna and we do not know if this is just a mistake or Atanasii Mel'nyk married again in the early 1890s. According to the same biographer, Andrii's mother died in 1897, and Atanasii Mel'nyk remarried. Andrii Mel'nyk had warm memories of his stepmother. He was studying in Sambir for a while and then entered the gymnasium in Stryi.¹⁵⁹ Atanasii Mel'nyk maintained contacts with Edmund Solecki, Ivan Franko and Franko's friend from the Drohobych gymnasium, an attorney, Izaak Tigermann.

Atanasii Mel'nyk's sentences were light, while these of Berehuliak and Rymar were harsh even for Galician peasants, who considered prison (*kryminał*) to be another school, saying that one is not a *gazda* (an independent farmer and family father) unless he spends some time in prison.¹⁶⁰ Hryhorii Rymar's sentence changed a lot in his life; it deprived him of state pension, of the office of community's scribe, of the right to be elected to the community's offices. Perhaps it modified his views as well. The prison term made Rymar to reflect on the nature of humankind:

¹⁵⁷ APP, ABGK, sygn.3680, s.539.

¹⁵⁸ Kurjer Drohobycki, 1889, No.5.

¹⁵⁹ Petro Kulyniak, "Polkovnyk Andrii Mel'nyk," 672.

¹⁶⁰ This is used in this way in Andrii Chaikovs'kyi's prose and Ivan Mykhas' complaint to the Consistory – See APP, ABGK, sygn. 4272, No.192. (while I was reading this file it was not paginated yet, that is why in the reference I am providing number from Consistory's book-keeping.

Quite often I was wandering why all the people are not born to this world without any evil temper and drives? Man would live much better in the world if he did not have anything evil inborn. He would not cause any harm either to himself or to another person on freedom, health, body, life, wealth, honor etc. So who is guilty of this? I cannot tell for sure.¹⁶¹

The worst thing for Hryhorii Rymar was that in prison he got “swelling” of the right foot, most probably this was periostitis. Twice he was in L’viv and underwent two surgeries removing parts of the bone. Rymar decided to look at his own sentence as on a kind of redemption for the “possible” sins. This indicates that after having reexamined in prison his own thoughts and behavior, Rymar might have indeed found them blasphemous.

By the way, it was not too bad in the prison for me. A man is considered man there as well and people approach each other like humans. If a prisoner shows himself to be a wild beast there is also a way to handle him in a wild way. I have luck that people everywhere like me, only my own current pastor does not like me somehow.¹⁶²

Rymar was released on 6 June 1888. Because after the prison term his citizen’s rights were seriously severed, he took a role usually played by the Jews and started his own shop at the beginning of 1889. He describes his new life in Dobrivliany as following:

I did not go out of my house; did not talk much to anyone when had an opportunity; did not touch upon the community’s matters; lived lonely and quietly in my own house, dishonored as usually and, in comparison with other people living here, discriminated against in everything.¹⁶³

He was exaggerating his loneliness and, as we should see, did some public business as well. The position of the village storekeeper unavoidably led to much contact with people. However, Rymar pretends to be very surprised when in October 1892 he was called for questioning to the Sambir court. There he was asked about his talks with other people and, especially, why Ivan Franko was visiting Dobrivliany in 1892. This interrogation did not have any consequences. According to Rymar, investigators realized that complaints against Hryhorii just like complaints against his brother Il’ko Rymar, with whom they had a joint farm,

¹⁶¹ [Hryhorii Rymar], “Liubov do blyzhnioho. Pamiatka po bl. p. Hryhoriuu Rymari,” *Khliborob*, 1893, No.21, 22 and 23.

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

result from the personal hatred of the local priest. This reinforced Rymar's trust in the system of justice:

Gentlemen Judges and Prosecutors are, however, people highly educated, diligent and just, because all the justice rests in their hands and on their conscience. They will not allow to be driven by ire, hate, pride, obstinacy, or any side circumstances – they behave with a man according to the existing law and their own convictions.¹⁶⁴

Then, Rymar discloses why the priest hates him so much. It appears that in 1888 Rev. Hrabovins'kyi had built a building consisting of wood-house and coach-house, and neither of these was among older parish buildings. When the time for the renovation of parish buildings came, Rev. Hrabovins'kyi wanted to include the expenses for this newly erected building to the renovation's costs shared by the parishioners. In 1890 Ivan Nyzhnyk, one of the defendants in 1886 process and now a new village mayor, approached Rymar to write a recourse against priest's budget of renovation – the current community scribe was not good enough. Rymar presented all the inaccuracies of the priest's proposal, and in 1892 the answer from the Vice-Roy's office arrived, which agreed with Rymar's recourse. In 1892, newly elected community council asked Rymar to check the balances of the estate and funds left from the old community council. It appeared that a large amount of money was missing. At this point Rymar's memoir ends, but we can guess that this fraud was somehow also connected with Rev. Hrabovins'kyi.

There is a document showing that Rymar was not going to stop his struggle with the priest and exaggerated his own peacefulness in the memoir: immediately when he had been released from prison he wrote a complaint against Rev. Hrabovins'kyi. We have a copy of the community's complain to the L'viv Archbishop (which meant bypassing the Przemyśl bishop, to which this kind of complaints had to be directed). This complaint starts with the reference to 1886 affair, when Rev. Hrabovins'kyi “not knowing yet local people, or local customs and traditions” presented local people as spoiled, and initiated an investigation that had a sorrowful ending.

Because of that we thought that our spiritual father Hrabovins'kyi is a man possessing all the best virtues and qualities, spiritual as well as corporal, and not tolerating the slightest evil and irregularity; that by his exemplary behavior and his teaching he will dispel all the evil from among his parishioners, just like the light dispels darkness, and cure all of us from various corporal and spiritual wounds; – in meantime we realized that were misled by this thought, albeit we, as very simple people, do not understand

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

either Church or secular rights and regulations, we still, [even] with our simple mind, consider behavior and acts of spiritual father Hrabovins'kyi as inadequate for his rank and vocation, not raising morality and other virtues of his parishioners, but causing demoralization.¹⁶⁵

The complaint accused Rev. Hrabovins'kyi in the appropriation of parish funds (claiming that the money were spent for wine and communion bread), against which church controllers protested referring to the practices of Rev. Chapel's'kyi; in the attempts to bribe church controllers, and in the desecration of the "very holy for us" cemetery:

It would be very embarrassing for us to see if some unintelligent brute polluted this place holy for us; – so how more unpleasant for us is to see that educated, intelligent, the person that should be an example, pastor and leader for all of us pollutes this, so holy for us place, the place he so often sprinkles with holy water, and that person is our spiritual father Ivan Hrabovins'kyi.

We have never had an opportunity to see some simple dark peasant urinating or peeing on cemetery or near the church, as our spiritual father does.

Then, there were dates when Rev. Hrabovins'kyi was seen urinating near the church (May 1886) and on the cemetery (April and May 1888). Rev. Hrabovins'kyi was blamed for drinking vodka and praising it. As a penance after confession the priest was assigning akathists or Service in the church instead of prayer or lent. The point was that for akathist and Services peasants had to pay the priest and it discouraged them from confessing at all. During akathist the priest was cheating both God and people reading instead of twelve only six to nine stanzas. Once, administering the communion, the priest swore and that made a bad impression on those taking communion. This complaint was already the second one and it explains why it went straight to L'viv bypassing Przemyśl. In response to the first one, there was an investigation conducted by the Drohobych dean Rev. Skobel's'kyi from Lishnia, but that investigation did not have any consequences, and the peasants decided to address the archbishop himself.

In 1893 Hryhorii Rymar died.¹⁶⁶ When he died he left eighteen Gulden for both priests, Rev. Hrabovins'kyi in Dobrivliany and Rev. Harbins'kyi, saying "let priests not to complain about radicals that they urge not to pay priests, I am leaving ten Gulden for my first enemy and eight Gulden for the neighboring Rev. Harbins'kyi."¹⁶⁷ It is interesting that just before this Rymar resumed his writing

¹⁶⁵ VR II, f.3, spr.2322, a.172.

¹⁶⁶ Khliborob, 1893, 184.

¹⁶⁷ Khliborob, 1893, 184.

activity and in 1893 published several articles in Khliborob, a popular newspaper of the Radical Party. The party was founded in 1890, being the first Ukrainian political party, and Ivan Franko was among its founders.

It is very characteristic that the first article Rymar contributed to the newspaper was titled “How much does the wedding cost for the poor farmer?” In this article he picked up one of his favorite themes from the early 1880s, as if not much had changed since that time. Rymar shows no respect for Ukrainian wedding rites beloved by the ethnographers, which for him were too expensive, albeit Rymar tries to make his article to fit into the national discourse:

What kind of wise things you can hear or see there [on the weddings]? Only distorted Polish words, moreover, dirty words, songs, shouts etc., with some stupid things. And a lot of precious time is wasted, not only by wedding guests but also by closer and farther neighbors, who come to watch stupidities, instead of doing something [useful] at home.¹⁶⁸

Rymar’s investigation of the wedding that occurred in fall 1892 showed that the peasant organizing it spent 86 Gulden 12 Kreuzer. That person had already organized two weddings and three or four were still waiting ahead. Rymar concludes that this kind of wedding could ruin even seven Joch farmer. There was an urgent need to introduce more modesty and to limit the wedding to two days. Rymar’s obsession with thriftiness is also visible in the already cited article on village schools, which also dates by 1893.¹⁶⁹

The discourse of Hryhorii Rymar was not unique. In 1892, on the peasant meeting in Karliv, Ivan Sanduliak proposed resolutions about moderate christenings and weddings, and all the radical peasants agreed to this. Another peasant, Ivan Kuzyk, proposed not to trade on Sundays and holidays, to forbid youngsters drinking and wearing hair-pins, “because there were cases when cattle getting [them] with water was dieing for nothing.” Sanduliak also proposed to pay priests only the amounts indicated in the patent of Joseph II, but at the same time “not to conduct inappropriate conversations in the church, because the church is the place of prayer.”¹⁷⁰ In this we can see an obvious attempt to order and discipline the village, to propagate new values, which have little in common with either socialism or atheism.

Probably the most interesting Rymar’s article is called “Oh, these Radicals!”¹⁷¹ At the beginning of this article he assumes a posture of simple peasant, mentions that he does not know much and claims to stay all the time at home. Despite it

¹⁶⁸ Hryhorii Rymar, “Kil’ko koshtuie bidnoho hospodaria vesillia,” Khliborob, 1893, No.1.

¹⁶⁹ Hryhorii Rymar, “Interesy hromady u teperishnia mistseva shkil’na rada,” Khliborob, 1893, No.8 and 9.

¹⁷⁰ Khliborob, 1892, No.1.

¹⁷¹ Hryhorii Rymar, “Oi ti radykaly, radykaly!”, Khliborob, 1893, No.6.

some rumors about radicals have reached him. He heard all the rumors and thought that these radicals were godless, evil and dangerous people. Here we meet an interesting pattern: peasants, who were involved into radical activities in the 1880s, in the 1890s would claim that they were converting to them just now and this was their first exposure to radicalism.¹⁷² One can see this as a rhetorical trick, however the fact that this was not a single case, and that the editors, to whom peasants were sending these letters, knew them very well back in the 1880s, seems to indicate that peasants indeed did not perceive their activities in the 1880s as “radical” and directly connected with the foundation of the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party in 1890. The party was for them a new phenomenon. Hryhorii Rymar presented the way he was figuring what the Radical party was about as following:

I thought like following. There are more people on the Earth who can reason, not only crazy radicals; so if the Radicals wanted to do something evil, then other smart people would never allow for that, tie them like madmen and cure them so that these could come back to the full reasoning. The land, the state, has army, has wise people.

And if they were really so godless, that they do not believe in God, then Lord God has power over them: if the Lord God handled proud Angels and pushed them down to the Hell, while Angels had more importance than people, so Lord God could also handle these radicals, who are not any Angels but simple people...

So I think if God really as disliked radicals as many people did, he would make an order with them, because he is an Almighty Father above all the humans, Radicals included! One strong earthquake – and bodies of radicals are underground and their souls are in Hell.

No natural disaster occurred, however, and this allowed Rymar to guess that people attacking radicals were pursuing their own hidden interests, interests that had nothing to do with God’s attitude. After hearing all the rumors Rymar wished to look at radical Khliborob. One farmer nearby had the newspaper, so he borrowed it from him:

I took that Khliborob to my house, read, read it, and was afraid not to get infected with something bad from it, because I had already heard that there were hundreds of swears thrown at this newspaper. But then I became braver and read without fear, thinking that if Mr. Prosecutor was not afraid to read it while censoring so why should I, a simple peasant, be afraid of reading it!!

¹⁷² This was also the case with Ivan Mykhas, who claimed to convert to radicalism under his friend’s influence and Jesus Christ’s teachings only in 1892.

While reading this newspaper Rymar discovered that radicals were writing extremely wisely, “only the truth, pure truth” as, for example, when arguing for the introduction of general elections. They want all the people, no matter what their estate and tax class is, to elect representatives of their own.

This wish of theirs is absolutely just. Land, wealth and taxes do not need councilors or deputies, only people require them to organize land, earthly wealth and taxes in relation to people and their social and state needs. Land in general is God’s and the only real councilor above it is Lord God. Lord God had created land, maintains, clothes, waters, dries, warms and rules it. Land will not attack or abuse each other because its every part lies in its place and does not move. Land will not die from hunger, it does not need accommodation, clothing, or fuel. In this respect it does not need a counselor at all and it does not need to vote.

People, live beings require deputies or people’s representatives and therefore voting, so that these deputies will care about the order among them, about the mode and security of life, and care about everything else what is needed by the human life and order in the society.

A man comes to this world according to God’s right, general and equal for all people, and through this very coming to the world acquires the right to life in this world; only because of this a man must also acquire this general human right on the earth – to take part in the establishment of customs and orders to regulate through human laws the mode and the order to human life and security in the human society and in the state. Every man who came to the world by God’s right must be able to satisfy the most general needs, to be able to maintain his own life from the same land, on which he was born; because to another land, as for example Mars, Venus or Mercury etc., no railway is yet constructed, so one cannot go there from this land for bread necessary for life.

Finally, Rymar says that he does not know the program of radicals in detail and is not sure if he would like this program if he knew it, “because I like to get to everything by my own simple peasant reasoning.” But he likes things he found in Khliborob. He does not understand everything from what he reads but he can see what is aiming at truth and what – at calumny or injustice, what aims at evil and what – at good. This article is very important for us because it provides clues to what the blasphemy and agitation against the social order in which he was accused in 1886 could look like.

It can be said for sure that Rymar was not an atheist and his anticlericalism was not directed against all the priests. He had very high opinion of Rev. Ivan Chapel’s’kyi, the son of Rev. Antin Chapel’s’kyi, who was Franko’s friend and became a renown Ukrainian activist, one of the leaders of clerical and conservative party. Speaking about Rev. Antin Chapel’s’kyi Rymar says:

However, he did not die not leaving even a trace, but left children, among whom the most remarkable is his son, spiritual father Ivan Chapel’s’kyi.

This son inherited all the virtues of his father. And in respect of the intellect, knowledge and character, this son is much more superior to his father.¹⁷³

Rev. Ivan Chapel's'kyi, a classmate of Ivan Franko from gymnasium and Pavlyk's fiend, became a parish priest and after the death of his wife, a canon in L'viv. While being a parish priest in Kropyvnyk (close to the place where his father caught horse thieves) in 1884 he got into trouble: having borrowed 300 Gulden from local peasants and not from the Jew (which would be the usual practice among priests) he was transferred to another parish, and peasants requested to return the debt immediately being afraid that they would not get their money back from another village. He solved the problem with the help of Franko and Pavlyk.¹⁷⁴ In early 1890s, when Rymar was writing his "memoirs," Rev. Chapel's'kyi was a cooperator of Metropolitan Sembratovych and a proponent of Ukrainian-Polish compromise, against which radicals conducted campaign in press and on public meetings – Rymar must have known about this. In 1895 Rev. Ivan Chapel's'kyi ran unsuccessfully for the Diet deputy as a governmental candidate, the same year from the Radical party Ivan Franko ran for the parliament seat, also without a success.

Rymar's reflections, however, also show that his ideas about humankind had been drawing on early Ukrainian socialist brochures. He was reworking them "creatively" dropping out parts about labor value, revolutionary struggle and read them rather in the tradition of popular publication for peasants from the 1860s and 1870s. For example, the brochure "On farming" states "all the riches come from work," meaning that labor power is the source of all the value produced.¹⁷⁵ At the same time, Rymar interprets this as a statement that diligent work is necessary for any prosperity. The book says that all the evil in human relationships comes from the wish to force others to work for oneself, from which the state and class divisions derive. Rymar interprets this as personal envy and evil will, while legal framework is seen by him as one that can help to tame these encroachments.¹⁷⁶ He says explicitly that he was not sure about the source of all the evil but was inclined to see it in the nature of some individuals; while good was described in terms of individual freedom and inalienability of property.

In the texts left by peasants from Dobrivliany affair one would never find anything about "underpaid labor," and this was powerfully stressed in the

¹⁷³ [Hryhorii Rymar], "Liubov blyzhnioho. Pamiatka po bl. p. Hryhoriuu Rymari," *Khliborob*, 1893, ch.21, 22, 23.

¹⁷⁴ VR II., f.3, s.1618, a.651.

¹⁷⁵ [Mykhailo Drahomanov] Lyps'kyi, *Pro khliborobstvo. Rozмова tretia. Iak de zemlia podilena i iak by treba ii derzhaty*, (1877), V.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., VI.

socialist brochures they allegedly read. The brochures stated that one could not look for some just price, that one under current relationships of production was never paid the value he actually produced with his labor.¹⁷⁷ In the socialist brochures it was said that capital cannot be acquired by means other than exploitation and appropriation of the other's work.¹⁷⁸ And peasant activists in Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova argued for the individual and community's prosperity, entrepreneurship and thriftiness.

Rymar misses in Podolyns'kyi's texts all the discussion of oppressive legal systems, of the Roman law pressing out the remains of the communal order and common usage of natural resources. And this does not look strange, if we remember his gendarme background. All the activists from Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova tried to get in power so that the village government would be controlled by them and this part of state structure would operate justly. Rymar eagerly picks up descriptions of the joyful communal life in the future for his reflections on the natural rights and inherent good in humans.¹⁷⁹ This communal life is supposed to save from envy and enmity and this is something Rymar would like to implement in his community but with the help of the law and order, not of the overturn of social relationships.

Hryhorii Rymar died in 1893 at the age of 41. Rev. Harbins'kyi died in 1899 at the age of 80. Just before his death the neighboring priest, Rev. Ivan Hrabovins'kyi from Dobrivliany in the letter to the Przemyśl Consistory reported that Rev. Harbins'kyi was ill and he was substituting him for free, as neighbor's favor. In this letter Rev. Hrabovins'kyi implied that Rev. Harbins'kyi was a greedy man, who even dying felt better when knowing that he did not have to pay the priest substituting him.¹⁸⁰ But we know that in 1894, when Rev. Hrabovins'kyi was granted two months' leave to improve his health, Rev. Harbins'kyi was substituting him for free as well.¹⁸¹

It is interesting that Rev. Hrabovins'kyi was accusing Harbins'kyi in gluttony while being involved into even more rotten affair. In 1899 certain widow, Anders, accused Rev. Hrabovins'kyi in supporting his son's Kornel' affair with her and their marriage despite the fact that she was thirty years older than Kornel' and Rev. Hrabovins'kyi must had known that money was the only Kornel's motivation. The marriage was bringing to his son half of the Anders' estate, and she was an owner of the apartment building, at first in Rzeszów and later in

¹⁷⁷ Serhii Podolyns'kyi, "Pro bahatstvo i bidnist'," in Roman Serbyn (ed.) *Vybrani tvory* (Ukrain's'ke istorychne tovarystvo, 1990), 37.

¹⁷⁸ Serhii Podolyns'kyi, "Pro bahatstvo i bidnist'," 41.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 132.

¹⁸⁰ APP, AGKBP, sygn.3699.

¹⁸¹ TsDIAuL, f.201, op.4a, spr.6531, a.146.

Krakow. Rev. Hrabovins'kyi was trying to clear himself that this was the affair of his sons and not his, nevertheless it appeared that he had known about it since 1891, although his approval of the affair was never proved.¹⁸²

Atanasii Mel'nyk remained among local peasant leaders. He was one to advise brothers Franko to sell their land in Nahuievychi for 6,000 Gulden and to buy 40 Joch near Kalush for 8,000 Gulden.¹⁸³ Atanasii Mel'nyk was an organizer of the Radical Party in the Drohobych district and participated in the Party Convention in 1897. This was a remarkable convention that brought together the largest number of peasant activists and bright intellectuals in the whole party's history. At this convention Mel'nyk was reporting on the development of the Radical movement in the Drohobych district and although he could not boast with too much success, made a point that from the Drohobych district Ivan Franko, "the first early bird," came out. The speech of Mel'nyk was colorful with many peasant metaphors ridiculed by the national-populist press.¹⁸⁴ He was also talking against some legal prerogatives of the state administration, and against obligatory agricultural unions proposed by the Diet.¹⁸⁵

In 1899 Atanasii Mel'nyk complained to Franko that he was sick and besides that, still had civil and criminal processes against the deceased Rev. Harbins'kyi. Some of these processes he started against the priest and others the priest against him. There were radicals in the village and they contributed for the celebration of Franko's jubilee (eight peasants), however Mel'nyk asked about receiving from now only one copy of Hromads'kyi Holos (radical newspaper) instead of three – two other subscribers left for the Basilian Fathers' school in Drohobych. The only copy had to be sent to Dmytro Hrekh.¹⁸⁶

In 1902, he participated in the Thirteenth Convention of the Radical Party, and proposed a resolution to transform party's biweekly Hromads'kyi Holos into a weekly, even if it meant the of the format to a smaller one.¹⁸⁷ Mel'nyk, finally became a mayor of the village, and a lasting one. As a mayor he bought one of three taverns the village had, and turned it into the community house.¹⁸⁸ Atanasii Mel'nyk died on 27 April 1905. The same year he was accused by the district organization of Ukrainian National Democracy in receiving his mandate to the district council from the hands of Rus' enemies, and in testifying against the

¹⁸² APP, ABGK, sygn.4047.

¹⁸³ Ivan Franko u spohadakh suchasnykiv, Knyha druha, 31.

¹⁸⁴ "Z'ezd ruskoj partii radykal'noi," Dilo, 1897, No.203-210.

¹⁸⁵ "Z'ezd rusko-ukrains'koi radykal'noi partii," Ruslan, 1897, No.206.

¹⁸⁶ VR II, f.3, spr.1624, a.36.

¹⁸⁷ "13-tyi kraievyy z'ezd radykal'noi partii," Khlopska pravda, 1903, No.1, 3.

¹⁸⁸ Petro Kulyniak, "Takubova Volia," in Luka Lutsiv (ed.), Drohobychchyna, 246.

national movement in the district administration.¹⁸⁹ The burial was attended by his son Andrii Mel'nyk, then a gymnasium student.

After Atanasii Mel'nyk's death, on the eve of general elections of 1907, the district captaincy in Drohobych arrested numerous peasants from Volia Iakubova accused of violating public order. This was connected with the agitation in favor of socialist candidate, Semen Vityk. According to one of the arrested peasants, local forester had provoked the unrest. He started criticizing agitation for Vityk and when one of the peasants replied, the forester with the local gendarme had beaten the peasant. Later, the peasant with his friends attacked the forester's house, the forester replied with two rifle shoots what provoked further excesses and a "siege" of the forester's house.¹⁹⁰ The case ended with the dispatch of the infantry company which was stationed in the village.¹⁹¹ Among those involved certain Panteleimon Mel'nyk figures prominently

Dean's visitation of Iakubova Volia from 6 August 1908, when the parish priest was Rev. Nykyfor Leshchyshak, documents such manifestations of parishioners' piety as participation in the candle and sobriety brotherhoods, although the first one did not have statutes and the second one lacked funds. Individual donations, 9,600 crowns in total, were collected for the construction of a new church, and there was an active parish loan department, from which 2,600 crowns were borrowed by peasants. Although two latter institutions were proofs not so much of piety as of community's activity. There was only one "wild" (unsanctioned by Church) marriage with children in the village, and this one was between native brother and sister. If there was any lasting impact of radical agitation it was not in religion and religious feelings but in the peasants' stand against parish priest. Peasants from Volia Iakubova during the visitation submitted their remonstrations against the parish priest, while in most villages the visitation stated that peasants were fully satisfied with their priests. They complained that the priest was using grass from the cemetery without compensation for the community (no mention of the place's holy status this time), that the priest did not allow for a road to be paved through the parish field, was refusing to exchange parish land for the establishment of a new cemetery and did not allow to transfer communal granary from the church square as long as peasants continued to resist the construction of a new stable and barn for the priest.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁹ "Politychni zbory v Drohobychi," *Dilo*, 1905, No.126.

¹⁹⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.5031, a.4.

¹⁹¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.5031, a.10-11.

¹⁹² APP, ABGK, sygn.5691. The last point is especially interesting because it relates the struggle for the control community's space. Conservative and clerical publication continued the tradition of the 1870s and were insisting on locating all the community institutions in close proximity to the church, while national-populists from the very beginning were emphasizing the importance of the reading club which, as well as other voluntary and economic institutions of the village, had to be sheltered in the community's building together with community's administration.

In the 1890s, two villages were the stronghold of the radical party in the Drohobych district. Hromads'kyi Holos was subscribed by the Dobrivliany reading club, at least four peasants from Volia Iakubova, as well as one peasant from Dorozhiv.¹⁹³ Radical movement started by Atanasii Mel'nyk and Hryhorii Rymar developed and in the interwar period both villages had numerous members of the leftist Ukrainian political parties and organizations. Volia Iakubova was among few villages, in which local radicals were in power. Radical gymnastic and fire-fighting society *Sich* in Volia Iakubova counted 50 men in 1909, they had a hydrant and almost every Sunday practiced gymnastics and fire-fighting. *Sich* meetings took place in the community's chancery while exercises – on the common. This *Sich* was once fighting fire in Dobrivliany and twice in its own village. For that it got 40 crowns from the *Dnister* insurance society. There were 40 books in its library, as well as newspapers Svoboda and Hromads'kyi Holos. All *Sich* members were literate. In 1909 there were four performances by this *Sich* and one evening in the honor of Taras Shevchenko. Certain Fed' Mel'nyk was among the most active members and local teacher, not the priest, was *Sich's* greatest enemy. Neighboring *Sich* organizations in Dobrivliany and Nahuievychi were also developing well, albeit there is no report from Dobrivliany to compare.¹⁹⁴

In both villages peasants remembered Hryhorii Rymar and Atanasii Mel'nyk as those who brought “new times” to their villages, not so much for their “socialist” and anti-clerical views as for their contribution to the change of the social landscape of the villages.¹⁹⁵ Radical Dobrivliany also became famous for their fights with Russophile peasants from neighboring Hrushiv, in which Pliaton Chapel's'kyi, Antin's son figured most prominently as a man of unusual physical strength (which by the way in Ukrainian folktales quite often is ascribed precisely to the priest's son, *popovych*).¹⁹⁶

Conclusions

I have not brought all these details and prolonged citations to my description of this affair only to make this story look more complete, although I must confess that the urge to tell the “whole story” shaped this chapter more than anything else. First of all, these details were brought in to prove that to represent this affair

¹⁹³ LODA, f.116, op.1, spr.1, a.8.

¹⁹⁴ TsDIAuL, f.847, op.1, spr.2, Iakubova Volia.

¹⁹⁵ Drohobychchyna – zemlia Ivana Franka (Niu Iork-Paryzh-Sydnei-Toronto, 1973), passim.

¹⁹⁶ Volodymyr Chapel's'kyi, Op. cit., 202-206.

as either socialist conspiracy, or the case of socialist agitation, or grass-root socialism, does not do justice to its complex nature. They also showed that this case was intimately connected with the Ukrainian national project. Even socialism in this case has particular Ukrainian appearance and cannot be understood outside of the context of the national project. However, there was very little socialism in peasants' ideas but neither was there much nationalism, if we look for their articulations or programs in peasant texts. There is very little national antagonism seen, and the worst enemies of the Ruthenian peasant activists in this case are other Ruthenians, peasants as well priests. There are no Polish landlords, and very little references to *robot* times, but there are strong connections with past and present Ruthenian projects as well as with local history. The splits in the communities were hardly based on the different economic interests.

On the other hand, if nationalism and socialism are understood as "projects" at work; and not ideologies; projects, to which peasants were exposed and projects that targeted peasants, then these village conflicts were indeed their consequence. All the examples of "real grievances" and priests' "unbearable" exploitation and pressure were brought by the peasants only to prove that they were right in the conflict. At stake in this conflict were not the reduction of the payments to the priest but the influence in the village community and the reform of that community. The new projects were not simply indoctrinating peasants, they were also empowering them, making them to believe in their own importance. They were transforming peasant distrust of the world of gentlemen and local power conflicts into integral parts of some larger process occurring objectively and simultaneously in many communities, and in the world in general. But at the same time these new projects were not arriving into peasant heads in form of ready thoughts and ideas: their power lay in the ability to use local context and to color it with new meanings.

It seems that this case rather provides one more example of the conflict between "liberal" peasants and "conservative" priests. Conflicts of this type were sweeping European countryside in the second half of the nineteenth century.¹⁹⁷ Up to now these conflicts were described in France and Italy: in the context of the establishment of control over countryside by the modern nation-state. However, in the Dobrivliany case such a context was provided by the Ukrainian national movement. Peasant activists from Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova were among the first peasant correspondents to the national newspapers. They were

¹⁹⁷ For the Italian example see Roland Sarti, Long Live The Strong: A History of The Rural Society in The Apennine Mountains (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985). For the French example see conflicts between village pastors, mayors and schoolmasters in Barrett Singer, Village Notables in Nineteenth-Century France: Priests, Mayors, Schoolmasters, (SUNY series on European social history) (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983). It seems that nothing like that happened in Russia, while tensions between priests and village communities for sure existed they were never translated into something bigger, never went through the prism of ideology, never got into the space of public debate.

among those exemplary peasants whose words were selected by the movement as representative of the peasantry, and who, in turn, gave their trust to the movement and sought there for the allies. Sources of the enlightenment these activists tried to bring to their villages, unlike in the case of France and Italy, lay outside of state institutions. The whole discussion of this affair took place in the context of national press, was evaluated and assigned its place in the narrative of nation-making. It also seems that by narrating the case, evaluating and drawing conclusions from it, this national project tried to incorporate social (socialist) component.

As I have already mentioned, peasant activists' agenda was neither socialist nor nationalist despite the fact that both socialist and nationalist cultural production was used by them. The activists started asking new questions and were answering them with the help of new categories. Their agenda was reformist: to change community's balance of power, mode of politics, morals, and individual habits. Their enlightenment was not only about subjective identification with nationality or class, it was about transformation of subjectivity; their ideal individual was a new individual. But both nationalist and radical projects appeared to be conspicuously implicated in this agenda. Perhaps, it was because of the fact that these projects had some common and more general connection. This larger connection is seen in the intellectuals' concern with rationalism, positivism, enlightenment and being "European." These topics fit readily into the concept of "modernity," much discussed nowadays, as some of its most important features.

The whole case seems to signal that the connection between peasant activists and intellectuals went beyond the exchange of ideas, search for some "common interests" or common enemies. The two were connected by the Ukrainian project itself, by its practice, by the attempt on behalf of the intellectuals to define, and on behalf of the peasant activists – to grasp it. This Ukrainian project itself seems to be in condition of coming to terms with "modernity" and defining its own position. This chapter has also showed that the project did not start from blank page in the 1880s and in its work traces not only of former social experiences but, first of all, of other projects are seen.

In the four chapters to follow this one I'll try to excavate the layers of these other projects and encounters. To situate the story I'll try unfolding it back in time, only to return again to the 1880s in chapter VI, and then to project it into future in chapters VII and VIII. This unfolding and projecting will deal with other people and other locations, but with these same issues and concerns. The next chapter will go back to the first intellectual project that targeted with its nationalist and socialist constructions Galician peasantry, to the Polish revolution of 1846.

Chapter 2

1846: NOT JUST BLOODY

The dark peasantry loves to live in fantasy and will rather resort to the creations of fantasy than to the creations of enlightened and mature reason ... that is why in 1846 people allowed themselves to be persuaded that Poles wanted to slaughter them and that they would eat them as beef and thus allowed themselves to be moved against their own freedom and against all the suit-men; that is why now our villagers tell themselves that our Emperor in his goodness released the Poles from prisons, but after thinking it over regretted it, and reached an agreement with the Muscovite [tsar] and both, with peasant help, are supposed to attack the Poles gathered in the cities and squash them like flies; that is why people believe in the rumor that when three boys got together to play, the first one played an Austrian, the second a Muscovite and the third a Pole, and fighting each other, they killed the Pole, two brave ones who survived supposedly got a large life-long pension from the Emperor's bank. And similar foolish things they tell each other every time they meet; but they firmly believe in all this, because there is no stupid thing that could not find a place in the head of a stupid man.¹

Despite the fact that originally my dissertation was to begin in 1848, I shall start with 1846. There is a precedent for such an approach. The connection between 1846 and 1848 was stressed by Roman Rosdolsky in his analysis of peasant politics in 1848. According to his approach, 1846, with its anti-feudal peasant action helps to explain peasant behavior in 1848.² For my thesis it is very important to remember that the Polish project in 1846 was one of achieving a Polish nation-state by the means of social revolution. Perhaps for the first time in history, “national movement’s” ideology and activities were applied to the

¹ Vasył' Podolyns'kyi, “Slovo perestorohy,” in Volodymyr Pylypovych (ed.), *Lirvak z-nad Sianu. Peremys'ki druky seredyny XIX st.* (Peremysyl', 2001), 365.

² Roman Rosdolsky, *Die Bauernabgeordneten im konstituierenden österreichischen Reichstag 1848-1849*, in “Materialien zur Arbeiterbewegung Nr.5” (Wien: Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung, 1976).

nation's peasantry. 1846 was not just an episode, but had grown out of the Polish revolutionary activities of the 1830s.

The Polish project in 1846 was an emancipatory project, one that was supposed to emancipate the nation as well as the peasantry. In the context of this project in the 1830s and 1840s in Galicia agitators for the first time in history appeared among the peasantry trying to disseminate the modern conception of the nation and of a new social order. Roman Szporluk emphasizes the pioneering role the Polish national project played in nineteenth century Europe,³ while Peter Brock was the first one to note the revolutionary approach of Polish nationalism to the social question:

the first attempt to adapt the ideas of West European socialism, which had been devised for application in a society where industrial revolution had made great strides, to an almost wholly agrarian economy and to transform them into a doctrine of peasant, of agrarian socialism, came not from the Russians but from a small group of Polish émigrés who had found refuge in the early 1830s on English soil.⁴

The boundaries of Poland, these revolutionaries imagined, coincided with the borders of the eighteenth century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.⁵

In 1846 Polish revolutionaries working from Paris, and in contact with secret societies in the Poznań region, the free city of Krakow and Habsburg Galicia, organized an insurrection. The insurgency was to spread into the Russian Empire and the guerilla warfare was to start there. This insurrection had to be synchronized with revolutions in France, Germany and Italy which would overturn the whole political and social order in Europe. A revolutionary government was created in Krakow and existed for several days before it was defeated by the regular Austrian army. After this Krakow was annexed by the Habsburg monarchy and remained among its territories till 1918. Events in Austrian Galicia proper were even more dramatic, because insurgents here died not from bullets of Austrian soldiers but from scythes and axes of "Polish" peasants who instead of joining the insurgents helped the Austrian government to defeat them. This in brief is the story of the Polish revolution in 1846.

The importance of 1846 for the Polish national movement and the nature of the crisis it caused are widely discussed in Polish historiography. For instance, there is

³ Roman Szporluk, *Communism and Nationalism. Karl Marx versus Friedrich List* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 83-85.

⁴ Peter Brock, *Polish Revolutionary Populism: A Study in Agrarian Socialist Thought from the 1830s to the 1850s* (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1977), 4.

⁵ This is how they are defined in the manifesto of the Polish Democratic Society. See Hryhorii Herbil's'kyi, *Rozvytok prohresyvnykh idei v Halychyni u pershii polovyni XIX st. (do 1848 r.)* (L'viv: Vydavnytstvo L'vivs'koho universytetu, 1964), 229.

an ongoing discussion on the causes of the “slaughter,” on the nature of peasant action and the role played by the Austrian government.⁶ It is assumed that 1846 heavily influenced the attitudes of Polish landlords and Polish democratic politicians towards the Polish peasantry. Recent research, in contrast to the Marxist approaches that dominated post-World War II historiography, concentrates on the revolutionaries, their organizations and the intellectual climate of the time, neglecting the peasantry.⁷ Another great shortcoming of both older and more recent historiography on 1846 is the neglect of the events in East Galician countryside.

The only research available for East Galician events, done by Roman Rosdolsky and Feodosii Steblii, concentrates on those few cases from East Galicia that resembled events in the Western part of the province, where peasants had sided with the Austrian government and stood up against Polish conspirators (mostly landlords and their officials).⁸ In fact, there is only one such case in East Galicia – the village of Horozhanna. In my opinion, the pattern more common for East Galicia is even more fascinating. That pattern can be described simply – the Ruthenian peasantry did not participate in the “slaughter,” and there was no armed confrontation between the peasants and gentry. That pattern was so surprising to Polish revolutionaries, Galician landlords and Western European intellectuals informed by them, especially in connection with the events and discourse of 1848, that the myth about the Ruthenian peasantry performing the slaughter of 1846 was created. This myth survived 1848 and appeared from time to time in general histories of Habsburg Empire and nineteenth century throughout the twentieth century.⁹

Several explanations of the behavior of the Ruthenian peasantry have been advanced, but I do not find them persuasive. The first one was proposed by the Polish noble revolutionaries in 1848. Trying to prevent a feared uprising of Ruthenian peasants, the revolutionaries begged them not to follow the example of the godless *Mazury* (Polish peasants in West Galicia) who performed the slaughter and were punished by God with a famine. In this appeal the authors

⁶ For good introduction to this discussion see Thomas W. Simons, Jr., “The Peasant Revolt of 1846 in Galicia: Recent Polish Historiography,” *Slavic Review*, v. 30, No.4, December 1971, 795-817.

⁷ As an example see Michał Śliwa, ed., *Rok 1846 w Galicji. Ludzie, wydarzenia, tradycje* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo naukowe WSP, 1997).

⁸ See Roman Rozdolski, “Do historii ‘Krwawego roku’ 1846,” *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 65, no.2, 1958, 403-22; Feodosii Steblii, “Selians’kyi rukh u Skhidnii Halychyni v 1846 rotsi,” *Z istorii zakhidnoukrains’kykh zemel’*, vypusk 5 (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Akademii Nauk Ukrainy RSR, 1960); Feodosii Steblii, *Borot’ba selian Skhidnoi Halychyny proty feodal’noho hntu*.

⁹ For an account of this myth and the best explanation of it see Roman Rosdolsky, *Engels and the “Nonhistoric” Peoples: The National Question in the Revolution of 1848* ([Glasgow]: Critique Books, 1986). Despite this critique this myth can still be found in some surveys of the Austrian history.

made reference to the greater religiosity of Ruthenian peasants which allegedly prevented them from sinning in 1846.¹⁰ Another, similar argument, based on some essential difference between the Polish and Ruthenian peasantry in Galicia, was advanced in the second half of the nineteenth century by the Ruthenian national movement which was concerned with the “softer” and more “submissive” nature of Ruthenian peasants and was pointing to their “harder” and more militant Polish counterparts as an example to follow.¹¹ Another, more recent and more scholarly explanation was advanced by Stefan Kieniewicz in his book on the peasant movement in 1846. This was based on the assumption that there were no important differences between the two peasantries and the non-violent attitude of the Ruthenian peasantry was based on the fact that there was almost no Polish conspiracy active in East Galicia, except in the village of Horozhanna (in which case the peasants behaved just like in West Galicia).

The most comprehensive account of events in the East Galician countryside was written by Feodosii Steblii. His research concentrated on East Galicia and brought to our attention some excellent material on the peasantry in 1846. But in Steblii’s explanation the Polish conspiracy itself becomes unimportant: the slaughter of the Polish nobility is seen as simply the beginning of the larger anti-feudal movement, which spread to East Galicia in the spring and summer of 1846 and did not stop until 1848.¹² Steblii’s schema does not explain why there was a time-lag between the events in the West Galicia and the anti-feudal movement in the spring and summer of 1846. This actually contradicts the more general pattern of peasant insurgency, the characteristic feature of which, according to Ranajit Guha, is simultaneity.¹³

Moreover, the “slaughter” of the Polish nobility in February 1846 seems to be something different from the numerous cases of active peasant resistance, usually having to deal with *robot* obligations, either before or after February 1846. Steblii describes the Polish revolution in East Galicia – the famous attack on Naraïv in the Berezhany circle and the conspiracy in the Chortkiv circle – to prove his thesis about the anti-feudal nature of the peasant action, which itself was a culmination of the larger anti-feudal struggle taking place throughout the whole

¹⁰ Do moich Bratej ludu Halyckoho! (1848).

¹¹ See Osyp Makovei, “Zalissia,” in Tvory v dvokh tomakh, t.1 (Kyïv: Dnipro, 1990), 332-518, passim. For this stereotype in Polish work from the interwar period see Władysław Podoliński, Powiat Samborski, (Sambor, z drukarni Józefa Metzgera), 39.

¹² Feodosii Steblii, “Selians’kyi rukh u Skhidnii Halychyni v 1846 rotsi,” Z istorii zakhidnoukrains’kykh zemel’, vypusk 5, (Kyïv: Vydavnytstvo Akademii Nauk Ukrain’skoi RSR, 1960), 37-38.

¹³ Ranajit Guha, Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983), 225. In Guha’s account this contagion-like spread of the insurgency enables peasants to rise simultaneously despite ethnic and religious differences and creates among the dominant classes an illusion of a larger conspiracy at work.

first half of the nineteenth century. According to him, the non-participation of peasants in the revolutionaries' actions proves that the Polish conspiracy had nothing to do with peasant action. Steblii, however, fails to explain the absence of the armed confrontation between peasants and revolutionaries in the cited cases.¹⁴ The peasantry was avoiding involvement in attempts to start a Polish uprising; but in East Galicia this was the case with many Polish conspirators as well.

It is not my intention to identify causes of the different behavior of the two peasantries, but I hope to provide a better description of the interaction between the Ruthenian peasantry and the Polish revolutionaries. To do this I will look at some cases from Sambir circle, paying particular attention to everything connected with manifested or projected identity. I am concerned with the behavior of Ruthenian (i. e. Greek Catholic) peasants and petty gentry of the region. I shall look into identity politics surrounding the peasantry, with the projects aimed to win the peasantry for their cause, as well as at the signs of peasant self-identification. Sambir circle is especially interesting because there was only one manor destroyed and one major conflict between peasants and Polish revolutionaries (Horozhanna); despite extended Polish conspiracy and network of peasant guards in the villages many conspirators escaped arrest and managed to run across the province's border, to Hungary.¹⁵

The cases I discuss are interesting for several reasons. For the Sambir circle the existing historiography limits Polish conspiracy and, correspondingly, peasant response to it, to Rumno and neighboring Horozhanna, while I shall look at other areas as well. Moreover, in my cases peasants were suspected of cooperation with conspirators. These cases are petty, but unlike other petty cases (Chochołów, for example) these have never appeared in greater conceptualizations of 1846. My description of these cases is based on peasants' answers during the interrogations conducted by the Austrian authorities. Events described in this section have no direct connection to the Dobrivliany affair in terms of the places and people involved. Nevertheless, many places and some surnames will resurface in my further stories from the Sambir area.

As a point of departure I take Stefan Kieniewicz's statement in which he says that

In other areas of Sambir circle it never came to an uprising; the village of Horozhanna itself serves as a proof that the Ukrainian population in these areas was decisively hostile [to the Polish insurgents]. As opposed to West

¹⁴ Feodosii Steblii, "Selians'kyi rukh u Skhidnii Halychyni v 1846 rotsi," 41-42.

¹⁵ Czesław Wycech, Powstanie chłopów w 1846 roku. Jakub Szela (Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1955), 187.

Galicia, Horozhanna insurgents died in open fight and it is difficult to put their death to the account of some particular peasant treachery.¹⁶

This assumption, about the ethnic identity of the Ukrainians peasants reinforcing the social antagonism in East Galicia, was never questioned in twentieth century historiography despite the obvious fact that the Ukrainian peasantry in East Galicia did not participate in the massacre of the Polish nobility in 1846.

The Story of Józef Boberski

Most of the stories in this section will deal with a forgotten episode from the 1846 insurrection. There were lively preparations for the Polish uprising in the southern corner of the Sambir circle, the later Turka district. Conspirators had managed to organize a significant armed group on the Turka road (leading from Sambir to Hungary). However, the Sambir circle captain managed to spread a rumor about an army detachment advancing from Sambir to Turka. The insurgents got scared, dispersed, and their leaders escaped into the mountains and to Hungary. Using this panic, a functionary from state estate's office in Turka, a certain Kostheim, organized searches and arrests of all conspirators known to him.¹⁷ This rather formidable attempt at an uprising was totally forgotten in the historiography. The scholarly figure most paradigmatic for the study of 1846, Stefan Kieniewicz, mentions only four other attempts of an uprising besides the one in Tarnów, the largest and bloodiest of all – Sanok, Horozhanna, Naraiv and Chochołów.¹⁸

The landlord of the village of Vysots'ko Vyzhnie was Józef Boberski. The surname Boberski indicates the place of origin of the Boberski clan of petty gentry – the village of Boberka in the Turka district. Genealogists of the Polish gentry have found that the Boberskis' noble origin was recognized by the Polish king August III who gave several Boberskis office of mayor (*viitivstvo*) in the village of Lopushna.¹⁹ This village is, perhaps, the village of Lopushanka Lekhnova (Olekhnova), where a cluster of Boberskis was firmly established at the

¹⁶ Stefan Kieniewicz, *Ruch chłopski w Galicji w 1846 roku* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Zakładu narodowego imienia Ossolińskich, 1951), 169-170.

¹⁷ Ivan Franko, "Zhyttia Ivana Fedorovycha i ioho chasy," in Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.46, kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 108.

¹⁸ Stefan Kieniewicz, "Galicja w latach 1846-1848," in Natalia Gąsiorowska-Grobalska, ed. *W stulecie Wiosny ludów, 1848-1948*, t.1, *Wiosna ludów na ziemiach polskich* (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1948), 274.

¹⁹ Seweryn hrabia Uruski, Adam Amilkar Kościński, and Aleksandr Włodarski, eds., *Rodzina. Herbarz szlachty Polskiej*, t.1 (Warszawa, 1904), 244.

turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.²⁰ They came from the so-called rustic petty gentry, which lived in the villages on rustic (peasant) and not on dominical (landlords') land.

In the Sambir circle at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth century 11.8% of the male population were gentrymen. There were four clusters of petty gentry. The first one was: Matkiv, Krasne, Mokhnate, Husne, Vyzhnie i Nyzhnie Vysots'ko, Komarnyky and Iablonyv. The second one was: Il'nyk, Mel'nyche, Turka, Iavora, Losynets' i Radych. The third one consisted of Vynnyky, Stupnytsia, Silets', Hordynia, Horodyshche, Luzhok, Novotychi, Ortynets', Luka, Bykiv, Dorozhiv, Kul'chytsi, Kruzhyky, Kornalovychi, Bilyna Velyka, Uhertsy Zaplatyns'ki, Bilynka Mala, Radlovychi, Sokyryntsi. And the last one was: Rukhchyntsi, Lishnia, Uniatychi, Iasenysia Sil'na, Popeli, Boryslav, Tustanovychi, Modrych, Slons'ko. In these villages petty gentry comprised almost 40% of the total population.²¹ In the second half of the nineteenth century, when the former circle was divided into districts, the presence of the petty gentry in the Sambir and Staryi Sambir districts became even more significant – the northern Rudky area, which became a separate district, had very little presence of petty gentry.

Józef Boberski did not own an estate; he had it in a long-term lease, a condition that was common for nineteenth century Galicia (in fact, the same was true for the village of Horozhanna). Three members of Boberski's family were involved in the 1846 conspiracy. The most prominent of them was Józef's son Alojzy Boberski, who was a member of the revolutionary committee in L'viv, the so-called "Confederation Government."²² Alojzy Boberski (1822-87) studied law at L'viv university from 1841 to 1846. He was arrested when the Austrian police rounded up the leadership of the planned uprising on 12 and 13 February 1846, but was released in 1847 due to an unusually clever defense. After this release he received a job at the estate of the famous Polish magnate Tadeusz Wasilewski. During the revolution of 1848 Alojzy joined the Hungarian insurgents and after their defeat went to Turkey with the remains of the Hungarian insurgent army, then moved to England working as an accountant in some ironworks factory in Sheffield, returning to Galicia only in 1870.²³

Józef Boberski was a Greek Catholic. The protocol of his interrogation composed in May, 1846 gives us some details of his biography. He was born in Lopushanka (Lopushna), Sambir circle. In 1846 he was 76 or 77 (not knowing

²⁰ VR LNB, f. Aleksander Czołowski, 58/p.4.

²¹ Ślusarek, Op. cit., 35, 54, 56.

²² Stanisław Sławomir Nicieja, Mariusz Patelski, „Rok 1846 we Lwowie. Stracenie Kapuścińskiego i Wiśniowskiego i ich kult we Lwowie,” in Michał Śliwa, ed., Rok 1846 w Galicji. Ludzie, wydarzenia, tradycje (Kraków: Wydawnictwo naukowe WSP, 1997), 77.

²³ Marjan Tyrowicz, “Alojzy Boberski,” Polski Słownik Biograficzny, t.2 (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1936), 150.

the exact date of his birth). He was married and had nine children – five sons and four daughters. As of May 1846, his oldest son, Wincenty, was renting a manorial estate in the village of Zarais'ko (very close to the town of Turka). Ambrozy, 24 year old, had been involved in the conspiracy even more than his father, and was missing at the time investigation was conducted. Ambrozy was renting the neighboring manorial estate in the village of Krasne. Ałojzy had been arrested that winter in Lviv. Adolf was sick and was not accused of participation in the conspiracy. The youngest son, Emeryk, attended the Sambir gymnasium. We do not know much about his daughters, and it seems that the investigators in general paid very little attention to the women's role in the conspiracy.

In connection with the revolutionary events of 1846, investigators were interested in two things: Józef's actions around 20 February and the actions of his son Ambrozy. According to Józef's testimony, on Sunday after the conscription he went to L'viv where he had a court case being conducted for him by the attorney Starzewski. He planned to meet his sons Ałojzy and Adolf. Having arrived in L'viv he found that Ałojzy was in detention; Józef gave the reason for his son's arrest as "he had borrowed a forbidden book." Józef spent two weeks for this trip and came back on 18 February. He was sick and did not find Ambrozy at home. Ambrozy did not actually live at Józef's house but at his own place on the estate in Krasne. Józef's wife reported to her husband that during his absence Ambrozy had visited their house once.

The investigators suspected that Józef Boberski was gathering the community of Vysots'ko Vyzhnie to incite it to the rebellion against the government. Allegedly, on 20 February (Friday) Józef talked to the tavern-keeper Bazyli Wysoczański and read something to him. Józef answered: "It would be impossible because I was in bed sick." When asked "Why did you gather people to the tavern on Friday?" Józef replied:

After my return from L'viv my servant Ivan N. from Butlia told me that peasants had already for two weeks refused to fulfill *robot* obligations, it was on Thursday ... I told that servant to announce a community meeting to ask them why they did not want to work *robot*. But it happened that on Friday I got sick. The community gathered, so my son Ambrozy told them about my sickness and ordered them to go home.

However, the investigation had established that Józef Boberski talked to Iats'ko Fershtyk and Luts' Lakhman on the same day, so how could he possibly have been sick? Józef answered that he did not remember that conversation.²⁴ When asked about the acquaintances of his son, Józef testified that his son knew Albert Strzelecki (one of the leaders of the conspiracy in the Turka area) from

²⁴ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7378, a.23-25.

gymnasium in Sambir, which both had attended. He also added that he had never seen any Polish newspaper in his son's hands.²⁵

There were peasants who supported their landlord's testimony, saying that when they gathered in the tavern they were told that the landlord wanted them to go back home.²⁶ Hryn' Danyliak, 60 years old and married, who characterized himself in the following way: "I own a land and household in Vysots'ko Vyzhnie and I am mayor there," testified about the meeting in a tavern:

One day the foreman (*desiatnyk*) Iats'ko Fershtyk came to my hut and told me to go to the community which is gathering in the tavern. There were around 20 people.²⁷ These men did not know why they were gathered here. They asked me but I did not know as well. Then Boberski's steward, Michal Wysoczański, came and told us to go home because gentleman Boberski was sick and could not talk. What Boberski had to say to us I did not know because I was not at his estate and did not ask him about this.²⁸

Here we must note that Wysoczański was the surname of the majority of the petty gentry in this village. As a rule landlords did not have their officials recruited from the local petty gentry community. For example, in Hordynia this happened only in 1848 and was an exceptional event.²⁹ In this case, however, both the former and current stewards were recruited from the local petty gentry. The fact that Józef Boberski was of petty gentry origin himself could have played an important role.

Despite Józef's defense, the investigators had testimonies of some peasants, who talked to Boberski on the day he allegedly was sick. Iats'ko Tyshlyk, illiterate, 32, married, a "councilor" (a member of the village council), testified that on 11 February old Boberski gathered the community to clean snow, while the second time he gathered the community without specifying the goal. Old Boberski was indeed sick and almost could not talk. When the witness approached the bed on which old Boberski lay, he heard Józef saying that *robot* and tax were abolished and the peasants could go home.³⁰

²⁵ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7378, a.26.

²⁶ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7378, a.3.

²⁷ It is worth noting that the "community" in this case is only 20 adult men, heads of the patriarchal extended families. Quite often historians talking about peasant community (or commune) do not notice this. While talking about "community" action, they neglect the difference between the "community's" population and the "community" as a hierarchical organization.

²⁸ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7378, a.10-11.

²⁹ This was the case in Hordynia, see Andrii Chaikovs'kyi, "U chuzhomu hnizdi," in U chuzhomu hnizdi: povisti z XIX stolittia (L'viv: Chervona Kalyna, 1994), 26-348.

³⁰ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.30-31.

Boberski's behavior seems to prove that he knew about the conspiracy and planned insurgency. Michał Wysoczański had heard that Józef Boberski ordered his subject from Borynia to notify him when the army would approach Vysots'ko Vyzhnie.³¹ Ivan Vysochans'kyi, local petty gentry who found the community was gathered in the tavern and did not know the purpose of this meeting, together with several peasants, managed to see Józef Boberski later in the evening.³² He testified that Boberski was talking about taxes and *robot*, most probably about abolition – allegedly he could not hear Boberski's words well. To the question whether Boberski mentioned Poland, Ivan Vysochans'kyi answered that no one ever talked about Poland.³³ Viktor Pleshka, not a subject but Boberski's personal driver, testified that Józef Boberski had gathered people to tell them that salt would be cheaper.³⁴

The Story of Bazyl Wyszoczański

The behavior of Józef Boberski was not very different from that of many other landlords involved in the conspiracy of 1846: he was afraid, he had waited until the very last day of the uprising to tell his peasants about upcoming events, and then pretended to get sick. This behavior by and large fits the image of the 1846 Polish revolution as created by the Marxist historiography: there was an unbridgeable gap separating the Polish conspiracy and the peasant masses; the class interests of the Polish landlords did not allow for a more effective strategy. While Józef Boberski's behavior was not exceptional there was another person, of a type never mentioned in the accounts of the events of 1846, equally foreign to both Marxist and romantic nationalist interpretations of the revolution. This person was close to Józef Boberski and served for many years as his steward (*ekonom*); in 1846 this man was keeping a tavern in the village of Vysots'ko Vyzhnie.³⁵ His name was Bazyl Wyszoczański.³⁶ Many peasants and petty gentry testified about his activities and participation in the conspiracy.

³¹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7382, a.4.

³² TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7378, a.2

³³ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7378, a.5.

³⁴ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7383, a.14.

³⁵ It is interesting that the Jewish tavern-keeper of Horozhanna's landlord, Mozes Brinks from Saska, was also accused of participation in the insurrection; the investigators suspected that he knew about the insurgents' intentions for quite some time. See F. I. Steblii et. al., eds., Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849). Dokumenty i materialy (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1974), 283.

³⁶ I use Polish form of gentry names like Bazyl Wyszoczański in the case of all those who were consciously Polish (willingly joining the Polish conspiracy, no matter what it meant to them, and the Ukrainian form, like Vasył Vysochans'kyi, for the Greek Catholic petty gentry in general.

Mykhailo Vysochans'kyi Lutsykevych (“Lutsykevych” here is the so-called *prydomok* or cognomen used by the petty gentry to differentiate between too many men with the same first and last name), 26 years old, the father of two children, literate (in the sense that he could sign his testimony with his name), retold the story of the subject (*piddanyi, Untertan*)³⁷, Vasyl’ Sidor, which Vasyl’ Sidor himself told to Stefan Vysochans’kyi, and from whom the witness heard it. According to his story, Vasyl’ Sidor complained to Bazyli Wysoczański that the priest was charging him too much for a wedding. Bazyli Wysoczański answered: “wait, that *pop* [priest of the eastern rite, the word was used in reference to Greek-Catholic priests as a pejorative term] on the day after tomorrow will not need Gulden” (implying that he would be killed). In a snowstorm, Bazyli Wysoczański and Hryhorii Kopystyns’kyi met with Ambrozy Boberski and went to Teodor Komarnicki’s place. This was the same great snowstorm that prevented the outbreak of an uprising in many localities and figures in peasant testimonies cited here.³⁸ There they had a clandestine meeting. Teodor Komarnicki was a landlord as well. After this meeting the peasant Vasyl’ Hryb asked Bazyli Wysoczański about the money Vasyl’ Hryb owed him. Instead of insisting on its return, the tavern-keeper called upon Vasyl’ Hryb to “stick with us, because all who want to go can go; I will saddle the horse and go with my brothers.”

Now we should note that the word “brother” was used by the Polish revolutionaries of the mid-nineteenth century to stress the egalitarian character of their movement. It was also used in many leaflets and proclamations to the people published in 1846 and 1848. In 1846, landlords were persuading peasants that they would become “brothers” in the new Poland.³⁹ In the tradition of the

³⁷ Throughout this text I use the term “subject” instead of the term “serf.” As William H. Hagen remarks, “The English meaning of ‘serfdom’ is more nearly reflected in the German *Leibeigenschaft*. . . . As for Polish *poddaństwo*, ‘subjection’ is its literal translation Moreover, legal subjection was not confined to early modern conditions alone, but existed also in medieval forms whose abuses were certainly unpleasant. It likewise survives in some aspects of state citizenship in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the abuse of which has in some cases proven disastrous.” William H. Hagen, “Subject Farmers in Brandenburg-Prussia and Poland: Village Life and Fortunes under Manorialism in Early Modern Central Europe,” in Michael L. Bush, ed., *Serfdom and Slavery. Studies in Legal Bondage* (London and New York: Longman, 1996), 309. For the particular Austrian context Jerome Blum was one to state that there was no serfdom in Austrian Empire after the Josephinian reform: “It is clear that the peasant of the *Vormärz*, held as he was in a servile status, was not a serf. He was bound neither to the soil nor to the body of his lord. He could leave the land when he wanted and go where he wanted within the Monarchy. He could settle on another estate under another lord. Nor was he the complete subject of his lord. The state had intervened, protecting the peasant and standing between him and his lord, providing him with recourse that the serf had lacked.” See Jerome Blum, *Noble Landowners and Agriculture in Austria, 1815-1848. A Study in The Origin of The Peasant Emancipation of 1848* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1948), 90. For my particular purposes I also assume that classical serfdom ended with the Josephinian reforms; the same reforms made the first step towards the construction of modern subjects from the former serfs.

³⁸ Ivan Franko, “Zhyttia Ivana Fedorovycha i ioho chasy,” 102.

³⁹ Roman Rozdolski, “Do historii “krwawego roku” 1846”, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 65, no.2, 1958, 415.

Polish gentry all the nobles were “brothers” to each other. Gentry revolutionaries addressing peasants as “brothers” signified their willingness to incorporate peasants into the new community of the Polish nation, which would replace the Polish gentry nation and its subjects. But in this village (and in many others with a petty gentry population as well) the petty gentry used the word “brother” to distinguish between themselves and the peasantry. In this context Bazyli Wysoczański was not able to overcome the perceived difference of status between peasants and petty gentry. Unlike many revolutionaries-landlords (in the cases from Horozhanna, Tarnów circle, and in this account below), while asking Vasyl’ Hryb to join the insurgents, he did not offer him the opportunity to become a “brother.” Bazyli Wysoczański just asked Vasyl’ Hryb, “tell me if you will go with me, give me your hand for that.”⁴⁰

Stefan Vysochans’kyi, petty gentry, 49, literate, denied the words Vasyl’ Sidor had reportedly told him and everything else that Mykhailo Vysochans’kyi allegedly heard from him.⁴¹ On the other hand, Ivan Vysochans’kyi, illiterate, supported Mykhailo’s testimony.⁴² Vasyl’ Sidor himself, illiterate as well, also supported this testimony.⁴³ The attempts of Bazyli Wysoczański to recruit people were widely known in the village. Mykhailo Dmytrykevych Vysochans’kyi, literate, testified that although Bazyli Wysoczański had not been recruiting him personally, he heard about the attempts to recruit Vasyl’ Hryb, Hryhorii Vysochanskyi and Mykhailo Nanovs’kyi.⁴⁴ Another peasant whom Bazyli Wysoczański was trying to recruit was Stefan Pukita. On 22 February, in the tavern, Bazyli Wysoczański said that he would go to war and asked Stefan to join him.⁴⁵

Hryhorii Vysochans’kyi, 29 years old, gentryman, literate, stated that two days before the snowstorm started, he visited Bazyli Wysoczański at the tavern to have a shot of vodka. Bazyli Wysoczański told him:

“Oh troubles, troubles! See, the Russian tsar plans to take over Poland; we must defend it. The priest has already received [the order] to bless the standards, and we, we all must go. No one will stay home, you also must go.” But I told him that I would not go.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.20.

⁴¹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.21.

⁴² TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.24.

⁴³ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.25-7.

⁴⁴ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.4.

⁴⁵ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7378, a.1.

⁴⁶ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.39-41.

When asked by the investigators if Bazyli Wysoczański had indicated who told him that they must defend Poland and who gave the order to bless the standards, Hryhorii Vysochans'kyi answered that Bazyli Wysoczański

related that the parish priest received a letter which says that we have to defend the whole of Galicia against the Russians and that the priest has to bless us and standards for this war against the Russians.

It seems plausible that Hryhorii Vysochans'kyi became more deeply involved in the conspiracy than he was ready to acknowledge. He was actually acquainted with Albert Strzelecki and knew that the latter had weapons and was preparing for an expedition.⁴⁷ And Albert Strzelecki, a son of the landlord of Komarnyky, together with the Przestrzelski brothers was among the leaders of the revolution in the south of Sambir circle. Hryhorii's attempt to draw the attention of investigators to the priest and the priest's role in the conspiracy also looks suspicious.

Mykhailo Nanovs'kyi, 34, literate, allegedly rejected Bazyli's offer from the outset. He visited Bazyli Wysoczański to have some vodka. Bazyli told him:

Listen, Michał [Polish form of Mykhailo], do you know what is going on? We should defend motherland and free ourselves from slavery. I wish you and tell you to join us. Our [cause] must win, and after the victory we shall have glory and honors.

To this Mykhailo Nanovs'kyi answered:

I sit peacefully on my piece of land and no one harms me, I am satisfied with my fate, I have wife, I have children and I do not believe in the things you want from me and to which you are trying to recruit me with your instigation. I do not profess this, and I pray God that victory is not yours because what will I do after that?

Bazyli concluded this exchange: "Do not worry, victory will be ours and if you do not go voluntarily we shall force you."⁴⁸

The next testimony is by Mykhailo Vysochans'kyi:

Bazyli Wysoczański tried to recruit me earlier when I visited the tavern to have some vodka and some drunk men were there. Bazyli Wysoczański said to me: "Mikhas' [diminutive form of Michał; usage of these name forms was common among the petty gentry], I am revealing this to you, but do not tell it to anyone. Where I will go, you will go; we will go with the Poles."

⁴⁷ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7376, a.25-27.

⁴⁸ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.42-43.

As he told me that I jumped on my feet and left the tavern, not saying a word to him.⁴⁹

In these accounts we see an interesting difference in the reactions described to the words “Poland” and “Poles.” While Poland, which was usually understood as Galicia,⁵⁰ did not raise fears, the word “Poles” terrified and forced Mykhailo to react immediately. Hryhorii Komarnyts’kyi testified that when they were asking Bazyli Wysoczański about the plans of Ambrozy Boberski, he answered, “I do not know, but I swear in the name of God that there is nothing bad in it.”⁵¹

Another Mykhailo Nanovs’kyi, who had once been in Sambir under criminal investigation as suspect in the crime of aggravated assault but released because of the lack of evidence, testified that Bazyli Wysoczański did not try to recruit him to the *Bund* [sic], but mentioned preparations for an expedition and said that Ambrozy Boberski and the priest knew everything about this. According to this testimony, Wysoczański was a frequent visitor at the estate and was on friendly terms with Boberski’s family. Although he testified that Wysoczański agitated to defend the motherland and to be liberated from slavery, Nanovs’kyi said that Bazyli Wysoczański did not specify against whom they would have to defend the motherland.⁵²

When pressed by the authorities Bazyli Wysoczański tried to blame everything on Józef Boberski. He told them that when he visited Józef Boberski to get some vodka for his tavern, Boberski told him the news: all the gentrymen must enlist into the army, and everyone must go (peasants as well as gentry). From another room Boberski brought a paper that had two points:

- 1) those who will not go will be punished with death;
- 2) if the priest does not inform the community about this he will also be punished with death.⁵³

Bazyli Wysoczański denied that he ever tried to recruit other people.⁵⁴ It is interesting that while explaining his behavior to his interrogators Bazyli Wysoczański made no reference to any national issues and pretended to be

⁴⁹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7375, a.4-5.

⁵⁰ Especially, in the mountains, inhabitants of Galicia were called “Poles” and their land “Poland” even in the second half of the 19th century. See Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi, “Pachkarstvo bakunu (tiutiunu) v horakh u Halychyni v XIX st.,” in *Naukovyi zbirnyk prysviachenyi profesorovy Hrushevs’komu uchenykamy i prykhyl’nykamy z nahody Ioho desiatylytn’oi naukovoï pratsi v Halychyni (1894-1904)* (L’viv, 1906), 409-31.

⁵¹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7375, a.11.

⁵² TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7376, a.23.

⁵³ Obviously he was showing the so-called “Rules on the Uprising” published in Steblii, *Klasova borot’ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 259-60.

⁵⁴ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7381, a.2, 3, 6.

exposed to the kind of agitation he used while recruiting peasants. Another interesting thing is that the social benefits, promised to peasants by the revolutionaries are absent from the agitation of Bazyli Wysoczański. When he spoke to peasants he emphasized compulsion – “everyone must go.” And his agitation among the petty gentry was conducted in terms of solidarity, “honor and glory,” and of the liberation of Poland. This kind of agitation was not especially successful either with peasants or with petty gentry, though it seems that latter was more receptive to it. Nevertheless, the very accessibility of the person conducting the agitation and the fact that Bazyli Wysoczański was a member of the community mattered more than the ideas he was articulating. It also seems that the literate petty gentry were more receptive to his agitation than their illiterate “brothers.”

Clandestine Meeting

Viktor Pleshka for a long time served as a coachman for Józef Boberski and for three years – up to 1846 – as a coachman for his son Ambrozy. He was “of free estate,” not a subject. According to his testimony, Ambrozy went to Tarnava in the Sanok circle to marry a certain Tereza, a daughter of the local landlord. On their way back, in Turka, they met a stranger, and instead of returning to Vysots’ko Vyzhnie, they went to Komarnyky, where a meeting took place.⁵⁵

According to Pleshka’s testimony there were about 10 people at the estate in Komarnyky: two soldiers on leave, several petty gentry and peasants. Besides these humble people there were also gentlemen (*Pany*).⁵⁶ These gentlemen were Ambrozy Boberski, Jasio Pilatowski from Husne, Albert Strzelecki from Komarnyky, and Łukasz Uściński, the forester from Matkiv. Besides these, there was also Bazyli Wysoczański from Vysots’ko Vyzhnie. It seems that Pleshka was not sure if Bazyli Wysoczański was a gentleman as well, although by other gentlemen he was treated as one of their own. Ambrozy gave vodka and bread with butter to the peasants. He was telling them: “We will go.” People started asking where they would go,

But he did not say where they had to go, he only said: “Do not be afraid, all of you will get weapons in Butelka.” He also said: “Everything will be fine, there will be no taxes, no *robot*, salt will be cheap, all will be able to [to afford] smoking tobacco... . All of us will be equal, I will marry a peasant girl, and a peasant could marry my sister. Right now go home but be prepared and at midnight I will let you know.”

⁵⁵ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7383, a.1.

⁵⁶ This testimony proves that there was an immense difference in social position between the rustic petty gentry (never called gentlemen) and landlords-renters, foresters and other manor officials, some of them not of gentry origin, but nevertheless gentlemen.

To these “instigations” of Ambrozy Boberski, the peasants answered that they did not have boots and therefore could not go. Ambrozy reassured them that boots and money would be provided for them. “After this, people drifted apart, peasants on foot and gentlemen in their carts.”⁵⁷ Stefan Hryb, 50 years old, married and illiterate, who had characterized himself as “living from land,” testified that he saw a meeting at Bazyli Komarnicki’s place. Ambrozy Boberski also was there with Bazyli Wysoczański and both tried to “recruit” (*verbovaly*) him.⁵⁸

Vasyl’ Komarnyts’kyi, 30 years old, petty gentry, who “was helping his father in the household” (meaning that he was not an independent farmer), also testified about this meeting. He knew Ambrozy Boberski very well because his stepmother had served Ambrozy Boberski for more than a year. In winter Bazyli Wysoczański invited him and Hryhorii Komarnyts’kyi to the estate for a meeting. He found there Ambrozy Boberski, Albert Strzelecki, Stanislaw Grodziski, Pilatowski from Husne and Antoni Biliński. Antoni Biliński Słotyłowicz was a petty landlord (a member of the dominical petty gentry who shared with others a dominical estate) from Mokhnate.⁵⁹ It should be mentioned that this dominical gentry (or petty landlords) was present among the conspirators in great number and the area itself had not only clusters of rustic gentry but also nests of this dominical gentry, whose members as a rule owned only several subjects. Komarnyky was the location where both – such a nest and a large community of rustic gentry – could be found. Ambrozy ordered two petty gentry to have some food in the kitchen and wait for other people to arrive. He and Hryhorii were waiting for a long time but no one came, then Ambrozy invited them to the room. Ambrozy Boberski and Albert Strzelecki told them:

Join the army with us. You see how bad the situation is now, you barely have a piece of rye bread, and you must have it without salt because salt is expensive and sale tax is high, but if you become soldiers with us, so you will do everything we do and everything will be better. If you do not join us, then – death.

The investigator asked Vasyl’ if the gentlemen had specified which army he must join, but he answered that they did not. They requested only that he join them and do whatever they do. “I told them that I will not join any army and I will not go to any war, then Ambrozy and Albert said: ‘You scamp, you do not want to join us. Look, here is Gentleman Pilatowski, who has his own estate but must go

⁵⁷ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7383, a.10.

⁵⁸ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.28-29.

⁵⁹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7384, a.16.

with us.” Bazyli Wysoczański also said the words “If all must go, then you also must go.” Pilatowski said: “As everyone sees, I am sick but despite this I am joining them.”⁶⁰

Vasyl’ Komarnyts’kyi also said that Ambrozy Boberski ordered them to join the army but did not specify which army.⁶¹ Vasyl’ Komarnyts’kyi said that when he was asked to join the conspirators, at first he did not reject the offer – he thought they were talking about travel. But when he discovered that they were talking about going to war he rejected the offer outright.⁶²

Petty landlord Teodor Komarnicki (“I live on dominical land”) objected to the testimonies about the conspirators’ meeting at his place.⁶³ He said that on Monday of the great snowstorm there was a wedding at his place. There were gentry and peasants but he did not hear what they were talking about. According to him, except for this wedding there was no other meeting there.⁶⁴ Villagers’ testimonies, however, proved that there was a separate meeting, which had nothing to do with the wedding. Mykhailo Vysochans’kyi, 24 years old, petty gentry from Matsoshyn, testified that when he went to the estate he saw there Albert Strzelecki, Ambrozy Boberski, Łukasz Usciński, a forester from Matkiv, Bazyli Wysoczański, Vasyl’ Komarnyts’kyi, Iatsentii Komarnyts’kyi (Vasyl’s father), Antoni Biliński and two soldiers on leave with the same name: Andrii Liakh.⁶⁵

Andrii Liakh, 32 years old, a subject, “I own my own land,” was one of the soldiers on leave participating in the meeting. He said that having to work *robot* for them he knew both Józef and Ambrozy Boberski very well.⁶⁶ He was not able to tell the day and month: “About counting months I have very little idea.”⁶⁷ But one day, when Andrii Liakh went to bed, a cavalry soldier on leave, Luts’ Likhman, came to his place saying that the young landlord asked Liakh to come.

I put on my clothes and went, while Likhman went to find one more soldier on leave. Ambrozy told us to go with him. When we asked: “Where?” he answered: “Do not ask, just go.” Likhman refused to go anywhere during the night saying that he was too old – he was serving already a second term, while Andrii Liakh refused because “on nights only

⁶⁰ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7384, a.3-5.

⁶¹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7384, a.12.

⁶² TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7384, a.18.

⁶³ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.37.

⁶⁴ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7378, a.12.

⁶⁵ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7375, a.4-5.

⁶⁶ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7380, a.3.

⁶⁷ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7380, a.4.

bad people and thieves go.” To this Ambrozy did not answer and we went home.⁶⁸

Ivan Iakymovych, the third soldier on leave, testified that Ambrozy asked them to take an oath but he refused to do it saying that he had already taken an oath to the monarch and would not take an oath again.⁶⁹ Vasyl' Komarnyts'kyi testified that he was not in the yard and did not see brothers Liakh, therefore he did not hear the words of Albert and Ambrozy. They allegedly said: “Brothers, because brothers we all are, you should go with us, we will fight for the motherland, for freedom. Those who do not join us voluntarily will be forced.”⁷⁰

The case of these soldiers on leave is especially fascinating because it uncovers yet another myth about 1846. After February 1846 these soldiers on leave were considered as faithful supporters of the Austrian authorities. It was said that in 1846 the Austrian government was sending soldiers from Galicia home on purpose to have a reserve force that could be used against the Poles. In 1848 the Polish nobility was afraid of these soldiers on leave and asked Governor Stadion to mobilize all the peasant soldiers back to their respective regiments.⁷¹ They were saying that in 1846 the Austrian government had actually used soldiers on leave against Polish revolutionaries. In fact, in 1846 the Austrian government was concerned with the loyalty of even regular Galician troops stationed in the province, and it is hard to believe that soldiers on leave could have been considered more reliable.⁷² We have numerous examples that soldiers on leave were the primary target of Polish conspirators and were thought of as the best human material for the troops of the planned uprising.⁷³

In the Priest's House

After the unsuccessful attempt at insurrection Ambrozy Boberski disappeared, and the authorities could not interrogate him.⁷⁴ Not Józef but Ambrozy Boberski

⁶⁸ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7380, a.4-5.

⁶⁹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7380, a.12.

⁷⁰ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7384, a.9.

⁷¹ Henryk Bogdański, *Pamiętnik, 1832-1848*, ed. by Antoni Knot (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1971), 343.

⁷² Steblii, *Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 254.

⁷³ In the case from Horozhanna, Moses Brinks was saying that “all the soldiers on leave now will serve Poles and not the Emperor”, see Steblii, *Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 283. For the soldiers on leave being part of the group of insurgents see the part “Case from Matkiv” in this paper.

⁷⁴ Probably he was one of “many dispersed participants in the insurgency from the Sambir circle” hiding in the mountains near the Hungarian border in the Liutovys'ka area between the Sanok and Sambir circle. See Steblii, *Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 285.

was the one going to organize peasants to rise in Vysots'ko Vyzhnie on the 20th of February, when his father pretended to be sick. In the cited testimonies, the priest figures prominently. The conspirators indicated him as the person who received an order from the pope in Rome, who had to bless the standards and "knew about everything." Obviously they considered it necessary that their action be supported by the religious authority. At the same time the conspirators' position towards the Greek Catholic clergy was ambivalent. Bazyli Wysoczański told a peasant that after the uprising there would be no priest anymore. He called him *pop* and most probably knew about the priest's not so friendly attitude towards the Polish revolution.

The parish priest of Vysots'ko Vyzhnie was Rev. Iulian Iasenys'kyi. In the parish house he lived together with his wife Iuliia Iasenys'ka, mother-in-law Teklia Vitoshyns'ka and his brother's wife Naida Iasenys'ka. Teklia Vitoshyns'ka, 44 years old, widow of Rev. Mykolai Vitoshyns'kyi, parish priest of Nahuievychi, was born in Limna, southern Sambir circle, and testified about this event as follows. On 20 February the young landlord (*panych*) Ambrozy Boberski came to the priest's house. After he had warmed up he asked the priest to join him uphill where he would tell him some news. The priest refused to join excusing himself with the lack of proper clothing and his own sickness. Boberski insisted on the priest going out, saying that people must be told about the revolution and about the things that were happening in L'viv. He brought up as an example Sanok circle, where allegedly everyone joined the uprising; women there had been asking their husbands not to go, but it did not help. Boberski said: "We will see that in two weeks in the village you will not find a peasant from 16 to 50 years old, everyone must go."

The priest tried to get rid of the landlord and to avoid participating in such a doubtful enterprise. He reminded the young landlord of the responsibilities of a parish priest. The woman herself told Boberski that they had a responsibility to the government. The young landlord responded: "Which government? Tomorrow the government will be ours." The priest's wife started crying from fear. The priest was also crying; he showed Boberski a rifle and said that Boberski could kill him and his family, but he took an oath to the government and would die "in that faith." After that Boberski offered a compromise: "Let's go to the hill and although the priest will not talk there himself, people will see that the priest is with it." Nevertheless, the priest refused to obey. Boberski was irritated and left the house. He came back once more in a fury. Everyone in the house thought that he was going to kill all of them. The priest hid and the women cried. Boberski, not finding the priest, left the house saying to other members of the family: "Do not be afraid." Teklia signed her testimony herself. The words of Teklia were supported by the almost identical testimony of Naida Iasenys'ka, 22

years old, married to Ivan Iasenys'kyi who at that time studied in the theological seminary in Przemyśl.⁷⁵

It seems that in this scene Ambrozy Boberski was following “The instructions for Polish insurgents” spread among the conspirators. These instructions said that the priest who participates in the conspiracy must proclaim the insurrection with all solemnity, using standards and a cross. He was to bless the insurgents and their weapons and accompany the group of insurgents to another village. If there was no priest already participating in the conspiracy, a local patriot had to talk to the local priest confidentially and, under the threat of death, force him to make a speech to the people.⁷⁶ This had to be done despite the fact that most revolutionaries were imagining the new Poland as a secular state. They needed to use religion for purely utilitarian reasons – to obtain peasant support. That is why the conspirators were reminded not to say anything against religion, and on the contrary, to support their own arguments with the references to the Bible.⁷⁷

It is interesting that in our case the priest reacted as if he knew the rules issued by the conspirators. He prevented the confidential talk and made Boberski speak in the presence of the women. Moreover, he was the one to provoke Boberski, handing him a rifle, while Boberski was not yet threatening him with death. There is another moment as well as in this story. 1846 also witnessed an outburst of anti-clerical agitation, to which little attention has been paid. In May 1846, Bishop Snihurs'kyi was warning clergy about an anti-clerical society, which was trying to compromise priests and agitating for turning their lands over to teachers who would educate peasants better than priests. There was a song circulating among peasants and directed against both priests and landlords.⁷⁸ It seems quite plausible that this anti-clerical agitation developed in connection with the Polish revolutionary conspiracy.

An Assault on the Circle Capital

This section serves the goal of rebutting possible claims that such an extensive conspiracy, and the exposure of peasants to it, was limited to the mountainous regions with their more flexible social structure. To give some idea about what was going on in the lowlands of Sambir circle I shall relate the testimonies of two brothers Hordyński. One of these was Franciszek Hordyński, born in the village

⁷⁵ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr. 7372, a.11-12.

⁷⁶ Steblii, *Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 259-60.

⁷⁷ Włodzimierz Borys, “Z dziejów walk o wyzwolenie narodowe i społeczne Galicji w pierwszej połowie XIX w.,” *Przemyskie Zapiski Historyczne*, R.IV-V, 1987, 227.

⁷⁸ See the documents in Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, “Prychynky do istorii rus'koho dukhovenstva v Halychyni vid 1820 do 1853 r.,” *ZNTSh*, t.88, kn.2, 1909, 136-140.

of Blazhiv (Sambir circle), who described himself as being “of the free estate, and a gentry,” unlike the village petty gentry in the cases from Vysots’ko Vyzhnie, Komarnyky and Matkiv, who would say: “I am a gentry and own land.” Obviously this difference is due to Hordyński’s belonging to yet another category of petty gentry, the so-called service gentry. He held the position of an official on a manorial estate. In 1838 he finished two years of Sambir gymnasium, and then spent some time in Vrubliovychi gaining practical experience in managing agriculture. From 1841 to 1842 he worked as a scribe in a court, from 1842 to 1843 as a diarist in the counting department of the Sambir Chancellory. After that, he was an actuary at the state mandatorate in Luka. In his own words he “did not fulfill a service oath but took a clandestine oath [to the conspiracy].” Franciszek was arrested in Drohobych on 23 March. He testified about the leaders of the conspiracy in Sambir circle – Michał Tarnawski, Popiel from Kul’chytsi and Elijasz Czajkowski (neither of them lived in the southern mountainous region).⁷⁹ Obviously he had connections among the petty gentry in the Sambir area. Most probably, he became acquainted with his comrades in the conspiracy, as well as with the conspiracy’s ideology, in Sambir gymnasium, which was among the centers of revolutionary agitation as early as the 1830s.⁸⁰

Karol Hordyński from Luka, born in Ortynychy, 20, Franciszek’s brother and scribe in Luka, was also arrested in Drohobych where he went to buy cloth for a coat. Unlike his brother, he broke down early and expressed his wish to tell sincerely how he came to his present condition. Usually, he lived together with his brother in Luka, but on 18 or 19 February 1846 he got sick and went to his father’s place for rehabilitation. There

On Saturday, 21 February, Michał Tarnawski, a judge and actuary of Mr. Macieszkiewicz, came to my father’s place and found me in bed, where I was being massaged. I knew Michał Tarnawski from the schools we attended [together], but was not in close relationships with him. When he came to visit me, he gave me a card from my brother with the following content: “When Michał Tarnawski comes to your place, go with him to Sambir and he will later tell you the goal of this trip.” Michał also told me to bring a rifle. Meanwhile Michał went with me to the local peasant Ivan Bul’ba, where unknown to me peasants and soldiers on leave were present. Michał told me to bring them tobacco and vodka and called them “brothers.” He was telling them about freedom, that they will not have to work *robot* and wanted them to go with him without specifying where.

On two sleighs all of us went to the tavern near Kul’chytsi where Tarnawski bought vodka and bread and disclosed to me the goal of our trip: “This night, at 8 or 8:30 in the evening there will be a revolution in Sambir, people will gather from the mountains and from Drohobych and from all

⁷⁹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr.7478, a.3-5.

⁸⁰ On the revolutionary activities there see Zygmunt Zborucki, Proces studentow samborskich, (Lwów, 1927).

the sides we shall attack Sambir. The army in Sambir is already with us. I will go to Kul'chytsi, to a certain Popiel ... and that Popiel will be the *Führer* in our revolution." Hordyński himself had to go with the soldiers on leave to the so-called Red Tavern (which was located on the circle road from Krushyna through Radlovychi to Sambir on the wasteland close to Sambir).

There Hordyński and his group had to wait for Tarnawski. Tarnawski "told [me] that the Austrian government will be abolished and that only Poland will be here. I allowed him to mislead me." They waited at the tavern where Karol was buying bread and vodka for his comrades, but Tarnawski never arrived. They were hiding for a while around and then left separately to their respective places of residence.⁸¹

It is unclear which Popiel is mentioned in these accounts. The most famous Popiel from Kul'chytsi is Michał Popiel (1817-1903), who was born in Kul'chytsi, of Greek Catholic rite, and who had studied in Sambir gymnasium, where in 1834 Kasper Cięglewicz, the famous agitator from the 1830s, recruited him to the democratic conspiracy. In 1836 he was a cofounder of the organization "Society, Members Ruthenian Students." Just like their spiritual father, Cięglewicz, the members of the society tried to work with peasants and townsmen. In 1837 Popiel was arrested, spent time in prison and was released in 1843. After that he worked as a private teacher in the Zolochiv circle. Historiography does not know anything about his participation in the events of 1846. His biographer says: "For sure he took part in the insurgents' preparations of 1846 but this time repression omitted him."⁸² In 1848 he would return to active participation in public political life. Being a member of the pro-Polish "Ruthenian Assembly," he would also become an active member of the Sambir National Council. In June 1848 he was elected as a deputy to the *Reichstag* from the electoral district Stara Sil' in Sambir circle with the significant absence of peasant electors. In the *Reichstag* he was allegedly one of few Polish deputies who influenced the behavior of peasant deputies.⁸³ We shall meet him later on in this thesis.

Case from Matkiv

The last case I would like to present in this chapter is different from the case of Vysots'ko Vyzhnie and Komarnyky. Despite the similar social structure of the villages, all of which had two communities (one of petty gentry and another one of peasants), the Polish conspiracy in Matkiv lacked agents like Bazyli Wyszoczański. Manor officials involved in the conspiracy were not that

⁸¹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr.7479.

⁸² *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, v.27, 563.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, s.564.

benevolent as the Boberskis and the way they were trying to recruit peasants to the conspiracy rather resembles patterns described by Roman Rosdolsky.⁸⁴ But even in this case peasants did not rise against the conspiring landlords.

Oleksa Shakala, 30, peasant from Matkiv, testified that on 20 February (the peasant specified this day as the Friday before the Cheesefare Sunday):

mayor Ivan Rykavets' told me to go to the estate to the gentleman judge Stebelski. I went there with the mayor and with Ivan Vyklych. We walked into the hall, there were gentlemen (*pany*) and the forester Uściński. The young landlord, Roman Smoliński, was sitting in the neighboring room and did not join the gathering although he was able to see and hear everything from there. When we entered, the forester requested us to take an oath that we would faithfully serve. All three of us answered that we did not want to take an oath. Then he said that we must do so otherwise he would shoot us; saying this, he pulled up two guns from under the table. Because of this [threat] we gave up.

In front of the crucifix with lighted candles the peasants had to raise three fingers of the right hand and repeat the words Uściński was telling them: that they would never tell anyone what he was going to say to them. After the oath was taken the forester said

that he was our brother and we were his brothers, that he got a patent from Rome ... that we do not have to pay taxes any longer and that we will not work *robot*, and that salt will be cheaper... After that he repeated once more that he had a right to punish with death anyone who was not going to obey. He told us to join him and to take iron pitchforks and bread for this trip.

When Oleksa asked where they would go to, Uściński answered: "You will go where I will order you". Just before the interrogation, when Shakala had to go to the commission, Stebelski warned him not to tell investigators anything even if they [the circle officers] were going to kill him. Although in preliminary investigation Oleksa testified that Uściński was talking about war, later he said that Uściński did not mention war.⁸⁵

Another peasant participant in this meeting was Il'ko Vyklych also from Matkiv, 20 years old. Having to characterize himself he said, just like many others dependent peasants: "I own a *robot* land," but did not say "I am a subject," which was the usual way to refer to peasants in the discourse of the state and manor. Supporting Oleksa in the description of the oath that took place Il'ko added that after Uściński had threatened them with guns he said that "peasants, although being Ruthenians, will become Poles, that we all are equal and brothers to each

⁸⁴ See Rozdolski, "Do historii 'Krwawego roku' 1846."

⁸⁵ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr.7490, a.3-5.

other.” And after that, Uściński spoke about taxes, *robot*, salt and tobacco. According to Vyklych, “Uściński said that we had to go to the war but would not specify to which and where.”⁸⁶

About Ivan Matkovs’kyi Fedashkovych, 32, “of the Ruthenian rite,” a gentryman from Matkiv, the authorities were informed that when there were disturbances he ran to Husne to avoid recruitment – that is how he explained his appearance in Husne to the local people. It is interesting that in Matkiv we meet a two-sided fear, a double-faced rumor: that landlords (or gentlemen – *pany*) wanted to slaughter all the peasants (in the case of peasants) or that peasants were going to slaughter landlords (in the case of landlords). This kind of fear is absent in the case of Vysots’ko Vyzhnie.⁸⁷ Ivan Matkovs’kyi testified that he heard about Kornel Smoliński, Uściński and Stebelski gathering all the subjects and petty gentrymen in Matkiv to sign a letter, but he himself was not there. Petty gentrymen did not want to sign but the owner of the estate, Madam Smoliński, assured them that it would not oblige them to anything. Ivan Rykavets’, the mayor, allegedly told him about the letter from Rome, which was saying “that we all are brothers, gentlemen and peasants we are equal and the same.” Rykavets’ was also telling him about coming abolition of taxes and the need to prepare bread to to war.⁸⁸

The letter mentioned here is, most probably, Goslar’s letter known as “The New Gospel for the Polish People.” Julian Maciej Goslar, the son of an Austrian soldier and a Polish peasant woman, was the most radical and most plebeian of all Polish democrats participating in the Revolution of 1846. Goslar’s “Gospel” was one of many attempts of the Polish revolutionaries to mobilize the peasantry by using Rome as the center of religious authority to legitimize their ideas in the eyes of peasants. The conspirators could not use the authority of the state structures personalized in the monarch and therefore were forced to emphasize even more strongly the link with the spiritual authority recognized by the peasantry. We know about the attempt of the Roman Catholic priest Piotr Ściegienny, who tried to mobilize peasantry with a “Bulla of the Holy Father to the Polish People” which circulated in the Warsaw, Radom, Kielce and Lublin regions.⁸⁹ Dembowski’s appeal in 1846 also started “In the name of Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, Amen,” and only after that went about explaining the origin of social categories, still making references to the Old Testament.⁹⁰

⁸⁶ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr.7490, a.9-10.

⁸⁷ For the description of this peasants’ fear as explaining peasants’ behavior, see the Governor’s report to the Ministry of Interior in Steblii, *Klasova borot’ba sčianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 267.

⁸⁸ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr.7490, a.13, 14, 17.

⁸⁹ Tyrowicz, *Prawda i mit w biografii Juliana Macieja Goslarsa: 1820-1852* (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1972), 76.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 82.

Of all these, Goslar's address was, perhaps, the most successful attempt to address peasants in the whole tradition of Polish revolutionary activity of the nineteenth century. It consciously copied the form of "Letters from Heaven," popular apocrypha spread in the countryside as chain letters.⁹¹ Goslar's letter had a religious introduction promising God's blessing for all those spreading this address. It had the form of an apostolic teaching and was written from the first person, implicating that the author of this Gospel was either Jesus Christ or one of the Apostles. It was much shorter than Dembowski's appeal and stated explicitly that the enemies were Germans and Russians. It had a strong emphasis on social injustice, for which the Austrian government was blamed.⁹² We know that in the Sambir circle Goslar visited Boberka, Turka, Dvernyk, Smol'nyk and Il'nyk.⁹³ When Goslar was in Turka on 12 February he read his "New Gospel" to the peasants.⁹⁴ We also know that in the first half of February Leo Mazurkiewicz, another very active left-wing agitator, on advice from Popiel went to work with the petty gentry in Sanok and Sambir circle.⁹⁵

However, our testimonies from Matkiv say that the conspirators from the manor did not read the letter to the peasantry. They were just referring to it, using its authority but not disseminating it. Another interesting thing about these conspirators from the manor is the way they were presenting the social program of the coming revolution, the program prepared specially for the peasants. According to Czaplicki (one of the Horozhanna conspirators), the program of a new government, which the revolutionaries had to read out to the peasants, was the following:

- 1) abolition of *robot*,
- 2) abolition of subject-dependency and equality of all estates,
- 3) decrease of income and house taxes,
- 4) abolition of all other taxes and additions,
- 5) abolition of stamps,
- 6) abolition of the monopoly on tobacco,
- 7) cheaper salt,

⁹¹ Another example of the attempts to mimic this text by the Polish revolutionaries is the letter found by the cantor in Lodyn near his door in March, 1846. It was written in Ukrainian and was intended to circulate from cantor to cantor just like Letters from Heaven did. The letter said that the cantor because of whom the Letter stopped circulating would be killed for sure. See Steblii, Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849), 271-73, 276-7. It is interesting that this letter calls for an insurgency but does not mention at all Poland and Poles, only a better order to be established after the Revolution.

⁹² Tyrowicz, Prawda i mit w biografii Juliana Macieja Goslara (1820-1852), 117-118.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 130.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 130.

⁹⁵ Józef Swieradski and Czesław Wycech, (eds.), Rok 1846 w Galicji. Materiały źródłowe (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1958), 40.

- 8) open salt sources for the communities and cattle,
- 9) land for the landless participants in the rebellion,
- 10) enlistment of recruits only according to the resolution of *Sejm* (parliament),
- 11) army service period shortened from 14 to three years.⁹⁶

Almost all the points can be found in peasants' testimonies about the agitation to which they were exposed, except for the last two, connected with army service. It is not surprising, if we consider that one of the insurgents' most pressing tasks was to force peasants to join an insurgent army, threatening them with death in the case of disobedience. It seems that the peasants and petty gentry, whose testimonies I cited earlier, were suspicious of the conspirators' activity and reluctant to participate in it not because it was anti-Austrian or aimed at the restoration of the old Poland, but because it was associated with war, troubled times and general calamity, from which peasants suffered especially badly. Perhaps the burdens imposed by the state were seen as well compensated by the peace and stability provided by the state. Conspirators from our cases never mentioned five Joch of land for the landless participants in the Revolution. There is a visible discrepancy between the liberal program of the Revolution and the reliance on the old methods of dealing with subjects while dragging them into the promised future. The conspirators were supposed to deal with whole communities, force everyone in the army, threaten with and inflict death upon everyone resisting.⁹⁷ Those in Horozhanna followed the instructions closely while Bazyli Wysoczański was actually acting against the spirit of the "Rules," talking with individual villagers and differentiating between them.

Another petty gentryman from Matkiv, Martyn Wysokins'kyi, 22, testified that the community was gathered by Stebelski because "the letter has arrived from our Emperor, that there will be Poland and all people will be equal." Salt and tobacco were also mentioned. "But we must gather because the Emperor said that every farmer (*hospodar*) [the term which applied to both peasants and petty gentry] must go to the war to defend him." Usciński told them that blood will flow like water, but he did not specify against whom this war was going to be waged.⁹⁸

One of the main conspirators was Onufer Stebelski, 36, born in the village of Morozovychi, Sambir circle, of Greek rite, of free estate, who had been working as the local tax collector for the last 18 years. Initially he tried to separate himself from Usciński when questioned about their relationship. Stebelski said that there was no relationship between him and Usciński – they only played cards on several occasions together, and lived on the same estate of Madam Smoliński. He allegedly saw how Oleksa, Ivan and Il'ko visited the estate, but denied that he had

⁹⁶ Fr. M. Wł. Czaplicki, *Rzeź w Horozanie. Pamiętnik więźnia stanu. Dwa dzieła w jednym tomie* (Kraków: nakładem Marcelego Lumilskiego, 1872), 42.

⁹⁷ Steblii, *Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 259-60.

⁹⁸ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr.7490, 21, 23.

ever spoken with them about Poland, equality, etc. He also testified that Uściński had visited Komarnyky and Vysots'ko Vyzhnie quite often. Several times he saw him getting together with Ambrozy Boberski, Albert Strzelecki and others. They, in turn, were also visiting Matkiv quite often.⁹⁹

After several interrogations Onufer Stebelski broke down. It turned out that his proper surname was Sarakhman, since his father was Hryhorii Sarakhman; Stebelski was the maiden name of his mother Anastasiia. He justified the change of name saying that people had been calling him Stebelski-Sarakhman from early childhood and he decided "to continue this name." Obviously we are dealing here with an attempt to present oneself as a gentryman, which was easy among the petty gentry in Matkiv, who could have never been to Morozovychi. During the investigation he acknowledged, "I am of free estate, not a gentryman." He did not possess anything except for the piece of land he bought in Matkiv for 80 Gulden. He had been in Matkiv since the age of 17. At first he was collecting taxes, but he had not taken the oath to the Emperor, which he did only in 1838. Before he arrived in Matkiv he finished six grades of grammar school in Sambir.

Stebelski testified that he heard about the revolution for the first time from Łukasz Uściński. Uściński said that the commissar of the financial guard arrived and distributed 24 full cartridges for each forester. The commissar allegedly was the one who said that not just here, but in France and Austria as well, people were preparing a revolution. A messenger from Vysots'ko from the young landlord Smoliński brought news that the landlords were going to slaughter peasants and the peasants were going to slaughter landlords. The news spread, and people became disturbed. Stebelski blamed Uściński for everything, saying that three peasants were ordered to come not by him but by Uściński. During the trial Stebelski said that Uściński forced him to read the letter entitled "Propaganda." The content of this letter was the following:

The time has come, and the moment when all the Poles will rise. There will be no taxes in the future and no *robot*; salt and tobacco will be cheaper, and everyone who does not have one will get a piece of land.

However, as I have already said, peasants from Matkiv do not mention this gain of land in their descriptions of the agitation to which they were exposed.

After he read this letter he went to Madam Smoliński and related the content to her; she started crying, being worried about her sons. Onufer also knew Ambrozy Boberski from the schools they attended together. Stebelski testifies that he saw Ambrozy, Albert Strzelecki and Pilatowski come to Madam Smoliński's, and they were talking for a long time with Uściński. He did not participate in these talks nor in the talk with the three peasants. Stebelski also denied all accusations that

⁹⁹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr.7490, a.26-28.

he had made statements that were anti-German (Germans are bad) or directed against the Emperor (like: “Were not you born from a mother just as the Emperor was?”).¹⁰⁰

Łukasz Uściński, 28, Roman-Catholic, was born in Bus’k. He graduated from normal school in Zhovkva in 1830 and went to the school in Stanislaviv, but had to leave because of poor marks. In 1830-31 he lived with his parents in Zhovkva circle, then served in various capacities on several manors in Zhovkva circle, and finally in 1846 obtained the position of forester in Matkiv. He heard about the revolution from the financial guard and passed the information on to Stebelski at the beginning of February.

Just as Stebelski blamed Uściński for getting him involved in the conspiracy, Uściński was blaming Albert Strzelecki. On 20 February Albert Strzelecki sent him a card with a peasant whom both knew. On 20 and 21 February Uściński stayed in Komarnyky at Strzelecki’s place. From there he, Albert and three petty gentrymen went hunting. During their hunting adventure Strzelecki repeatedly told him that there was going to be a revolution in Poland, “that all the people are rising to get freedom.” Albert ordered them to go home to get weapons ready and then come back to join the insurgents in Sanok circle or elsewhere. “I said that I did not want to join, but Strzelecki insisted so I had to agree.” On 22 February, in Komarnyky, he found Wincenty Przestrzelski, Leon and Stanisław Grodziski, and Ambrozy Boberski. He saw Ambrozy quite often in Vysots’ko. Despite acknowledging this level of participation, he denied that he was trying to persuade someone else to join the insurrection. Even after several months of interrogations (in October 1846) he continued to reject as false peasant testimonies about forcing them into the conspiracy.

An interesting moment came at the end of April, when the investigators arranged a confrontation with the peasants who testified against him. Łukasz rebutted peasants’ testimonies, saying that they were taking revenge on him. He said he once caught Ivan Rykavets’ harming the forest. On the very day of the supposed meeting to which the peasants referred Uściński was drunk the whole day and could not even recall if he saw Rykavets’ on that day. Oleksa Shakala in 1844 also was supposed “to have stood [idly] at the digging of potatoes, trying to avoid the work, and for this I hit him, so he jumped at me and tore my coat.” Peasants firmly insisted on the truth of their words; neither Shakala nor Rykavets’ remembered the incidents mentioned by Uściński.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr.7491.

¹⁰¹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2, spr.7492.

Interpretation

I believe that the Polish conspiracy had a much greater influence on the Galician peasantry than has been thought in both Polish nationalist and Marxist historiographies. For Sambir circle, it was said that the only conspiracy was in the northern part of the circle in Rumno and neighboring Horozhanna. In fact, that center of the planned uprising was connected with the L'viv uprising, and the conspirators from Horozhanna had to join insurgents in L'viv. As I showed there was a separate attack planned against Sambir which has been conveniently forgotten in the historiography¹⁰² and there was a well established network of conspirators in the southern and central Sambir circle connected to the underground government in L'viv. On the one hand, the functioning of this network seems to prove Sala's and Tyrowicz's points that in the areas of Goslar's democratic activity, the Polish cause looked more attractive to the peasants and they did not slaughter the Polish nobility. On the other hand, from the cases I looked at, it seems that the interaction between the Polish revolutionaries and peasants was much more profound and more complicated a phenomenon than usually assumed. In fact, we do not see the support of the various classes of population ascribed by Sala to southern Sambir district,¹⁰³ and we know that in some other areas Goslar's agitation was not that successful. In the villages I investigated neither Goslar nor Mazurkiewicz conducted any agitation.

I have not found particularly strong hostility of peasants towards the conspirators. There is no reason to believe that the peasant attitude in East Galicia was determined by ethnic difference, which made social antagonism stronger than in West Galicia. On the contrary, in the analyzed area the mediating presence of the petty gentry helped to mitigate antagonism and made the Polish agitation more successful. However, the involvement of the petty gentry should be reconsidered. Usually, Polish historians just state this gentry's Polish identity and find its expression in the gentry's participation in Polish uprisings. These cases show that active conspirators were recruited from the dominical (petty landlords) and service gentry while the rustic or village petty gentry's attitude was

¹⁰² Moritz Sala mentions events in southern Sambir circle in his history of the uprising published in 1867. From there it was borrowed by Franko for his posthumously published biography of Ivan Fedorovych, but then the case disappears from Polish and Ukrainian historiography. The conspiracy around the city of Sambir has never been mentioned.

¹⁰³ Moritz Sala, *Geschichte des polnischen Aufstandes vom Jahre 1846* (Wien, 1867), 236-237. According to Sala, Nikodem and Wincent Przestrzelski, employees of the state estates' administration in Turka, Albert Strzelecki, son of the landlord from Komarnyky, managed to mobilize all classes of population for the insurrection. It seems that during 1848 most of those who in 1846 had to run to Hungary managed to legalize themselves. Albert Strzelecki also came back and stayed in Sambir in the 1850s remaining on the list of suspected people together with 10 other – Stanisław Schnür-Peplowski, *Z tajnego archiwum. (Karta z dziejów Galicji)* (Lwów, 1906), 31.

not that much different from that of peasants. Village gentrymen defined themselves not only through their noble origin, which was increasingly questioned by the Austrian state authorities, but also through the possession of land, family status and farming occupation. Participants in the conspiracy from the petty gentry as a rule passed through the Sambir gymnasium and it seems that literate rustic gentrymen were more sympathetic to the conspiracy.

I have not found evidence of the malicious influence of the Austrian government inducing peasants against their masters. But I have also not encountered something that could be interpreted as autonomous peasant action against their oppressors. It is worth stressing the importance of 1846 as a phenomenon in its own right rather than just trying to explain it through the existing social relationships. Polish revolutionaries did not appeal just to Poland and the national consciousness peasants were supposed to have. From the very beginning the national was intertwined with the social – the peasantry was idealized as the class that preserved the true Polish nature.¹⁰⁴ Goslar's appeal addressed peasants thus:

To whom does the land for which you must perform labor services belong?
Does it belong to the gentry or to the emperor, as they tell you?... Villagers,
your little plot of land belongs first of all to God – and then to one who tills
it. It is through our own labors alone that we can acquire any of God's
gifts.¹⁰⁵

In the transcripts of talks, agitations and actions, Poland is mentioned quite often, Austria – never (although there could be anti-German phrases), the Emperor – rarely. In most cases the conspirators did not specify what kind of Poland they had in mind, and we know that for the peasantry (especially here, close to the Hungarian border) Poland could mean Galicia. The conspirators asked the peasants to join the army and they did not feel any need to specify which army. On the one hand, the army service to which they were being recruited was supposed to bring certain benefits and to improve peasant living conditions; on the other hand, the threat of direct coercion was used. The conspirators did not feel any need to connect the war or the army they asked the peasants to join with a certain nationality or cause, and the peasants were not requesting this kind of specification; moreover they did not find the very lack of such specifications suspicious. Suspicious was the activity itself. While conspirators were acting as they would be expected to act in the feudal mode of power,¹⁰⁶ their activity was

¹⁰⁴ Brock, *Polish Revolutionary Populism*, 28-9.

¹⁰⁵ Brock, *Polish Revolutionary Populism*, 61.

¹⁰⁶ Using the phrase “modes of power” I follow Partha Chatterjee who introduced the theory of the possible coexistence of various modes of power (communal, feudal and bourgeois) in the countryside. See Partha

aimed at introducing a very different mode of power relationship (bourgeois and nationalist at the same time).¹⁰⁷ Moreover, their power was curtailed and undermined by the institutions and discourse of the absolutist state, which peasants, contrary to the conspirators, did not perceive as evil.

Despite all the discrepancy between goals and methods, 1846 was not just another Polish uprising. The revolutionaries' program – full emancipation of landlords' subjects, but for practical purposes – preservation of manorial farms, actually envisioned the social landscape of the countryside as it appeared after 1848.¹⁰⁸ It was the first attempt to combine political and social revolution in order to achieve an independent nation-state. This was the first time that the national was articulated as linked with the social, at least in Galicia, if not in the whole of Eastern Europe. Because of this the event produced all kinds of apocryphal stories which would be later reproduced in national mythologies.

Everyone following Soviet collections of Ukrainian folk tales knows the story about Shevchenko's agitation among the peasants. Allegedly, speaking in a certain tavern to the peasants Shevchenko explained to them the structure of society in terms of wheat (peasants) and tare (their exploiters). Then, mixing wheat and tares together he showed how outnumbered the landlords were by peasants and what peasants should do with them. There was a similar legend about 1846 attributed to various leaders of the Polish uprising. One of the versions says that Czaplicki during his speech in Horozhanna pointed towards wheat and oats, and mixing them together was showing that there would be no difference between peasants and lords after revolution. Ivan Franko heard that legend as a gymnasium student in Drohobych among many other "unclear rumors about the ideas of Polish revolutionaries." Only much later did Franko hear this legend attached to Shevchenko's biography and traced its origin back to 1846.¹⁰⁹ Roman Rosdolsky showed that in the 1830s Kaspar Ciegiewicz indeed used exactly the same parable in his propaganda among the peasants.¹¹⁰ Polish democrats in their agitation used many tropes that would be picked up later on by the Ukrainian movement. One of these was community action. Phrases like "the community is

Chatterjee, "More on Modes of Power and the Peasantry," in Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, eds., *Selected Subaltern Studies* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 351-90.

¹⁰⁷ This was explicitly stated by the Governor of Galicia in his address to the people. According to this address, the aim of the insurgents was "the restoration of Poland through the social revolution," but "their true goal is to destroy the social order which strongly stands on the ground of religion and law." See Steblii, *Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 257.

¹⁰⁸ Brock, *Polish Revolutionary Populism*, 7.

¹⁰⁹ VR IL, f.3, spr.2663, a.18.

¹¹⁰ Roman Rosdolsky, "A Revolutionary Parable on the Equality of Men," *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, No.3, 1963, 291-293.

a big man” were used by Polish agitators (in this case – Horoszkewicz) who called upon peasants to rise as communities.¹¹¹

I believe that in the discourses of 1846 the question of national identity is more complicated than the simple equation between Poles and landlords which the peasants were allegedly making. The usage of the word “Poles” by the peasants seems to have been very fresh in 1846. The group of Czaplicki’s conspirators encountered a strange attitude of the population towards the Poles, about whom there were bizarre rumors. They encountered this attitude during the snowstorm, when the group of peasants helped them:

In between they said that they would accompany us gladly if only we defended them from the Poles who are supposed to massacre them and they would rather ask us for protection, than Russians, who are supposed to come and help them against the Poles.

This encounter, instead of making the conspirators rethink the way they were informing people about the coming revolution, only reinforced their stereotypes. They blamed the Austrian government for the false rumors circulating among peasants: “We knew who spread them out.”¹¹² But peasantry used the word “Poles” as an ambiguous sign whose meaning was constructed during the rebellion depending on the prevailing power, the very ambiguity of the word “Poles” was used by peasants even during the slaughter of the gentry in western Galician circles.¹¹³ Similarly, just as peasants feared “Poles,” they could also fear peasant mob. Several descriptions of 1846 panic in the farmsteads of rural clergy prove it. Local peasants (cantors, priest’s servants and others) share fear of other peasants coming in, peasant organize community night guard not against Polish revolutionaries but against other peasants from rioting communities.¹¹⁴

Austrian authorities also were important but not in the way it is usually assumed by Polish historiography. Austrian authorities were important because they were

¹¹¹ Herbil’s’kyi, *Rozvytok prohresyvnnykh idei v Halychyni u pershii polovyni XIX st.*, 228.

¹¹² Fr. M. Wł. Czaplicki, *Rzeź w Horożanie. Pamiętnik więźnia stanu. Dwa dzieła w jednym tomie* (Kraków: nakładem Marcelego Lumilskiego, 1872), 24.

¹¹³ According to the report from the Sanok circle the peasants call “Poles” all non-peasants who do not wear state uniform. See Steblii, *Klasova borot’ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 262. In another report it was said that peasant insurgency threatens with death everyone who is not a peasant or a Jew, see Steblii, *Klasova borot’ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 269. There is evidence that peasant insurgency threatened not just landlords but townspeople in general, see Franciszek Bujak, *Limanowa. Miasteczko powiatowe w zachodniej Galicyi. Stan społeczny i gospodarczy* (Kraków: G. Gebehethner i spółka, drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1902), 36.

¹¹⁴ Hladylovych, “Spomyny rus’koho sviashchenyka pro rizniu 1846 roku,” *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Shevchenka* (further on – ZNTSh), 12, kn.4, “Miscellanea,” (L’viv, 1896); Vasył’ Chernetskii, “Zhadky z 1846 roku,” *Dilo*, 1892, No.176.

the first to introduce a new component into the power configuration working in the Galician countryside – the state. Josephinian reforms instituted a state administration in the feudal setting of the Galician countryside as an independent agent interested in peasantry. But during the period of reaction manors were integrated into the state administration, the state showed readiness to tolerate feudal relationships in the villages and the distinction between the landlords and the state was slowly disappearing again. After 1846 things changed forever.

Usually historians emphasize the abolition of the so-called “helping days” as a major gain of the peasants from the events of 1846. But another important achievement granted by the emperor was the right to complain directly to circular authorities bypassing the manor.¹¹⁵ Moreover, the branch offices of circular authorities were established in the smaller towns to improve control over the situation and provide for the population more direct access to the authorities. And although this institution was short-lived, another one – security guard created on the basis of the army and financial guard survived not only 1846 but also 1848, and was eventually transformed into gendarmerie.¹¹⁶ 1846 seriously undermined the position of estate administration as part of the governmental structure and increased the importance of mayors – this was the year when mayors received leather belts with attached metallic badges, on which imperial eagle and inscription “mayor” were engraved, and which they were supposed to wear across their shoulders.¹¹⁷

The Austrian authorities contributed to the change, but in the cases I analyzed they did it not so much through inciting peasants against Poles as by asking questions, by the insistence to specify which Motherland, which army and which emperor. These authorities made a distinction between Poland and Galicia and stressed the disloyalty of the Poles. By doing so they also acknowledged the weakness of the state they represented, the instability of power relationships and the existence of alternatives to the current social and political order.

Aside from this, the Austrian authorities feared peasant action no less than the landlords and were trying to find its causes in the “communist” Polish agitation, which, according to the Zolochiv circle captain, was the source of all the rumors and fears worrying the Polish gentry in the winter of 1846.¹¹⁸ And individual property indeed was questioned by radical Polish revolutionaries who argued in favor of collective property.¹¹⁹ Not all the gentry sympathized with the

¹¹⁵ LODA, f.1245, op.2, spr.10.

¹¹⁶ Bronisław Łoziński, “Z czasów i akt dominkalnych. (Przyczynek do historii administracji w Galicyi,” Kwartalnik Historyczny, t.20, 1906, 274.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 277.

¹¹⁸ See the report of the Zolochiv captaincy from January 15, 1846 in Steblii, Klasova borot’ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849), 254.

¹¹⁹ Brock, Polish Revolutionary Populism, 28-9.

revolutionaries, and many of them were suspicious of the agitators. While peasants were talking about the nobility being about to slaughter the peasantry, the nobility talked about peasants who were supposed to rise on Good Friday 1845 and to slaughter the nobility.¹²⁰

The refusals to work *robot* in the eastern circles were directly connected with the unsuccessful uprising and Polish promises.¹²¹ Therefore, it is not surprising at all that the police director believed that in the summer of 1846 the only hope of the Polish emigration was in East Galician peasantry among whom they were preparing another uprising.¹²² The tactics of waiting were employed by the peasants here, and they sided with the government only after the Polish conspiracy was obviously defeated. Peasants in Sambir circle after the Polish revolution was defeated were catching dispersed insurgents and handing them over to the authorities, just as peasants in L'viv, Berezhany and Zolochiv circles of East Galicia did.¹²³

Even if the cases I looked at do not apply to the whole of East Galicia they give us a clue as to why the pattern of West Galician slaughter stopped here. Sambir circle might be exceptional because it had the largest cluster of villages owned by the state, these were former Polish royal estates (including Stebelski's village of Morozovychi).¹²⁴ Thus the state figured among the landlords of this circle and was not just the third arbitrary power on which peasants could rely. Some leading conspirators here, like the brothers Przestrzelski, were in fact employed in the management of state estates. Another important thing is that Sambir circle was exposed to the democratic agitation more than any other circle. Ivan Franko also pointed to the fact that Turka mountains could become the stronghold of insurgency because of its inaccessible mountainous terrain, and perhaps this was the reason why the most ardent revolutionary agitators were sent there.¹²⁵

We know that Julian Maciej Goslar and Leo Mazurkiewicz worked here, but the tradition of the democratic agitation among the peasantry of this circle went back to the 1830s, something that would be difficult to find in West Galicia. Characteristically, in Sambir circle it was Greek Catholic revolutionaries that felt the need to work with the peasantry already in the 1830s. The villages exposed to their agitation near Sambir include Bilyna Velyka, where a public speech on the

¹²⁰ Ivan Franko, "Pol's'ke povstannia v Halychyni 1846 roku (Istorychna rozvidka)," 371.

¹²¹ Steblii, *Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 271, 287, 308.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 337.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 266.

¹²⁴ These state estates in the 1840s were divided between Sambir's management – 29 villages, Drohobych's – 24, Borynia – 26, Limna – 24, Pidbuzh – 21, Spas – 26. For comparison, the largest block of private estates was one of Komarno with 23 villages, Horozhanna was one of these 23. See BJ, sygn.5368 II, t.3, s.182.

¹²⁵ Franko, "Zhyttia Ivana Fedorovycha i ioho chasy," 107.

Polish revolution was held during the consecration of the local church, Voloshcha, where the local Roman Catholic priest participated in the conspiracy, Bukova, where the local Greek Catholic priest participated in the conspiracy, and the villages of Sprynia and Zvir, centers of state forestry.¹²⁶

In general, there is a tendency to underestimate the agitation conducted by Polish revolutionaries in the 1830s and 1840s, and the truth is that this agitation was not less significant than one conducted in West Galicia either in terms of its scale or of its impact.¹²⁷ The agitation was conducted here in both Polish and Ruthenian and we know some remarkable texts produced by this agitation for peasants only in Ruthenian, nothing even remotely as good written in Polish.¹²⁸

Stefan Kieniewicz characterized the situation with conspirators' propaganda in East Galicia as following:

The experiment of rapprochement with the Polish peasant started in the Tarnów's area had at the same time its counterpart in the eastern, Ukrainian half of the province. But because the conspiracy's authorities in L'viv were categorically rejecting any thought about popular propaganda, the initiative here came from more radical individuals, working on their own.¹²⁹

One of the revolutionaries' spiritual fathers, Seweryn Goszczyński, in fact believed that memories of the recent freedom made Ukrainian peasants accept the words of the revolutionary agitation "more sincerely."¹³⁰ Polish democrats, in general, were unusually sympathetic to the Cossack tradition and Cossack wars against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.¹³¹ Few testimonies that survived

¹²⁶ In 1837 certain Berehulski, gymnasium student and son of the Greek Catholic parish priest of Sambir, was arrested for the agitation he conducted among peasants in Sprynia and Zvir. Although Aleksandr Kuczera says that Berehulski was denounced by the parish priest of Zvir, Rev. Levyts'kyi; the priest in fact testified against Berehulski, who was a tutor of his children, only after Berehulski was arrested. It is interesting that both Sprynia and Zvir were state villages. Berehulski along with Michał Popiel was sentenced as the most guilty of all the members of this conspiracy among gymnasium students. Aleksander Kuczera, *Samborszczyzna: ilustrowana monografia miasta Sambora i ekonomiji Samborskiej*, t.2 (Sambor, Nakładem Księgarni nauczycielskiej, 1937), 315. For the best account of the agitations around Sambir see Bolesław Łopuszański, *Stowarzyszenie Ludu Polskiego (1835-1841). Geneza i dzieje* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1975), 163, 195-96, 206.

¹²⁷ Łopuszański, *Stowarzyszenie Ludu Polskiego*, 152-3.

¹²⁸ Usually these are works of Kaspar Ciegiewicz, but some other anonymous works figure as well. The works were well-known and even responses to them were written, such as one signed by "Diaconibus circuli Sanosensis." Łopuszański, *Stowarzyszenie Ludu Polskiego*, 158-60. See also Volodymyr Borys, "Antyfeodal'na ahitatsiia v Skhidnii Halychyni v polovyni 30-kh na pochatku 40-kh rr. XIX st.," *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, 1968, no. 3, 76-84.

¹²⁹ Stefan Kieniewicz, *Konspiracje galicyjskie, 1831-1845* (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1950), 155.

¹³⁰ Herbil's'kyi, *Rozvytok prohresyvnnykh idei*, 221.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 230.

about peasant support of the conspirators, and promises to participate in the revolution, come from East Galicia.¹³² Up to 1846 the peasantry of Galicia could be divided into three ethnographic groups – *Mazury*, *Górale* and *Rusini*, after 1846 it was usually Polish peasants against Ruthenian.¹³³

The way the events of 1846 were encoded by Polish nationalism would be very important for the understanding of identity formations in the Galician countryside. Roman Rosdolsky analyzed one aspect of this – the great reversal when the slaughter perpetrated by “ethnically” Polish peasants was ascribed to the Ruthenian peasantry and became one of the myths constantly resurfacing in the historiography. But there are more reversals like this. I have already mentioned the case with the soldiers on leave, who in fact were the target of Polish agitation and sometimes even became active participants in the conspiracy, but later they were feared as the tools of the Austrian bureaucracy. The promise of cheaper tobacco and salt, which figured so prominently in the Polish agitation in 1846, later on with the addition of another element – forests and pastures, were ascribed to the Ruthenian movement. It was part of labeling the Ruthenian movement as populist, utilitarian, and conniving at mob’s rude instincts: somehow it was forgotten that this was exactly the program with which Poles approached peasantry in 1846.

The reversal of roles and projection of one’s own unsuccessful tactics onto Ruthenians were part of the larger project to forget 1846, which was necessary for the Polish national movement. In my opinion this Polish problem with 1846 is very important for understanding why the Ruthenians did not become Poles. It was not just the case of Ruthenians rejecting Polish identity; simple rejection does not work well in the cases where both sides are involved. It actually might well be that the secret of why Ruthenians did not become Poles lies in the Polish position, which was not able to accommodate this “East” inside of the Polish nation. Bogdański, one of the democrats, wrote in his diary from 1846:

In the peasant we have been always seeing a man dark, humble and unable to see the decline of the motherland and humiliation of his nationality, but we could not concede such a bestiality and so thoughtless obedience even in the execution of the ordered crime.¹³⁴

These words prove that in 1846 the Polish nation encountered the split in itself, it encountered a dangerous faction and from the very beginning tried to deal with it by representing peasants as puppets of the Austrian bureaucracy with its devilish

¹³² Ivan Franko, “Pol’s’ke povstannia v Halychyni 1846 roku (Istorychna rozvidka),” 383.

¹³³ Czesław Wycech, *Powstanie chłopów w 1846 roku*. Jakub Szela, (Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1955), 36.

¹³⁴ Henryk Bogdański, *Pamiętnik, 1832-1848*, 308.

plans. But this was not enough, the fear had to be projected outside, the Austrian bureaucracy, which was not a nation, could not serve as the “Other” of the nationalist discourse and then the fear of minority was projected on Ruthenians.

Already in 1848 the slaughter appears as connected symbolically with troubled Ruthenian connection in Poland’s past. Andrzej Rydel’s poem about “Bloody Bath in Galicia” says:

Gonta, Żeleźniak and the Third Undead (*Trzeci Nieżywy*) // Slaughtered
priests, gentry, Jews and children // Breinl managed more mercifully //
Killing their children // And leaving untouched [his] brothers-Jews //
Because like people will not harm each other...¹³⁵

The best example of such a projection, however, is Czaplicki’s memoir entitled “Slaughter in Horozhanna.” Besides the Austrian government, another evil agent figures prominently in this memoir published for the first time in 1862: Rev. Horodys’kyi commanding “peasant guards” from his house.¹³⁶ In fact Rev. Horodys’kyi originally promised to serve the liturgy but said that he was sick when the time of the uprising came (in a way it resembles the sickness of Józef Boberski from my account). There is no evidence whatsoever of his influence on the peasants in the investigations conducted by the Austrian authorities.¹³⁷ But for Czaplicki there is no doubt that Rev. Horodys’kyi played a key role in the slaughter.

Czaplicki explains his own experience through the stereotypes he constructs and these stereotypes reveal much about the Polish society in Galicia applauding his memoir in the 1860s and 1870s. The first type from his memoir is one of the noble conspirator, Łaskiewicz. The forester, former insurgent and emigrant from Lithuania works with peasants trying “to wake some spiritual life” in their souls. Working hard to make his living in the forest, he was working equally hard with the peasantry to educate them, had a perfect family, a beautiful wife with several children and his own an “expressive face”.¹³⁸

In opposition to him two other types stand. The first one – Rev. Horodys’kyi:

A small and fat figure, as if made by an unskilled sculptor. Short, fat, even from top down, with long arms moving with great difficulty, with swelled red fingers all the time making fists with the thumbs on one or another hand; short but fat, his neck clothed with a dirty and greasy collar, was hard

¹³⁵ [Andrzej Rydel], *Krwawa łaźnia w Galicji w dniach 19, 20 i 21 Lutego 1846 r. odbyta* (Kraków, 1848). among the perpetrators Ruthenian Khomins’kyi figures together with Breinl, Luxemburg and Szela.

¹³⁶ Czaplicki, *Rzeź w Horozanie*, 39.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 41.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

to find between the shoulders pressed to the chest, on which a head as big as the moon rose, with a very low and shrunken forehead.

And a certain Dutka, whose first name he does not remember, probably Marcin, 65 years old, mayor of Rychyiv:

Totally emaciated, in this case people say “like a bone,” an old man, but with unusually sharp features of the face; a moderately high forehead with deep wrinkles and covered with fairly long but thin, dark and protruding hair, a not less sharp cavity under this forehead, a sharp eagle’s nose, black eyes with fire in them, finally a stubborn blue mouth and a long sharp beard sticking to the front; all this from the first sight was indicating to an expert that this man, besides having unusual energy, was penetrating, vindictive and zealous.¹³⁹

The very fact that this encoding made on the basis of an untypical event became the most popular work written on 1846 proves the importance of the reversal of 1846 for the Polish discourse.

I think that at first Polish movement rejected the access to the Polish project for the Greek Catholic clergy (it was still open for individual priests but was closed to the Church as a whole), we already saw the ambivalent position of the Greek Catholic clergy in 1846 and in 1848 when the hierarchy supported the Austrian government, the stereotype was created. Then the Ruthenian peasantry was also placed on the other side of the boundary. The bonds of rite, but more probably, the Poles’ need to overcome symbolically the split inside the nation, which they encountered even before the nation was created, served as the foundation for the new boundary. That boundary became very productive and on it various identity projects of the Greek Catholic population grew up. In our cases the difference between the Poles and the Ruthenians is articulated explicitly only in one case, by the Roman Catholic Łukasz Usciński, who stated that peasants were Ruthenian but would become Poles. Contrary to the emphasized coincidence of ethnic and class factors that is said to have reinforced antagonism, the hypothesis can be advanced that the Ruthenian peasants felt safer than their Polish counterparts: they always could resort to the defense that they were not Poles; in 1846 they did not have to prove their loyalty to the state.¹⁴⁰ In West Galicia, though, the ambiguity of the situation was critical and caused more drastic peasant action.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 12-13.

¹⁴⁰ This was the defense used by the conspirators in the Sambir gymnasium, including Michał Popiel, who stated that he was a Ruthenian and therefore could not possibly participate in the Polish conspiracy. Of course, all this was made possible thanks to the Austrian administration which came in the late 18th century, and classifying its new acquisition, found that there were two nationalities inhabiting it.

The agitation in February 1846 in East Galicia was not limited to Sambir circle.¹⁴¹ It can be argued that the Polish revolutionaries were more concerned with the “different,” Ruthenian peasantry than with the Polish one, whose participation in the uprising did not look for them so problematic.

In the cases I analyzed it is a manor official Łukasz Usciński, who introduces serfdom as an explanation for the peasants’ behavior while peasants reject this interpretation. There is a persistent avoidance of characterizing oneself as a serf. There is only *robot* land and the ownership of this land requires one to fulfill *robot* obligations. I suppose that the peasants understood perfectly that *robot* was part of the system, officially recognized and their resistance was grounded in the usage of the existing system to their own ends, not in overthrowing it. Actually, most of the cases of peasant resistance from Galicia in the first half of the 19th century were directed against the landlords’ abuse of their rights. In all these cases, the landlords, strictly speaking, are involved in acts illegal from the point of view of the state, like appropriation of the commons or of peasant individual landholdings. This was actually the experience of the famous Jakub Szela, the leader of the peasant insurgency from 1846. Ivan Kapushchak in his famous speech from 1848 in the Austrian parliament said: “There is no doubt that the landlords had the right to *robot* from us. But did they stop on that?” Just as with the rest of cases, this was a protest against abuses, but not an attempt to overturn the system itself.¹⁴²

It is actually landlords (and state officials as well) who raised the issue of *robot* and tried to explain peasant behavior as well as the particular peasant human type through it. In many cases these explanations were actually dehumanizing the peasants by postulating the assumed debilitating influence of serfdom on them. This aspect is usually neglected in the class analysis of peasant resistance to serfdom in Galicia. Peasant resistance was not that dramatic and confrontational as presented by those writing on the class struggle in the Galician village.¹⁴³ As the citations in this paper show, acts of peasant resistance were not limited to the economic sphere but took place in the realm of signification as well. Not just actions but words mattered. The way peasants defined themselves, the way they reacted to others’ words materialized this aspect of resistance, resistance as a way of life.

Peter Guardino defines this from his Gramscian position in a following way:

¹⁴¹ For a report on agitation in Stanislaviv circle see Steblii, *Klasova borot’ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 256.

¹⁴² Jan Putek, *Pierwsze występy włościanstwa polskiego, 1848-1861* (Kraków: nakładem Domu Ludowego „Wisła” w Krakowie), 12.

¹⁴³ For a critique of this approach to resistance, see Gyan Prakash, “Introduction,” in Douglas Haynes and Gyan Prakash, (eds.), *Contesting Power: Resistance and Everyday Social Relations in South Asia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

Members of the lower classes constantly struggle within the predominant moral code or discursive framework. Part of this struggle involves the selective reconstruction of the code using the elements most favorable to lower-class interests; another, perhaps, more important, part involves the application of differential meanings to the symbols, values, heritages, and representations that make up the hegemonic ideology.¹⁴⁴

Although I believe that the typical peasant resistance indeed was the tactics inside of the *robot* system, I also believe that in 1846 an important new factor came into the game the peasants played. This factor was politics and frameworks designed to engage, use, and change peasants. These were projects that existed besides and despite state institutions and established social order. Peasants not only observed and opposed these projects – they started to engage with them actively. One symptom of such an engagement was rumor, to be more specific – political rumor connected with the awareness of possible change and peasant agency, visible but impossible to fix and therefore feared. The rumor played with the categories that were used in the 1830s-1840s by both, Polish conspirators and state authorities fighting them – Poland, Russia, landlords, Emperor, and so on. In the rumors these categories are very unstable, they collide, ally with other categories and indicate the possibility of change in the very order of things. The awareness of this possibility creates the space in which peasant agency appears. This rumor was not just an element of the traditional society, a means to spread rebellion, it was the “process of writing difference,” a way for the peasantry to construct the “Self.”¹⁴⁵ Since 1846 we see peasant reaction to every political change, every hint at the possibility of such a change. After the acquisition of Galicia Count Pergen in his memorial on the situation in the province said that “peasants did not care who ruled, if only they do well; they would not express any feelings towards underwent changes”; after 1846 no one could say the same.¹⁴⁶

This awareness provides a temporal, dynamic dimension for peasant agency, a temporal dimension that is easy to overlook because of the numerous proofs of the peasants’ inability to tell the date according to the calendar, their adherence to the conception of time other than linear. The temporality of this rumor was not the causal time of higher culture; it was based on the “time-lag” between utterance and articulation that allowed peasants relocation of meaning and the

¹⁴⁴ Peter F. Guardino, *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico’s National State, Guerrero, 1800-1857* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 9.

¹⁴⁵ For this interpretation of rumor and a critique of Guha’s discussion of rumor, see Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography,” in Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, (eds.), *Selected Subaltern Studies* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 21-26.

¹⁴⁶ Ludwik Finkel, “Memoryał Antoniego hr. Pergena, pierwszego gubernatora Galicyi o stanie kraju,” *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, t.14, No.1, 1900, 41.

maintenance of its ambiguity.¹⁴⁷ This peasant agency and its temporality were acknowledged by those in a position of domination who being deeply disturbed by this kind of rumor throughout the 1840s-1880s perceived it as something more than usual peasant unrest. Trying to pacify it they looked for the instigators, assigning to the rumor intentionality and purpose just as they did with the insurgency of 1846. This political rumor threatening with the possibility of action, this awareness of change and agency started the age of mutual fear with peasants spreading the rumors, landlords reporting on them and the state authority investigating them; the age which continued well into the 1880s and ended with the transformation of that fear into an antagonism rationalized in terms of class and national conflict.

Both Polish and Ruthenian (Ukrainian) versions of the events of 1846 were written in high tones, were tragic and heroic, despite the fact that they were based on numerous uncritically taken anecdotes. I would like to end this chapter with one more “anecdote.” Nykolai Khimak interviewed participants of the Horozhanna events in 1887. There still were 70-year-old farmers in Horozhanna Velyka, who remembered *revulutsiia* of 1846 very well. These peasants remembered very well the response their mayor, Dmytro Kukhar, gave to Czaplicki’s appeal to join the insurgents against the Germans, the response after which the first shots were fired. He said “for this advice, kiss our ass (*pane za tuiu poradnytsiu potsiluite nas v hozytsiu*),” and not the apocryphal “the community does not accept it” which is in Czaplicki’s memoir.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ Homi Bhabha, “In a Spirit of Calm Violence,” in Gyan Prakash, (ed.), After Colonialism. Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements, (Princeton Studies in Culture/Power/History) (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 326-43 (revised version of the article “By Bread Alone”).

¹⁴⁸ VR II., f.3, spr.218, a.130. Peasants remembered the words pretty well. Three weeks after the events in Horozhanna Sambir captain reported the following words “*za svoiu dumytsiu potsilui nas v b...*,” although his report ascribes these words to Hnat Pali, a mayor from Pidvysoke. See Steblii, *Klasova borot’ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny*, 279. In general, many ideas about community ascribed to the peasants, seem to be relatively recent invention. Il’kevych’s publication of Galician proverbs from 1841 knows only one proverb about community – “community is a big man.” See [Hryhorii Il’kevych (ed.)], Halytskii prypovidky i zahadky zibrani Hryhorym Il’kivychom (Viden’: cherenky o. o. Mekhytarystiv, 1841).

Chapter 3

1848: LANGUAGES OF EMANCIPATION

An enlightened person can be transformed by one reasonable word, completely and forever, but the ignorance cannot be moved either by the most excellent argumentation or by most painful push, especially if its nationality is not emphasized and it has already been provoked to rebellion from somewhere else. But I do not agree with those who imagine the Ruthenian peasant to be so ignorant in respect of his nationality. Even if one has poured one's soul into him, teaching that he is a Pole, one will not persuade him, to the contrary, one will only expose to ridicule oneself and Poland; but let one only speak to him as to a Ruthenian, then without a difficulty one will push him into the whirlwind of political trends and for Polish Rus'.¹

All the histories of Galicia, be they Marxist or nationalist, agree on the importance of 1848. So many important events occurred in that year: the emancipation itself, i. e. the abolition of peasant subject-dependency on the landlords and of *robot* (usually represented as the abolition of serfdom), the creation of the first Ruthenian political organization, the appearance of the first Ruthenian newspaper, finally – the election of the first Ruthenian deputies to the parliament. Discussing all these events in detail in one chapter would be a senseless and futile exercise. For a brief account of the 1848 events one can consult more general accounts of either Ukrainian or Polish history. Nevertheless, I think that it is absolutely necessary to include some discussion of 1848 into the present work. I shall concentrate on the specificity of the Ruthenian discourse with respect to the nationality and the peasantry, something that otherwise

¹ Vasył Podolyns'kyi, "Slovo perestorohy," 363-4.

excellent works on the period lack.² I shall also attempt to draw a picture of the networks that formed the “Ruthenian” movement in the Sambir area, and to describe some local developments in 1848 and the 1850s.

National

What strikes one in the Ruthenian discourse of 1848, especially when compared with the Ruthenian texts from pre-1848 era, is the maturity of its nationalism. This discourse was informed by the view of the world as naturally divided into national communities of citizens:

Nationality is the life of the people (narod), to give them the best possible existence and to take away nationality is the same as giving to someone all the material well-being but [at the same time] requesting his death. The death of nation means the agony of millions for thousands years.³

This nationalist worldview must have grown up on the ideas that had been circulating for a while in the Austrian universities. We know that the Ruthenian activists from 1848 read the texts of the Slavic revival; perhaps Fichte, Schelling and Herder were on their reading list as well.⁴ It cannot be an accident that so

² Still unsurpassed work on the Ruthenian movement in that period is Jan Kozik, *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia: 1815-1849*, (Edited and with an Introduction by Lawrence D. Orton, translated by Andrew Gorski and Lawrence D. Orton) (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986), this translation is a shortened version of his two Polish monographs: *Ukraiński ruch narodowy w Galicji w latach 1830-1848* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1973), and *Miedzy reakcją a rewolucją: studija z dziejów ukraińskiego ruchu narodowego w Galicji w latach 1848-1849* (Warszawa: PWN, 1975). He also wrote an excellent article on peasantry and Ruthenian movement: Jan Kozik, “Kwestia włościańska w Galicja Wschodniej w polityce Hołownej Rady Ruskiej 1848-1849,” *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, Nr.364, Prace Historyczne, 1974, 64-92. A more general work on the peasantry in 1848, which also includes extensive chapters on Galicia is Roman Rozdolski, *Die Bauernabgeordneten im konstituierenden osterreichischen Reichstag 1848-1849* (Wien, 1976). The position of Greek Catholic clergy and its inside divisions are analyzed by Oleh Turii in his *Hreko-katolyts'ka tserkva v suspil'no-politychnomu zhytti Halychyny, 1848-1867* (rukopys kandydats'koi dysertatsii, L'viv, 1994).

³ L., *Odpowiedź na artykuł o nieistnieniu Rusinów umieszczony w Numerze 2gim Dzieńnika Narodowego* (1848), 3.

⁴ We have the register of the books borrowed by Markiiian Shashkevych, Ivan Vahylevych, and Iakiv Holovats'kyi from the *Ossolineum* Library. The list is dominated by the works of Slavic revival and on Slavic history, literature and folklore. See F. I. Steblii, O. A. Kupchyns'kyi, Ia. I. Hrytsak, V. I. Parubii, O. A. Polians'kyi, Ie. M. Humeniuk (eds.), *“Rusalka Dnistrova”: Dokumenty i materialy* (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1989), 18-51. But the problem is that this list reflects only one source of intellectual influences and reflects specificity of the institution, from which the books were borrowed. The same can be said about the literature mentioned in police investigations: connections with Russian Empire, other Slavic revivals. That is why literature in German is little mentioned in these documents.

many activists from 1848 either studied in the cities in the western part of the Austrian Empire, usually Vienna, or spent at least some time there. Future Metropolitan Lytvynovych had learned Cyrillic and started writing Ruthenian poems in the 1830s in Vienna as well.⁵ The two most important activists from the Sambir area – Rev. Lavrets’kyi and Rev. Korostens’kyi, were educated in the “near abroad,” on western territories of Austrian Empire.⁶ The same is true for Rev. Pavlo Iasenyts’kyi, who replaced Rev. Korostens’kyi in the position of the catechist of Sambir gymnasium. For those who studied at home, their world-view was profoundly influenced by Polish nationalist activities of the 1830s and 1840s, with which many Ruthenian activists were connected.⁷ The knowledge about nations was there and in 1848 it was applied to the Ruthenian case.

The Ruthenian nation in 1848 had two keystones on which the whole construction of its distinctiveness could be built: the Ruthenian language and Greek rite. The government used these categories to distinguish between Ruthenian and Poles, local population itself was doing exactly the same. Moreover, the Austrian authorities had been since the end of the eighteenth century legitimizing and developing these markers of ethnicity. The Church was better institutionalized, having acquired its own archdiocese and Metropolitan; the language – worse, being limited up to 1848 only to elementary schools and faculties of theology. More educated people were supposed to use German, which was the language of the Empire’s high culture. No one, however, tried to “Germanize” the simple people, who were supposed to receive a basic education in their own language. Thus, in 1848 differences did not have to be invented; only the history of these differences had to be constructed and new meanings attached to them.

In the “Memorandum of The Ruthenian Nation in Galicia to Clarify Its Position,” published in German in L’viv in 1848, the peculiarities of Ruthenians were listed in the following way: “Ruthenians are different from Poles by language, script, habits, customs and Church rite.”⁸ Taking aside customs and

⁵ His notes from the year 1834, “Mnemosina. Zeszyt II,” show this. Exercises in Cyrillic parallel reading Kant and construction of the genealogy of Lytvynovychs. Despite this learning of Cyrillic, even in 1836 during his tourist trip together with Ipolyt Dzerovych in the Austrian Alps, he was writing down Ruthenian rhythms they composed together in Latin script. See VR LNB, f. Narodnyi Dim (further on – ND), spr.396/p.100.

⁶ For the influence of Vienna and German culture on the Ruthenian intellectual and cultural life see Jon-Paul Himka, “German Culture and the National Awakening in Western Ukraine before the Revolution of 1848,” in Hans-Joachim Torke and John-Paul Himka (eds.), *German-Ukrainian Relations in Historical Perspective* (Edmonton, Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1994), 29-44.

⁷ See Kyrylo Studyns’kyi, “Pol’s’ki konspiratsii sered rus’kykh pytomtsiv i dukhoven’sstva v Halychyniv rokakh 1831-1846,” *ZNTSh*, t.80 (L’viv, 1907), 53-108.

⁸ *Denkschrift der ruthenischen Nation in Galizien zur Aufklärung ihrer Verhältnisse* (L’viv, 1848).

habits, which according to the nationalist creed had to be different in every nation, we are left again with language and rite. By projecting these marks of difference back in time, a particular Ruthenian history was being discovered. A great national entity was discovered in the past, and nineteenth century Ruthenians were but scattered remnants of this one: "Once we also were an independent, strong nation under our own princes from the tribe of Volodymyr the Great."⁹ These statements were made despite the fact that no history comparable either to the academic Czech or to the patriotic Ukrainian texts had been yet written in the Ruthenian case.

The patriotic vocabulary of the two most popular Ruthenian songs from 1848 that functioned as anthems – "Peace to You, Brothers" (*Myr vam, Brattia*) and "God, Give Us Luck" (*Schast' nam, Bozhe*), consists of "faith," "language," and "mother-Rus'." The adjective "Ruthenian" is amply applied to the natural objects of the "homeland," so that the Ruthenian nation looks natural and the Ruthenian nature of the "homeland" is emphasized. Both songs allude to the times of St. Volodymyr.¹⁰ It is important to note that the "handicapped" social composition of the nation consisting from "peasants and priests," its "peasant" character, were not mentioned in this nationalist discourse at all. To the contrary, the Ruthenian national movement (composed almost exclusively of Greek Catholic priests) wished to detach itself from the too close association with peasants, with all the connotations of disorder, blood-thirstiness, and ignorance; the movement tried to emphasize its own "normality."¹¹ Despite the long period of "slavery" and their problems with enjoying constitutional liberties at the moment, Ruthenians were stating that they, just like everybody, else preferred freedom and a constitution, under the auspices of which they would be able to develop their own nationality.¹²

As with any other national discourse, the Ruthenian one looked into the past. But the choice of a particular past and its codifications are very revealing of the character of these discourses. One of the key postulates of the Ruthenian one was the idea about continuity from Old Rus', in particular from the Principality (Kingdom) of Halych and Volyn'. It is worth noting that the tale of the "national

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ [Iustyn Zhelekhovskii], Iu.V.Zh. *Vospomyaniia iz 1848 goda*, (Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Kachkovskoho ch.269-270) (L'viv, 1898), 128-129.

¹¹ Here we must note that the Ruthenian clergy and Ruthenian patriots in 1846 did not feel safer than Polish landlords; many of prominent Ruthenian activists, who were students in 1846 and traveled into the countryside, recall their own fears, sharing in the concern of the Polish population of the towns, being searched by peasants checkpoints and the panic in the parish houses. See about this Rev. Pavlo Matkovs'kyi's memoirs in APP, ABGK, sygn.9447, strona (further on – s.) 2-3, Iurii Hladylovykh, "Spomyny rus'koho sviashchenyka pro rizniu 1846 roku," *ZNTSh*, t.XII, kn.4 (L'viv, 1896).

¹² TsDIAuL, f. 180, op. 1, spr. 4, a. 10-13.

glory” for the activists of 1848 ends in the fourteenth century, when the Principality of Halych and Volyn' became part of the Polish kingdom. Nowhere in 1848, could one find stories about Ukrainian Cossacks and Hetmans, despite the fact that early Ruthenian Romantics, the so-called Ruthenian Triad in the 1830s, were writing about Cossacks as a glorious episode in Ruthenian history.¹³ Ruthenian history, as it was constructed in 1848, could be integrated very well with the loyalty to the dynasty – the Habsburgs legitimized their rule over Galicia by referring to the precedent with the principality of Halych and Volyn', which was once ruled by the king of Hungary.

Let us look at the public representations of Ruthenian national history. As an example we can take the speech by Rev. Iosyf Levyts'kyi made at the opening of the Ruthenian Council in Drohobych. In its published version the list of the Ruthenian princes with the dates of their rule takes up almost two pages. Then, the history stops – there are no names, no dates, until the Habsburg dynasty takes over Galicia and the Ruthenian nation living there. The Polish king, Kazimierz the Great, who annexed the principality, is presented as a thief stealing another's land.¹⁴ The great care was taken to stress the continuity of the Ruthenian history and that Ruthenians were an “autochthonous” nationality in Galicia: “The great and glorious Ruthenian nation living in East Galicia and *Volodomyriia* is a primordial nation of the Galician land, not arriving here from somewhere else.”¹⁵ Levyts'kyi said that the ancestors of Ruthenians had been living on the territory of this province since the times of Volodymyr the Great; they were called Ruthenians and spoke the same language. The dark ages of unhappiness for Galician Ruthenians continued from 1390 to 1772, with the greatest oppression starting during the rule of Zygmunt III (1587-1632).¹⁶

This kind of history with an emphasis on the times of the ancient Rus' was difficult to utilize for the practical purposes. Old Rus' could hardly provide the national terminology necessary in many fields. While the discourse never appeals to the Cossack polity and institutions, military terminology, for example, was developed on the basis of terms borrowed from Cossack times: *Hetman* was taken to designate an army commander, *bulava* for staff, *vataha* for corps, *desiatnyk* for

¹³ Feodosii Steblii shows that the attention paid by the Ruthenian Triad to the Cossack period can be traced among people connected to the Triad up to 1847. See Feodosii Steblii, “Derzhavnyts'ki aktsenty v diial'nosti ‘Rus’koï Triitsi’,” in *Shashkevychivana*, v.3-4 (L'viv-Winnipeg, 2000), 22-41. There is also no doubt that this interest in Cossack times resurfaced after 1848-1849 and was upheld by some people even in 1848-49. But in 1848 it was totally marginalized by the focus on Ancient Rus'.

¹⁴ [Iustyn Zhelekhivs'kyi] Iu.V.Zh., *Vospomynaniia iz 1848 goda*, 121-122.

¹⁵ [Iosyf Levytskyi], *Besida hovorena dnia 22 Maia 1848 roku v Drohobychy pry osnovanii Komiteta Ruskoho* (Peremyshl': v Typohrafi sobornoï hr. kat. Kapituly, 1848).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

corporal, *polkovnyk* for colonel, *sotnia* for company, *sotnyk* for captain, and *kehorubov* for standard.¹⁷

Besides history, there was a territory as well. The Ruthenian nation in 1848 was imagined as a territorial entity and Ruthenians claimed the right to enjoy special privileges on their national territory.¹⁸ The very idea of the division of Galicia into two provinces – Polish and Ruthenian, was a consequence of the fact that the nation was imagined not just historically but also spatially. Vasyl' Podolyns'kyi's work articulates the idea that every nation has a right to his its own home and this is its "natural right."¹⁹ Rev. Rudol'f Mokh, another activist and well known Ruthenian writer from the mid-nineteenth century, in his speech to the people during a "people's meeting" talked about "our motherland." That "motherland" was equated with the "beloved nation" and not with the Empire.²⁰ The change wrought by 1848 was seen as a reorganization of the world according to the national principle of the mysterious unity between soil and blood, between land and people, the union that creates a nation. This territoriality legitimized the proposed restructuring of the monarchy, and the division of the province, based on the national principle:

Ruthenians for sure wish the unity and good for the common motherland, but they desire a unity that is moral and spiritual, not physical, mechanical, they want good for the common motherland, one in which they could see and recognize themselves as a nation; they want to be a goal and not means, and not to serve another nation, even brotherly, they want to see their motherland as Switzerland and not as Lacedaemon, they want to be a nation and to stand once more among the nations of Europe.²¹

In Ruthenian texts from 1848 the monarchy, Austria, and the Emperor are mentioned as well. And all the nationalism expressed in these texts does not undermine Ruthenian loyalty to them. On the other hand all these references to imperial structures and symbols, together with the proverbial conservatism of the

¹⁷ Vypys z rukovodstva do vpravy dlia strazhy narodnoi, (Dodatok do chysla 25 Zori Halytskoi, 1848).

¹⁸ Andriy Zayarnyuk, "Mapping *Halychyna*: Constructing the Ukrainian National Space in Habsburg Galicia," in Susan Ingram, Markus Reisenleitner, Cornelia Szabó-Knotik (eds.), Identität·Kultur·Raum: Kulturelle Praktiken und die Ausbildung von Imagined Communities in Nordamerika und Zentraleuropa (Wien: Turia und Kant, 2001), 123-40.

¹⁹ Vasyl' Podolyns'kyi, "Slovo perestorohy," 362.

²⁰ [Rudol'f Mokh], Slovo do naroda halytsko-ruskoho, holosyv Rudol'f Mokh, sekretar Rady Ruskoï Ounevskoi parokh z Lahodova v chasi Narodnoho Sobraniia dnia 12 Oktovriia/ 30 septembria 1848 (L'viv: koshtom Chestnoi Ruskoï Ounevskoi Rady, 1848).

²¹ L., Odpowiedź na artykuł o nieistnieniu Rusinów umieszczony w Numerze 2gim Dziennika Narodowego (1848), 15.

“Tyrolians of the East,” were not softening or constraining the nationalist discourse. This “paradox” should be analyzed in the context of what Austria and Empire stood for.

The Ruthenian nationalist discourse of 1848 was connected with the disorganization of the absolutist monarchy. This was the time when realization of various liberal projects of the Empire’s reorganization seemed plausible. Ruthenians, quite often accused of conservatism and supporting absolutism, were in fact deeply engaged into liberal rhetoric. Despite the leadership of the conservative Church hierarchy, and the fact that Ruthenians’ anti-Polish stance required an alliance with the conservative forces, leading Ruthenian public speakers shared many views with the spokesmen of the liberal Austrian bourgeoisie. The historiography has already pointed to the co-existence of both conservative and liberal trends in the Ruthenian movement of 1848.²² This difference, however, did not undermine this movement’s outside monolithic appearance. In fact it seems that truly conservative persona, like Metropolitan Levyts’kyi, were indifferent to the Ruthenian movement and were criticized from within the hierarchy (in this case by Rev. Kuzems’kyi).²³ The majority of Ruthenian activists can be safely placed among the liberals, in terms of their views on politics and society. As Geof Eley has argued, liberalism is not antonymous to paternalism, and mid-nineteenth century one had serious reservations towards democracy.²⁴ Ruthenian liberals could easily reconcile their liberal values with Austrian loyalty, and even with the monarchy. In fact, there was no need for reconciliation because Austria and the monarchy were the epitome of liberalism and the guarantor of the Constitution. On the basis of these two pillars, the just and responsible political organization would be built: “Austria promised and took [upon itself] a beautiful task: to make everyone situated in its borders free and happy.”²⁵

This belief in a liberal Austria had little to do with some pro-German cultural orientation. Being Austrian for Ruthenians meant being enlightened and liberal.²⁶

²² For this see Jan Kozik, *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia: 1815-1849*, 177-214.

²³ Oleh Turii, „Hreko-katolyts’ka tserkva i revoliutsiia 1848-1849 rr. u Halychyni,” in Władysław Wic (ed.), *Rok 1848. Wiosna Ludów w Galicji. Zbiór studiów*, (Akademia Pedagogiczna im. Komisji Edukacji Narodowej w Krakowie, Prace Monograficzne, Nr.27) (Kraków, 1999), 87.

²⁴ Geoff Eley, “Liberalism, Europe, and the Bourgeoisie 1860-1914,” in David Blackbourn and Richard J. Evans, *The German Bourgeoisie. Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 299-300.

²⁵ [Rudolf Mokh], *Slovo do naroda halytsko-ruskoho*, 7.

²⁶ In this they shared with the Austrian liberals, See Pieter M. Judson, *Exclusive Revolutionaries. Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848–1914* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996), *passim*.

Their Austria was synonymous with the political and legal framework, in which the distinctiveness of the Ruthenian nation could be fully realized. Ruthenians were loyal Austrians, but their Austria was not ethnically German. Austria meant the Enlightenment, a sharing of high culture and liberal values. That is why the rhetoric of Habsburg loyalism in the Ruthenian case was intertwined with the rhetoric of the Enlightenment:

For God and holy faith, for the *Tsar* [here it stands for the Austrian Emperor] and Motherland, for freedom and human rights, which to you from God are due and which our benevolent Monarch confirms, arm yourself and stand bravely, so that in the case of unjust violence you can beat it off with a just and strong blow.²⁷

However, 1848 witnessed not only the triumph of the nationalist liberal discourse, but also the beginnings of its permanent crisis. Just like the discourse of Austrian liberals, the Ruthenian one also was tested on the peasantry's acquisition of the rights of citizenship, most notably – the franchise. The abolition of *robot* and of peasants' subject-dependency to their landlords did not automatically transform them into citizens and Ruthenians. In the 1848 elections the Ruthenian movement realized that masses of the Ruthenian peasants were not "ready" to utilize their constitutional rights. They exhibited a "lack of sense [which] resulted in the situation in which the greatest part of our simple brothers did not give their trust to anyone."²⁸

The Ruthenian movement made great efforts to persuade peasants into constitutionalism. The appeal on the issue of the Constitution from the Supreme Ruthenian Council to the masses, written in Ukrainian but in Latin script explained that from now on every nation had the right to establish laws. The problem was that the whole nation could not think about every question. If this was the case, the explanation continued, solving of even the most important problems would take centuries. According to the Council's appeal this was the reason for the need to select people of trust, who would decide "instead of us;" that is why the elections were so important. People were advised to elect a "learned Ruthenian" because only such a man would be fit for the task.

Therefore Brothers Ruthenians! Let's give sincerely our hands [to each other], let's not become guided during the elections by personal profit, pride or hate... [be guided] only by one, and pure thought about the resurrection

²⁷ [Rudolf Mokh], *Slovo do naroda halytsko-ruskoho*, 16.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.

of the Ruthenian nationality and about elevating it and waking it from the sleep that has lasted till now.²⁹

Nationality was the natural difference, which could be recognized by a consciousness grounded in the knowledge. Peasant behavior was explained as resulting from the lack of this consciousness, the latter itself being an outcome of the ages of slavery. Rev. Mokh lamented the situation: “my dearest Ruthenian brothers, the freedom can be lost if the consciousness (knowledge) comes later than freedom.”³⁰ Consciousness would naturally make Ruthenians knowledgeable about their nationality and their responsibilities as citizens. The enemies of the Ruthenian movement were enemies of progress in general – they were taking advantage of peasants’ ignorance: “The enemies of humanities [sic!] would like to found their devilish kingdom using ignorance.”³¹ These enemies were Poles, who in 1848 did not attempt to persuade peasants into social and national revolution but, instead, decided to leave them to their own fate, anchoring their own movement in the cities and bodies of representational politics.

This does not mean that there were no Polish publications targeting peasants in 1848, but unlike in 1846 this time they appealed specifically to the Ruthenian peasantry, whom Polish activists hoped to turn against the Ruthenian movement. The Polish national movement and “Polish Ruthenians” proposed a counter-narrative of the Ruthenian history. According to this story, the Rus’ lands came under the control of King Kazimierz the Great voluntarily. The king started hiring brave men to fight the Muscovites, Germans and Tartars. These brave men came from everywhere, including the reader’s own community. For their service to the king and country they were awarded noble status. The nobles then lent their lands to the peasants and, in exchange, asked them to work several days for the rightful owners of the land. In compensation for this peasants were exempted from the military duty. The narrative contrasts this situation to Austrian times: back then peasants did not have to pay any taxes, had free salt and tobacco. This is how the origins of the gentry and *robot* were presented.

According to this interpretation, in Polish times “the peasant with land was not called a subject but an owner, a villager (*włościanin*), from the word “power” (*wlast*) [Polish-Ruthenian word speculation], which he enjoyed as a result of an agreement with the landlord. He was his landlord’s neighbor and friend.” This continued as long as there were good Polish kings. However, these kings died out and a king from the Saxon dynasty had to be hired. This king brought to Poland

²⁹ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.30, a.1-3.

³⁰ [Rudol’f Mokh], *Slovo do naroda halytsko-ruskoho*, 16.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 9.

vodka, and many other misfortunes as well. Against him the Constitution of 3 May was accepted. Neither the Muscovites, nor Prussia nor Kaunitz liked it and that is why they attacked Poland. "Since that time the Polish government ceased to exist and a new government was created; it is difficult to describe this government in our Ruthenian language, this was the government of *bureaucracy*." Despite the fact that the Emperor's family had been very nice, its ministers were bad. They introduced excise, taxes, stamps, expensive tobacco and salt without alleviating *robot*.³²

An interesting pattern can be discerned here. In the Ruthenian discourse of 1848 peasant subject-dependency and *robot* are not emphasized. It is hard to distinguish a particular peasant slavery from the more general national enslavement of the Ruthenian people in that discourse. In contrast the Polish publication is at pains to provide the "correct" picture of serfdom and of social relations in old Poland, rather than rebuffing claims about the "national" slavery of Ruthenians. The Polish discourse in 1848 remained anti-absolutist, but lost by that time all the revolutionary ideas about the transformation of social relations. And only a handful of left-wing Polish intellectuals thought about working closer with peasants. They rallied around the short-lived left-wing democratic newspaper, *Progress*. Of these intellectuals only Leon Rzewuski was pro-socialist and ready to acknowledge Ruthenians' right for to self-determination. These his thoughts, however, were unacceptable even for his own newspaper.³³ The Ruthenian discourse remained monarchist but was anti-feudal; it hoped that the peasantry, getting rid of the chains of feudal relationships, would become a public, one represented in politics (by the movement), and conscious of its nationality.

The Polish discourse in 1848 reflected the fear of having to deal with the peasantry and shied away from imagining it altogether. Just as it had problems with imagining the peasantry, it had difficulty imagining Ruthenians. The newly created pro-Polish Ruthenian Assembly, being itself an acknowledgment of a certain distinctiveness of Ruthenians, had a hard time with explaining this distinctiveness, translating it into the languages of a purposeful history, liberal politics and national principles. The discourse could not go any deeper than addressing the population as "brothers Ruthenians." In fact, the Assembly was not engaged into a discussion with the bulk of the Ruthenian population, and talked rather to fellow Ruthenians "misled" into an anti-Polish position. In this respect the activity of the Ruthenian movement was more to the point.

³² Baltazar Szczucki, *Widkie sia wzięła Slachta, Pany, Panszczyzna i piddani* (Lwiv: 11.05.1848).

³³ Brock, *Polish Revolutionary Populism*, 71.

The Polish discourse and Polish Ruthenians were constantly struggling with the Ruthenianness inside of the Polish nation. The concept of *gente Ruthene nationae Polonae* was brought up, but when applied properly did not leave much space for Ruthenian distinctiveness – many members of the Assembly were examples of this.³⁴ There was little space for accommodating difference in this process of making a nation in spite of the state. The Ruthenians at this moment did not have this problem: a clear separation from the Poles left quite homogenous community. The problem would come later with the need to define the eastern limits of the nation, with the choice between Russian and Ukrainian identity. Right now the Other of the Ruthenian discourse was the Polish nation, close enough to observe and clear enough to oppose. The other of the pro-Polish or Polish-Ruthenian discourse was the Muscovites, but these were far away and too abstract.³⁵ And Austrian bureaucracy, another enemy of the Polish discourse, whom which the Polish movement in its popular publications tried to separate from the person of monarch, was in fact the cradle of all Ruthenian intellectuals (including pro-Polish figures like Ivan Vahylevych). The Ruthenian clergy itself, as a result of the Josephinian reforms, to large extent became merely a fraction of that bureaucracy.

There were still some remains of the rhetoric of revolutionary egalitarianism in the Polish discourse. A pro-Polish poem was stated: “We are brothers for the Poles and Poland is our mother// all will be equal after Poland is resurrected.”³⁶ But this rhetoric had not advanced since 1846, but rather degraded; it was compromised precisely by this connection with 1846. Publications referring to 1846 were exceptional the discourse in general tried to remain silent about 1846.³⁷ Most of the publications were very ambivalent in their representation of the peasants. On the one hand, authors wanted to see peasants on their side, on the other hand – by now there were no illusions about the peasantry eagerly joining the Polish national cause. Most celebrated revolutionaries of 1846 era, like Horoszkiewicz and Ciegliewicz, completely changed their views on social question, and beginning with 1848 we can speak about them as about

³⁴ On the concept of *gente Ruthene nationae Polonae* as nineteenth century invention see David M. Althoen, That Noble Quest: From True Nobility to Enlightened Society in The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, 1550-1830, v.1 and 2 (Ph. D dissertation: University of Michigan, Ann Arbor).

³⁵ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.70, a.2-4. See also Holos świta do brati Rusnakiw! (1848), which ends with “*Hodi tobi Moskwytyne panowaty nad namy ... Chłopci na konia, Byty Moskala.*”

³⁶ [Podolak z za Kordonu], Pisń o Wyszniowskim (Lwów: z drukarni Ossolińskich, 1848).

³⁷ One of the exceptions was [Celestyn Srokowski?], C...t.n S...r...i, Na czest' bratej powernuwszych z newoli, 2.09.1848.

conservatives.³⁸ Ivan Franko wrote that recent revolutionaries and democrats forgot about “the people” and started proving that there were only Polish gentry and no Polish people.³⁹

The Polish movement in 1848 also preferred more moderate and appeasing politics towards the government.⁴⁰ The group of 1846 radical revolutionaries was literally decimated by 1846:

Emissaries and political activists proclaiming slogans of political liberty and equality, as well as the abolition of *robot*, inviting peasants into the cooperation in order to materialize these intentions, died at peasant hands or were turned by them into the hands of the Austrian government, were hanged from gallows or filled the prisons.⁴¹

This ambivalence about peasants is seen in the Polish brochure “Publication of a Constitution to the Ruthenian Peasants by a German in the year 1848.” Both Polish hopes and fears were projected onto the peasantry. On the one hand, peasants allegedly understood the revolution as an opportunity to kick the Germans out. The German in this brochure is sure that *Attentata*, an insurgent from 1846 must have incited peasants against the Germans. The German reassures the peasants that the German bureaucracy will endure the crisis and help peasants against landlords: “*Beamter* will always be and take care that no one takes the stake out of peasant hands.” The peasant answers that it was a German who incited them against the landlords (ordered them to stand a night guard around the manor), but now they do not see any reason to continue this antagonism (they would cancel that the night guard service). Thus the brochure hoped that peasants would not go against the Polish movement this time. But this neutral position was not presented as informed by national consciousness. The brochure describes the peasant community as dense: peasants were afraid to sign *Publikations-Protokoll*, and understood the freedom of publication as the freedom

³⁸ Włodzimierz Borys, “Z dziejów walk o wyzwolenie narodowe i społeczne Galicji w pierwszej połowie XIX w.,” *Przemyskie zapiski historyczne*, R.4-5, 1987, 224.

³⁹ Ivan Franko, “Halyts’ka indemnizatsiia,” *Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.44 kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 93.

⁴⁰ Michał Śliwa, “Rok 1846 w Galicji i późniejsza Rewolucja 1848,” in Władysław Wic (ed.), *Rok 1848. Wiosna Ludów w Galicji. Zbiór studiów*, (Akademia Pedagogiczna im. Komisji Edukacji Narodowej w Krakowie, Prace Monograficzne, Nr.27) (Kraków, 1999), 15.

⁴¹ Jan Putek, *Pierwsze występy włościanstwa polskiego, 1848-1861* (Kraków: nakładem Domu Ludowego „Wisła” w Krakowie), 7.

of the stick, (*druka-driuka*).⁴² Polish hopes were placed not in peasant consciousness but in its absence and in the weakness of peasant action.

Polish discourse from the very beginning did not express much optimism about peasants and in this differed remarkably from the discourse of Austrian liberals. Polish democratic parties were based on the petty bourgeoisie and townsfolk, while the so-called Polish Ruthenians to large extent were controlled by the Polish gentry – Ruthenian “renegades” from the Ruthenian Assembly made their living as clients of Polish magnates. The whole Polish movement in 1848 was based on a compromise with the Polish landowning gentry, the influence of this gentry on the movement foreshadowed the gentry’s hegemony of the 1860s.

If the Ruthenian nationalist rhetoric of 1848 was so mature why there was so little success achieved in the nationalization of the masses? Why did this discourse have so little impact on the peasantry? Why was the movement so weak and so short-lived? The movement itself explained these shortcomings by serfdom, by the sufferings and the oppressions, from which the peasantry had never recovered. But serfdom was not the only legacy left from pre-1848 era. In my opinion, the legacy of the absolutist monarchy was of much greater importance.

Legacy of Absolutism

We shall proceed from the top to bottom, starting with the social group, to which the overwhelming majority of Ruthenian activists belonged, and moving down to peasants. The activists of the Ruthenian movement could not but be unaffected by the position in which they were placed by the Austrian absolutism; they, could not remain outside of the languages employed by the system. And these activists were priests. Analyzing the Ruthenian movement in 1848 we must not forget that for more than half a century Greek Catholic priests were the only state employees working directly with and inside of the peasant communities. Other officials who were in contact with the peasantry resided in manors and were first of all manorial, and only then – state employees. In 1848 priests were the only people with higher education to communicate with the communities (as a rule no manorial official had possessed even a gymnasium level education). On the one hand, this position provided the clergy direct access to the peasantry, on the other hand, it imbued priests with the language of absolutism, and accustomed them to a specific way of addressing peasants.

There are two sides in the absolutist state’s influence on clergy. The first one is the clergy’s position as lower state officials, supposed not only to provide a

⁴² *Publikacja konstytucji chłopom Rusinom przez Komisarza Niemca w roku 1848* (L’viv: Ossolineum, 1848).

pastoral care but also to maintain order and help in controlling the peasantry. Religion was not just about one's conscience but was one of the foundations of the state. Religion was considered to be a duty of the subjects just as *robot* was.⁴³ Besides this ideological role, the priest was responsible for the registers of births, marriages and deaths, and kept statistics on the peasantry vital for the army conscription. We must remember that in the absolutist state the peasantry was valued as state's most important source of income and also as the main source of its manpower. Besides keeping statistics on this manpower, priests were also responsible for its peasants' spiritual and physical health. In the absence of the certified medical specialists in the countryside, priests were the only representatives of official medicine. The basics of the medical science were part of their education, and they were required to establish the causes of one's death before entering it in the register. When in 1848 the governor Stadion, in his letter to Bishop Iakhymovych from 18 May 1848, spoke about the clergy as about those maintaining law and order in the communities, he was referring not to the role that the priests suddenly assumed in 1848, but to the functions they were fulfilling in the village communities under the absolutist system, functions which they continued to fulfill despite the general disorganization of the state administration.⁴⁴

The second aspect of the state's influence was the acceptance and internalization by the priests of the attitudes and politics the state employed towards peasantry. This complex of the attitudes and practices shaped priests' own position in 1848. Since the time of Maria-Theresia and Joseph II, the state had shown great interest in the peasantry and targeted peasants with its politics. This intervention of the state was a lasting and purposeful effort. For a short time, during the reign of Joseph II, the peasantry was actually central to the politics of the state. Joseph II considered peasants to be first of all subjects of the state, and only then of landlords.⁴⁵ Usually, in the historiography only the great reforms involving the regulation of landholdings and *robot*, the introduction of cadastre, and the system of appeals to the state authorities are mentioned.⁴⁶ But this intervention was aimed at transforming all aspects of peasants' lives.

For example, there was an order for the priests to distract boys and girls in the pastures from the games in which both sexes took part and which, it was thought,

⁴³ Jan Świątek, *Brzozowa i okolica...* cz.IV (Wrocław, 2000), 123.

⁴⁴ See printed copy of the letter: "Vsechestniishyi Kyr Iepyskope," pro.6425 in LNB.

⁴⁵ Ivan Franko, "Panshchyna ta її skasuvannia 1848 r. V Halychyni," *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.47 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 99.

⁴⁶ For good description of these see Roman Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze w dawnej Galicji*, 2 vs. (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962).

could lead to immorality.⁴⁷ Of course, this order in the particular circumstances at the end of the eighteenth century was impossible to execute, but it must have influenced priests' attitudes to certain phenomena of peasant life. Some other orders were too theoretical and made no sense in the Galician circumstances, as for example, the order not to overfeed children, which the priests were supposed to watch out for.⁴⁸ Decrees like that were usually used in Polish gentry historiography to show how detached from the real life in Galicia bureaucratic machine and its projects were. Nonetheless, peasants indeed experienced many other changes aimed not at the regulation of their social status and obligations but at "civilizing" of the countryside.

The Austrian government introduced the first state roads, administration, measurements, and new system of taxes were brought here by the Austrian government. These new taxes meant not just the extraction of the surplus of production; they also meant the introduction of the concept of productivity. The difference in productivity was represented, as determining profit. In the first cadastre the quality of land was determined on the basis of peasant testimonies about how much this or that parcel of land produced in recent years. The Josephinian cadastre stabilized the system of land parcels, fixing the agricultural landscape of the province for a century and half; it made individual landholding the only acceptable form of agriculture. In some places even the first dug-out wells appeared at the end of the eighteenth century (as in the village of Berehy, where prior to this the drinking water was stored in the barrels which were filled directly from the river).⁴⁹ In most of the villages sanitary reorganizations of the cemeteries, and the rearrangement of farm buildings in respect of public space (sewage ditches) were introduced at the end of the eighteenth and at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Besides these very material changes occurring in the village communities, other sites of transformation were connected with the mode of dealing with peasantry. Physical violence was widespread and the state employed its power to force peasants to work on manors. But the regime was also employing a set of practices aimed at supervising the peasantry, which was seen not just as a resource of free labor for the manors, but also as the source of state income and state's manpower, whose prosperity was vital for the prosperity of the state; although from the state's perspective it remained a rowdy and dangerous, undifferentiated

⁴⁷ Zofia Strzetelska Grynbergowa, *Staromijeskie: Ziemia i ludność*, (Lwów: Nakładem Muzeum imienia Dzieduszyckich z drukarni E. Winiarza, 1899), 336.

⁴⁸ Zofia Strzetelska Grynbergowa, *Staromicjskie*, 335.

⁴⁹ Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv Sambirs'koho povitu* (Sambir: vydavnytstvo chytal'ni „Prosvity” v Berehakh ch.1, nakladom kul'turnykh ustanov sela: Chytal'ni Prosvity, Kooperatyvy „Iednist”, Kasy „Selians'ka pomich” i kruzhka „Sil's'koho hospodaria, 1935), 36.

mass. To control this mass the government, in addition to the estates exercising patrimonial jurisdiction, organized peasant communities as administrative units, which were growing in importance throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, and to which the state power could be more effectively applied. The division between rustical and dominical land made the peasantry visible and distinct from the estates, its economic potential being measurable and protected. There is evidence that the absolutist government indeed was applying measures to defend landlords' subjects in concrete cases as well. Between 1781 and 1829 landlords paid 84,818 Gulden for abusing their subjects and 122,262 Gulden as compensation to their abused subjects.⁵⁰

These measures created a situation, in which individual peasants, being landlords' subjects, were not immediate objects of the application of state power techniques. There was neither the need nor resources to subjectify them; the only peasants to undergo this process were army recruits, who even after returning to their villages remained visibly distinct. In such a situation there was very little either state or manor intervention inside of the community. Limiting their objective to the extraction of labor force, landlords were not interested in the further supervision of the individual peasants as well, and preferred to deal with peasant communities. Just like as the state, in the case of the need to suppress peasants, pacified entire communities, the landlords ordered the fulfillment of certain tasks to the communities as a whole. And although during *robot* work individual coercion was used, the general organization of the *robot* work went through the community as a whole.

It is interesting that a community which for many Galician Ukrainian socialists and populists was an example of primeval communism and a potential basis for a more just social order was to large extent the creation of an enlightened absolutism. Already at the end of the eighteenth century the decline of the system when villages were exchanging periodically pasture and arable lands was far advanced. Most of the communities switched only to holding some common pasture. Nineteenth century practices were the result of the growing intervention from the state and the manor, as part of that state, rather than the continuation of

⁵⁰ Ivan Franko, "Panshchyna ta її skasuvannia 1848 r. v Halychyni," 45. That Enlightened Absolutism indeed alleviated the situation of *robot* subjects and curtailed power of the landlords was proven in Roman Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze*. Franko's data shows that even during the reaction to the reforms of Enlightened Absolutism, many of its achievements were preserved and subjects still resort to the circular authorities in their conflicts with the landlords, despite the fact that now it was more difficult. This continuity in state politics and lasting influence of absolutism was something Polish gentry historians were stressing for quite some time. See, for example, Bronisław Łoziński, "Z czasów i akt dominikalnych. (Przyczynek do historii administracji w Galicyi)," *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, t.20, 1906, 266-286.

some “primitive communism.”⁵¹ In the 1840s for Polish reformers and revolutionaries it was clear that the community was an instrument in the hands of state administration more than anything else. That is why the projects of the creation of “joint” communities, which would include both manor and village, were advanced.⁵²

The intervention of the government transformed the old system of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and reshuffled social identities in the countryside. While the peasantry as an estate was treated juridically as a uniform mass and its social boundaries did not change in comparison with Polish times (although even there the distinction between landlords’ and state peasants was growing), this was not the case with other strata of population. There were landlords, whose privileges were acknowledged by the state, but they did not necessarily had to be gentry. The nobility had to prove its status, and there were petty gentry whose rights as a rule were contested by the government. Despite the fact that the government exempted petty gentry who proved their nobility documentary from army service and all those enjoying gentry status back in the Commonwealth did not have to do *robot* in the new state as well, the status of rustical petty gentry declined and the process, which scholars have defined as “declassation” of the petty gentry, had advanced far by 1848.⁵³

For the Austrian government, with its new evaluation of various social groups, based not only on their origin but also on their role in the state, the rustic gentry looked too much like the peasantry. The state did not have any interest in the maintenance of that gentry’s special status. In many cases estates’ administration, as parts of the governmental structure, had been siding with peasants and against the petty gentry, which tried to defend its former privileges. For example, in 1822 the petty gentry in the village of Torhanovychi complained to the estate about village mayor’s order to do night guard duty together with peasants. In this complaint the petty gentry were asking the estate “to look into this and to protect us from the peasants’ ridicule because it would be the worst disgust (*obyda*) for us gentry to join together with peasants.” But the estate in this case supported the peasants, recognized the mayor’s order as a legitimate one, and ordered the petty gentry to obey it.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Roman Rozdolski, *Wspólnota gminna w b. Galicji wschodniej i jej zanik*, (Badania z dziejów społecznych i gospodarczych po redakcją prof. Fr. Bujaka, Nr.27) (Lwów, 1936).

⁵² Erazm Kostołowski, *Studia nad kwestią włościańską w latach 1846-1864. Ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem literatury politycznej*, (Badania z dziejów społecznych i gospodarczych po redakcją prof. Fr. Bujaka, Nr.33) (Lwów, 1938), 278-279.

⁵³ Krzysztof Ślusarek, *Drobna szlachta*, 143.

⁵⁴ Strzetelska Grynbergowa, *Staromiejskie*, 344.

The Austrian absolutism, while declassing the mass of petty gentry, also gave some of them an opportunity to advance. The Sozański family, the most important family among nineteenth century landlords in the Sambir district, was of petty gentry origin. At the end of the eighteenth century Michał Sozański from the village of Sozan' appropriated some common land from the petty gentry community, to which he belonged, and soon became the owner of the estate of another petty gentry village, Bachyna. Having secured the political rights of a landlord, he built the first tavern in that village, took over the right of propination and forbade petty gentry free fishing in Dnister. He also appropriated some common meadows and several parcels of forest in Bachyna. The struggle of the petty gentry community with Sozański, when the community attempted to enforce its decision not to allow Sozański the usage of former common land, ended with the squadron of hussars being stationed in the village.⁵⁵ Adam, the son of Michał Sozański, continued to exploit local petty gentry using the acquisitions of his father, built two more taverns and a brewery. The local petty gentry sued the landlord, but all the court decisions and administrative resolutions favored Adam Sozański. The son of Adam Sozański was Antoni, a local politician and Polish bibliographer, whom we shall meet later in this thesis.⁵⁶

Having until recently enjoyed the privileges of the Polish nobility, it seems that the petty gentry proved more apt to defend its rights than the peasantry. Franko says that many of the so-called peasant plenipotentiaries were of petty gentry origin. (This again reminds us of the fact that the plenipotentiaries, who came to life together with the establishment of state circle administration, to which appeals against landlords could be made, were representatives not of the peasantry in general but of particular communities). As an example Ivan Franko proposes a certain Dulski, who walked once on foot from the Drohobych district to Vienna and more than 20 times to L'viv.⁵⁷ This also shows that local landlords quite often were the enemy of both petty gentry and the peasantry. Many clusters of the petty gentry did not constitute separate communities but were parts of the peasant communities. We have testimonies about petty gentry who felt their distinctiveness very much, and nevertheless criticized *robot* system and the landlords, and characterized *robot* as unjust. According to Rev. Iosyf Iavors'kyi, this was the case with his grandfather, a veteran of the Napoleonic wars.⁵⁸ This

⁵⁵ Antoni Schneider, Encyklopedia do krajoznawstwa Galicyi po wzgledem historycznym, statystycznym, topograficznym, orograficznym, handlowym, przemyslowym, sfragistycznym, etc., etc., t.2, zeszyt 7 (Lwów: z drukarni J. Dobrzańskiego, 1874), 288.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 289.

⁵⁷ Ivan Franko, "Zapysky ruskoho selianyna z pochatku XIX v.," ZNTSh, t.115 (L'viv, 1913), 157.

⁵⁸ LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.90, a.2.

should not be seen as contradicting previous chapter's argument about peasant action as developing in the framework of the *robot* system and unable to transcend it: "the claim is not that one's fated condition is loved, only that it is here to stay whether one likes it or not."⁵⁹

Enlightened absolutism's approach to the peasantry had many inherent tensions. On the one hand, the monarchy was siding with landlords, on the other hand, in the Galician case these landlords were not that reliable as Poles. On the one hand, the state had to guarantee and reinforce the extraction of peasant labor, on the other hand, in line with the cameralist thinking, the state had to protect peasants as an estate on which the well-being of the state depended. Despite all its unwillingness to do so, the state had to sort out these contradictions in a viable conceptualization, with which the peasantry could be acquainted and which would be acceptable to the landlords as well. And indeed such conceptualizations were made and brought to peasant knowledge.

The most widely known such a conceptualization was Catechism of the Galician subjects on Their Duties Towards Government, Manor and Them Themselves. The very title of this book reflected the compromise between the authority of the state and the authority of the landlords. The book stated that subject-dependency was a widespread phenomenon, known among ancient people as well as among contemporary Englishmen, Swedes, Russians, Hungarians, Germans, Italians, Frenchmen, "and in the whole world." It was stressed that subject-dependency is not the same as slavery.⁶⁰ Starting with duties towards the government – tax, army service, transport and housing obligations towards those in governmental service, participation in public construction work, the book went on to discuss peasants' duties towards the manor, among which *robot* was of foremost importance.

The customary character of *robot* and its origin in a mutual agreement between the landlord and peasant settlers were stressed. Because of this its origin, *robot* could not be regulated universally, but only on the basis of concrete estate inventories. Discussing various additional obligations, issues of personal freedom, common pastures and so on, the book stressed not only peasant duties but also their rights, ways and methods to deal with the perceived injustice. Proper procedure was emphasized as being of the foremost importance. The conclusion of the book was:

For the rights and obligations of the Galician subjects described here, these subjects should become convinced that they remain under the special patronage of the Government, which defends them from all kinds of

⁵⁹ James C. Scott, Domination and the Arts of Resistance (London, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 75.

⁶⁰ Leliw Słotwiński, Katechizm poddanych galicyjskich o prawach i powinnościach ich względem Rządu, Dworu i samych siebie (Lwow, 1832), 4.

oppression and does not allow injustice to be done to them; let them only be obeying, laborious, diligent and attentive, and they will have open all kinds of ways to seek remedy for the injustice against them. One and the most important duty of the subject is complete obedience to any Supremacy; no one can sin with obedience, and even if one suffers because of it, the suffering will be properly rewarded in the prescribed way... And on the other side, the smallest disobedience leads to insolence, insolence to the uprising and uprising to the crime, and because nothing can go unpunished, such a subject loses his property, good name and freedom. No subject should dream in his head that with the resistance he can prove something against the law, because the Government possesses the means to pacify even the most stubborn subjects and whole communities, even the largest.⁶¹

This kind of knowledge was provided to subjects most often through the school system, although some other means, like speeches of the estate and state officials, and priests' talks, could be also used. In 1817 the booklet Duties of the Subjects Towards Their Monarch was published and for a long time remained the only book printed in Ruthenian in Galicia. This was the textbook for parish schools.⁶² And there indeed were quite a few schools, in which this book had to be studied.

The school reform started under Maria Theresia and was developed under Joseph II. In theory, every village, in which at least 90-100 children of school age could be found in the distance of half an hour walk from the school building, was supposed to have its own school. Many villages did not qualify for a school, being either too extended and dispersed (Mshanets') or too small (Morozovychi). This, however, did not prevent some children in these villages from being sent to the schools in the neighboring villages. In 1805 the reforms slowed down because of the Napoleonic wars, and school supervision was transferred to the Church authorities. In 1812 obligatory elementary schooling was abolished, and this date can be seen as the end of the first attempt to introduce mass schooling in the Galician countryside. Attempts to develop elementary schools were renewed in 1817 under the initiative of the Church authorities.⁶³

In 1817 "trivial" (*trivialschule* as opposed to "main" *hauptschule*) schools existed in Khyriv, Linyana, Stril'bychi, Strashevychi and Bilych.⁶⁴ According to another source, in 1817, there also were trivial schools in Babyna, Prusy, Dorozhiv,

⁶¹ Ibid., 178-179.

⁶² Ivan Fylypchak, Roman Lukan', *Ts. K. Okružna Holovna shkola v Lavrovi 1788/89-1910/11. Istorychna monohrafiia*, (Biblioteka „Zapysok ChSVV,” ch.15) (L'viv: nakladom redaktsii “Zapysok ChSVV”, 1936), 53.

⁶³ Teodor Bilen'kyi, “Shkil'nytstvo narodne v peremyskii eparkhii v r.1848 i 1849,” *Ruslan*, 1902, No.199.

⁶⁴ Zofia Strzetelska Grynbergowa, *Staromiejskie*, 337.

Stril'bychi, and Limna. The teacher in such a state-funded school had received 250 Gulden a year and was supposed to teach in German, Polish and Church Slavonic. Besides these state schools, there were numerous parish and community schools, which technically corresponded to the level of trivial schools but were not state-sponsored. Berehy, for example, had had a parish school since the end of the eighteenth century. Although there seemed to be a decline in the number of schools in the 1820s-1840s, their number still remained significant. In 1856-1860 in the vicinity of the city of Sambir alone there were three Ruthenian elementary schools: Babyna (trivial), Radlovychi (community school) and Berehy (parish school).⁶⁵

The decline of schooling was due not so much to the decrease in the number of schools, but to the fact that many state schools were turned from state into parish. Parish schools were intended for the community and provided the knowledge necessary at the community level; those who thought about continuing their education had to attend state schools. This was the case with Ivan Franko, who attended a state school in Iasenytisia Sil'na, and not the parish school in Nahuievychi.⁶⁶ Other sources seem to confirm progress in elementary schooling in the area up to around approximately 1820.⁶⁷ The decline which started in the 1820s seems to have been caused by the change in the development of a more negative attitude towards schools amongst the rural clergy. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi explains this change by the general economic crisis felt by the local rural clergy particularly badly.⁶⁸ On the other hand, the change of the clergy's attitude can also be explained by the lifting of state control from rural schools and the betterment of the relationships between the rural clergy and estates' officials, which was part of the rural clergy's social transformation.

In 1805 the government published "Information for the Local School Guardians," which was an instruction on the content of education in elementary schools. According to this instruction, peasants, just as all other Emperor's other subjects, had to learn religion, and the first part of education consisted of the catechism. The second part included an introduction to the art of husbandry, a lecture on the duties of the subject to the monarch and landlord, to "other leaders," and, finally, a lecture on the soldier's status. This shows the hierarchy of state priorities in respect of to the peasants' knowledge. Religion was the

⁶⁵ Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv*, 51.

⁶⁶ I. I. Bass and A. A. Kaspruk, *Ivan Franko: zhyttievyi i tvorchyi shliakh* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1983), 12.

⁶⁷ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Kartyna do istorii shkil'nytstva v Halychyni na pochatku XIX viku," *Dilo*, 1900, 21.02 (2.02).

⁶⁸ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Dekanal'ni i parokhiial'ni biblioteky Peremys'koi eparkhii," *ZNTSh*, t.90 (L'viv, 1909), 135.

foremost priority, providing the moral foundations for peaceful and responsible behavior; then the peasant had to be a diligent farmer, contributing to the state's economic prosperity; and finally he had to know some basics about social order, focused on the monarch and landlord. Army service had to be especially promoted, because of peasants' reluctance to serve, and great efforts to avoid service, sometimes even by means of self-inflicted mutilation. Those drafted into the army from the peasantry as a rule did not advance even to the rank of sergeant. In the 1820s in the village in Mshanets' only one peasant reached the rank of a corporal and because the case was so extraordinary, *Kapral'* became his surname. An important thing to remember is that those among rustical petty gentry whose families passed the process of legitimating their noble status, were exempt from army service.⁶⁹

According to the cited above "Information," the goal of elementary schooling was following:

The school has to implant the fruit seed, from which they will grow into good Christians, and therefore useful and willing workers, prudent farmers, good spouses, wise Fathers, amiable neighbors, respectful and staying on their own income economically independent people, quiet and loyal subjects, respecting the Monarch and Their Own Landlords, as well as ready executioners of the law.

We should acknowledge that this school system did not intervene too much into the lives of peasants. Teachers of the majority of village schools (the so-called parish schools), usually were cantors. The same cantors were the most literate people among peasants. They had access to the liturgical books and holy language of these books, Church Slavonic. But this literacy was different from the institutionalized literacy of the system. The institute for cantors established by Bishop Snihurs'kyi to improve and standardize cantors' performance could not give anything comparable to priests' education. Cantors' knowledge and worldview was very different from the one the state expected from its teachers to propagate. Cantors were "carnavalesque" figures in village life. They were creators of a particular discourse containing bits and pieces of learned Church Slavonic mixed with the humor in the vernacular.⁷⁰ They were part of the not totally entirely oral but nevertheless traditional vernacular culture, of something that could be called "popular" in accord with the tradition, discerning in "popular" distinctiveness and the resources to resist.

⁶⁹ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Prychynky do istorii rekruchchyny v Halychyni pry kintsi XVIII i do polovyny XIX stolittia," t.42, *ZNTSh* (L'viv, 1901), 2-9.

⁷⁰ Ivan Verkhrats'kyi, "Z diakivs'koi literatury," *ZNTSh*, t.113 (L'viv, 1913), 147.

Written texts – various books, local chronicles - circulated in the countryside. Despite the fact that no one cared too much about preserving them quite a few were found at the end of the nineteenth century in the region in which we are interested in. Various apocryphal fragments, such as the lives of Adam and Eve, Samson, Basilii the Great and others circulated in the manuscript collections.⁷¹ Zofia Strzelecka Grynbergowa found a manuscript, a kind of peasant (petty gentry) “*silva rerum*” (that is how similar eighteenth century manuscript collections circulating among upper classes are called) in Topil'nytsia.⁷² From 1804 we have some notes for the petty gentry woman Kasia Krechkovska from Kindrativ found by Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi as well as extended notes of a peasant, Andrii Lemets', on his family misfortunes.⁷³ These peasant books quite often included songs, Ukrainian and Polish, folk as well as religious songs and those directed against vodka. Petty gentry books often included texts of various charters and privileges.⁷⁴ Other books contained charms, magic recipes, and “interesting advices for young people, which are not suitable for publication.”⁷⁵ There were separate manuscript collections of the religious songs that changed their owners frequently.⁷⁶

Some authors state that the petty gentry were educated better than the peasantry. The petty gentry allegedly had higher number of the experienced and literary people.⁷⁷ However, this “education” and “literacy” were on the peasant side of a great divide between the institutionalized and the vernacular. Books, owned and copied, songs sung, even if in some cases different from those owned by peasants, were part of the local knowledge, not fitting well either into Polish nobility's or state projects and narratives.

In the village of Hordynia a school was officially established in 1791 but actually working since around 1820. Rev. Vasyl' Ianovs'kyi (1788-1846), the priest of *antiqua educatio* (i. e. without regular education introduced by Habsburgs) taught here. Rev. Ianovs'kyi was replaced by Rev. Nykolai Horodys'kyi but the latter did not have to teach at the school, since local landlord, Maria L. baroness Verenko,

⁷¹ Hryhorii Dem'ian, “Malovidomi storinky zhyttia i naukovoï pratsi Mykhaila Zubryts'koho,” *ZNTSh*, t.222, (Pratsi seksii etnohrafii i fol'klorystyky) (L'viv, 1992), 181.

⁷² Zofia Strzetelska Grynbergowa, *Staromieskie*, 330.

⁷³ Ivan Franko, “Zapysky rus'koho selianyna z pochatku XIX v.,” *ZNTSh*, 1913, v.115, 155-166.

⁷⁴ Zofia Strzetelska Grynbergowa, *Staromieskie*, 545-550.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 553-555.

⁷⁶ Volodymyr Hnatiuk, “Kil'ka dukhovnykh virshiv,” *ZNTSh*, 1903, v.56, 26. Many of the manuscripts with texts circulating among Ruthenian peasants can be found in VR LNB, f.NTSh, spr. 349-370, 726/7.

⁷⁷ Ivan Franko, “Zapysky ruskoho selianyna z pochatku XIX v.,” 157.

left a donation to fund a separate cantor-teacher. This particular landlord was very unusual because of the friendly relationships with the petty gentry. She organized games and dances for the petty gentry participating in them herself. Andrii Chaikovs'kyi born in Hordynia, depicted her in the novel In the Foreign Nest (*V chuzhomu hnizdi*). With the help of this donation teaching in Hordynia school improved in the second half of the nineteenth century.⁷⁸

In many cases the situation in the state schools was not better. In the village of Stril'bychi, the first school teacher was Teodor Kulczycki, *magister*, but there was no memory about him in the village by the beginning of the twentieth century, although he was teaching there from around 1805 to 1840 (the school was officially founded in 1791). School records show that the attendance was poor, and the teacher kept his school journals in Polish in spite of the prevalence of German in the school system.⁷⁹

It seems that primary schooling in the villages was rather formal, and peasants by and large were not interested in schools. The necessary knowledge could be taken from other sources, even if written not connected with the school cannon. Peasants understood that schools were gates to the upper world and social mobility was connected with them. If the parents saw the interest of a child in schooling, they could ask a cantor-teacher to take special care of their child and teach him more seriously because they were going to send the child to city schools.⁸⁰ However, there was no place for this school knowledge in peasants' own world.

It was during the first half of the nineteenth century that Ruthenian parish clergy became divorced from the common "village culture." While in the eighteenth century priests were reading the same liturgical texts and apocrypha, singing the same songs, in general this was no longer the case in 1848. The material culture of priests became that of petty bourgeoisie; the texts they read changed to printed and urban, and they themselves thought that they had little in common with peasants (except for nationality, for some of them). Such a change had fundamental implications. First of all, it made possible the appearance of the Ruthenian nationalism in 1848, secondly, it placed this other culture directly in the midst of the peasants to observe, compare, evaluate, copy, oppose, or accept.

The change occurring in 1848 had influence on the curriculum of village schools. The new textbook printed in 1848 can give us some idea of both the

⁷⁸ Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Hordyni. Narys z istorii shkil'nytstva*, (Pedahohichno-metodychna biblioteka, vypusk 7) (L'viv: nakladom tovarystva „Vzaimna pomich ukrains'koho vchytel'stva,” 1938), 7-8.

⁷⁹ Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Strilbychakh. Narys z istorii shkil'nytstva* (L'viv, 1936), 4, 7.

⁸⁰ Ivan Fylypchak, "Z istorii shkil'nytstva na zakhidnii Boikivshchyni (1772-1930)," *Litopys Boikivshchyny*, 1931, No.1, 84.

traditional politics of the absolutist monarchy in respect to the peasants and of how the languages of 1848 fitted into these politics. The textbook for the elementary village schools, readings included, starts with the rules of behavior in school, with a set of prescriptions: how to clean, how to greet the teacher and other people, how to sit, how to keep things, how to behave in the church and so on. From these prescriptions the textbook then discusses to the behavior outside of school, about taking care of general public discipline and taking care of one's own safety.⁸¹

There was an emphasis on punishments for bad behavior and encouragements for the good behavior:

Fulfill all these rules willingly and punctually. Those who will work against them will be punished according to the circumstances: with secret or public orders and threats [the Ukrainian language was not developed yet so probably in this case they would later use the word "reprimands" instead of "threats"], retraction of the cards of diligence, depriving of the honors' seat, of the honors' sign, exclusion from the honors' service, sitting or standing in the special place, deletion from the honors' book, acceptance or inscription in the disgrace book, and even punishment with the birch or rod. Besides this, those punished will have a bad mark in morals and those will not improve should be excluded from the school.⁸²

We see that school is seen as a system with a set of uniform rules. Children were supposed to get used to these rules and find them worth to obeying. The worst punishment provided here is the exclusion from the privileged space of the school. Thus, the state appears to be introducing new politics in the rural setting and becomes concerned with individual peasants, who had to be trained in a certain way, so that their behavior becomes controlled by the set of internalized rules and not only by the community. The state is no longer concerned only with the basics of morality and an appropriate for peasants knowledge but also with the disciplining of an individual.

After the explanation of the rules of this micro-system, an explanation of the ideology of Austrian Absolutism follows. It starts with 165 pages of Biblical stories from the Old Testament. This is the main body of textual knowledge, the main set of references to be used by pupils. Then we have an introduction to the natural history, which starts with the words "who of all us would not love to cognize more closely all these various things which beloved God for our good

⁸¹ Knyzhka do chytaniia dlia druhoi klasiy uchylyshch sel'skykh v c. k. avstriiskykh Derzhavakh (Viden': Izdaniem ts. k. shkolnoho Knyhopravytel'stva u S. Anny v ulytsi Ivannovoi, 1848), 3-12.

⁸² Ibid., 12.

created?”⁸³ Pupils were taught to be deeply pious, but at the same time – conscious of the cognitive potential of their individual reason with the help of which they could understand things better. This idea of individual self-consciousness was new and there is nothing like that in the texts for the peasantry from the previous period.

God’s wisdom and goodness are more amazingly manifested in the fact that people in all the corners of the world, under all kinds of climate, can live happily if they only use wisely and moderately the gifts of nature prepared for them by God, control their bodily inclinations and passions, are able to control them, fulfill exactly God’s commandments and see their own happiness and blessedness only in God’s love and goodness.⁸⁴

Again, there is an emphasis on self-discipline based on self-consciousness, self-discipline that leads to happiness. After this general introduction we find a more concrete part on how exactly the well-being of the people has to be created. This part is entitled “Duties of the subjects towards their monarch, towards the leaders appointed by him, and to the motherland.” The references to the landlords from pre-1848 textbook are dropped. This chapter starts with the statement that there always must be someone to order things, “if everyone did whatever he liked, and there was no one with the will to order how everyone in the society should behave, there would be a disorder, disturbance and disagreement, and a family or a community would not be able to hold on.”⁸⁵ The monarch symbolizes law and order; he is an embodiment of the monarchy, or more accurately – of its government. Duties to the motherland in this text are separated from the duties to the monarch.

It is interesting that even later, peasants did not use the word *Tsisar* (Emperor, what was the standard reference to the Emperor in a vernacular) while speaking officially, but “Monarch,” something one could not find in the Russian Empire. This could indicate that the politics of absolutism succeeded in persuading peasantry that the Monarch is not just God’s hand on the Earth, but a necessary part of the state, and of the society based on that state. In this, the language of the Austrian absolutism was different from the language of Russian absolutism. The “naïve” monarchism of the Galician peasantry was very different from the “naïve” monarchism of the Russian peasantry and historically could be traced back to the very definite point – times of the Enlightened Absolutism. Before Galician Ruthenian became more standardized in line with Ukrainian from

⁸³ Ibid., 182.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 222-223.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 229-244.

Russian Empire the word used by the peasantry for “the law” was German *recht*, and not *pravo*, although the latter was used by the Ruthenian writers.⁸⁶

Being subjects to of the monarch and being conscious of that status, meant being citizens in relation to each other. Our textbook says that “Members of the civil society are called co-citizens and in the relation to their ruler they are called subjects.”⁸⁷ Similarly, laws and orders were taking care of the well-being of the whole society and of the whole land. There was some larger picture, larger secret of politics, which could not be proved true or false from the individual local standpoint: “Every citizen of the land separately cannot see the needs of all the subjects; therefore he cannot in many cases to see the reason why these or those laws and orders are issued by the ruler.”⁸⁸

There was also the discourse about territory: “The land in which one was born and raised up, or in which one settled forever is called motherland.” It was very important to love the motherland. One who loved the motherland would pay taxes and fulfill all the duties willingly because one understood the usefulness of these acts.⁸⁹ Such an attitude towards the motherland was supported by the references to the Christian faith. Love to the Motherland and service to it were presented as the only way to serve God.⁹⁰ The territorial communities of people were presented as natural, and bonding men together better than allegiances to the person of the ruler. Life was to be regulated by the law, not by the orders of the monarch, this law was restrictive, but necessary for happiness. Among the advices given to the youth in a versed form there was the following one: “The law must forbid us to do evil; // The law must teach us good; // Although it restricts our will. // But no one can be happy without it.”⁹¹

We see in this text significant changes brought by 1848, although most of the framework found in this book was laid down at the end of the eighteenth century. The most important part of that framework was the idea of the state itself. One of the Polish ethnographers working in one of the Galician villages at the end of the nineteenth century said: “there is no doubt that *robot* peasants before the partitions of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had no idea about state in proper meaning of the word.”⁹² It was the Austrian government that

⁸⁶ Franko to Shchasnyi Sel's'kyi, in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.48 (Kyiv: “Naukova dumka,” 1986), 87.

⁸⁷ *Knyzhka do chytnaniia dlia druhoi klassy uchylshch sel'skykh*, 230.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 231.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 234.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 239.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 246.

⁹² Jan Świątek, *Brzozowa i okolica... cz.IV* (Wrocław, 2000), 115-116.

introduced among peasants the idea of state authority. And although the very word “state” was not used too frequently, the Emperor in fact symbolized not so much the divine royal power as almighty authority of the state.

1848 witnessed the attempt to reformulate the position of the peasantry in the context of the revolutionary discourse. The textbook prepared for the schools in 1848 represented the language of the state appropriated and translated by the Ruthenian activists. Similarly, languages of the state were used and reworked by the Polish gentry. In 1848, the Austrian state’s ability to intervene in the Galician setting was the weakest it had ever been. While the textbook charted directions for the education of new state’s subjects, actual appeals to the peasantry in 1848 were composed in a way not different from the previous period. While all the references to the landlords were dropped from the new textbook for primary schools, landlords and manorial officials nonetheless were shaping the actual appeals made to the peasantry on behalf of the state.

The most important of these appeals was one on the abolition of *robot*. Contrary to what Alan Sked states about 1848,⁹³ the Austrian government did not use the language of class and did not incite class war against the unreliable landlords, at least not in Galicia. The text of the speech to the subjects during the proclamation of the patent on the abolition of *robot* proves that the government was still talking in terms of the paternalist patronage provided to the communities by the landlords. Communities were warned against unruly disturbances and were told to obey landlords’ as well as governmental authority.⁹⁴ It is interesting that local officials responsible for reading it to the peasants modified this speech at least in some places in favor of the Polish landlords.

During the revolution of 1848 the government had to rely on the officials who were more loyal to local landlords than to the state; indeed the very process of emancipation was mediated through them. That is why it does not seem to be true that the Stadion’s proclamations about the abolition of *robot* were accompanied by the emphasis on the peasant loyalty during the events of 1846.⁹⁵ We have a copy of the emancipation manifesto read to peasants with some important changes penciled changes by the official who read it. The manifesto is entitled “A speech to subjects on the publication of the circular about abolition of *robot* and other subjects’ duties.” The very first change made in pencil says that

⁹³ Alan Sked, *The Decline and Fall of the Habsburg Empire* (London, New York: Longman, 1989), 57-68, section “A Revolt of Nobility?”

⁹⁴ Ivan Franko, “Panshchyna ta її skasuvannia 1848 r. V Halychyni,” 85.

⁹⁵ This is stated in Oleh Turii, “Hreko-katolyts’ka tserkva i revoliutsiia 1848-1849 rr. u Halychyni,” in Władysław Wic (ed.), *Rok 1848. Wiosna Ludów w Galicji. Zbiór studiów*, (Akademia Pedagogiczna im. Komisji Edukacji Narodowej w Krakowie, Prace Monograficzne nr.27) (Kraków, 1999), 75. But he refers to other Polish works as well.

the Emperor finally gave the thing promised to the peasants by the landlords in 1846. Then it says:

For this gift, which you owe only to the well-wishing of the Most Enlightened Caesar... You should promise **the Most Enlightened Lord*** that you will preserve unchanging loyalty and that any tempting promises will not manage to weaken or shatter allegiance to the Most Enlightened Lord, and you will be obedient to the **governmental, namely Circular** orders and wishes because these authorities have as a goal only your and the general well-being, and nevertheless **are guardians of your rights, [of rights] of your landlords and all the population of this country**, you are called upon to **be obedient to the orders of your landlords and of the local authority**, you should be respectful of your landlord and his representative, and respect piously his person and his property.

The pencil correction after this inserts the following passage: “because the owners of the estates proposed their wishes about lightening of the burdens of subjects to the most Enlightened Emperor, they with this great benevolence gave you another reason to honor and respect their persons.” The task of the pencil corrections is to connect the Emperor with the landowners even more and to present the abolition of *robot* as the gift of both the Emperor and the landlords. Finally, the decree about the emancipation ends with the warning: “In the end you are ordered not only to be quiet, so as not to sow threats, not to harm another's property or assurance, but above that, together with the landlords to take care that no one else will do these things.”⁹⁶ It is interesting that even without the insertions of the pro-Polish official, the text of the document was quite loyal to the landlords and called upon peasants to obey orders, warned against starting riots and other calamities.

I believe that all this proves how far rooted in pre-1848 languages the discourse of 1848 was. This language of the enlightened absolutism informed and shaped languages of both national sides, Poles and Ruthenians. And in 1848 both Ruthenians and Poles attempted to negotiate with the authorities and influence their language. Finally, both Ruthenians and Poles in 1848 had to work in the countryside with the setting to large extent constructed by the politics and discourses of Austrian absolutism.

* Bold in original

⁹⁶ “Przemowa do poddanych przy publikacji okolnika o zniesieniu panszczyzny i innych danin poddańczych,” VR LNB, f. Okremykh Nadkhodzhen’ (further on – o/n), spr.3181.

Social

Standard works in Ukrainian history often speak about the nexus in strivings and actions that emerged in 1848 between the peasantry and the Ruthenian national movement. Pro-Ukrainian historians as a rule have been arguing that the interests of the peasants were channeled, mediated and defended by the Supreme Ruthenian Council, and that the peasantry saw in that Council the defender and representative of its interests.⁹⁷ In this section I'll take an issue with such a representation of the attitudes of the Ruthenian peasantry and the Ruthenian movement. I'll analyze largely the social politics of the movement and, to a lesser extent, actions of the peasantry.

I shall start with the fact that the Supreme Ruthenian Council in L'viv did not have a single peasant deputy among its members.⁹⁸ At times, peasants could be brought into its sessions. On 19 May 1848, there were deputies from a dozen of rural communities in the Zhovkva and Berezhany circles present on at the Council's session.⁹⁹ But this was the only session at which peasants were present. And these two circles were unusual. The Ruthenian councils in the Zhovkva and Berezhany circles included some very prominent Ruthenian activists who actually brought these peasants to L'viv. The Zhovkva Ruthenian council was among the few with a high proportion of peasant deputies (24 against 44 clergymen), and was accused by the Polish Council of alluding to the events of 1846 and encouraging peasants to repeat their attacks on the landlords; however this was not proven during the Supreme Ruthenian Council's investigation.¹⁰⁰ The Zhovkva Council was one to produced the only known to us Ruthenian peasant activist from 1848, whose texts (perhaps, actually written by someone else) were published in the Ruthenian newspaper. It is not an accident that Count Stadion, the governor of Galicia in 1848, was elected to the parliament by peasant votes in two districts of the same Zhovkva circle.¹⁰¹ It seems very plausible that he ran in the area, in which the Supreme Ruthenian Council was most certain of success. This is all that can be said about the physical presence of the peasants in the supreme representative and coordinating body of the Ruthenian movement.

⁹⁷ This interpretation was most fully developed in the works of Omelian Terlets'kyi whose valuable unpublished manuscripts are hold in VR LNB, f. Omelian Terlets'kyi. Documents selected by Feodosii Steblii, despite his obligatory critique of the "bourgeois nationalism" in the preface, also support this.

⁹⁸ Kozik, "Kwestia włościańska," 72.

⁹⁹ Pavlyk, *Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni*, 37.

¹⁰⁰ Kozik, *Ukrainian National Movement*, 205, 342.

¹⁰¹ Jan Kozik, "Kwestia włościańska," 74.

It can be argued that the peasantry, although not participating itself in the work of the council, still viewed this organization as its defender, as the legal body defending the interests of all the Ruthenians, and that it appealed to the Council with the grievances directed against the landlords. It is said that “the fact that the Supreme Ruthenian Council defended so passionately the justice for peasants proves that it had become closely connected with the people’s mass.”¹⁰² The proof of the Council’s pro-peasant stance is seen in the establishment of the special “people’s (*narodnyi*)” department, which had to deal with peasant issues.¹⁰³ This concern with peasant issues produced three volumes of peasant complaints to the Council, which can be seen as the main proof of the alliance between the peasantry and the movement in 1848.

Let’s look at these peasants’ complaints. They start with the following note dated by 26 June 1848: “Borysikevych proposed to collect evidence of the cheating of our people by our enemies with the goal of harming us.” In the response to Borysikevych’s proposition, on 12 July 1848, the Supreme Ruthenian Council decided “that each member of the Council must collect similar cases and to submit them to the knowledge of the Council.”¹⁰⁴ There were no complaints received from the communities to the Council prior to these documents. I looked through the majority of the complaints but analyzed closely only those coming from the Sambir area.

There is only one “typical” (community against its landlord) complaint form the Sambir circle to the Supreme Ruthenian Council. And this one is from the ethnically mixed, Polish-Ruthenian village of Kornalovychi. The community complained that the landlord took over their forest and attempted to cut it down. The landlord of this community belonged to Sozański family. In 1848 the community pushed the landlord’s wood-cutters out of the forest (according to the complaint, “without harming them”). In the response to this community action, an investigating commission arrived from the circle authorities, but this commission was chaired by the landlord’s friend. The community asked the Sambir court to replace the commissar but the court did not satisfy the request. That is why Kornalovychi community prepared an appeal to the Appellation Court and asked the Supreme Ruthenian Council to support its request in the face of the state authorities. This letter to the Council was “signed” with crosses by the community plenipotentiaries Nykola Kachor (a mayor), Stefan Betsa, and Ivan Vozniak. The letter was written in Ruthenian on 12 March 1849 by Vasyl’ Pak, who also wrote the community’s petition to the Appellation court in

¹⁰² VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets’kyi, spr.128/XII, a.11.

¹⁰³ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets’kyi, spr.127/XII.

¹⁰⁴ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.35, a. 2

Polish.¹⁰⁵ This Vasyl' Pak was a cantor-teacher in Kornalovychi and also one of four "peasant" members of the Sambir Ruthenian Council.

Another letter from this community was written although in Ruthenian but in Latin and not Cyrillic script on 23 March 1849. The community described not only the most recent case, but all the injustices done to it by the landlord. The common pasture that they used together with the landlord had already been decreased twice through the inclusion of its parts among the estates' fields. For the first time the landlord occupied part of this common transforming it into an arable land in 1811. Then, in 1841, a section on the border with Hordynia was annexed to the estate's land by the widow of Adam Sozański. The community tried to defend its right to the common but the estate, employing people from the neighboring Dubliany, "terrorized people out of the land" and ordered them handcuffed: "our poor people, not able to manage with this, and fearing even worse measures, neglected this injustice." In 1843, Salwery Sozański hired people from Biskovychi to dig around another part of the common and joined it to his own meadow.

Besides the issue of the common, plowed by the landlord, the struggle went on around the community's forest. The community had its own forest. The landlord Michał Dwernicki "took it under his own care," but continued to give out wood to people without any obstacle. His successor, Antoni Dwernicki, also behaved well. In 1821, with the death of Antoni Dwernicki, the village was bought by Adam Sozański. (It is interesting that the community knows these dates very well). From 1821 to 1832 he behaved just like his predecessor, but in 1833 he demanded additional *robot* for the wood that local peasants were taking from the forest. In 1847, the new landlord, Sylwestr Sozański "started using our forest as his own property, cutting it down." The community tried to resist, but its plenipotentiaries were imprisoned "even without a protocol."

The third group of community's grievances was about the individual peasants' landholdings appropriated by the landlord. There were ten landholdings appropriated by the estate, whose rightful owners had to move elsewhere. One of these was the landholding of the soldier, Lavro Radzits'kyi; this peasant landholding was not simply joined to the landlords' land, as one would might expect, but another peasant, Nykyta Nadolishnii, was settled there. Obviously, the landlord simply did not want to loose the *robot* due from that landholding and settled there another peasant. This second letter was also written by Vasyl' Pak, and signed by mayor Nykola Kachor along with six other councilors.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁵ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.35, a. 175.

¹⁰⁶ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.44, a. 44-5.

Letters written in the name of Kornalovychi community show that Vasyl' Pak was a well educated person, able to write without mistakes in Polish and Ruthenian, and, perhaps, German as well. Many complaints to the Ruthenian Council were written by educated people of Pak's type. Even most "peasant" complaints, with numerous grammatical and orthographic mistakes, with illogical sentences, were, in fact, written by cantors.¹⁰⁷ In 1848 cantors figure prominently among the villagers in contact with the Ruthenian movement, and this can be explained by their particular position vis-à-vis priests and the Greek Catholic Church in general.¹⁰⁸ Cantors were those who stayed in touch with the Ruthenian peasant deputies in Vienna and asked them about Ruthenian and state politics. Vasyl' Pak himself was a member of the regional Ruthenian council.

Was there some general knowledge among the peasantry about the Ruthenian movement organized as a system of regional councils? The only evidence of such knowledge are the testimonies about crowds of peasants attending the rallies (opening ceremonies and opening sessions) of the local councils. However, at least in Sambir, Polish National Councils enjoyed similar popularity.¹⁰⁹ On the other hand, we do not have a single piece of evidence that peasants considered Ruthenian councils to be bodies defending their collective interests. In the Sambir area the peasantry was reluctant to participate in the Council's activities.¹¹⁰ Outside of the Ruthenian activists residing in the village, the interaction between the peasant communities and the Ruthenian movement seems to have been of an accidental character and not based on any collective consciousness or understanding of the commonality of interests.

The following story is as characteristic of the peasant-movement relationships as the story of the Kornalovychi community. Plenipotentiaries from the village of Tatory (in the document it was misspelled as Tatorynov) in the Sambir circle came to L'viv in 1848. Being engaged in a legal dispute over the community's pasture, they wanted to hire a scribe to write their petition. The scribe, whom they found, took their money and disappeared. This brought them to the Supreme Ruthenian Council (near the St. George cathedral), where they asked for an advice of a certain Mr. Kudernashka. The latter in the name of the Council promised to these peasants help but they never showed up a second time.¹¹¹ This case reveals the

¹⁰⁷ See, for example, the letter of Derzhiv cantor persecuted by the local landlord from 1 June 1849, - TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.35, a. 57.

¹⁰⁸ For the best description of cantors as part of the "rural notables" see Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 105-33.

¹⁰⁹ See the speech of Michał Popiel on the opening ceremony of the Sambir National Council cited below in this chapter.

¹¹⁰ Jan Kozik, *Ukrainian National Movement*, 205.

¹¹¹ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.43, a. 25.

accidental nature of some contacts: the peasants found out about the Council only because it was located near the center of the recognized by them Church authority. They expected to use it just as they were using corner scribes. It seems that even after getting a promise of help they decided not to establish some any long-lasting and mutually obligatory relationships.

In the Supreme Ruthenian Council there was no consensus on the work with the peasantry. While some members (such as Borysikeyvych, who belonged to the more liberal fraction) were in favor of closer work with the peasants, numerous others were disappointed with peasants' attitudes. With the time this latter sentiment grew stronger. The newspaper *Zoria Halyts'ka* in 1850 described a case in which peasants came to the council to complain about their conflict with the landlord over common and one of the Council's members turned these peasants back, pointing to the an article from a German newspaper, in which peasants were described as drunks and idle men.¹¹² Such an attitude testifies not so much to growing conservative moods within the Council but to Ruthenians' sharing in a more general liberal disappointment with the peasantry. Liberals after 1848 saw the peasants as the allies of the reaction; in the case of the Ruthenian movement the disappointment was provoked by the peasants' tremendous passivity and opposition to the "enlightening" guidance of the clergy.¹¹³ In both cases the disappointment was with peasants' inability to live up to the expectations placed on them.

In the end, the Council did not make use of the peasants' complaints that it had gathered. From the very beginning the Council was not ready to provide legal advices. It was waiting for the decisions of state authorities on the procedure for the solving of the community-landlord disputes. By and large it directed peasants to the circle administrations, and did not dare to assume any real mediating role of its own. The representative body of the Ruthenian nation delegated problems of its constituency to the Austrian state. In its responses to the peasants' complaints, the Council emphasized the importance of the documents. Peasants could hope for the justice only if they had the documents proving to prove the rights they claimed to enjoy or the property they claimed to possess.¹¹⁴ The Council emphasized proper legal procedure and did not believe in the any truth residing outside of such a procedure.

This is not to say that the Council never took peasants' side in their disputes against the landlords. It frequently urged the government to deal with the peasant-landlord land disputes, create responsible commissions and to solve these

¹¹² Pavlyk, *Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni*, 62-3.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 72-73.

¹¹⁴ For this principle in the work of the Zhovkva Ruthenian Council see VR LNB, f.ND, spr.225, p.46, a.278.

disputes on the basis of the Josephinian cadastre.¹¹⁵ Ruthenian councils were especially concerned with the incidents of landlords' violence, with the continuation of patrimonial power based on violence against the peasantry.¹¹⁶

They were even more concerned with these incidents when there was a discrimination against those peasants who were connected with the Ruthenian movement.¹¹⁷ But all their efforts in defense of peasant interests had been part of the larger issue – the movement was concerned with the disparity between the newly proclaimed liberal legal and political framework and the administrative practices, still informed by the already abolished system of patrimonial dependency. Because of the local administration's attitude, the landlords were still able to employ their already abolished feudal powers and gain advantages that would be preserved in the new order (the acquisition of common or community lands).¹¹⁸ Conducting this kind of politics, the Ruthenian movement appealed to the state's interests and indicated the anti-Austrian stance of the local gentry and middle class. The administrative practice, however, already in 1848 was modified by the influences and interests of the landowning nobility, who were able to negotiate with the central government, convincing it of their loyalty while imposing their interests. This is clearly seen in the cases of peasants' refusals to work for landlords even for the payments and in the administrative coercion employed to force them to work.

The Supreme Ruthenian Council shared the liberals' hopes about the transformation of the Austrian state and it knew that the gentry were not the only ones to hinder this transformation. The Council was also concerned with peasants' inability to understand the nature of change, with too little knowledge peasants had of their new rights and the new opportunities that now opened to them. This concern also served as a justification of the Council's own claims to represent the Ruthenians, as an argument in favor of electing priests the peasants' deputies. When it came to taking concrete things actions done for the peasantry, little was done. The Supreme Ruthenian Council warned the peasantry not to enter into any transactions with the landlords, not to borrow money and not to pawn land.¹¹⁹ But this warning did not mean taking peasants' side in the conflicts with the landlords. The peasantry had to be taught to value the land, which now was becoming their property.

¹¹⁵ F. I. Steblii et. al., (eds.), *Klasova borot'ba selianstva Skhidnoi Halychyny (1772-1849)*, 451-2.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 461-2.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 405, 424-7, 481-2.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 493.

¹¹⁹ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.43, a. 2-10.

Usually, peasants' support of for the Ruthenian councils and the Council's care of peasants, as well as peasants' animosity towards the Polish movement have been assumed as something given:

There should be not doubt that peasants were disposed inimically towards Poles: they had seen that Polish landlords were doing injustice to them, that they were wronged by the *mandators*, and all other officials who were Poles.¹²⁰

In this light it should be noted that the appeals from the Polish side to the peasants were not much different from the Ruthenian. The Polish discourse also expressed a willingness to look after the peasantry. In the Polish brochures we can actually find very similar warnings directed at the peasantry. A Polish brochure printed in Ukrainian in both Cyrillic and Latin characters addressed peasants as "brothers" and reminded them that their "brothers" had already been fighting for their freedom for eighteen years. In the same way that Ruthenian texts complained about Polish agents, this brochure complained about the Ruthenian leaders, who were calling these "brothers" – "Poles" and scaring Ruthenian peasants. The brochure tried to persuade peasants that there was nothing evil in "Poles" and that they were Ruthenians' native brothers. With the help of the Poles Ruthenians could become gentlemen and landlords of their own land. That is why the peasants had to take care of this land. The brochure warned peasants against those who were offering ready cash for their land trying to persuade peasants to pawn their land, as well as against those eager to buy peasant land:

With this proclamation we warn you beloved brothers not to waste your own land, because the time is coming when the land will become so expensive that for the amount, for which now you buy ten Joch you will not get even one. And after the money is gone you will be forced to go into dependency once more, maybe even to a foreigner, and you know very well how it is to be a subject of a landlord-foreigner.

In order to keep the land, peasants were advised to stay sober and be hard-working. "The Poles" would help peasants, and provide them with cheap credit from the Polish National Bank.¹²¹

By and large the Polish movement did not have any problems with acknowledging as just and accepting the "social program" of the Ruthenian

¹²⁰ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terletskyi, spr.131/I, a.2.

¹²¹ [Baltasar Szczucki?] Widozwa towarzystwa Bratej, do mylych bratej selaniu, aby swoi grunta nemarnowaly (L'viv: Z drukarni Poremby, 30.09.1848).

movement. The pro-Polish Ruthenian Assembly in a proclamation to “Brothers Ruthenians!” published on 29 June 1848 discussed the Ruthenian brochure Die Wünsche der ruthenischen Nation in Galizien auf den künftigen Reichstage. They acknowledged that the author of this brochure “described the real needs of the Ruthenian nation but mixed them up with disgusting and mad ideas as if to ridicule the people's needs.”¹²² And the disgusting and ridiculous ideas were those about a separate Ruthenian nation, which had been oppressed by Poles. That is why I disagree with those emphasizing that Polish brochures in 1848 were expressing expressed the interests of the landlords, propagated class peace and did not pay any attention to the real social problems of peasantry.¹²³ In terms of the social solutions proposed they were not different from the texts coming from the Ruthenian movement, and there were serious differences amongst them with different trends dominating in different periods of the revolution.

Polish democracy also tried to overcome its fear of the peasantry, a fear stretching back to 1846. This fear became a fact of the urban life in Galicia in 1846-1849. The city of Sambir was overwhelmed by the fears of peasant insurgency not only in 1846 and in 1848, but also in 1847, when a peasant insurgency around Sambir was expected on the eve of Easter eve. Mykhail Kachkovs'kyi reporting these fears to his brother-in-law, added that the disturbances had indeed taken place in some areas, but these were thefts, robberies and arsons caused by a famine, a famine that had forced more than half of the rural population to go begging.¹²⁴ In 1848, when the atmosphere became even more heated, any petty skirmish could immediately turn into a matter of great concern.¹²⁵ As was shown by Ivan Krevets'kyi even the largest and best known such a skirmish in 1848, the so-called Tsutsyliv alarm, had nothing to do with peasants' desire to repeat 1846 and to attack the landlords.¹²⁶ The strategic position of the Sambir circle – on the road to Hungary, made the situation even more volatile than in Galician in general.

¹²² Brattia Rusynyi (L'viv, 1848).

¹²³ N. M. Pashaeva, „Otrazhenie natsional'nykh i sotsial'nykh protivorechii v vostochnoi Galichine v 1848 g. v listovkakh Russkogo Sobora,” in Slavianskoe vozrozhdenie. Sbornik state i materialov, (Moskva: “Nauka,” 1966), 48-82.

¹²⁴ VR LNB, f.Vasyi' Shchurat, spr.736, p.19, a.5.

¹²⁵ Ivan Krevets'kyi, “Do psykholohii 1848 roku. (Sprava St. Hoshovskoho),” ZNTSh, t.90 (L'viv, 1909), 137-157.

¹²⁶ Ivan Krevets'kyi, “Tsutsylivs'ka trivoha v 1848 r.: prychnyky do istorii ostannikh dnev panshchyny v Halychyni,” in Naukovyi zbirnyk prysviachenyi pro Mykhailovy Hrushevs'komu uchenykamy i prykhyl'nykamy z nahody Ioho desiatylnioi naukovoii pratsi v Halychyni (1894-1904) (L'viv, 1906), 446-482.

In 1848 a special brochure, Peasant and Fear, was published. The brochure is very sympathetic to the peasants: it blames the government for inciting this fear and using it as justification for the oppression of liberty. Allegedly, the government tried to create the a rift between the Polish movement and the peasants, arguing that if there was going to be freedom for all, then the peasants would enjoy the same rights as anyone else, including the right to gather in thousands. The brochure states that not the Poles but the government should fear the peasantry. The peasants should be enlisted into the National Guard just as townsmen were: “The peasantry knows what is going on and progresses with every day, we can say for sure that three quarters of them sympathize with the good cause.” The brochure ends with the call for work amongst the peasantry: “Only work, only work!” and “Let’s teach people.”¹²⁷

However, brochures of a democratic bent were not the only to appear. There were other brochures that emphasized the gentry’s interests, and, although remaining inside of the Polish nationalist discourse, differed markedly from those written within the democratic tradition. They expressed a similar concern about Ruthenians, trying to demonstrate the unity between the Poles and Ruthenians, and describing the Ruthenian movement as evil, not allowing peasants to realize that

the Poles are your brothers, born with you on the same land, and because you yourself are Poles, because this name Poles derives from *pole* (field), from cut logs (*polinok*), of which [i. e. of fields made of forest] we have more than other nations.¹²⁸

Despite this national rhetoric about brotherhood, the brochure was concerned with the issue of *robot* more than with anything else. The story goes as following: the Emperor gave freedom to the people. The landlords asked him “to liberate all the subjects from *robot*,” they even went to the Emperor in person to ask him for this favor to the communities. But the lordings (*panky*) near the Emperor gave him evil advices; they actually were those guilty of the perpetuation of *robot*. The brochure states that it is not easy to abolish *robot* because the landlord pays taxes for everything and maintains all the administration. If the Emperor was to abolish these burdens, then the landlords would agree to abolish *robot* gladly.

However, the brochure warned peasants not to ask the Emperor simply to abolish *robot*. It would be as if one man was giving as a gift something that did not belong to him: “We all are the Emperor’s native children, he should divide his favor equally among us and not at someone’s else cost.” The brochure

¹²⁷ P. Chlop i strach (1848).

¹²⁸ Do moich Bratej ludu Halyckoho! (1848).

differentiates between good settled peasants and all kinds of tramps, rascals and vagabonds. Because of these latter, incited by the Devilish agitators, Polish peasants in 1846 brought God's punishment down on themselves and had been suffering from the famine for last three years.¹²⁹ This was used to scare Ruthenian peasants and to prevent their possible rising.

This was an early publication, later on, after the abolition of *robot*, no one dared to doubt its validity and legality. Still, in summer 1848, after the abolition of *robot*, rumors about another slaughter of the nobility increased.¹³⁰ Polish activists approached circular authorities with the requests to maintain order. In contrast to the many brochures published for the peasantry in the first half of 1848, the second half of 1848 was characterized by a certain distancing from the peasantry. This was connected with the parliamentary elections and general change of the attitude towards the peasantry, seen as a conservative ally of the dynasty.

Even Polish democracy tried to appeal not so much to peasants as to the landlords, to change their attitude “because the peasant is not cattle, because peasants are humans,” and “peasants are humans just like others, we must live with people.” Old slogans of being brothers, of sharing the same land appeared up again and again, but this time (unlike in 1846) they were directed not at peasants at the landlords.¹³¹ The direct appeals to the peasantry made by some activists with a history of revolutionary involvement were noticeable only in the first period of the revolution. Michał Popiel (who in 1848 was also a member of the pro-Polish Ruthenian Assembly) made the most famous of these appeals. During his talk to the Ruthenian peasants at a meeting of the Polish National Council in Sambir he said:

Brothers Peasants! You must be surprised that we invited you peasants to this meeting, you have enough knowledge but no one has ever been invited you to a council. I am a Ruthenian just like you, christened in the church [*tserkva* as opposed to Roman Catholic *kostioł*], I do not have serfs, and I am not in the [governmental] service in order to live off of your taxes.

Then Popiel told the version of history he thought of as suitable for peasants, or, perhaps the one he believed. All people are brothers by virtue of their common ancestry from Adam. But soldiers were assigned to people to defend them, and these people in turn worked for the soldiers. This was the beginning of serfdom and of the division into landlords and peasants. Now things were different: “We all are brothers, there is no Gentleman, no Peasant, all are equal, all are

¹²⁹ *Do moich Bratej ludu Halyckoho!* (1848).

¹³⁰ Jan Kozik, „Kwestia włościańska,” 77.

¹³¹ A. L., *Pisni radosty* (Lwów: Drukiem Piotra Pillen, 1848).

Gentlemen, all are Peasants.” Poland was said to be a motherland inhabited by Ruthenians, Ukrainians, *Mazur*-s, and Lithuanians. In order to explain this coexistence of one motherland and various ethnic groups, Popiel employed the metaphor of a garden. Just like in a garden you have pears, apples etc., you have all these ethnic groups in one Poland.¹³²

All this was brought in to show that in 1848 the “social” discourse of the Polish movement was actually more developed than that of the Ruthenians, who were obsessed with the issue of nationality and did not have time to conceptualize their views on social questions. While the first draft of the Polish address from of 1848 asked for the abolition of *robot*, the first Ruthenian address did not mention *robot* at all.¹³³ Many socially sensitive future Greek-Catholic priests in 1848 were sympathized with the Polish movement. One of these was Ivan Naumovych, back then a seminary student, who in 1848 together with his friends Ivan Havryshkevych and Kornylii Strons’kyi undertook an excursion in the Sambir and Stryi mountains.¹³⁴ Rev. Naumovych was expelled from the seminary because of his pro-Polish sympathies.¹³⁵ Mykola Ustyianovych back in 1848 wore Polish national headgear (*konfederatka*) with the Polish national emblem; the same was said about Antin Liubych-Mohyl’nyts’kyi, who was not able to finish his speech at the rally of the Stanislaviv Ruthenian council precisely because of such pro-Polish expressions.¹³⁶ The events of 1846 scared educated Ruthenians just as they scared Polish activists.¹³⁷ And the alliance between the Ruthenian movement and the peasantry was forged only when both ended on the same pro-dynastic side; the alliance, both hoped, would be cemented by the state.

Still, Polish activists could play with the peasantry, the way Franciszek Smolka did approaching Polish peasant deputies to the parliament. He invited them to his place and treated them with good wine, of which, he complained in a private letter, they drunk too much. Now, when the Polish movement felt itself to be in power, it did not think about larger action towards the peasantry and preferred to treat peasant parliamentary deputies in the fashion some landlords treated their peasants back in 1846. By this time all the attempts to start popular publications

¹³² [Michał Popiel], *Ogłoszenie Mychaila Popela do WSICH RUSYNIW wo Samborskoj radi na 25 (hreczynsk. kal. 13) maja 1848 r. po Chr.* (Lviv: z drukarni M. Premby, 1848).

¹³³ Kozik, „Kwestia włościańska,” 65, 70.

¹³⁴ VR LNB, f. Ivan Levyts’kyi, op.2, spr.623, p.25, 18.

¹³⁵ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets’kyi, spr.131/I, a.137.

¹³⁶ Turii, “Natsional’ne i polityczne polonofil’stvo,” 193.

¹³⁷ Kozik, “Kwestia włościańska,” 68.

for the people had failed as well and were not supported even by the minority of democratic activists.¹³⁸

It is often said that the attitude of the peasantry in 1848 was informed by a consciousness of class interests. Stefan Kieniewicz summed up this interpretation of peasant behavior in the following words:

Of course it could be said that the peasant movement was not organized and was not conscious of its goals and means. There were no peasant leaders who had authority over more than one circle. There was no provincial leadership and no unified tactics either in negotiations with the government or with the revolutionary camp. Peasant deputies in Vienna could not fulfill this role. Nevertheless, we can conclude that the peasant masses in 1848 had more than just an instinctive feeling of their own interests. They appreciated the favorable state of affairs and did not ruin it with violent acts, they were looking for the support from the side with which they were discerning power, but in the decisive moments they voted correctly. The peasant had his eyes focused on the land, all the rest did not matter: perhaps, because of that and despite the lack of the political experience, the mistakes, which could deprive him of his gain were avoided.¹³⁹

Let us look at the content of “peasant complaints” to the Ruthenian movement. The striking thing is that many of them were directed not against the landlord. This is clearly seen in the complaints from the archive of the Zhovkva Council, which was more in touch with peasants than any other regional Council. Brothers Andrukh and Il'ko Iurkiv complained to the Zhovkva Council that another peasant, Stefan Bubela, had taken over their father's land. For three years they had been “looking for the justice” but without any success. Stefan Bubela ridiculed them saying: “I shall pave every footpath and cover it with *zwanziger*-s but shall not return your land.” And, according to the brothers, this had been „our property since our grandfathers and great grandparents.” To this letter the Zhovkva Ruthenian Council replied with the advice to send all the written documents from of this case to the local estate.¹⁴⁰ This complaint is not unique.¹⁴¹

Similar cases can be found among the complaints to the Supreme Ruthenian Council from the Sambir district. The community of Kav's'ko in the Sambir circle on 1 November 1848 complained about the local miller, Oleksa Vasył'tsiv, who

¹³⁸ Putek, *Pierwsze występy*, 17-18, 22.

¹³⁹ Stefan Kieniewicz, *Pomiędzy Stadionem a Gosławem. Sprawa włościańska a Galicji w 1848 r.* (Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, 1980), 146.

¹⁴⁰ VR LNB, f.ND, spr.225, p.46, a.28

¹⁴¹ VR LNB, f. ND, spr.225, p.46, a.41-42.

had taken over some community land. The court had decided in favor of Vasyl'tsiv and the community was seeking ways to remedy this decision.¹⁴² The community of Kav's'ko was able to organize testimonies from the neighboring communities Medynychi, Hai Nyzhni and Bil'che, supporting claims of the Kav's'ko community.¹⁴³ The last news from this community was from 4 April 1849 – it was looking for another judge in the case against the miller Vasyl'tsiv and asked for the support of the Supreme Ruthenian Council.¹⁴⁴ The community also wondered what had happened to the documents it had sent to the Council and asked why there had been no resolution of its case.¹⁴⁵

Oleksa Marchyshyn, a literate “farmer,” from Hai Nyzhni, complained about the fact that his brother's widow and her family had been deprived of her landholding while a local peasant, (and landlord's forester) Petro Stets'kiv, had been settled there. He asked “to intercede for me” [*z'a mnov vstavytysia*].¹⁴⁶ The last two cases are actually from the jurisdiction of the Drohobych Ruthenian Council. It is interesting that the Drohobych Ruthenian Council had provided many more complaints from peasantry in the comparison with the Sambir one.¹⁴⁷ This should not surprise us because an important member of this council, Rev. Iosyf Levyts'kyi, had connections with peasants back in pre-1848 era. He was known for his pro-peasant sympathies and even wrote an anonymous letter to the Emperor in the defense of the peasants. It is interesting that Levyts'kyi's empathy with the peasants did not lead him to call for the abolition of *robot*, only the abolition of the abuses of the system.¹⁴⁸ Peasants often sought his advice and the government even once employed him as a mediator to calm the peasants down.¹⁴⁹

There is much in common between these “individual” complaints of the peasants against their neighbors and complaints of the some communities against their landlords. These kinds of conflicts were formulated in similar terms of justice and injustice, acts were measured as being wrong or right, and in both cases the peasants were looking for someone to translate their grievances into the language of legal system. We saw, that in the Kornalovychi case the estate's appropriation of the peasant landholdings actually meant the settling on these

¹⁴² TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.43, a. 96.

¹⁴³ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.43, a. 102-106.

¹⁴⁴ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.44, a. 60.

¹⁴⁵ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets'kyi, spr.129/XII, a.44.

¹⁴⁶ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.43, a. 100.

¹⁴⁷ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.15, a.8.

¹⁴⁸ Herbil's'kyi, *Rozvytok prohresyvnnykh idei v Halychyni*, 75-6.

¹⁴⁹ Steblii, *Klasova borot'ba*, 334.

landholdings of other subjects. Finally, the Supreme Ruthenian Council became bored with these complaints and stated explicitly that it was not going to consider individual cases and grievances. The answer from the Supreme Ruthenian Council to the letter from the Kolomyia Ruthenian Council dated by 15 February 1850 stated: “The Supreme Council whose members are overloaded with work only then is able to start some measures when the subject touches on the common interests.” The Supreme Council advised the local Ruthenian Council to be choosier in dealing with all kinds of cases sent to it.¹⁵⁰

It is true that almost all the peasants’ complaints had something to do with the land. It has become a commonplace in the historiography to state that the peasants were concerned if not obsessed with the land. Peasant struggle is presented as the struggle for land. In the Soviet tradition, the peasants engaged into class struggle, had to put forward the demands for the division of the landlords’ land. These demands were found in Galicia in the 1840s as well. But in all the cases that the historians have cited to support this thesis, the peasants were only requesting back the return of community pasture or some arable land from the individual landholdings appropriated by the landlords.¹⁵¹ No claims on the landlords’ land were either put down on paper or acted on at this point.

Peasants’ obsession with the land invented by historiography was interpreted as an omnipotent determinant of their behavior. In fact, pre-1848 era provides many examples of more relaxed peasant attitude toward the land. In fact, the appropriation of the individual peasant landholdings and community land was possible because peasants did not value land as a property, and were concerned only with its use-value. Land could wait for those recruited to return from the army for a dozen of years. In the years following 1846, the years of poor harvests and famines, peasants were willing simply to leave their land and move elsewhere.¹⁵² That is actually why we have all these warnings from the movements asking peasants not to sell their land, and attempts to explain that the land after the emancipation will turn into something it was not before, into a property.

¹⁵⁰ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.45, a. 21.

¹⁵¹ Steblii, “Selians'kyi rukh u Skhidnii Halychyni v 1846 rotsi,” *Z istorii Zakhidnoukrains'kykh zemel'* (Kyiv: V-vo An URSS, 1960), 45, 51.

¹⁵² For the great exodus from the villages in 1846, and again in the 1860s, see Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, “Tisni roky,” *ZNTSh*, t. 26, kn.6 (L'viv, 1898), 1-16. For this as normal practice in the years of harvest failures see his autobiography – VR LNB, f.206, spr.922, p.27, a.22. For the fact that his was normal practice not only in the mountains but also in the lowlands, see Ivan Mykhas' article [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny I,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.50, 312.

It is true that just like in many agricultural societies possession of a strip of land was very important for peasants' self-definition.¹⁵³ And in the chapter on 1846 we saw that this was true in the case of the Ruthenian peasantry as well. This importance, however, stemmed not from some particular relationships between the individual and the land it toiled, but from the regimes of power, in which the peasant was placed. The ownership of the land was important for one's position in the community and in the state. And in 1848 this ownership acquired a new meaning, the land was about to become a private property. On the one hand, the Supreme Ruthenian Councils suspected Polish landlords of the attempting to cheat the peasants and dispossess them, taking advantage of peasants' ignorance of what property was about. That is why some Poles tried to persuade the Ruthenian council that conflicts over land between the landlords and the peasants were not a malevolent Polish conspiracy but something that had been taking place for centuries. In a letter to the Supreme Ruthenian Council from 16 March 1849, an unknown Polish author tried to explain the situation, stating that "the communities for centuries have been involved in disputes with their landlords mostly because of the appropriation by the landlords of lands, pastures and forests."¹⁵⁴ On the other hand, the Ruthenian movement was afraid of being misled by the peasantry into undermining of the "holy" idea of property. This is clearly seen in the discussion of the common rights and other related conflicts about mutual obligations between landlords and peasants that took place immediately after the revolution of 1848.

A Polish address from 19 March, well in line with the democratic tradition from of the 1830s and 1840s, asked for the abolition of *robot* and servitudes, both – rights of a feudal and rights deriving from the usage of the land of a feudal, had to be abolished.¹⁵⁵ Servitudes were seen as an integral part of the system of subject-dependency and that was the rationale for their abolition. In fact, the servitudes' complaints constituted the minority among peasant complaints, the majority of which was concerned with the land illegally appropriated by the landlords prior to 1848.¹⁵⁶ But this did not make things easier. Inalienable private property was the basis for the formation of new citizens and therefore, was as untouchable for the Ruthenian movement as for the Polish landlords.

For example, Rev. Hryhorii Shashkevych, a parliamentary deputy and a liaison person between Ruthenian movement and Ruthenian peasant deputies to the

¹⁵³ John William Knott, "Land, Kinship and Identity: The Cultural Roots of Agrarian Agitation in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Ireland," *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, v.12, No.1, 1984, 93-108.

¹⁵⁴ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.44, a. 54.

¹⁵⁵ Kozik, "Kwestia włościańska," 65.

¹⁵⁶ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets'kyi, spr.131/I, a.181. Calculations were done by Omelian Terlets'kyi.

parliament, had written a nice proposal on the resolution of the servitudes' question. However, during the voting about indemnity (compensation to the landlords for the abolition of *robot*) he abstained.¹⁵⁷ In his private correspondence the whole case appears as an issue of conscience. He thought that abolition of *robot* must be compensated, otherwise it would violate the rights of property, and therefore to vote against compensation would be a sin. On the other hand, he could not vote in favor of the indemnity payments, being afraid of losing the trust of the peasant deputies. Rev. Shashkevych was also not satisfied with the Constitution, because it abolished capital and corporal punishment.¹⁵⁸ This could be considered as a conservative stance, and its origin in the discourse pre-dating 1848 is quite clear. On the other hand, there is no doubt that Rev. Shashkevych's views fitted into the larger liberal framework as well.

The same idea about untouchable and inalienable private property shaped another intervention by the prominent Ruthenian activist. Rev. Mykola Ustyianovych, replying to the already cited Szujski's brochure on the origins of landlords, subjects and *robot*, argued in favor of transforming all the land in the possession of the peasants into their property. He warned however, that one should not think

That the communities had the right to recover farmsteads, forests and pastures that now are used by landlords. The communities no longer have this right and cannot have, because it died out long ago, and these farmsteads, forests and pastures now are sacred and untouchable property of the current owners.

According to Rev. Ustyianovych, peasant attacks on pastures and forests were dishonoring the Ruthenian name.¹⁵⁹ Similarly, in 1849 *Zoria Halyts'ka* tried to teach peasants that while one's own is sacred, someone else's is even more so.¹⁶⁰ While the paternalist attitude of the Ruthenian movement was not much different from the paternalism of the Polish movement, the parish clergy, prevalent among Ruthenian activists, had better means to work inside of the village communities.

Materials left by the Zhovkva Ruthenian Council (which was also among the few most sensitive to peasant issues) allow us to look into its work with the peasants more closely. Its members, Ivan Zaluzhnyi from Kam'ianka Volos'ka and mayor Skomorovs'kyi were the first peasants to join local Ruthenian

¹⁵⁷ Jan Kozik, "Kwestia włościańska," 78.

¹⁵⁸ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets'kyi, spr.131/I, a.60.

¹⁵⁹ Jan Kozik, "Kwestia włościańska," 82.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 86.

councils;, both were from the Rava district. ¹⁶¹ The program of the Zhovkva Council stated:

The Circle Council is a representative and defender of the whole people of the Zhovkva circle (*tsiloho v okruzzi Zhovkivskim naroda*) and because Ruthenian peasants are unenlightened (*pomrachen*), they need help and wish [to receive it] and therefore the intelligentsia [composed] of the priests should help them.

It was said that townsmen and Jews also recognized and obeyed the Council. But there were special relationships between the Council and peasants. These special relationships, however, were not caused by peasants' greater importance; they had to be established because the peasants needed help and advice more than anyone else:

Now when peasants have to collect taxes themselves, and especially if they want to maintain their properties and rights, such as pastures, forests, gathering in forests, and when they are not able to help themselves, they need our advice and help more than ever before. ¹⁶²

But even these good intentions of the Council in reality could help very little. On 30 September 1849 there was a deputation from the village of Oleshytska Futora, to which Rev. Merunovych explained that if in 1843 they agreed to have a separate pasture and "signed" (*pidpysahysia*), then they would never acquire the right to buy it back and should not waste their time and efforts.¹⁶³ The Ruthenian Council from the very beginning knew that there was little chances to win land disputes that went back into pre-1848 era. When it was about peasant rights to landlords' land, as for example, about peasant right to gather fuel or take timber from the landlord's forest, the Council advised communities to wait for the decisions of the "court of arbitration (*poliubovnyi sud*)," which had to be established from the representatives of both communities and landlords. In the cases when the communities were going to sue the landlord not waiting for these "courts of arbitration," Mr. Ivan Terlets'kyi, "a Ruthenian scribe" in Liubych was recommended to them as a person to whom they could refer for the help in their cases.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ VR LNB, f.ND, spr.225/p.46, a.46.

¹⁶² VR LNB, f.ND, spr.225/p.46, a.12.

¹⁶³ VR LNB, f.ND, spr.225/p.46, a.27.

¹⁶⁴ VR LNB, f.ND, spr.225/p.46, a.27

With time, the Council's interest of the Council in peasant-landlords' disputes declined. The government reestablished its authority and whatever little space the Ruthenian Councils could claim in the legal and political system in 1848-1849, it shrunk to almost nothing in 1850. Instead of arbitration courts, which could be expected to deal with the disputes between the peasantry and the landlords, the whole issue was relegated to the administrative authorities. The situation was not protested because the Ruthenian movement itself decided that peasants were unable to behave as responsible citizens of a constitutional state.

In 1850 the Zhovkva Ruthenian Council discussed peasant matters after the reading of German newspapers on "how people in the larger world think about us Ruthenians, and how slowly they begin to give us a justice" (materials of the a session held in June). One peasant issue discussed was the problem of village mayors. On the one hand, there had to be a respect for them, because they were part of the community self-government. On the other hand, – many mayors were elected back in the *robot* era, and obeyed manorial officials. The Council's resolution advised the communities to oppose these mayors and try to reason them. We see that already in 1848 the precarious position of the village mayors was visible, and peasants were saying that often no one among the more important community's members wanted to become a mayor. After 1848 the power of the mayors increased significantly. Between 1848 and 1867 communities elected mayors for three years; the mayors were given, and had combined administrative and legal powers in the community.¹⁶⁵ Liberation from the landlords' supervision led to an unheard extent of autonomy of the village communities.

I believe that the so-called "peasant strikes" from of 1848 should be also explained in this context of the separation of the peasant community from the estate. They had goals totally different from the agricultural Galician strikes at the beginning of the twentieth century. While the latter were organized with the aim of bargaining, negotiation and strove to put peasants into a position of power in these negotiations, the "strikes" of 1848 were meant to confirm the separation of the peasants from estates (these were, so to say, permanent refusals to work for the estates.) As Iats' Koval' from Franko's fiction spells out peasants' idea about the consequences of working for the landlord:

We know the smell of it! Landlords at once will run to the Emperor and say: 'See, the peasants themselves voluntary go to work for us, and you abolished *robot*. Return it because these people got used to it. They will work the best with it, and when it was abolished they rioted.'¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁵ Jan Świątek, *Brzozowa i okolica...* cz.IV, 129.

¹⁶⁶ Ivan Franko, "Velykyi shum," in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.22 (Kyiv: "Naukova dumka," 1979), 212.

At a session of the Zhovkva council the problem of the so-called “agrarian strikes” was also raised. The problem was that during the mass refusals to work for the landlords in the years following the emancipation provincial authorities and the Church hierarchy on their request, were trying to persuade peasants to start working. The position taken by the Zhovkva Circle Council was different from that of the provincial authorities. The question was asked by the peasants: “What should we do if the landlord establishes one price for grain thrashing, the community does not agree to it, and the landlord starts threatening the community while the community contests it?” The answer of the Council was that no one had right to force the community to work.¹⁶⁷

It is worth to note, however, that calls for work of the church hierarchy betrayed not so much its alliance with the Polish landlords as the lasting legacy of enlightened absolutism. Pastoral letter already on 24 June 1848 was saying that village folk does not want to work for any money, “even having no work on own farms, they prefer to sit at home and spend precious time in sloth. The harm which such laziness can bring to the advance of province’s economy and good, and even morals can be enormous.”¹⁶⁸ This concern with peasant laziness and harm for agriculture can be traced back to the times of Joseph II, when Galician captains were proposing various solutions for “busying the peasants with work.”¹⁶⁹

We have very little evidence about the activities of the councils in the Sambir area. Allegedly, Rev. Iosyf Levyts’kyi, whom the authorities considered to be very influential among peasants in pre-1848 era, was defended by peasants from an angry Polish crowd in the town of Drohobych.¹⁷⁰ However, in his Drohobych speech Rev. Iosyf Levyts’kyi valued emancipation not for liberating peasants but for liberating the Ruthenian nation. He was talking not about the dignity of the peasants but about the dignity of the Ruthenian nation, having a literature and liturgy in their own language: “Our nation is not negligible and deserves honor and respect from Europe.”¹⁷¹

Not just peasant participation in the organizations of the Ruthenian movement but also its exposure to the cultural production of the movement was very limited. Among the subscribers to *Visnyk* (“The Galician Ruthenian Newsletter”),

¹⁶⁷ VR LNB, f. ND, 225/p.46, a.49.

¹⁶⁸ APP, ABGK, sygn.3515.

¹⁶⁹ Wacław Tokarz, *Galicja w początkach ery józefińskiej w świetle ankiety urzędowej z roku 1783* (Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1909), 219.

¹⁷⁰ [Zhelekkhovs’kyi] Iu.V.Zh., “Vospomyaniia iz 1848 goda,” 126-127.

¹⁷¹ [Iosyf Levytskyi], *Besida hovorena dnia 22 Maia 1848 roku*, 8.

there were nine Ruthenian communities from Hungary and more than sixty from Galicia. On the one hand these numbers seem to be impressive, on the other hand it was only around two percent of all Ruthenian communities. Moreover, their subscription most probably was done at the request of the local priest. On 13 March, when the Galician-Ruthenian *Matytsia* was founded, we find forty communities among its founders, (of these forty – thirty nine were village communities). But among these communities thirty one was from the Stanislaviv circle.¹⁷² Just like with the peasants from the Zhovkva and Berezhany districts present at the session of the Supreme Ruthenian Council, the presence of these communities was a one-time decorative affair, the result of the work of certain activists, like Revs. Iosyf Kobryns'kyi and Rudol'f Mokh.

Ivan Zaluzhnyi (mentioned earlier) is, most probably, the only identifiable peasant correspondent to *Zoria Halytska*. However, as was established by Omelian Terlets'kyi some texts that appeared in the name of Zaluzhnyi and put forward nationalist arguments about antiquity of the Ruthenian nation, which had to be older than Polish, about Ruthenian princes, were written by other Ruthenian activist.¹⁷³ Zaluzhnyi was the only prominent peasant to appear in 1848 within the framework of the Ruthenian councils. Other prominent peasant figures appeared through the parliamentary elections, quite often against the wishes of the Ruthenian movement, and only later established a kind of cooperation with it. Among Zaluzhnyi's articles we have one entitled "Glory to the Ruthenian Nation in Galicia and Honor to the Sobriety and Temperance," and published under pseudonym "Ivan from beyond Hoshiv."¹⁷⁴ The title of this article combining nationalist discourse with the virtues of "capitalist" and liberal subjects, is very characteristic of the Ruthenian discourse in 1848.

The abstinence movement, which started in Galicia around 1845, during and especially after the revolution of 1848 remained the Greek Catholic clergy's only real social action directed towards peasants. In 1851 a new definition of the Church's brotherhood was introduced. According to this definition, a Church brotherhood had to struggle for the sobriety and take care that there was no vodka at the village festivities.¹⁷⁵ Thus, the new statute of Church brotherhoods foreshadowed the Sobriety brotherhoods of the 1870s. We have some testimonies about attempts to implement this sobriety movement in the Sambir circle. In 1849 there was an attempt to introduce sobriety in the village of

¹⁷² Pavlyk, *Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni*, 48.

¹⁷³ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets'kyi, spr.131/I, a.2.

¹⁷⁴ Ivan izza Hoshova, "Slava narodu russkomu v Halychyni i chest' tverezosty i vozderzhanosty," *Zoria Halytska*, 1849, No.87. On this see VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 163, p.6, a.93.

¹⁷⁵ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 163, p.6, a.166.

Mshanets'. Rev. Nazarevych explained to peasants that the sobriety would make peasant more capable of work and help them to save money. But this attempt at sobriety was not long lasting and in the 1880s the sobriety movement in the village had to be started from scratch.¹⁷⁶ One could argue that sobriety was the only thing left to the Ruthenian movement because so many issues were voluntarily turned over to the state authorities. But the sobriety campaign also indicates some profound connections between the emancipation and new ethos that the movement tried to introduce among the peasantry.

In 1849 the first anniversary of the abolition of serfdom was celebrated. In its address to Ruthenians to celebrate the anniversary the Council described the “emancipation” as follows:

A Ruthenian, liberated from the slave-like dependence [and] being up to that day someone else's property, became a free man in himself. On that day his breast became able to breathe lighter and a feeling of the higher status, for which he was longing for many centuries, appeared in his soul.¹⁷⁷

There was nothing about the abolition of *robot*; only rhetoric about slavery and freedom. The slavery was centuries-long, and had connotations of the national not social slavery. The emancipation was liberation of the Ruthenian nation and not of peasants; this nation was enslaved and now was coming back to a normal, “dignified” condition. However, it was stressed that the legal basis for the free peasant was only the beginning – there were other things necessary for emancipation as well. The same announcement, calling to celebrating the anniversary, also advised fathers

to teach their children to use their freedom rationally and righteously... Now, when the chains of dependency had fallen down from them, they should try to become free in their souls from [various] addictions and to become men honorable to the world and righteous to the God.¹⁷⁸

From the community of Mistkovychi in the Sambir circle a certain Teodor Pitsiura was sent to participate in the celebration of the anniversary of emancipation, and the Supreme Ruthenian Council refunded his travel expenses of three Gulden 25 Kreuzer c. m. (convention money). The letter of introduction for Teodor Pitsiura was signed by Iosafat Panas, the mayor, and Andrei

¹⁷⁶ VR IL, f.3, spr.4217.

¹⁷⁷ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.15, a.1.

¹⁷⁸ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.15, a.2.

Kustryts'kyi, a controller and a scribe.¹⁷⁹ Andrei Kustryts'kyi was perhaps a relative of a certain Pavlo Kustryts'kyi, another peasant member of the Sambir Ruthenian Council. The letter supplied by the community says that the community had sent Pitsiura to participate in the liturgy and gratify God for the emancipation. The community and, perhaps, Pitsiura himself were not aware that the leaders of the Council had organized the celebration as a spectacle, representing the loyal Ruthenian nation supported by the state authorities, the spectacle in which an important role as the main constituency of the liberated Ruthenian nation peasants had to play.

The ceremony was not limited to the liturgy. It was defined as “religious-national festivity.”¹⁸⁰ On 14 May representatives from the communities and priests with their families arrived in masse to L'viv. At 4 am next morning salute from cannons signaled the beginning of the holiday. Church brotherhoods from the neighboring villages and from the city itself started arriving to the hill, where St. George cathedral stood. On the open space in front of the cathedral blue and yellow tent was put for the service. The space was filled with people. Besides the Greek Catholic hierarchy, Governor Gołuchowski, Austrian and Russian generals and higher officers, as well as detachments of Austrian army attended the service. After the Liturgy with speeches, salutes from troops with firearms and distribution of the little crosses, specially produced for this event followed. There were 5,000 crosses, and all of them were gone while many complained that did not receive any.¹⁸¹

At 1:30 pm the procession was organized from the St. George hill to the palace of the Governor. In-between four blue and yellow flags on the cart decorated with blue and yellow colors six pairs of oxen with gilded horns were bringing specially baked for this purpose huge holiday bread (*karavai*) and honey. These were gifts from the Ruthenian nation to the Emperor. The procession was accompanied by the military band playing music. The space in front of the Governor's palace was filled with people as well and the Governor greeted the procession with “Glory to our Emperor, and long live Ruthenian nation!” Celebrations in the afternoon continued in the “Jesuit Garden,” the most popular city park very close to St. George Cathedral. The park was decorated with Ruthenian colors and inscriptions in Ruthenian, Ruthenian performances were shown, while the firework crowned the celebration.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁹ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.15, a.2b.

¹⁸⁰ *Zoria Halytska*, 1849, No.37.

¹⁸¹ *Zoria Halytska*, 1849, No.41.

¹⁸² “L'viv 3/15 Maia,” *Zoria Halytska*, 1849, No.39.

It is easy to explain why the emancipation was presented as the liberation of the Ruthenian nation and not as the abolition of *robot* or emancipation of the peasantry. Just as the Polish movement tried to forget 1846, Ruthenians tried to forget their plebeian condition. That is where this emphasize on slavery fits, implying that this plebeian character will disappear under normal circumstances. The documents of the Councils reveal a preoccupation with the historical arguments and historical legitimization: the Ruthenian nation appears to be rather ashamed of its peasant character.¹⁸³ Peasant communities were brought into the movement's discourse to prove that this movement is was not just clerical intrigue and had a wider secular constituency.

On one hand this can be seen a response to the position of the Polish movement, which from the very beginning emphasized that the so-called Ruthenian problem was just a social problem.¹⁸⁴ On the other – there were deeper links as well. The denial of the plebeian character of the nation entailed a particular representation of the peasantry. Ruthenians had to appreciate

the liberation of our peasant from a dependency similar to the Egyptian captivity, through the promised and granted rights, constitutional freedom, and guarantee of equal rights for all the nations of the great Empire, especially [taking into account the fact that] we Ruthenians received so much humiliation and for so long.

It was stressed that being once freed Ruthenian peasants and priests proved to be perfectly up to their new status of the responsible citizens:

Our peasants do not cease to fulfill their duties to the land and to the Monarch, just as Ruthenians and priests of the Ruthenian spirit do not stop to propagate to our nation [or people, *narod*] teachings of loyalty, obedience and agreement, which it needs so much, with their own example...¹⁸⁵

The discourse of emancipation from the very beginning was built around the idea of citizenship. The representation of a centuries-long slavery implied that subject-dependency on the landlords was the total opposite of the citizenship. Subject-dependency had deprived Ruthenians of citizenship, the condition necessary for

¹⁸³ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.19, a.10-13.

¹⁸⁴ Jan Kozik, "Kwestia włościańska," 90.

¹⁸⁵ [Petro Lozyns'kyi] Slovo v chasi torzhestvennoi Sluzhby Bozhoi odpravlenoi z postanovleniia Holovnoi Rady Ruskoj z prychny vstupleniia na tron Tsisarstva Avstriiskoho Ieho Velychestva Kesaria i Korolia Frantsishka Iosyfa Iho v tserkvi Lvovskoi mistskoi or. hr. kat. v prytochnosti vsikh V. V. c. k. Voiskovykh i Tsyvil'nykh Ouriadiv i mnohochyslenno sobrannoho liuda, izrechonnoie Petrom Lozyns'kym Vikariem toizhe tserkvy i chlenom Holovnoi Ruskoj Rady dnia 10 Dekevria 1848.

their nation's well-being. And emancipation was seen as the emancipation of the nation, whose members could manifest themselves as a nation only having acquired citizenship rights. That is why individual freedom, which was said to be the sweetest thing for every man, was represented in the context of a national community:

And if that man finds sensitive hearts, with which to share his joy, if he easily finds those who with a sincere handshake will show him that they share with him [his joy] and wish him happiness in obtaining freedom. How much louder then the joy will sound and fly with extensive echo to all ends of the Universe, when in place of the liberated single man the whole nation will appear and when that nation, liberated by the unpredictable fate of the eternal governor of the human history from the long, long and heavy slavery, slavery of spirit and body, will advance with united force because of the a shared thought and stand on its own space, appointed to it from by God, and with one voice exclaim to all the nations of the earthly globe: "I am free! I am a nation!"¹⁸⁶

This kind of freedom had very specific implications. Now, when free, people had to obey their superiors voluntary. Moreover, free people were required to preserve the faith, to uproot drinking, theft and give up their pride. New free citizens were supposed to be laborious and God-fearing God.¹⁸⁷ These new duties were the burden of civilization and humanity: "the Ruthenian peasant, till recently valued little more than the cattle, now enriched with the rights of citizenship acquires human dignity."¹⁸⁸

Peasants themselves, in fact, perceived emancipation as first of all liberation from *robot*: they never called themselves their landlords' subjects and did not differentiate between *robot* and other kinds of the obligatory work. In 1862 a peasant from Rolliv during a governmental inquiry into the priest's alleged abuses testified about the work they did for the priest:

I do not know if this load [of work] is prescribed, but it seems to me that if the Most Enlightened Monarch freed us from the *robot*, which we had to provide to our landlords, and in exchange for what they were obliged to

¹⁸⁶ [Hryhorii Shashkevych], Besida podchas festynu narodovoho ruskoho, vidpravlenoho v Stanislavovi dnia 30 Maia 1848 hovorena Hryhoriem Shashkevychem, Parokhom Ouhrynivskim (L'viv: Typom Stavropigiians'kym, 1848), 4. Later in this speech the slavery is traced back to the 1340s, "when our house collapsed," and it is obviously that slavery in this case is not serfdom but Polish occupation of the Galician-Volhynian Rus'.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 9-10.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 11.

provide us with food in the case of privation, then this obligatory work [for the priest] should also be abolished.¹⁸⁹

From the very beginning, discrepancy existed between the metaphors of slavery abundant in the national discourse and peasants' own attitude. Even in the late nineteenth century peasants readily compared their current hardships with *robot* times and often concluded that *robot* was much easier.¹⁹⁰

The many songs about the abolition of *robot* seem to have originated among learned people. Some of them were not in the repertory of the songs sung by peasants together, but among those performed by a special group of minstrels. One of the more famous, "*Teper nasha liuds'ka kryvda uzhe skasovana*" was written down by Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi from the blind beggar Dmytro Babets' in 1891. The song is directed against landlords, because of what Babets' several times had problems while performing for the non-peasant audience. Babets' himself learned it from another beggar, and it was not the song known and performed by other peasants.¹⁹¹ Even when more widely known they can be traced to the written original. This was the case with "*Pryletila zazulen'ka tai stala kuvaty*," which was for the first time published in *Zoria Halyts'ka* on 4 July 1848 as written by "some respected Ruthenian lady." The song became very popular and numerous versions of this song were recorded in many regions, including Transcarpathian Rus', Bukovyna, and Russian Ukraine. But this geography also proves that its popularity was not about some particular memory of *robot* and its abolition, rather about general composition and language of the song.¹⁹²

Not only the songs but also other "materializations" of the memory about *robot* were not raising from below. The celebration of emancipation was introduced from above, and modeled on the commemoration of the event in the western part of the Austrian monarchy, especially in Czech lands, where crosses were raised.¹⁹³ The Ruthenians' celebration of the emancipation by the Ruthenians started when the movement organized one in L'viv in 1849. Already in the 1880s peasant son Mykhailo Pavlyk and his generation had no idea how the abolition of *robot* was celebrated in the villages. To Drahomanov's inquiry about the ritual Pavlyk said that they believed that people were burying "*robot*," but what exactly

¹⁸⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr. 2545, 27-28.

¹⁹⁰ „Iz Sambora,” *Russkoje Slovo*, 1896, No.9.

¹⁹¹ VR II, f.3, spr.4138.

¹⁹² For the detailed analysis of the authorship of the song and its versions see Ivan Sen'ko, "Pisnia pro skasuvannia panshchyny," in *ZNTSh*, t.223, (Pratsi sektsii etnografii ta fol'klorystyky) (L'viv, 1992), 63-76.

¹⁹³ Putek, *Pierwsze występy włościactwa*, 22.

was buried and where they did not know and Pavlyk had to consult Bohdan Didyts'kyi as a representative of the "older generation."¹⁹⁴

This discrepancy was part of a larger rift between the peasants and the movement. The movement's position was difficult. While the Polish project could simply discard peasants for a while, the Ruthenians could not. Hence, the differences between the movement's leaders' imagined ideal of peasant citizens and the real behavior of peasants were felt especially painfully. Parliamentary elections made the rift visible and forced the movement to take action. The elections were the first test of the hopes that the Ruthenian movement placed on the transformation of peasant communities into communities of citizens.

The Ruthenian movement came from the elections totally dissatisfied by the election's results and angered by peasant electoral behavior. One problem was peasants' opposition to the clergy's patronage, which the movement advocated. The movement tried to persuade peasants to elect "learned and knowledgeable" who were priests, but it turned out that many priests were defeated by peasant candidates. The non-participation of the whole communities in the elections irritated the movement's leaders even more. Moreover, it appeared that non-participation in some cases was provoked, or at least justified, by the advices received from the Ruthenian movement.

On 8 July 1848, Rev. Toma Krasys'ts'kyi reported to the Supreme Ruthenian Council that "the Hryniv community by any measure and against all the advices did not want to elect electors [these were two-steps elections], justifying this by saying that there no man among them was fit for this."¹⁹⁵ This was an interesting drawback of the Councils' agitation to elect educated and literate people. To this letter the Supreme Ruthenian Council responded stating that: "it is not necessary to elect a literate person." The Council told the priest that:

There is a need to teach dark peasants on every occasion, so when there will be an opportunity to elect deputies to the provincial Diet to L'viv, they should be prudent and do not give up such an important right, because otherwise they would give an opportunity to the enemies of the Ruthenian cause to turn elections according to their will.¹⁹⁶

The Zolochiv Ruthenian Council explained the avoidance of the elections by peasants by two things: 1) peasants did not realize that the great change occurred; 2) there was strong enemy agitation.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁴ Volodymyr Kachkan. *Mykhailo Pavlyk. Narys zhyttia i tvorchosti* (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1986), 116.

¹⁹⁵ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.30, a.58-59.

¹⁹⁶ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.30, a.58.

¹⁹⁷ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.30, a.33.

The Ruthenian movement saw the elections as a crucial first step towards the larger reorganization of political life in the state. On 18 September 1848 the Supreme Ruthenian Council issued a “Warning” to the communities. He told them that the old *dominia* and *mandatoria* would be abolished and in their place village and town councils would be established. These bodies would become the supreme local authorities. The Council encouraged peasants not to give up in the face of the coercion and to elect good citizens, honest, religious, and sober. Special care should be taken to elect those who could read and write.¹⁹⁸ Obviously, the warning was issued in light of peasants’ behavior during the parliamentary elections. The Ruthenian movement, anticipating further elections to the diet and local legislatures, tried to prepare Ruthenians for the parliamentary order.¹⁹⁹ However, the next elections did not take place until the 1860s.

In the immediate aftermath of the election movement leaders characterized peasants’ stubborn position mildly. It was not a lack of consciousness, or peasants’ unpreparedness for political life, but rather their slow-mindedness. With time the Council’s characterizations become more indicting. The proclamation of the Supreme Ruthenian Council “To the honest Ruthenian communities, in the towns and villages of the Ruthenian-Galician and Volodymyrian kingdom of the Austrian Empire” is an example of this changing attitudes, reproaching peasants for their ignorance: “You [peasants] are saying: whatever the God should give he will give, today he gave to us the right of freedom; but the God does not help idleness and negligence.” The proclamation defended clergy from peasants’ accusations and tried to expose peasants’ position as the result of their ignorance:

There are some among the people, who getting drunk and have no ability to look around, were shouting to the people not to go to the elections, not to sign, because (they said) the *robot* would come back... or they also said “do not trust anyone, even your learned son, if he is not in peasant dress.”²⁰⁰

Though the Polish movement in Ruthenian discourse is usually presented as one that took advantage of peasants’ ignorance, it appears that this movement was also attempted to teach peasants about new constitutional realities, to guide peasants out of the dark:

Now you have a right to elect a deputy. This is not going to be the community’s deputy who quite often with the community’s complaint went to the Circle and came back with nothing! Oh, no! The deputy in the

¹⁹⁸ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.35, a. 31.

¹⁹⁹ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.30, a.30.

²⁰⁰ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.70, a.2-4.

Constitution is the whole community! The deputy can insist on abolishing some heavy taxes as, for example, excise, to make salt cheaper, to allow people to grow tobacco to smoke and to sell [it], just as now everyone can grow and sell wheat and rye, to forbid your landlord and now your neighbor, or Circle, to enforce their own candidate as your mayor, to make your children to be recruited not in such great numbers and for shorter time, to make it so that your children will not be sent to the end of the world, to foreign land but will be defending your own houses and farmsteads...²⁰¹

Despite all the fears and accusations of ignorance, Galician peasants avoided violent action in 1848 just as the majority of them did in 1846. In 1848, if the peasantry was concerned with something more than with anything else, it was not the land (as Kieniewicz presents it) but the return of *robot*. The peasants could not imagine that someone could take their rustical landholdings away from them in normal circumstances, and their conflicts with the landlords were a continuation of the old disputes about the land in common usage; neither peasants nor landlords thought about a large-scale reshuffling of the structure of landholding. We should remember that, although Joseph II divided the land into rustical and dominical, all the rustical land remained titular property of landowners; it is only that their rights to dispose of this property were severely limited.²⁰²

Peasants did not, however, translate their particular position into their own actions. Some peasant deputies joined the Ruthenian camp. But the most famous Galician peasant from 1848, Ivan Kapushchak, as a parliamentary deputy joined the Viennese democrats and paraded in the uniform of the Viennese National Guard featuring a Calabrian hat, which he wore when returned to the village after the parliament was dissolved.²⁰³ Many other peasant activists found themselves in the similar contact with the Ruthenian movement. This was a type personified in Vasyl' Pak. Perhaps, some peasant parliamentary deputies were quite influential, and some communities tried to channel their demands through them, imagining these deputies to be community "plenipotentiaries" of some higher rank. There were local literate villagers, (again cantors figure prominently), who were corresponding with their respective deputies in Vienna. They forwarded to them

²⁰¹ Ivan Franko, "Prychynok do halyts'ko-rus'koï bibliografii 1848-1849 r.," *ZNTSh*, t.22 (L'viv, 1898), 7.

²⁰² Originally the land was divided into rustical and dominical for fiscal purposes – to tax separately the landlords and the peasants, but weak tenure of the peasants was causing frequent changes in their landholdings, therefore the state decided to fix rustical part of the landlords' lands, and made of them in Franko's words certain *fundus instructus*, which was neither landlords' nor peasants' property. See Tokarz, *Galicja w początkach ery Józefińskiej*, 193-205. Ivan Franko, "Zemel'na vlasnist' v Halychyni," *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'atdesiaty tomakh*, t.44, kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1984), 575-580.

²⁰³ Ivan Krevets'kyi, "Z vyborchoho rukhu vu skhidnii Halychyni v 1848 r. (Vybir Ivana Kapushchaka)," *ZNTSh*, t.70 (L'viv, 1906) 81.

their grievances and requests for the return of fields, commons and pastures, and inquired about political events: for example about the formation of the Ruthenian guard, or “was the minister hanged, by whom and for what, and is Emperor in Vienna or not.”²⁰⁴

At the same time most of the communities never had any access to these deputies. Some communities acted very much in line with the 1846 pattern. This was, for example, the case in the Sambir circle. Not just landlords’ but also state peasants in the area, just as in 1846, created community guards, blocked the roads and did not allow volunteers for the Hungarian army to cross into Hungary. This action was done before the regular detachments of self-defense and National Guard were created by the authorities and the Ruthenian movement.²⁰⁵ This peasant action caused great panic in the city of Sambir and Polish activists begged the circle administration to do something about peasants in order to prevent another slaughter. Ruthenian activists did not make a single attempt to use these peasant disturbances and to do something about it. In fact, we have numerous testimonies that the clergy did not know how to approach the peasantry after 1846 and was afraid of it just like the landlords.²⁰⁶

In general, peasant communities in 1848 wanted to be left alone for the time being and were wary of the involvement into larger politics. The issue of signing of the petition for the division of Galician into two provinces, Polish and Ruthenian, proves this and characterizes the relationship between the movement and peasant communities better than anything else. Although great numbers of signatures were reported there are no original petitions with signatures, and only reports on them. Sometimes, as many as 133,000 or even 200,000 signatures are claimed.²⁰⁷ We do not have reports on peasants signing the petition, but there are many reports on the peasants refusing to sign. This refusal to sign was not a statement against the content of the petition, rather a negation of the process of signing itself.

We have many examples of this type of behavior from the Sambir circle. When in 1848 in Stare Koblo, Rev. Ivan Lopushanskyi, who had been a pastor of this village for twelve years, asked his parishioners to sign the petition the following dialogue took place:

²⁰⁴ Ivan Franko, “Prychynky do istorii 1848 r.,” *Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.47 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 390.

²⁰⁵ Aleksander Kuczera, *Samborszczyzna*, t.2, 350; Kieniewicz, *Pomiedzy Stadionem a Goslarem*, 125.

²⁰⁶ See Vasyl’ Chernetskii, “Zhadky z 1846 roku,” *Dilo*, 1892, No.176. See also Rev. Matkovs’kyi’s memoir describing how Greek Catholic priests were afraid of applying for the parish of Horozhanna because of the events that took place there in 1846. APP ABGK, sygn.9447.

²⁰⁷ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terletsykyi, spr.131/I, a.87-88.

-Do you want the division of Galicia, would you like to have guaranteed to the Ruthenian nation your Ruthenian schools, Ruthenian offices, a Ruthenian gubernium?
-We want it.
-Will you sign for it?
-We shall not sign because we are afraid of the signature, – that the *Robot* will come back, or, that there might be some treason.²⁰⁸

Similarly, in 1848, Hvizdets' parishioners refused to sign the petition against the appropriation of the Church and parish lands, saying that they were afraid of treason and the return of serfdom.²⁰⁹ The attempt to organize the signing of the petition on the division of Galicia in Mshanets' by Rev. Nazarevych led him to write three letters, which tell us that parishioners were afraid of signing the petition because they suspected treason.²¹⁰ The issue of signing petition for the division of Galicia had to spoil relationships between Rev. Iosyf Levyts'kyi and his parishioners, who suspected him of trying to introduce specific “priest's *robot*.”²¹¹

We also have a letter from the Sambir circle council to the Drohobych council dated by 7 September 1848 and signed by the council's secretary, Rev. Korostens'kyi. The letter explains the situation as following:

Because our people are confused by the enemies of our nation, in many places of our circle they refuse to sign the petition for the division of Galicia, although they wish conscientiously the rise of the Ruthenian nation and separation of the Galician Ruthenian land from the Polish [*mazurskoj*]...²¹²

Because of this, the Council accepted the following tactics. Priests did not have to force the people to sign if the refusals were taking place. Instead, of that they were supposed to compose the following protocol: “Do you desire the division of Galicia?” – “Yes, we want it.” “Will you sign?” – “No, we shall not sign because we are afraid of the signatures, of the return of serfdom, or of treason (or whatever else they say).” If even such a protocol could not be written, then, at

²⁰⁸ Iuryi Kmit, “Z sil's'kykh vidnosyn u Halychyni v seredyni XIX v.,” *ZNTSh*, 1903, v.54, 8.

²⁰⁹ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, “Parokhiiiany vidmovliaiut' pidpysiv na petytsiiu protyv vidobrannia tserkovnykh i parokhiiial'nykh dibr v 1848 r.,” *ZNTSh*, t.57 “Miscellanea” (L'viv, 1904), 6-8.

²¹⁰ VR IL, f.3, spr.1630, a.292.

²¹¹ Ivan Franko, “Velykyi shum,” in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.22 (Kyiv: “Naukova dumka,” 1979), 239.

²¹² LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.19.

least priests with their relatives and servants, cantor, older brother of Church brotherhood, sexton, and church controller, had to sign the petition.²¹³

This explanation was meant as a response to numerous complaints by local priests. After having received this advice, Rev. Kmitykevych, the chair of Drohobych Ruthenian council, asked Drohobych dean Rev. Haponovych to send this to those priests who could not gather signatures in favor of the division of Galicia as of 16 October 1848. The Drohobych council obtained by that date 1746 signatures, and the following villages refused to sign: Bil'che, Boryslav, Doliava, Dobrohostiv, Dobrivliany, Dovhe, Horuts'ko, Hubychi, Kropyvnyk Novyi, Kropyvnyk Staryi, Krynytsia, Letnia, Medenychi, Oriv, Popeli, Ripchytisi, Rybnyk, Skhidnytsia, Stebnyk, Truskavets', Tustanovychi, Ulychne and Vatsiovychi. – This means that the majority of the district's communities refused to sign the petition.²¹⁴ In total there were 5,457 signatures reported to have been collected in the Sambir circle.²¹⁵ The highest number was reported from the Przemyśl circle – 10,813 and the lowest from the L'viv circle – 1040.²¹⁶

Here we have a fundamental conflict between the liberal constitutional world of citizens imagined by the Ruthenian movement and peasant tactics of the avoiding of the world of Word. Peasants viewed not just oaths but any promises with suspicions. As late as 1906 peasants in the court under the threat of arrest refused to testify because of the fear to “utter even one word wrong.”²¹⁷ The fear expressed by the peasantry was not the fear of the documents but fear of the arrested Word, words fixed and unchangeable, a “captured” word that could be used by someone else, interpreted as an expression of the intent. For priests this was just another proof of the fact that peasants remained an “element dead set against any propaganda.”²¹⁸ In the youth gangs' slang of the 1980s in the Soviet Union, “to sign” meant to take on certain obligations, and responsibility for someone else. This had to be avoided at all costs and done only in respect of one's own gang's members.

²¹³ LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.19.

²¹⁴ LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.19.

²¹⁵ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets'kyi, spr.131/I, a.87-88.

²¹⁶ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets'kyi, spr.131/I, a.87-88.

²¹⁷ *Dilo*, 1906, No.243.

²¹⁸ Iosafat Kobryns'kyi to Iakiv Holovats'kyi, cited in Jan Kozik, “Kwestia,” 74.

Sambir Ruthenians

The appearance of the Ruthenian national movement in 1848 surprised everyone, including the Ruthenians themselves. At the same time we know that Polish revolutionaries, the Austrian government and Ruthenian activists had paid attention to the difference between Ruthenians and Poles for quite some time prior to 1848. What was actually so surprising to many in 1848 was the appearance of organized Ruthenian activities, in the context of which a Ruthenian national discourse was articulated. Ruthenian organizations attempted to transform the Ruthenian question into a matter of high politics, to influence the politics of the state, and this was something to date unheard of.

The Ruthenian movement in 1848 was structured as a network of the Ruthenian councils. The Supreme Ruthenian Council was founded in L'viv (on 2 May 1848), and local, "smaller" Ruthenian councils were founded in province responding to the appeals of the Supreme Council and of the hierarchy of the Greek Catholic Church. The Supreme Ruthenian Council in its proclamation from 18 May 1848 called for the establishment of regional Ruthenian councils and proposed their following composition:

Three rural representatives possessing the peasants' backing three burghers, three lesser noblemen who rent [the land they work] (if such nobles could be found) and three cantors, which comes to twelve members. To this number eighteen more are to be added from among our learned men, who have earned the confidence of the Ruthenian nation. But there should not be more than ten clergymen among them.²¹⁹

Obviously, the envisioned structure of the local councils secured the clergy's domination and at the same time expressed a desire that the councils appear to be representative of various strata of population, so that no one could accuse the councils in being clerical intrigue. There were three Ruthenian councils founded in the Sambir circle. One was founded in Sambir, another one in Drohobych and a third one in Turka.

The Council in Turka was a unique one; this was the only of all Ruthenian councils chaired by the peasant.²²⁰ This council was formed on the territory of the Vysots'ko deanery. This was the southernmost corner of the Sambir circle, where most of the events, described in the chapter on 1846, took place. The Vysots'ko Ruthenian Council was created in Turka on 28 June 1848. On 1 July 1848 there

²¹⁹ Cited in Kozik, *Ukrainian National Movement*, 197.

²²⁰ This was established by Omelian Terlets'kyi, see Oleh Turii, "Hreko-katolyts'ka tserkva i revoliutsiia 1848-1849 rr. u Halychyni," 81.

was a festive opening of the Council in Turka and Rev. Roman Pasichyns'kyi had read a sermon in the Ruthenian language: this was the usual practice at the openings of Ruthenian councils. "But there was only a small number of peasant Ruthenians who came to the church, so we could actually find there more gentlemen, who came to the meeting because of pure curiosity."²²¹ After the Service there was a session in the house of the local parish priest. Rev. Iosyf Hurkevych from Il'nyk had made a speech and "according to the wish of peasants present there, Stefan Tsybuliak, the mayor from Sianky, was elected as a chair of the council." The vice-chair was Rev. Atanazii Iamins'kyi, the local dean and parish priest of Iablonka Nyzhnia. Revs. Iosyf Hurkevych and Roman Pasichyns'kyi (a parish priest from Krasne) became the Council's secretaries and Vasyl' Krup'iak, a teacher from Iablonka nyzhnia, became the Council's scribe. There were eleven priests among Council's members. Of the other nineteen members there was one postman, one townsman, five rustical gentry (one from Iavora and the rest – from Komarnyky), and nine peasants, besides the chair. The peasants were from Bahnovate, Bitlia, Zadir'sko, Iabloniv, Krasne, Il'nyk, and Iablonka Nyzhnia (from the villages that were under the influence of the priests-activists). Stefan Tsybuliak was able to sign this letter himself in Ruthenian but though in Latin script.²²²

Did the events of 1846 contribute to this situation? I have no idea. The participation of the peasants in this council can also be explained by the presence of Rev. Roman Pasichyns'kyi. Rev. Roman Pasichyns'kyi died in Krasne as late as 1901, although already in the late 1870s he was ill and could not participate in Ruthenian politics actively. He was loved by his parishioners from the villages of Krasne and Zadir'sko. In the 1870s and 1880s, the district administration called peasant electors from Krasne who were voting in the district center, Turka, "Krasne cadets," because on the elections they voted for the Ruthenian candidate without a single exception. The contrast between the late Rev. Roman and the priest who replaced him was so striking that Roman's son, Rev. Izydor said that with priests like that there was no wonder in peasants' becoming radicals, in the presence of the new priest he himself felt to be a radical.²²³ The Turka area was the only electoral district in the Sambir circle, from which a Ruthenian priest was elected to the Reichstag in 1848 – Rev. Ivan Lomnyts'kyi.²²⁴

²²¹ It is interesting that the original of this document uses the German system of capitalization of nouns, which has never been used in Ruthenian or Ukrainian. This kind of capitalization is often met in the Ruthenian documents connected with the activity of the Supreme Ruthenian Council.

²²² TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.4, a.51

²²³ LODA, f.1245, op.3, spr.4, a.1-8,

²²⁴ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 2/p/1, a.12.

On 28 August 1848, the Vysots'ko Ruthenian Council advised the Supreme Ruthenian Council to establish councils that would coincide with the administrative boundaries, "because in this way the council could better know the village people and in case of need to take better care of the various cases." Therefore, the Vysots'ko Council had decided to resign in favor of the Sambir council.²²⁵ No other Council was that short-lived. This could be connected with the fact that the Supreme Ruthenian Council never managed to create a hierarchy of the councils, with local councils being subordinated to the circular.²²⁶ But the significant presence of the peasantry might also have caused significant discomfort amongst other members of this council. Despite the fact that we know so little about its activities, this council entered accounts of the Galician history as a typical case proving the existing cooperation between the clergy and the peasantry in the Ruthenian movement.²²⁷ In fact, this was the only Council, where a peasant was elected as chair and where peasants played such an active role. In most other cases, peasants were fictive members, serving as a decoration and proof that the Ruthenian councils enjoyed the support of the "secular members" representing "numerous communities."²²⁸

The Circular Sambir Ruthenian Council was in this respect more typical. It was founded on 4 July 1848. Members of the Council were:

Rev. Iosyf Lavretskii, the dean of the Sambir deanery, born in 1797 and ordained in 1821, parish priest of Sambir

Rev. Antonii Pashkevych, vice-dean from Baranchytsi

Rev. Iosyf Polianskii, from Babyna

Rev. Iosyf Slyvyns'kyi, from P'ianovychi

Rev. Antonii Hylytovych, from Chukva

Rev. Vasyl' Lavrovskii, from Torchynovychi

Rev. Ivan Lopushan's'kyi, from Koblo Stare

Rev. Nykolai Horodys'kyi, from Hordynia

Rev. Iosyf Khoinats'kyi, from Berehy²²⁹

Rev. Vasyl' Shkol'nyts'kyi, from Vil'shanyk

Rev. Iakiv Lysnio

²²⁵ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.4, a.53.

²²⁶ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets'kyi, spr.128/XII, a.14.

²²⁷ John-Paul Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 32.

²²⁸ Andriy Zayarnyuk, "Mapping *Halychyna*: Constructing the Ukrainian National Space in Habsburg Galicia," in Susan Ingram, Markus Reisenleitner, Cornelia Szabó-Knotik (eds.), *Identität: Kultur: Raum: Kulturelle Praktiken und die Ausbildung von Imagined Communities in Nordamerika und Zentraleuropa* (Wien: Turia und Kant, 2001), 124-125.

²²⁹ in *Schematismus* he figures not as Iosyf but as Ivan.

Rev. Ivan Novakovs'kyi, from Kul'chytsi
 Rev. Ivan Korostens'kyi, assistant from Tatory, Sambir.
 Rev. Ivan Iasenys'kyi, from Luzhok dol'nyi
 Rev. Ilarion Il'nyts'kyi, dean of Mokirany deanery from Silets'
 Hrehorii Bandrovskiyi, peasant
 Antonii Chachkovs'kii, manager of state estate
 Vasyli' Pak, who is described here as an "aid of the parish school"
 Pavlo Kustryskii, peasant (perhaps, from Mistkovychi)
 Semen Bilikovskii, another "aid of the parish school."
 Rev. Dam'ian Hnatyshak, from Stupnytsia
 Karol' Bachynskii, another manager of state estates,
 Mykhailo Seletskiyi, "literate" (*pys'mennyi*), perhaps a scribe.

The chair of this council was Rev. Iosyf Lavrets'kyi and the secretary – Rev. Ivan Korostens'kyi. We have no material about activities of this council except a letter about its foundation and letter to the Drohobych Ruthenian Council on collecting signatures for the division of Galicia into Polish and Ruthenian parts.²³⁰ The problem seems to be in following. While the Turka Council resigned in favor of the Sambir council, the city of Sambir was not a good place for large-scale Ruthenian activity. Sambir was a gymnasium city with tradition of Polish patriotism dating back at least to the 1830s. Even in more Ukrainian and largely Jewish town of Drohobych Ruthenian activist Rev. Iosyf Levyts'kyi had to run from the Polish crowd after his speech on the opening of the local Ruthenian Council. In the Sambir circle one priest was threatened with murder if he would ever dare to think about organizing a Ruthenian Council (either Rev. Lavrets'kyi or Korostens'kyi).²³¹

The Sambir circle captain sympathized with the Poles, and Ruthenian activity was limited to the network of the local priests. The captain reported to the governor about the Pan-Slavic sympathies of the local clergy, giving Rev. Iosyf Levyts'kyi as an example. He also reported about the good behavior and non-involvement into politics of the former Polish conspirators: Teodor Kulczycki and Michał Popiel, which was obviously false in the case with the latter.²³² The Ruthenian position of the Church hierarchy was very important for the viability of the Ruthenian movement. The hierarchy could force priests to leave Polish organizations, as it happened in the Berezhany circle, where the Polish national council had nine Greek Catholic priests among its seventy one members – around twelve percent. These priests had to resign from their membership in the

²³⁰ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.4, a.184.

²³¹ *Zoria Halyts'ka*, 1848, No.5.

²³² VR LNB, f.Omelian Terletskyi, spr.131/I, a.121, 137.

council.²³³ In the Sambir deanery many priests did not support Ruthenian activities and sympathized with the Polish movement as well.²³⁴ As an example, we can take Rev. Nykolai Nestorovych, the founder of the Nestorovych clerical kin, whose numerous members later on could be found in positions of parish priests in the Sambir area.²³⁵ The Zhovkva circle itself, a stronghold of Ruthenians, had a number of Greek Catholic priests who sympathized with the Polish movement, including the local dean. The same was true of the Ternopil' area.²³⁶ Only Church discipline, and in most cases subordination to the deans – Ruthenian patriots, prevented the pro-Polish Greek Catholic clergy from voicing their discontent openly.

When funds were collected for the organization of the “religious-national festivity” in L'viv in 1849, commemorating the anniversary of emancipation Sambir Circular Council contributed with as little as 21 Gulden 40 Kreuzer, while separate communities as a rule were sending several Gulden. Staryi Sambir deanery sent 6 Gulden 20 Kreuzer. This can be compared with Oles'ko deanery, which sent 41 gulden. Some communities from the area of Drohobych Council contributed with funds – Rolliv and Litynia, while from the area of the Sambir council it seems that only the village of Hroziova sent money (perhaps, under the influence of Rev. Nazarevych).²³⁷

Although there were some peasant activists in the Sambir Council (two peasants and two cantors), among its members we also meet people like Anton Chachkovs'kyi, the manager of the state estate in Limna, who was known for his unfair treatment of peasants, and had frequent conflicts with local Greek Catholic priests.²³⁸ The Chair of this Council, Rev. Lavrets'kyi, was born in Przemyśl, and studied in Przemyśl, Chernivtsi and L'viv. After being ordained in celibate he became an army chaplain, serving in Bohemia and Moravia. There he learnt music, homeopathy, French, English, Italian and Romanian languages as well as literature in them. After his retirement from the army service he spent three years in Vienna, from where Bishop Snihors'kyi brought him back to Galicia. We do not know much about his activities in Sambir in 1848, except that he was “a wise

²³³ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 2/p/1, a.19-28.

²³⁴ Turii, “Natsional'ne i politychne polonofil'stvo,” 187.

²³⁵ Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv*, 44.

²³⁶ Kyrylo Studyns'kyi, “Pol's'ki konspiratsii sered rus'kykh pytomtsiv i dukhoven'stva v Halychyniv rokakh 1831-1846,” *ZNTSh*, t.82, 121.

²³⁷ *Zoria Halytska*, 1849, Nos. 41, 43, 53, 57.

²³⁸ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, “Prychynky do istorii rus'koho dukhovenstva v Halychyni vid 1820 do 1853 rr.,” *ZNTSh*, t.88 kn.2 (L'viv, 1909), 121, 135.

steersman” and a Ruthenian patriot. For his service and loyalty to the Dynasty in 1848 he was awarded golden medal.²³⁹

Two months lag between the appeal of the Supreme Ruthenian Council to found local Ruthenian councils and the foundation of the Vysots’ko and Sambir regional Councils indicate the connection between founding of these Councils and parliamentary elections. At the end of May the Supreme Ruthenian Council became concerned with elections for the first time and the beginning of July was the time of most intense pre-elections’ agitation. We must also note that the foundation of the Ruthenian councils was usually following the foundation of Polish Councils or Committees, this was the case with both central and regional councils. Poles were indicating that foundation of the Ruthenian Councils was initiated by the Governor Stadion to counter the foundation of the Polish Councils. Rev. Iosyf Levyts’kyi himself was justifying the founding of the Drohobych Ruthenian council by the fact that Poles had already got their own councils with clear national character. Therefore, Ruthenians, as a separate nation, also had right to found organizations like this.²⁴⁰

Ruthenian councils were short-lived but the activists participating in them were influential in the Ruthenian movement for the decades to follow. Rev. Mykhailo Kuzems’kyi, who was doing all the actual organizational and paper work of the Supreme Ruthenian Council, was coordinating the Ruthenian politics in the 1860s as well. The lasting impact of 1848 on the Ruthenian discourse is evident in the fact that very word *selianyn* (which is used for “peasant” in contemporary Ukrainian) came into usage in 1848. Moreover, already back then it was used as a counter-term to the Polish word *chłop*, which was normally used by Ruthenians in Galicia as well. Used in Polish at least since the end of the fourteenth century in two meanings as a “man” and as a servile “peasant,” the word had been for too long associated with the subject-dependence and acquired connotations of ignorance, simplicity, and rudeness, while the Ruthenian word *selianyn* yet had none of these, and literary meant “a villager.”²⁴¹

This opposition between two terms materializes in an article published in *Zoria Halyts’ka*. In this article a Pole uses an idiom “*chłop chłopom*” (a peasant will always remain a peasant, implying all the negative connotations of the word *chłop*),

²³⁹ “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 8(20).01.1874.

²⁴⁰ [Iosyf Levytskyi], *Besida hovorena dnia 22 Maia 1848 roku*.

²⁴¹ The two meanings of the word *chłop* appear in the known written texts of Old Polish almost simultaneously – Aleksandr Brückner, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* (Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, 1957). They are also mentioned in Linde’s *Dictionary of Polish Language*. The definition of the first meaning says that it means “agriculturalist in subject-dependency, expression which now connotes contempt (*wyraz dziś pogordę w sobie zawierający*).” M. Samuel Bogumił Linde, *Słownik języka polskiego*, wydanie drugie, t.1 (Lwów: w drukarni Zakładu Ossolińskich, 1854), 246.

to which the author of the articles responds: “It is not true! Our *selianyn* is good.” The word *selianyn* implies respectability and goodness and is opposed to the word *khlop*. Etymology of *selianyn* is the same as of the word *mishchanyn* (a townsman) and derives from the residential community (*selo*, a village).²⁴²

Many other things that played an important role in the Ruthenian movement in the second half of the nineteenth century could trace their origin back to 1848. This was the case with reading clubs. The idea about establishing reading clubs appeared in 1848 in the Kolomyia circle and was expressed by the priest Rev. Nykola Synevyd'skyi. However, although the backbone of the Ruthenian movement at the end of the nineteenth century were village reading clubs, in 1848 the idea was to establish urban reading clubs – no one could ever think of village reading club at that time.²⁴³ Thus, the parallels between the 1848 era and later period uncover not so much continuities as significant differences.

In numerous propagandist stories and short poems the character *khlop Zapeka* figured throughout the whole nineteenth century. By the end of the nineteenth century this character, whose surname implied stubbornness, figured as a positive character, whose stubbornness in the matters of religion and language benefited Ruthenian nation. However, when this character appeared for the first time in 1857 in the poem with the subtitle “a popular tale,” he appeared as a negative figure. His stubbornness was nothing good in the context of the liberal and enlightening ideas from 1848. Moreover, while in the later representation this character’s peasant origin was emphasized, back in the 1850s it did not matter – saying “peasant” the author of the poem warned that the character could belong to any other social groups as well.²⁴⁴

This ambivalence of the representation of peasants, whose peasantness was a stigmata, of which the movement had to get rid off, and who, on the other hand, were movement’s only constituency and had to become good Ruthenian citizens, was hunting all the texts written on the peasantry in the 1840s-1850s, and had a profound impact on the Ruthenian populists from the 1860s. The example of this ambivalence is a piece of correspondence that appeared in 1859 in the only Galician Ruthenian newspaper of that time. The article complains about peasantry’s disrespect of the Church holidays: “We must acknowledge that on Sundays and holidays no one is making more trade in the towns than peasants themselves, leaving not just their houses but their churches as well.” But at the same time the article expressed assurance about peasants’ advancement to the ideal of liberal citizens:

²⁴² Mykhailo z Dnistryka, “Kilka sliv do selian,” *Zoria Halystka*, 1851, No.32.

²⁴³ Mykhailo Pavlyk, *Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chyta'ni*, 40.

²⁴⁴ *Khlop Zapeka. Skazka narodna* (L'vov: Typm Instytutu Stavropihiiskoho, 1857).

Little by little knowledge of the humanity's dignity is waking up among our peasant people and with this also their respect to themselves as well as to each other. Quite often we hear that peasants title each other not only "Mister brother", "Mister mayor" but also "Mister this" and "Mister that". Even feminine sex is using honorary expressions and takes care not to miss the adequate honors; getting used to the elaborated addresses, our people become more cultivated and express disgust to impoliteness, simplicity and distrust.

The youth is also reported not to be as crazy and stubborn as it used to be.²⁴⁵ It is hard to believe that in the 1850s the change was so visible. This concern with the way people refer to each other was still very much actual for the Ruthenian newspapers in the late nineteenth century. We know that even at the beginning of the twentieth century in Galician Polish village the form of address "mister" [which by the way sounds just like "master" – *pan*] was used only towards some most important people in the village. Besides Jews, there were only three "mistres" in the village: mister organ-player, mister teacher and mister director of the railway station. The rest were peasants to whom the respectful form of address was usually *Wj*, [Polish *Wj* (Ukrainian *Vj*) corresponds to German *Sie* as opposed to more familiar *Du*] and not "Mister."²⁴⁶

Another interesting thing is that the articles from the 1850s only describe (and quite superficially) conditions in the villages but there are no calls for more active intervention of the Ruthenian movement into the lives of the villagers. The Ruthenian movement did not have such an intervention on its agenda; its liberalism was so to say "state-oriented." The state had to do the groundwork of creation of conscious citizens, who would eventually join the Ruthenian nation. That is why the Supreme Ruthenian Council did not think about working directly with people and was so concerned with securing the autonomy of the "Ruthenian" part of the province, the autonomy, which would eventually guarantee the development of Ruthenians.²⁴⁷ This reliance on state was the easiest solution for the movement propagating paternalist patronage of the communities by their more enlightened co-nationals and at the same time postulating hopes about the transformation of these communities into the associations of the individual and responsible citizens.

The only Ruthenian cultural society, created in the aftermath of 1848 on the Congress of Ruthenian "Scholars," was Galician-Ruthenian *Matysia*. The society

²⁴⁵ "Iz Nyzhankovets' v Liutom," *Vistnyk*, 1859, No.12.

²⁴⁶ Jan Piechota, *Gawęda mojego dzieciństwa. Wspomnienia z lat 1900-1918* (Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1987), 74.

²⁴⁷ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terletskyi, spr.127/XII, a.14.

was using existing Church structure, its agents and distributors of its publications were elected on the clergy's Deanery Congresses. Greek Catholic consistories were actually ordering deaneries to elect people responsible for the selling of these publications.²⁴⁸ In the Mokriany deanery of the Sambir circle three priests volunteered to do this work: Rev. Ivan Korostens'kyi a chaplain of Tatory, Rev. Emilian Hnatyshak, chaplain of Stupnytsia, and Rev. Ivan Lankevych, parish priest of Pobuzh (two of them were members of the Sambir Ruthenian Council in 1848, and the third one could be a member of one in Drohobych). Books were sent to the deanery and then distributed by these three priests. We must say that the clergy of the Mokriany deanery was more patriotic than that of the Sambir deanery. In the Mokriany deanery famous Ruthenian patriot (and accidentally and enemy of Rev. Iosyf Levyts'kyi) Rev. Lev Kordasevych was a vice-dean.²⁴⁹

The publications, distributed by the Galician-Ruthenian *Matytsia* among the peasants, consisted largely of ABCs (*bukvar*) and prayer books. These books were distributed among priests on the deanery meetings and then priests were selling them to their parishioners. From *Matytsia* correspondence it is obvious that the society's members were thinking about selling society's publications to already literate and conscious people and did not think about attracting to reading or raising national consciousness with the help of these texts. *Matytsia* hoped that the governmental reform, improvements in rural elementary schools will raise the readership. However, when the reform of the school system came in the 1860s, it was connected with the introduction of province's autonomy, the compromise reached between the dynasty and the Polish gentry, beginning of Polonization of the educational system, and transference of the authority to supervise elementary village schools from Church to the secular institutions. Some priests complained that because of this reform peasants did not learn how to read Ruthenian anymore, and there were no consumers for the Ruthenian prayer books.²⁵⁰ The introduction of the provincial autonomy and school reforms for many village priests signaled the end to *Matytsia's* activities and resulted in numerous complaints and desperate unrealistic advices to improve the situation, as for example, by starting to distribute its printed production in big towns and not in the villages.²⁵¹

²⁴⁸ TsDIAuL, f.148, op.1, spr.36, a.5.

²⁴⁹ TsDIAuL, f.148, op.1, spr.36, a.10.

²⁵⁰ TsDIAuL, f.148, op.1, spr.37, a.70.

²⁵¹ TsDIAuL, f.148, op.1, spr.37, a.73.

Matytsia's documents show that around 1860 the most popular book published by *Matytsia* was prayer book, so-called *Molytoslov*.²⁵² Paperback editions of large and smaller prayer books were selling quite well.²⁵³ Other, secular and more sophisticated books, like the play “Case in Klekotyn,” by Rev. Rudolf Mokh, *Matytsia's* statute, or “Explanation of the difference between Little Russian and Russian dialects,” even most active of Ruthenian activists were able to sell only to other priests.²⁵⁴

When funds for the National Home (*Narodnyi dim*) in L'viv were collected Rev. Iasenyts'kyi, (whom we met in 1846, now a Vysots'ko dean), spread the appeal but did not manage to raise funds among peasants:

Despite all the efforts we did not manage to incline Ruthenian people here to make donations. The reason for this is inhabitants' poverty because of the failed sowing in dry summer, local hail, and cattle disease.²⁵⁵

The similar story was told in 1863 as well. At the same time, some priests from the same area, Rev. Salamon Schastnyi in particular, managed to fundraise in their communities significant amounts.²⁵⁶ The data from other deaneries proves that the success of fund-raising depended on individual priests and not on economic prosperity of the peasantry. For example, Rev. Turchmanovych from Stril'bychi, the Staryi Sambir deanery, was sending money from Stril'bychi regularly, and after becoming a dean from other villages as well.²⁵⁷ In the Sambir deanery it was the case with Revs. Ivan Skobel's'kyi (Sambir, Baranchytsi, Khlivchyska), Mykola Horodys'kyi (Hordynia), Andrii Nyzhankovs'kyi (Cherkhava, Lukavytsia and Lopushna).²⁵⁸ In the Mokriany deanery it was Revs. Lev Kordasevych and Ivan Korostens'kyi, who managed to organize the fund-raising to which all the priests from the deanery contributed and contend this work during the 1870s as well.²⁵⁹

Even with the dissolution of the Ruthenian Councils and the demise of *Zoria Halyts'ka* the legacy of 1848 was very much alive. First of all, the networks of people created in 1848 were left intact, and many conscious Ruthenian were able

²⁵² TsDIAuL, f.148, op.1, spr.43, a.3.

²⁵³ TsDIAuL, f.148, op.1, spr.43, a.15.

²⁵⁴ TsDIAuL, f.148, op.1, spr.43, a.12.

²⁵⁵ TsDIAuL, f.130, op.1, spr.350, a.22.

²⁵⁶ TsDIAuL, f.130, op.1, spr.350.

²⁵⁷ TsDIAuL, f.130, op.1, spr.421.

²⁵⁸ TsDAIUL, f.130, op.1, spr.421.

²⁵⁹ TsDAIUL, f.130, op.1, spr.389.

to get to the important positions in Church hierarchy and secular institutions. The impact of 1848 was felt in the sphere of education as well; it consisted of both some concessions that Ruthenians got and influence of the Ruthenian movement on educated some educated villagers, cantors in particular. Even in some state schools the wave of Ruthenian patriotism was felt. The Consistory in 1848 tried to reorganize parish schools, to transform them into trivial and to take trivial schools in places with the majority of Ruthenian population under its own control, from the supervision of Roman-Catholic consistories.²⁶⁰

We have an account telling about following schools in the deaneries of the Sambir circle. In the Stara Sil' deanery trivial schools were in Stara Sil', Khyriv and Ful'shtyn. In Saryi Sambir deanery in Saryi Sambir, in the Vysots'ko deanery in Turka, in Sambir deanery in Sambir, Kaiserdorf, and Strilkovychi. All these schools were under the supervision of the Roman-Catholic consistory only in Saryi Sambir Ruthenian townsmen had parish school of their own as an alternative to the local trivial school. But the schools listed here are ones from the towns or from the villages with the majority of non-Ruthenian population. The data for Stara Sil', Saryi Sambir and Sambir deaneries seem to be incomplete and include only schools under the supervision of Roman-Catholic consistory. When we look at the schools in the Ruthenian villages of the Mokriany deanery we find trivial schools in Opaka, Pidbuzh, Iasenytsia sil'na, Nahuievychi, Tatory, Dorozhiv, Volia Iakubova and Bronnytsia.²⁶¹ In this deanery all the schools were under the supervision of Ruthenian consistory. We know that in the Saryi Sambir deanery there was another very successful trivial school in Stril'bychi, under the supervision of the Ruthenian consistory.

From 1840 to 1848 certain Patslavskyi taught in Strilbychi. He did not have required qualifications and because of that in 1848 had to move to the neighboring village to teach in the parish school. Instead of him Petro Bushchakovs'kyi came in and taught in the village from 1848 to 1876. He conducted his school journals in Ruthenian in 1848 -1855, then in German – in 1855-1862, and after the Provincial School Council (secular body supervising schools and formed by the province) was created – in Polish. In 1848 this teacher actively constructed Ruthenian language inventing some Ruthenian words; similar phenomenon is seen in the correspondence of the Ruthenian Councils as well. Between 1848 and 1855 his written Ruthenian evolved from Church Slavonic to more vernacular kind.²⁶²

²⁶⁰ Teodor Bilen'kyi, "Shkil'nytstvo narodne v peremyskii eparkhii v r.1848 i 1849," *Ruslan*, 1902, No.200.

²⁶¹ Teodor Bilen'kyi, "Shkil'nytstvo narodne v peremyskii eparkhii v r.1848 i 1849," *Ruslan*, 1902, No.201.

²⁶² Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Stril'bychakh*, 14-15, 19, 22-23.

The fact that even Rev. Turchmanovych, the parish priest of the neighboring Strashevychi, was sending his children to this school testifies about Bushchakovs'kyi's high qualifications. This teacher was also writing catalogues and reports for the schools in Linyna, Bilyna and Bystrytsia. Even in the twentieth century the memory about him was alive in the community, and he was considered to be the wisest man to ever live in that village. Besides teaching, he also served the community as a cantor, a scribe and plenipotentiary in the servitude process against the state estates. He led a choir, taught gardening and bee-keeping. In 1882 after he retired, he came back and settled in Stril'bychi.²⁶³

Petro Bushchakovs'kyi would be the typical example of the generation that received positions circa 1848 and was in prominence till the beginning of the 1880s. If we look at Sambir proper, and at the Turka and Mokriany deaneries we see the same thing. All the famous Ruthenian activists from the 1860s and 1870s – Revs. Salamon Shchastnyi and Roman Pasichyns'kyi from the Turka district, Rev. Pavlo Iasenys'kyi from the Sambir district and Rev. Ivan Korostens'kyi from the Drohobych district, for the first time appeared on public scene and in political life in 1848. It is very important to remember that educational concern of the Ruthenian activists were not limited to the sphere of high politics and obtainment of the concession from the government. In the 1850s village schooling was advancing precisely because of these people who obtained their positions around 1848. We have data only for the Mokriany and Drohobych deanery and as we have seen these two deaneries had more Ruthenian patriots than other deaneries of the Sambir circle. In 1851 Mokriany deanery had nine trivial and seven parish schools. In the Drohobych deanery in 1853 there were ten trivial schools and a number of parish schools could not be much smaller than that in the Mokriany deanery.²⁶⁴

As the result of 1848 events Ruthenian managed to get important position at the Sambir gymnasium. This was the position of the Greek-Catholic catechist and of the Professor of Ruthenian language, at first combined and then separated. Already in 1848, the Sambir council complained that 60 Ruthenians in the Sambir gymnasium were discriminated against and persecuted by the gymnasium teachers, especially Latin-rite catechist Rev. Podgurski.²⁶⁵ In 1849, Rev. Ivan Korostens'kyi, a member of the Sambir Ruthenian Council, was appointed as Greek Catholic catechist of the Sambir gymnasium. After this appointment he received “cat's music” (urban charivari) from the angered students, for whom this appointment was an offence against Polish patriotism. These students belonged

²⁶³ Ibid.

²⁶⁴ Teodor Bilen'kyi, “Shkil'nytstvo narodne v peremyskii eparkhii v r.1848 i 1849,” *Ruslan*, 1902, No.202.

²⁶⁵ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terlets'kyi, spr.131/I, a.21.

to both rites.²⁶⁶ There were only 60 Ruthenians mentioned in the Council's report in 1848 but we know that in 1850 there were 143 Roman-Catholics and 149 Greek-Catholics among 298 gymnasium students.²⁶⁷ In 1851 Sambir townsmen petitioned the school board to make Ruthenian a free subject.²⁶⁸

Rev. Ivan Korostens'kyi, born in 1811 and ordained in 1836, was also a new type of the Greek Catholic priest. He was educated in Vienna, and his career was very successful: from the administrator of Hordynia parish in 1845 he became an assistant in Sambir, and in 1849 – a catechist of the Sambir gymnasium, maintaining the position of Tatory chaplain. He was of petty gentry origin and was an opposite of another Rev. Ivan Korostens'kyi famous in the area, born in 1789 and ordained in 1833 in Vilnius. Being the priest of *antiqua educatio*, the latter had constant problems with getting permanent position, was a scandalous person, involved into numerous conflicts with clergy, state officials and peasants alike.²⁶⁹

Despite the resistance to his appointment, Rev. Korostens'kyi's activities already in 1850 brought the division of gymnasium's students into two national camps – Ruthenians and Poles.²⁷⁰ According to Rev. Mykhailo Polians'kyi, a teacher of the Ruthenian language, in May 1850 this gymnasium had “147 sincere orthodox Ruthenians, and 135 Poles, Germans, Jews and Polonized Ruthenians.” An interesting thing is that Polians'kyi does not mention social origin of these students at all, and this would be the case in all the reports from the Sambir gymnasium published in Ruthenian press in the 1880s-1900s.

With this period of the Sambir gymnasium is connected the central moment in the biography of Walery Łoziński, a writer, who for the first time described Galician petty gentry in his fiction *Szlachcic chodackowy* (1857), and *Szaraczek i karmazyn*, (1859).²⁷¹ Born in 1837, he moved into the Sambir circle with his father, *mandator* on the estates of Antoni Sozański. In 1855 he studied at the Sambir gymnasium and was member of the so-called “Polish party.” During this study he had to say something against Ruthenian students. Ruthenians, who by now constituted the “larger half” of all gymnasium students, wrote a formal complaint to the gymnasium's prefect. The result was the exclusion of Łoziński

²⁶⁶ Mykhailo Vozniak, “Z zakhodiv kolo rushchyny v sambirs'kii himnazii v 1849 i 1850 rr.,” *Nasha shkola*, 1913, No.4-5, 217.

²⁶⁷ VR LNB, f.Omelian Terletskiyi, spr.129/XII, a.146.

²⁶⁸ Mykhailo Vozniak, “Z zakhodiv kolo rushchyny v sambirs'kii himnazii v 1849 i 1850 rr.,” 226.

²⁶⁹ *Schematismus universi venerabilis cleri dioceseos graeco catholicae premislensis pro anno domini...* (all the accessible years were used to establish this biographic data). For the scandalous biography of older Korostens'kyi one can see documents in VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.794-808, 812-814, 861.

²⁷⁰ Mykhailo Vozniak, “Z zakhodiv kolo rushchyny v sambirs'kii himnazii v 1849 i 1850 rr.,” 219.

²⁷¹ Schneider, *Encyklopedya*, t.2, zeszyt 7, (Lwów, 1874), 283.

from all the Austrian gymnasia, and, consequently, the end of his education²⁷² Walery Łoziński was in touch with the Polish Galician democrats after 1848.²⁷³ But he died early on 31 January 1861 and that prevented him from becoming a star of the Galician political life.²⁷⁴

It seems quite probable that the behavior of the Ruthenian students in 1855 in the case of Walery Łoziński was the result of Rev. Korostens'kyi's influence. Already in the 1850s Poles were spreading various incredible rumors about him. These rumors were also repeated among the Greek Catholic clergy. Rev. Korostens'kyi himself reported one of these in his private correspondence: "it was told as a true story that I got angry and killed my cooking woman because she started talking to me in Polish." The clergy around Sambir was polonized, no one served a Liturgy on the day of emancipation 3(15) of May, and in the Stara Sil' deanery no Consistorial letter written in Ruthenian was kept. Similarly Polonized was the Horozhanna deanery in the northern part of the Sambir circle. The only exception was already mentioned Morkiany deanery.²⁷⁵

In 1858 the Consistory wanted Korostens'kyi to resign from the Tatar position, where he worked as a chaplain, and to remain only a catechist in Sambir, but Rev. Korostens'kyi chose Tatar, not wishing to start from scratch as a cooperator, in the case he would lost the position of catechist. Mykhailo Polians'kyi, gymnasium professor of Ruthenian tried to persuade Rev. Zhelekhivs'kyi to leave Rev. Korostens'kyi in Sambir: "he is needed here very much because he knows everything and knows everyone's weak side."²⁷⁶ However, Rev. Ivan Korostens'kyi left Sambir, and later moved to Hrushiv, finally becoming a dean of the Mokriany deanery. His position in the gymnasium was taken over by Rev. Pavlo Isenyts'kyi, who angered Rev. Korostens'kyi by not moving into the apartmental building owned by the latter.²⁷⁷ This personal animosity aside, Rev. Iasenyts'kyi was a good match for Rev. Korostens'kyi in terms of Ruthenian patriotism, influence on the Ruthenian population, and Ruthenian students in the

²⁷² [Walery Łoziński], Pisma pomniejsze Walerego Łozińskiego (Z życiorysem autora) (Lwów: Nakładem Karola Wilda, 1865), 481.

²⁷³ He was the one to return to the events of 1846 in his fiction and think about other ways to win peasants to Polish cause. Zbigniew Fras, Demokraci w życiu politycznym Galicji w latach 1848-1873, (Acta Universitatis Wratislavenensis No.1962, Historia CXXXII) (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1997), 120-123.

²⁷⁴ [Walery Łoziński], Pisma pomniejsze, 485.

²⁷⁵ Mykhailo Vozniak, "Z zakhodiv kolo rushchyny," 222-223.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 222.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 225.

Sambir gymnasium. Just like Rev. Korostens'kyi and Sambir dean Rev. Lavrets'kyi, Rev. Iasenys'kyi was a graduate of the Viennese seminary.²⁷⁸

Rev. Korostens'kyi was not much of a reporter to the newspapers, if my guess about his authorship of the reports is correct, and observations from the area published in the 1850s prove to be very schematic. In 1858 it was noticed that peasants came in mass to the city at the end of February when they had to pay their taxes. They brought various products to sell but only Jews were purchased them cheaply in order to resell later.²⁷⁹ The very same year a correspondent to Vistnyk from Sambir complained about the absence of Ruthenian correspondents to the newspaper in that town.²⁸⁰ Nobody could even think about recruiting peasants and publishing peasant correspondences. The movement relied on the state and waited for school education to bare its fruits. But because of such a position there was not much progress in village schools in the 1850s. Only in the 1860s, when the combined pressure from state and clerical authorities resumed, the village schooling system showed signs of reanimation. It is in the 1860s that some communities started once more to found village schools and fund their teachers.²⁸¹

²⁷⁸ VR LNB, f. Ivan Levyts'kyi, op.2, spr.3562, p.105, a.1-3.

²⁷⁹ "Dopys' z Sambora," Vistnyk, 1858, No.13.

²⁸⁰ "Dopys' iz Sambora," Vistnyk, 1858, No.36.

²⁸¹ Ivan Fylypchak, "Z istorii shkil'ntstva na zakhidnii Boikivshchyni (1772-1930)," Litopys Boikivshchyny, 1931, No.1, 91-98.

Chapter 4

THE POLITICS OF PROPERTY

Simple people have their own principles, the principles of ignorance and deception, and no one will lead them out of it, no temporary, one-time teaching; perhaps, only the protracted, systematic education of youth under the influence of a national and liberal government will manage to cleanse their grandchildren because the contemporary strata, soaked with the sin of antisocialism that had been fed to it and is still fed by the enemies of freedom, is dead for the motherland and is ready to swallow freedom only to return it to the despots as vomit.¹

Representations of the Servitudes' Problematic

In Ukrainian historiography the struggle over “servitudes,” that is, the struggles of subjects for the rights they held to commons, forests and pastures belonging to their landlords after *robot* was abolished, figures as the most important part of the Galician peasantry’s class struggle in the nineteenth century. The similar process which took place in Right-bank Ukraine (which was part of the Russian Empire) has not received any sustained academic attention and does not figure prominently in the Ukrainian historical narrative, although servitudinal struggles in Right-bank Ukraine were of a larger scale and even more violent than those in Galicia.² The reason for this concern with servitudes in Galicia is simple: there were not many other violent conflicts between the peasantry and the authorities in the history of Habsburg Galicia. In the case of the Russian Empire not the conflict over servitudes but bloody violence at the beginning of the twentieth

¹ Vasyl’ Podolyns’kyi, “Slovo perestorohy,” 366.

² Dmitrii Poida, *Krest’ianskoie dvizhenie na Pravvoberezhnoi Ukrainie v poreformennyi period (1866-1900 gg.)*.

century serves as an important focal point for describing the escalation of social contradictions in agriculture during its transition to capitalism and proving the existence of a peasant class consciousness by depicting violent class action.

The absence of any reference to the similar processes which took place all over the Europe (starting with English enclosures and ending with the way the issue of servitudes was resolved in the Kingdom of Poland, where servitudes were being abolished in the 1860s only on the basis of mutual agreement between peasants and landlords and where Russian administration in many cases privileged peasants and discriminated against the landlords³) is very revealing as to the character of the historiography on the struggles over servitudes in Galicia. Instead of looking at the abolition of servitudes as the specific Galician instance in the larger process of enclosing commons in rural Europe, historians have presented servitudes as a particularly Galician form of rural class struggle. This absence of any larger context has served the goal of connecting the issue of servitudes with the intentional class action of Galician landlords, who sought compensation for the losses they had suffered because of the abolition of *robot*. Peasant class action was the response to the class action of the Galician landlords. The very choice of the metaphor for the process described – the “servitudes struggle” instead of “servitude conflicts” or “the regulation of servitudes,” reveals much about this particular encoding of the events.⁴

The official History of the Towns and Villages in the L'viv region of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic describing villages in the Sambir district finds servitudinal “struggles” the only event in the nineteenth century worthy of mention.⁵ It also gives examples of these struggles. It reports that servitude trials were held in the village of Chaikovychi in 1858 and 1869, which ended with the community's cattle being confiscated by the landlord. Biskovychi had a servitude trial between 1867 and 1890. Struggles over servitudes also took place in Khlivys'ka, Lanivtsi (Lanovychi), and Bolzva Horishnia.

The first thing that strikes one about these accounts is the fact that these incidents represent only a tiny minority of villages in the contemporary Sambir district. In the example of Bolzva Horishnia, we can detect other strategies that were used in these descriptions to codify the “struggle” as a series of violations, pressures and resistances. The official history says that in 1850 the village had their forest taken away, in 1851 the peasants wrote a petition to the Emperor, and only in 1872 did they receive some compensation. While in 1789 the size of their

³ For this see Żanna Kormanowa and Irena Pietrzak-Pawłowska, (eds.), Historia Posłki, t.3, cz.1 (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1967), 373.

⁴ For example, the section in Himka, Galician Villagers is entitled “The Servitudes Struggle and Its Lessons,” which is translation of Ukrainian *borot'ba za servituty*, or *servitutova borot'ba*.

⁵ Istoriia mist i sil Ukraïns'koi RSR, L'vivs'ka oblast' (Kyïv, 1968), 674, 682.

pasture was 464 Joch and 605 Klafter of forest, the amount of recompense the community received was only 35 Joch.⁶

The description of this case creates the impression that in 1789 the peasants owned the land (which at one point is called “pasture” and later appears as “forest”), which, after the servitude trial, was taken from them and only partially compensated for after a prolonged dispute. The violation allegedly happened in 1850, the aftermath of 1848. The truth is that neither in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth nor in Austria prior to 1848 could the peasants own land as their own property. Even the most pro-peasant of scholars acknowledge that in Polish times peasants did not own their own forests and pastures but had to use those of their landlords. Forests and pastures as a rule were part of the demesne proper, and no legal difference between manorial and peasant land as yet existed.⁷

In 1789, the Josephinian cadastre delimited *dominical* (which corresponds to demesne) land from the land in peasant usage (*rustical*), protecting the latter. Both kinds of land technically remained the property of the landlord; only the landlords' rights to the *rustical* land were severely restricted by the state. The overwhelming majority of the forests (which were often also used as pastures) were already listed as dominical land in the 1789 cadastre, based on the fact that according to the forest law issued in 1782 all non-royal woodland had to be under the supervision of the estates.⁸ With pastures the situation was different. Although many of them appeared in the Josephinian cadastre as rustical land belonging to the community, with time a great number of them were appropriated by the landlords (this quite often went together with their conversion into arable land) and already by the time of the Franciscan cadastre (1819) appeared as dominical land. On the eve of 1848, peasants were using 70% of the arable land, 68.5% of the meadows, 63% of the pastures, and only 0.7% of the forests.⁹ The “equivalent” was land given to peasants in exchange for these rights of usage. The equivalent depended on the kind and scale of usage peasants were able to prove, on the scale and kind of usage the rightful owner (the landlord) was able to prove, and in these circumstances 35 Joch received by the community of Bolzva Horishnia was not the worst possible outcome.

Focused historical works have painted a more sophisticated picture of the servitudes problematic.¹⁰ Nevertheless, they have not challenged these codified

⁶ Mykola Kravets', “Selians'kyi rukh u skhidnii Halychyni v 50 - 80kh rokakh XIX st.,” in *Z istorii Ukrain's'koi RSR*, vyp.7 (Kyiv, 1962), 60, 63, 64.

⁷ Ivan Franko, “Panshchyna ta ii skasuvannia 1848 r. v Halychyni,” *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.47 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 100.

⁸ Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 37.

⁹ Kozik, “Kwestia wlościańska,” 63.

¹⁰ These are, first of all, works of Mykola Kravets'. See his *Selianstvo Skhidnoi Halychyny i Pivnichnoi Bukovyny u druhii polovyni XIX st.*

representations but rather have followed the latter in their emphasis on direct and violent confrontations and in total neglect of procedures regulating the solution of servitudes disputes. These historical works conform to the myth which assumed that the forests and pastures at a certain point back in time belonged to the communities, that the servitudinal struggles were class actions on the part of the peasantry against their landlords, and that the abolition of servitudes was an intentional action by the landlords trying to compensate themselves for the abolition of *robot*. All the works dealing with servitudinal issues try to give a uniform picture of this process, and this did not change with the creation of independent Ukraine. Mykola Kravets', the best-known specialist in Ukrainian soviet historiography on the issue of servitudes, demonstrates in his most recent article on the issue of servitudes that his view of the servitudes struggle has not changed since the 1960s.¹¹

First of all, we should remember that the grievances of the communities against their landlords can be divided into several categories. Servitudinal conflicts were different from the appropriation by landlords of individual peasant landholdings and communal lands. Secondly, servitude cases themselves can be divided into numerous classes. Some of them started with the landlords' ill-famed closure of forests and pastures in 1848, when they started demanding payment for the usage of these resources. This indeed was motivated by the acutely felt shortage of agricultural labor in 1848 and its immediate aftermath. But at first this did not cause any violent reaction from the communities. Later on, however, the indecisiveness of the situation and prolongations (at first with the legislation and, later on, with its implementation) brought about violent actions.

Until 1857 the majority of servitude cases were decided administratively in favor of the peasants, by imperial circular officials with no sympathy for the Polish landlords. That is why the peaks of "violent resistance," which according to studies of the struggles over servitudes took place in the immediate post-emancipation era, do not indicate any resistance to the way the issues were decided, only a mode of community action. Only with the establishment of a commission in the Viceroy's Office in 1857, and especially after 1860, did the landlords acquire increasing influence over the decisions. New commissions, in fact, revised many of the resolutions made by the political administration in the 1850s.¹²

Around 1860 the servitude problems entered a new phase and ushered in a new kind of conflict. In some cases, of communities involved in the action immediately following 1848, this phase involved a wider range of communities.

¹¹ Mykola Kravets', "Borot'ba selianstva skhidnoi Halychyny za 'lisy i pasovyska' v seredyni XIX st.," Ukraina: kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'. Iuvileinyi zbirnyk prats' na poshanu Feodosiia Stebliia, v.9 (L'viv, 2001), 188-196.

¹² Franko, "Panshchyna ta ii skasuvannia, 102.

As a former plenipotentiary and character in Franko's story "Forests and Pastures" explains:

Our misfortune started with conscription [here he means the investigation of the number of cattle pastured on commons by the servitudes commission, during which the landlord cheated the community] – you know, the one in 1859. Until that time we lived with our landlord in perfect harmony. He was afraid of touching us – there was still a fear among landlords because of that Mazurian slaughter. And we did not need to touch him: we had pasture, cut wood in the forest just as our parents had, and always thought that this was a community forest; there was even a community forester.¹³

The issue of servitudes was discussed and struggled over for such a long time that different modes of community action took place and the positions of the authorities on the question changed several times. Moreover, the issue of servitudes was part of the larger post-emancipation regulation of landholding and land usage in Galicia, the leitmotif of which was the introduction of "proper property relationships." As an integral part of this larger issue, the question of servitudes was present from the very beginning in all projects dealing with the emancipation of the Galician peasantry, including those of the Polish revolutionaries in the 1830s and 1840s. It is only because of the character of Galician emancipation in 1848 (conducted in a hurry by Governor Stadion while the revolution was going on) that the issue of servitudes was not dealt with in the very act of emancipation. However, it was mentioned there and the status quo was supposed to have been maintained until more detailed legislation could be issued.

The abolition of *robot* itself was legitimized not by the sufferings of the peasants but on account of economic needs. In 1842 Count Kazimierz Krasicki argued that Galicia was suffering from an acute shortage of rural labor because the peasants did not want to work more than they were obliged to. The fact that the peasantry could not acquire property, together with their in-born inclination to laziness, was presented as the plague of Galician agriculture. The solution was to transform peasant landholdings into property, i.e. the land had to be commodified. *Robot* itself, translated into its money equivalent, was described as merely a burden on property. The commodification of land, it was argued, would change the peasants' attitude and responsibilities. As peasants were now responsible only for their movable property and for their own bodies, they tried to keep this property to a minimum so as not to lose too much.¹⁴ Ivan Fedorovych, in his letters of 1844, represents *robot* as a burden on both peasant

¹³ Franko, "Lisy i pasovys'ka,"

¹⁴ Franko, "Zhyttia Ivana Fedorovycha," 119.

and landlord economies and argues that the abolition of *robot* will bring prosperity to the landlords' estates.¹⁵ All the work done in the Galician Diet to abolish *robot* saw this abolition only as necessary part of the commodification of peasant landholdings.¹⁶

After 1848, servitudes were still intact, although some landlords demanded payment for their usage. In many places peasants had had to provide some kind of payment for this even before 1848. A patent regulating servitudes was issued only in 1853, while the actual commissions started work only in 1857. By 1860 they had not decided a single case.¹⁷ Around 1850 a rumor spread that all the commons and forests would become communal property, which was accompanied by the peasants' violent exercising of their rights of usage. This was the beginning of the servitudinal conflicts and accounts for most cases in the statistics gathered by Mykola Kravets'. But there is a difference between peasants protesting against the closure of forests and pastures by landlords in the aftermath of 1848 or the illegal take-over of commonly used forests and pastures, and their protesting against the decisions of the servitude commissions. All the 1850s action fits into the first category; only in the 1860s do we encounter actions that either protest or try to influence the decisions of the servitude commissions.

There is no doubt that the results of the servitude trials by and large benefited the landlords. But I question the assumption that the purpose of the whole action was for their benefit – to compensate them for the loss of *robot*. The position of the landlords was not secure at any time during this period. It was secured only with the establishment of gentry political hegemony in the province's politics in the 1860s. This is when the power in the districts was transferred from the hands of the imperial bureaucracy to the hands of the large landowners. Prior to that time the landlords were not happy with the way servitudinal disputes were dealt with by the authorities. They complained that the authorities were purposefully prolonging the trials to maintain tensions between landlords and peasants.¹⁸ This prolonging of the servitudinal trials and avoidance of final decisions was in the interests of the officials, who saw delay not only as part of the politics of the central government but also as a way to enrich themselves, and this was recognized by some Ukrainian authors as well.¹⁹

When in 1860 the servitudes' conflicts were transferred from the administration to the courts, and thus circular administration could no longer influence their

¹⁵ Ibid., 127-29.

¹⁶ This was the case with the Diet commission of 1843. Franko, "Zhyttia Ivana Fedorovycha," 121.

¹⁷ Ivan Vytanovych, Ukrains'ke selianstvo na shliakhu do pobidy (Samoosvita No.79) (L'viv, 1936), 8-9.

¹⁸ Kostolowski, Studia nad kwestia, 138-9.

¹⁹ Franko, "Velykyi shum."

outcome, the landlords were unhappy again. Antoni Sozański, the landlord from the Sambir area, in 1865 complained to Józef Ignacy Kraszewski:

One of the most stupid things Gołuchowski did while being a minister was to transfer disputes with the peasants to courts while earlier they went through the political instances. Now we have a multitude of these disputes, because every peasant feels right to the landlord's land and for every stub starts a separate banal sue. People have been worsened.²⁰

The commissions were not simply influenced or bought off by the landlords to make decisions in their favor. The outcome of servitudinal trials was determined not by the interests of the landlords but by a juridical system that was in the process of being established. For this juridical system the keystone was private property, and the decisions of the servitude commissions benefited this relatively recent god. To state this is not to imply that the principle of private property was not in the landlords' interests, but to realize that more than just the interests of the landlords was involved. Besides the idea of private property there were other issues involved: common as opposed to individual usage of resources; the interests of the general economy and rationality as opposed to particularism and "irrationality"; and finally, there was the issue of proper procedure – one of the key principles of the new liberal constitutional framework.

Until 1895-1896, when the new civil law was introduced, the goal of court proceedings was to establish so-called "formal truth," based on documents or other reliable evidence; establishing "actual truth" was not the task of the court.²¹ It is easy to see that this was true in the case of the conflicts over servitudes as well. In most cases peasants did not have enough evidence to prove their claims to commons. They did not have any written documents, and they could not prove most of the abuses that the landlords had perpetrated in the time period between the Josephinian and Franciscan cadastres. They could not prove these with the help of documents, and they could not prove these with the help of witnesses either – very few were still alive in the 1860s and 1870s. Even after emancipation there was a problem with peasants not taking care to record their land transactions properly.²² And the majority of peasant claims and grievances that were considered by the servitude commissions were not an outcome of 1848 but went back to the era following the Napoleonic wars, when a boom in cereal prices led landlords to appropriate some commonly used pastures and convert them into arable land. Even more recent, post-1848 closures of commonly used

²⁰ BJ 6535/IV, s.24.

²¹ Antin Dol'nyts'kyi, *Pro novyii protses tsyvil'nyi* (Vydannia Prosvity ch.210) (L'viv, 1897).

²² Stanisław Grodziski, "Z badań nad czesko-austriackim prawem hipotecznym i jego znaczeniem dla Galicji," in *Małopolskie Studia Historyczne*, r.8, z.3/4 (Kraków, 1965), 82.

pastures and forests were legitimized by the fact that these pastures and forests were listed as *dominical* lands in the Franciscan cadastre. During the servitude trials, peasants usually referred to the older Josephinian inventories and landlords to the newer Franciscan one, with the latter coming out on top.²³

The interpretation of the struggles over servitudes dominating Ukrainian historiography came into being as a codification of the recent past by the Ukrainian national movement. For Ivan Franko and many others, the struggles over servitudes were a continuation of the centuries-long struggle between Polish landlords and the Ruthenian peasantry.²⁴ Besides the notion of struggle, Ukrainian activists also connected the struggles over servitudes with their idealized notions of the peasant community. The struggles over servitudes allowed them to advance the idea that there was a very distinct peasant attitude towards owning natural resources, something originally old and peasant in otherwise terribly modernized Galician rural relationships.²⁵

This anthropological interpretation was not much different from the position of the landlords, who accused the peasantry of “primitive communist” attitudes and justified their own actions by the need to teach the peasantry about the sanctity of private property. That is why we can find descriptions of the “primitive communism” of peasant communities among Polish conservative writers such as Aleksandr Kuczera. Kuczera speaks of the “pre-Slavic communal communism of property” and repeats the argument of many leftist Ukrainian ethnographers. He claims that the forest was seen as common property and that this view conflicted with the modern law supporting individual property. The attitude towards the forest was deep-rooted in a world-view which could not imagine natural resources as privately owned. Besides forests, the remnants of primitive communism included common pasturing of cattle and sheep, common production of cheese and coordinated plowing of land which allowed for the pasturing of cattle before St. George’s day (5 May) and after St. Pokrova (12 October) on one’s neighbors’ arable land. Another remnant was *toloka* – a common consisting of individual holdings for a meantime staying fallow, on which livestock grazed in common.²⁶ The plowed part of the landholdings was called *tsaryna*.

²³ Franko, “Panshchyna ta її skasuvannia,” 47.

²⁴ [Ivan Franko] Myron, *Rozmovy v Dobrovil’skii chytal’ni*, 14.

²⁵ For the difficulty to find in Galician context some original customary law indicating the set of beliefs and ideas different from institutionalized see the letter of Ivan Franko to Mykhailo Drahomanov, who was urging them to look for such a customary law. In 1884 Ivan Franko was writing: “Anyhow, it seems to me that customary law among us every moment becomes more detached from life, and even now the main contours of it can be reproduced only on the basis of talks, proverbs and few legal customs.” – Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv*, t.48, 441-2.

²⁶ Kuczera, *Samborszczyzna*, t.I., 82-83.

There is a significant literature on the practices of forest usage and the mixed cereal-producing and pastoral economy, accumulated at the end of the nineteenth century. Peasants allegedly imagined the forest as belonging to no one: “it is sown by God,” from which followed the belief that taking something in the forest was not theft but rather a normal practice, just as they thought that free hunting was just despite the fact that it was persecuted by law.²⁷ Ivan Franko, who was the most careful in providing evidence in this group of leftist romantics, explained the fact that the theft of wood was not considered to be sinful as follows:

Either it was the feeling that this kind of action was necessary, or, maybe some remote memories of the old community ownership of forests, i.e. in the idea that the forest is ‘God’s and humans’ and that ‘the landlord did not sow the forest to be able to forbid it to others.’²⁸

This conceptualization of a uniquely peasant attitude, of peasants having no idea as of what “property” meant and unable to imagine the forest as someone’s property, is very important because it was shared by the majority of Ruthenian activists back in the 1860s. But a “primitive-communist world-view” had not survived from the distant past. As Roman Rozdolski has shown, some of these practices extinct already at the end of the eighteenth century, as for example, repartition in some areas of community’s land, appeared quite late, perhaps in the seventeenth – early eighteenth century and were connected with both depopulation and the worsening of the peasantry’s legal position, particularly the weakening of peasant land tenure.²⁹

By and large village commons had nothing to do with the tradition of community ownership, but only with the convenient and effective use of local resources. There were no consistent rules about *toloka*, or regulations about pasturing livestock on the commons, or any such thing in any of the villages. There were villages in which the division into *tsaryna* and *toloka* never existed; cows and calves were pastured on one’s own land and oxen, sheep and goats on common land.³⁰ Actually the very division of land into *toloka* and *tsaryna* was a necessity imposed by the division of rustical land into numerous strips, of which individual landholdings consisted and which belonged to the peasants on the basis of heredity – Roman Rozdolski has shown that the practice of dividing a

²⁷ Volodymyr Okhrymovych, “Znadoby do piznannia narodnykh zvychaiv ta pohliadiv pravnykh,” *Zhytie i Slovo*, 1895, v.3, 398.

²⁸ Ivan Franko, “Znadoby do statystyky Ukrainy. I. Lisovi shkody i kary v s. Nahuievychi,” *Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.44 kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 83.

²⁹ Rozdolski, Roman, *Wspólnota gminna w b. Galicji wschodniej i jej zanik*, (Badania z dziejów społecznych i gospodarczych po redakcją prof. Fr. Bujaka, Nr.27) (Lwów, 1936), 72.

³⁰ Okhrymovych, “Znadoby do piznannia narodnykh zvychaiv ,” 394.

whole community's arable land into pasture and plowed land was caused by the absence of community pastures proper and the excess of arable land.³¹ He has also shown that in the nineteenth century in many cases the preservation of permanent community pastures was in the interest of richer peasants while poorer peasants demanded their division – the point was that richer peasants overgrazed the pastures with their livestock while poorer community members with very little livestock preferred to plow their parts of the common.³²

To sum up, it was not a matter of some kind of stable “peasant attitude” but rather of concrete practices connected with the general economic situation and the political and legal structure. It was this larger framework and not peasant traditions which determined the way resources were used. There is an interesting account of how peasants in Sushytsia Rykova remembered the loss of the forest. Peasant I. P. recalled: “Gentlemen came and said: ‘you are not in a position to pay taxes on the forest. Give it to us, we shall pay the taxes, and you shall have pasture in the forest and two carts of wood a week for every house for free.’” People liked the offer; they signed and gave up having enough pasture. Later, the government made the peasants the same offer. But after the government sold the forest to a count, the count issued an order that the peasants were not allowed to take anything from the forest.³³

In this account the loss of servitudes appears as complex process of negotiation in which the community cared little about “owning” the resource in question as long as they could use it. Peasants wished to have guaranteed their right of usage and not their right of ownership. We have testimonies about peasants declining ownership to their individual land-plots to avoid paying taxes. For example, in 1820 – when the cadastral measurements took place – farmers in Mshanets’ indicated their landholdings as large, but in 1857 they refused to list as theirs parts of the landholdings that were far away from the village and not readily accessible. As they were not working on them, they listed them as communal. In extreme cases some of the farmers listed even land around their houses as communal to pay less in taxes. This can be explained by the famines of the 1840s and 1850s, which reduced the numbers of villagers. In the 1860s, with the return of emigrants to other regions and a general rise in land prices, the farmers tried to claim their land back. The conflicts that started in the 1860s were not only conflicts between peasant communities and their landlords but also conflicts between peasants themselves. These conflicts continued well into the 1890s.

³¹ Rozdolski, *Wspólnota gminna*, 37.

³² *Ibid.*, 61.

³³ Evhen Hrytsak, “Topohrafichni nazvy s. Sushytsi Rykovoï u Starosambirshchyni,” *Litopys Boikivshchyny*, No.9, 1937, 63.

Some community members plowed the common while others defended its preservation.³⁴

Also looming large in this account from Sushytsia Rykova is that the change is connected with the growing value of the forest, with the beginnings of the forest industry connected with the development of the railway network. In a speech to Parliament at the beginning of the twentieth century, Ukrainian deputy V'iacheslav Budzynovs'kyi explained the "communism" of peasants in the 1850s and 1860s in the following way. This communism was not about beliefs but about pragmatic choices. Peasants heard rumors about incredibly high land taxes. These rumors, together with the fact that there was no trade in timber and the forest was used only for fuel and the construction of peasant houses, defined the peasant position and discouraged them from claiming their own rights to the forest. "At that time peasants did not care at all about whose property the forest was."³⁵ Similar peasant behavior is described by Ivan Franko in his "Forests and Pastures," although there it is represented as a landlord's trick.³⁶

Peasant behavior was still grounded in the feudal mode, in relationships based on a totally different form of property usage, in which the usage of one's own property by someone else was quite normal practice, legal ownership of the land itself was not that important, while terms of tenure connected with the relationships between the owner and its tenants were crucial. As Robert Brenner once remarked, "Feudalism, then, from the standpoint of lords, was not so much about ownership of land as about power over people."³⁷ Later, when things changed, peasants still confused paying tax from the land with having it registered as their own property: "There are many people among our peasants who believe that since one is paying tax on a certain part of land, he has the right of ownership to this part, and if he did not pay anything for the land he would not know if it was his land."³⁸

Despite all these indications of quite pragmatic attitudes on the part of the peasantry towards the land, a myth about some special connection between the peasants and "their land" was created. In light of such a myth, taking land from the peasantry took on demonic overtones; it was not just about property and economic well-being; it was about the peasant soul itself. The so-called "Ruthenian oath" is an example of ethnographic proof of a transcendental link between the peasants and their land and of the peasants' belief in the special life-

³⁴ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Tisni roky," t.26, kn.6, *ZNTSh* (L'viv, 1898), 6-7.

³⁵ "Promova Budzynovskoho v palati posliv," *Dilo*, 1907, No.254.

³⁶ Ivan Franko, "Lisy i pasovyska,"

³⁷ Robert Brenner, "The Rise and Declines of Serfdom in Medieval and Early Modern Europe," in Michael L. Bush (ed.), *Serfdom and Slavery. Studies in Legal Bondage* (London and New York: Longman, 1996), 248.

³⁸ Dr. Severyn Danylovych, *Khliborob*, 1892, No.13-14, 102.

giving qualities of the land. The oath took the following form. Those accused of over-plowing the boundary to someone else's land parcel had to undergo the following procedure – to put a pile of soil on the head and move on their knees to the place they believed the boundary of their land-plot to be. If they were wrong, it was believed they would die during the procedure. Usually this is interpreted as proof of the peasants' belief in the magical powers of the land, but in fact it is not the land but the boundary that has supernatural powers. One died if during the oath they crossed the boundary of their own land-plot.³⁹ It was not about community and commonality; rather, it was about the sanctity of one's own possession of a scarce resource, a resource, which, unlike the forests and pastures, was divided and pretty much fixed for quite a long period of time.

Knowledge of these pragmatic choices made by the peasant communities, which in the long run turned out to be not very smart, was widespread and well remembered. This non-canonized memory about servitudinal issues unexpectedly benefited even some Bosnians. Mykola Iavors'kyi, the son of the mayor of Stupnytsia, petty gentry, became a judge in the 1870s and was sent by the Austrian government to occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina. There he regulated landholdings, and despite the fact that the local population was afraid of paying taxes and would not acknowledge its pasturing and hunting rights to the land, he ascribed all the better pastures and forests to the communities and the worse lands – to the state.⁴⁰

In the majority of representations of the struggles over servitudes, moral judgment and the issue of guilt were of foremost importance. Contemporary Ukrainian historiography unquestioningly blames the landlords, but back in the nineteenth century the accounts were not as unanimous. In the few extant peasant stories about servitudes there are, it is the communities' and peasants' own awkwardness that is seen as deserving of blame. According to Ivan Mykhas, for example, his generation blamed the generation of his parents and not the landlords for the lost servitudes.⁴¹ In the 1890s Rev. Zubryts'kyi speaking about servitudes also said that “some communities either because their own neglect or because of some other reasons were left after the conduct of servitudes with empty hands...”⁴²

There is an idiom – “the community does not accept this” (*bromada sia tobo ne pryimaie*), – which in Czaplicki's memoir about 1846 figures as a proverb declaring the superiority of communal principles. The phrase was very popular in the romanticized descriptions of community in the radical discourse of the late

³⁹ Okhrymovych, “Znadoby do piznannia,” 400.

⁴⁰ LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.90, a.7.

⁴¹ Ivan Mykhas, “O partseliatsii,” *Svoboda*, 1904, No.9.

⁴² [Mykhailo] Zubrytskii, “O dotepershnim polozhenniu nashoho naroda,” *Dilo*, 1891, No.288-289.

nineteenth century. But the context in which this idiom was used by peasants was different. In the second half of the nineteenth century it was used as a form of ridicule, a sore joke – the repetition of

the old bitter resolutions of many communities... which in their disputes with landlords over the forests and pastures hearing but not understanding the explanations of the commissar, usually refused to sign the protocols.⁴³

Moreover, Ruthenians themselves accused the communities of being responsible for the results of servitude proceedings that went against them on account of their violent and illegal actions. The “heroes” of the peasant struggle were said to have been bribed by the landlords and to have used the community trials for their own interests. Osyp Monchalovskii, a Russophile, compared Ukrainian politicians with these plenipotentiaries, “older representatives of the communal interest,” uneducated and greedy, who used the communities’ trust in them to get rich. These plenipotentiaries concluded agreements with the landlords, which gave the community less forest than if it had agreed to the landlord’s original offer.⁴⁴

Thus there have been all kinds of testimonies which undermine the unified picture created in historiography and silenced there. There is a larger picture as well, totally missing in the historiography. Parallels can be found everywhere in Europe – England would be an obvious reference⁴⁵ as well as France (eighteenth-century enclosure was paid attention to by Marc Bloch.)⁴⁶ Peter Sahlins describes a similar phenomenon in the nineteenth-century Pyrenees.⁴⁷ Finally, a similar problem was the subject of an article written by Karl Marx in 1842 on the issue of the theft of wood in the Rein Assembly.⁴⁸ The absence of references to the last of these is especially surprising considering all the citations from the classics of Marxism-Leninism one finds in works of Ukrainian Soviet historiography.

For Karl Marx the whole conflict, and the law proposed by representatives of the feudal class, was a remnant of the feudal epoch – an attempt to put one’s own

⁴³ Ivan Franko, “Halys'ko-Rus'ki Narodni Prypovidky,” *Etnohrafichnyi Zbirnyk*, 1905, t.16, 465.

⁴⁴ Osyp Monchalovskii, “Sviaty! Il'ko ili avtory statte v “Dili,” “Ruslani” i “Bukovyni?”” *Galichanin*, 1899, No.128.

⁴⁵ Janet Neesson, *Commoners: Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700-1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

⁴⁶ Marc Bloch, *French Rural History: an Essay on its Basic Characteristics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970).

⁴⁷ Peter Sahlins, *Forest Rites: The War of Demoiselles in Nineteenth-Century France* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).

⁴⁸ Karl Marks, “Debaty Shestogo Reinskogo Landtaga (stat'ia tret'ia). Debaty po povodu zakona o krazhe lesa,” in Karl Marks i Friedrich Engels, *Sochineniia*, t.1 (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1955), 119-160.

estate interests ahead of general principles of humanism and bourgeois law. But, as we know, “feudal” landowners did not necessarily disappear during capitalism. Moreover, they could benefit from the new mode of production, just as the new mode of production could co-exist perfectly with the latifundia of the landowning aristocracy. In fact, the landlords in certain settings became promoters of the new modes of production. Galician landlords’ insistence on the strict abolition of servitudes made use of precisely the rhetoric of universal liberal principles and values, of equality before the law, and of the strict application of procedures. In the Galician case, the whole issue was connected with the introduction of capitalist relationships into the countryside, and the abolition of servitudes was presented as necessary for the establishment of capitalist property relationships with respect to the land. One could even argue that this was one of the most important means of forcing now free peasants to work on landlords’ estates, but I would not go that far here.

Galicia was not the only place where the abolition of commons appeared at the same moment as conscious attempts at modernization. Starting with the works of Scottish enlightened reformers, “commonable lands” (common fields and practices) and commons (lands held in common) were seen as obstacles to economic development. And these were merely the first two of many points on the list of things to be changed, followed by the size of land property, its intermixture, insecurity of tenure, absence of credit and lack of knowledge.⁴⁹ As Eric Hobsbawm explains:

The major reforms necessary were clearly in the field of property rights. What was required was to transform the land into a commodity. This in turn implied (a) the freedom to sell or mortgage land without restraint, and (b) its transformation into property units suitable for bourgeois enterprise, i.e. disentangling the owner’s or lessee’s right to dispose of it from the multiplicity of collective or individual obligations in which peasant customs and the ‘feudal system’ had enmeshed it. The program was utterly revolutionary, and the reformers were quite aware of this.⁵⁰

My next point is that the end of the discussion about servitudes did not mean the end of the discussion about commons – common ownership of the resources and sustainability of the economy based on this ownership. After the end of the servitude trials, the amount of property that remained communally owned was still formidable – it actually increased because of the so-called “equivalents” – compensation for the lost rights of usage, which, unlike the servitudes themselves, were the property of the communities. As could be expected, the conservative camp argued against this form of property. Conservative forces in

⁴⁹ Eric Hobsbawm, “Scottish Reformers of The Eighteenth Century and Capitalist Agriculture,” *Peasants in History. Essays in Honour of Daniel Thorner* (Oxford University Press, 1980), 8-9.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

the Diet until well into the beginning of the twentieth century continued to question how sustainable collective ownership of the forests was and complained about its inefficiency and the communities' inability to control its usage.⁵¹ This time conservatives cared not about their own estates but about the creation of the estate of "middle landowners" as different from village proletariat, to split the solidarity of the peasantry. It was said that village proletariat was able to eke out a bearable existence living as a "parasite" on the communities' land, i. e. – at the cost of other villagers. These "middle landowners" were "parasites":

These people, despite the fact that they do not own any land, keep whole herds of geese, several pigs, and often even a cow, and thus idling whole months sustain themselves from the exploitation of the pasture which harms other community members, whose rights they decrease and which is a burden on all the taxpayers in the community...⁵²

Of course, this statement should not be taken as truth. It can be argued that communities had very strict regulations about community pastures, and that in some cases poorer members of the communities demanded their division. The important thing from my perspective is that there was a trend inside the communities as well in favor of the division of community's property. Community forests continued to disappear throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. Some Ukrainian peasant activists figured prominently among those demanding the division of communal lands.⁵³ The process of "enclosing" commons continued even when landlords were left out of the picture. Just as in the case of servitudes, it went under slogans of more effective usage of the land and of more productive agriculture, which could be reached only through the establishment of adequate property relationships.

From the very beginning of the servitude issue, it was decided that not only the interests of the two parties involved but also something vaguely defined as the "country's civilization" (*kultura krajowa*) had to be taken into account.⁵⁴ In most discussions of servitudes, the latter were represented as an "encumbrance" on property, just as *robot* was a burden on rustical land. Even some Ukrainian works complaining of peasants' land hunger and agrarian overpopulation plundering the Ukrainian peasantry in Galicia had to acknowledge that servitudes hindered the economic development of the lands "burdened" with them. The statement was

⁵¹ Ivan Franko, "Dribnychky kraiovi," *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.44 kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 409.

⁵² Jan Hupka, *Gospodarka na gruntach wspólnie używanych w Galicji*, *Wydawnictwa klubu konserwatywnego*, zeszyt V, (Kraków, 1897), 20-21.

⁵³ "Hryts' Zaparniuk," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1890, No.12, 154-155.

⁵⁴ Stefan Inglot, (ed.), *Maurycego Kraińskiego rejestry materiałów do historii zniesienia stosunku poddańczego w Galicji*, (Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Archiwum komisji historycznej, 2 t.IV) (Kraków, 1948), 45.

modified by a sentence stating that “the servitudes were rights of the village population to foreign property and as such had to be adequately compensated.”⁵⁵ This means that even Ukrainian economists recognized the need for the abolition of servitudes and that the problem for them was only the unfair amount of compensation received by the peasantry. All this should be paid special attention to when the position of the Ruthenian movement on the issue of servitudes is discussed.

Another thing with the “struggle” over servitudes is its scale. Ukrainian historians exhibit a tendency to impress us with numbers. These numbers include, among others, 30,733 servitude cases that came before commissions for consideration. We should remember, however, that there were only around 6,000 communities in Galicia at that time. It would appear that every community had at least 5 servitude trials. And of these 30,733 cases, almost one third – 11,105 – were rejected as unsustainable and not investigated. It is interesting that in Ukrainian and pro-peasant Polish historiography all the calculations about the unfair decisions of the commissions use the number 30,733, while a more reasonable number would be 20,628. Peasants received 278,374 Joch and 1.2 million Gulden of compensation, which looks ridiculous in comparison with the amounts that landlords received as compensation for the abolition of *robot*, but why would anyone expect these numbers to be commensurable? *Robot* was a much more profitable right than servitudes were, and the task of regulation was not to correct wrongs done to the peasants. When compensation for lost servitudes is roughly divided between 6000 communities we have almost 50 Joch and 200 Gulden for every community, which is not the worst possible outcome.

It is also interesting that while the gains or losses in the struggles over servitudes are correlated with the number of cases, the incidents of illegal action are correlated with the number of communities. Leaving aside the fact that the most “stubborn” communities were involved in illegal actions for a number of years and that a gradation of illegal actions needs to be established, the “total” of 871 actions (according to Kravets’ calculations) is not correlated with the more than 30,000 cases. Such a correlation would make the matter look like an absolutely peaceful one, with less than 3% cases involving violence. By the way, Kravets’ calculations seem to exaggerate the number of protests. Franko, in a speech at the 1897 Congress of the Radical Party, mentioned 30,000 servitude trials but only 500 peasant “riots,” and he was referring to the whole of Galicia. If we accept the number 500 and assume that each riot occurred in a separate community, it

⁵⁵ Iulian Pavlykovs’kyi, *Zemel’na sprava u Skhidnii Halychyni (Korotkyi istorychnyi i ekonomichnyi ohliad zemel’noho pytannia ta suchasnyi ioho stan)*, (Peredruk z Literaturno-Naukovoho Visnyka, t.LXXVI) (L’viv: z drukarni NTSh, 1922), 9.

would mean that violent protests occurred in less than 9% of all Galician communities.⁵⁶

Usually, in accounts of the struggles over servitudes the size of the forests to which peasants had rights before and the size of the equivalent they received for them are given. But if we take into consideration that an equivalent was not given on the basis of the size of the forest which they had the right to use, and that many communities had rights of usage to the same forest, the size of the equivalent appears in a totally different light. Compensation was based not only on the number of rightful households, but also on the number of livestock actually pastured there and the number of livestock the community would be able to support over the winter. The goal of regulation was to transform rights into property, providing a solution which would guarantee the most efficient usage of resources. The local commission created by the Viceroy's Office, which at the same time became the provincial commission for servitude regulation, had to investigate the number and quality of cattle, the times of pasturing, measures of usage with respect to grass, fuel, timber, rights for gathering roots and branches etc.⁵⁷ Moreover, the rights of peasants could be taken into account only after the rights of the owner and the reserve needed for the reproduction of the forest itself were taken into account. In the densely populated Galician countryside, where forests were a rarity (except in the mountainous areas) even before 1848, this meant very small equivalents for peasants even without any malevolence or cheating by landlords.

Also of note is that historians concentrating on the issue of the struggle over servitudes do not mention the actual usage of the forests and pastures, with the one notable exception of Ivan Franko, who analyzed this situation later in the 1880s. My own research has revealed that on the estates of Count Potocki, for example, the closure of forests and pastures meant his officials signing individual contracts with the peasants, who had to pay either with money or in kind for the right to pasture cattle.⁵⁸

The 1860s were the decade of Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi's childhood, and in his memoirs he describes life in the village at that time. On the one hand, Zubryts'kyi describes life in Kindrativ in accordance with the national mythology that presents the times of common usage of the forests and pastures as golden times:

Earlier people lived well there; they pastured their oxen, cows, sheep and goats in the forests. They had enough milk, butter and cheese, slaughtered cattle and pigs from time

⁵⁶ "Z'ezd ruskoi partyi radykal'noi," *Dilo*, 1897, No.206.

⁵⁷ Putek, *Pierwsze występy polityczne*, 25.

⁵⁸ AGAD, Archiwum Potockich z Łańcutu, sygn.344 "Akta t. s. serwitutów orz indemnizacji w dobrach Leżajsk. 1832-1921."

to time, had money. They drank a lot at christening parties, weddings, holidays and on market days. When the forest was closed in 1870, everything changed.

This description has one very interesting moment: these golden times were the 1860s, and the forest was still open back then. Ivan Franko shows that the same was true in the case of Nahuievychi as well. The forest there was closed in 1870 as well. According to him, this happened in 1875 on the order of the minister of agriculture who, in 1875, went to Boryslav and ordered the state forests be closed to people's cattle. This was the beginning of the decline in the numbers of cattle held by peasants.⁵⁹ Obviously these closures had little to do with emancipation and more to do with the changes that the Galician economy underwent in the 1860s (the appearance of the timber industry in particular), with the new capitalist ethos that appeared in the 1860s, the introduction of railways, and attempts by landlords to integrate their economy into the capitalist economy of the monarchy. Not incidentally, most of the "final" decisions in the servitude cases were also made around 1870. This is obviously also connected with the establishment of the autonomous status of Galicia in the monarchy and of the political hegemony of landowning nobility in the province.

Another important thing is that in Zubryts'kyi's account, the usage of the forest continued after 1870. Of course this usage was illegal, but the truth is that even when servitudinal rights were still intact, peasants also seemed to constantly transgress the limits allowed (see the section below on the case of the village of Morozovychi). In the village of Kindrativ, for example, peasants in the 1860s pastured in the forests against many orders of the new Czech landowner. They paid significant fines but nevertheless never gave up pasturing in the forest. Between 1875 and 1882, 620 peasants from the village of Nahuievychi were fined 785 Gulden 92.5 Kreuzer for forest theft. In addition they were punished with 477 days and 3 hours of detention.⁶⁰

In some cases peasants were able to negotiate and found an acceptable compromise. Perhaps this was more often the case in the mountains where it was difficult to control the large forests. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi describes the situation in the Turka district as follows:

Everyone took wood whenever he wanted; the fact that there were foresters was not an obstacle. The forester in Iasynets' did not bother people but demanded certain services. These services included plowing his field,

⁵⁹ Ivan Franko, "[Stanovyshche selian sela Nahuievychiv]," *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.44 kn.1 (Kyiv, 1986), 80.

⁶⁰ Ivan Franko, "Lisovi shkody i kary v s. Nahuievychakh," *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t. 44, kn.1 (Kyiv, 1984), 82-84

harvesting, grass cutting, and the transportation of timber (for which he paid).⁶¹

At the same time there is no doubt that the communities especially in the mountains of the Sambir circle suffered a great deal. They relied not just on agriculture, as was increasingly the case in the majority of other Galician regions, but on their cattle and sheep. This was reflected in the saying “you do not judge one’s estate from the land one owns but from one’s oxen and cows.”⁶² The rapidly diminishing size of commons must have contributed to economic differentiation inside the village, as commons were a huge asset for landless peasants, who had no other land to keep their cattle on. At the same time, for the richer peasants the establishment of proper property relationships in the countryside was beneficial. But there was no universal rule for this – the contrary could be true as well. Sometimes richer peasants would overgraze the common pasture with their livestock or cut down most of the communal forest, while poorer peasants would be in favor of the division.

Jan Słomka, the most famous of the Polish “peasant memoirists” from Galicia, does not mention servitudes in his memoirs, but says that among the things that changed life in Galician villages in the second half of the nineteenth century he would place the introduction of “hypothech” in second place after the emancipation from *robot*:

because only since then has it become obvious for everyone that the things he possesses are his sanctified property, which no one can take away from him, – one can sell it, divide, mortgage it etc. This, as I well remember, motivated people a lot to better work and to expand their farms.⁶³

That is why I believe that when speaking about the servitude trials we should first of all keep in mind that they were part of a larger attempt to set peasants into new relationships. The regulation of servitudes did not simply teach peasants a lesson about community action or force them to look for other kinds of resistance. It was not just about resistance; it was about a different framework, of which resistance was part. Peasants had to conform to these new relationships, and the majority did conform. Those who wanted to come out on top in the new circumstances had to accept the terms in which the discussion was conducted.

To reinforce my argument I shall now describe the servitude cases I looked at, and in particular a case from the village of Morozovychi, the birthplace of Ivan Mykhas. After looking at some individual cases, I shall return to the discussion

⁶¹ VR LNB, f.206, spr.922, p.27, a.1-3.

⁶² Iv. Franko, “Halys'ko-Rus'ki Narodni Prypovidky,” *Etnohrafichnyi Zbirnyk*, 1905, t.16, 502.

⁶³ Jan Słomka, *Pamiętniki włościanina. Od pańszczyzny do dni dzisiejszych*, wyd. II (Kraków), 486.

that took place around the servitudes in the 1860s, trying to understand the position of the Ruthenian movement on this issue.

The Case of Bilyna Velyka

The case of the village of Bilyna Velyka, like most other servitude cases, started in the 1850s, and like many other cases, reached no final resolution at the time. As previously mentioned, Polish Diet deputies blamed the prolongation on governmental malevolence and the ill intent of officials trying to escalate tensions between the estates and the peasants. The governmental commission itself blamed the delay on their too heavy workload. The first request to divide the common pasture in Bilyna Velyka was submitted as early as 1858, and a second request was resubmitted in 1862.⁶⁴ It seems that the justification given by the commission was true – even after a change in provincial government and the introduction of Galicia’s autonomy, one of the tabular owners in Bilyna Velyka was still complaining in 1874 that the commission had still only determined the fact of common usage but had not fulfilled its task, which was – to divide the land.

As in most other servitude cases, the request to divide “burdened land” was submitted by one of the tabular owners of the land – it was never the initiative of the community. The justification with which this request was accompanied was also typical: “the arrangement to abolish the communal usage of the land has only one goal – the betterment of the economy (*hospodarstwa*).” It was stressed that the pasture’s economy needed a single hand and that the current conditions of having six other owners were destroying its swampy soil.⁶⁵ This argument was repeated in 1863. It was stressed that no proper farming was possible on a common used by two communities and five individual owners who overgrazed the pasture.⁶⁶ I should state at the outset that the communities in this village got a very good deal at the end of the trial; perhaps the absence of a single tabular owner – the tabular part being divided between six owners – contributed to this success.

The case was not typical in that this village consisted of two communities: one of petty gentry and one of peasantry. It was usually the case with peasant communities that the rights to graze or gather wood belonged to the community as a whole so that to define those eligible the commissions would compose a list of the heads of households. In the case of the petty gentry this could be complicated because as freemen they could change their residence while retaining rights of pasture. Ads were therefore placed in Gazeta Lwowska (14.10.1871),

⁶⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8745, ark.3.

⁶⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8745, ark.3.

⁶⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8745, ark.5.

offering notice that the common was about to be divided and asking all unknown holders of the right to use this common to contact the commission. There were four tabular individual owners, two communities and the Basilian Fathers, who formed the fifth tabular part.

At first, the commission considered the common pasture *Toloka* (Common), which consisted of 12 parts with a total size of 390 Joch and 1533 square Klafter.⁶⁷ Later, the rights of all interested sides to another smaller pasture called *Zarudzja* were also established, so the total of the common pastures in question consisted of 15 land parcels, 431 Joch and 186 Klafter.⁶⁸ It is interesting that both of the communities as well as the tabular owners united to rebut the claims of the other claimant: a group of local Jews, who were tavern-keepers. All sides agreed that the Jews had no rights to the pasture.⁶⁹

This was common for other servitude cases as well. It is hard to find out anything about the Jews that made these servitude claims. It could be that many were poor tavern-keepers, but some, in fact, became rich proprietors, taking advantage of the abolition of the restrictions on Jewish property to buy up estates of the Polish nobility. One of these was Leo Zelcer, who owned real estate in Dubrovka, Stari and Novi Kupnovychi, Morozovychi, Neudorf, Strilkovychi, Torchynovychi and Vanevychi. He claimed servitude rights to the pond in Dubrovka. Even Judah Bachmann, another Jewish landlord and tavern-keeper in Lanovychi and Berehy, whom Zelcer brought with him to support his claims, had no idea whatsoever about Zelcer's rights to the claimed land.⁷⁰

In the case of Bilyna Velyka, the commission established that the Jews indeed kept their cattle on the common but only because they were allowed to do so by the owners – it was not their customary right. Witnesses testified that the Jews used the pasture when they had a house or kept a tavern in the village.⁷¹ Witnesses also testified that there was no written, signed agreement on the conditions according to which the Jews could make use of the pasture. (In fact, there was no written agreement about the usage of the pasture at all, by any of the interested parties.)⁷² The Jew Jakób Hader, a tavern owner, stressed in his testimony that, despite being a newcomer, he also was a member of the community: “As a member of the community I have always pastured cattle on the common pastures in Bilyna Velyka and kept three cows.”⁷³ The only

⁶⁷ TsDIAL, f.146, op.64, spr.8745, ark.37.

⁶⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8750, ark.15.

⁶⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8745, ark.79.

⁷⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8868, a.46-74.

⁷¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8745, ark.41-46.

⁷² TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8745, ark.49.

⁷³ Ibid.

difference was that he was not a hereditary member of the community and had to obtain this status through settlement, on which basis his claims to the common pasture were rejected. The Jews were the only exception to the rule that all the households of the village had rights to the servitudes because, unlike in Bukovyna, where there were many free peasants who had no servitude rights, in Galicia the community of those having servitude rights generally coincided with the administrative community.

As usual in similar cases, the members of the communities of Bilyna Velyka (peasant and petty gentry) were in favor of continuing with the old ways of using the common, while the tabular owners insisted on the division of the common because “only such a division can influence the mode of farming advantageously.”⁷⁴ It is interesting that there was no conflict between the two communities (peasants and petty gentry). As already discussed in the chapter on 1848, petty gentry communities quite often had conflicts with their landlords, conflicts which dated back to the era of serfdom and which tended to have an adverse effect on the relationships between these communities and their landlords.⁷⁵

Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi also testified that there was no great enmity between petty gentry and peasants in the years of his childhood. Peasants and petty gentry ridiculed each other and figured in each other's proverbs, jokes etc., but it was not much different from, for example, the animosity often encountered between neighboring villages. Marriages between petty gentry and peasantry, although not frequent, were not considered abnormal. Zubryts'kyi gives an example of a petty conflict between “peasants and petty gentry,” which he had personally caused. Two of Zubryts'kyi's uncles married two peasant sisters. As a child, he played with the son of one of these couples:

We were telling each other something, but suddenly I got an idea to say him: ‘you should be cut into two halves: into peasant and into gentry.’ He complained to his mother, and she felt very offended and quite often mentioned this.⁷⁶

The Bilyna case shows that these two communities were capable of conducting common action. A further point of note is that the tabular owners against whom the communities' action was conducted were also petty gentry, although belonging to a higher strata, that of dominical gentry.

In 1876, the following number of cattle were grazing on the commons of 431 Joch and 186 square Klafter:

⁷⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8750, ark.83.

⁷⁵ This was the case with petty gentry in Luka, TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8929, a.9-73.

⁷⁶ VR LNB, f.206, spr.922, p.27, a.3.

petty gentry community: 127 members – 220 horses and 320 cattle
peasant community: 88 members – 75 horses and 226 cattle
tabular part No.1: – 16 horses and 28 cattle
tabular part No.2: – 12 horses and 18 cattle
tabular part No.3: – 12 horses and 22 cattle
tabular part No.4: – 8 horses and 12 cattle
tabular part No.5: – 6 horses and 12 cattle.⁷⁷

This shows that the peasants and petty gentry of Bilyna Velyka owned 84.5% of the horses and 85.6% of the cattle kept at pasture. It also proves that the average petty gentry household kept more horses than the average peasant one. One will note that, in this case, the commission had exact data available on the usage of the pasture. Such a situation allowed for the easy calculation of a land equivalent to recompense for the rights of usage. The fact that this was a common and not part of the tabular property also contributed to the positive resolution. An order to conduct delimitation of the pasture was issued on 25 July 1876, and the delimitation was successfully conducted. As the basis for the division of the common, the commission took the number of cattle each household could keep through winter by providing fodder from his own land.⁷⁸

Technically there was no cheating and the interests of the economy in general took precedent – such a principle prevented possible overgrazing. This principle was used in servitude cases concerning pastures in tabular ownership as well – not the number of actual cattle being grazed but the number of cattle for which the household could provide fodder in winter was taken as the basis for calculating the price of one's rights. On the other hand, those for whom the common was the main access to fodder and whose cattle had to get through the winter on a poor diet could lose the entire basis of their farming economy. This was the same principle as had been implemented in the cases of English parliamentary enclosure.⁷⁹ In Bilyna, this principle did not work to the major disadvantage of the communities – the local tabular owners did not have enough livestock. As a result, not the communities but the tabular owners were dissatisfied with the solution. Roman Tobaczyński, for example, was not satisfied

⁷⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8749, ark.32.

⁷⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8750, ark.3; TsDIAL, f.146, op.64, spr.8750, ark.15, 86.

⁷⁹ Neeson, *Commoners: Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change*. At the same time it seems that at least in some places (Cumberland) this principle was customary principle, preventing commons from overgrazing. At the same time with the advance of capitalist relationships and growing differentiation between the beneficiaries of the common right, it was abused by the richer members of the community, who were able to rent additional hay land in winter and keep more cattle through the winter. See Charles Searle, "Customary Tenants and the Enclosure of the Cumbrian Commons," *Northern History*, v.29, 1993, 128.

with the way delimitation was conducted or with the size of the equivalents and asked for an additional investigation.⁸⁰

But this recourse against the commission's decision did not help. On 30 June 1877, a final agreement was reached between the representatives of the various sides and the governmental commission. Both village communities represented by their plenipotentiary, Piotr Lityński, who at the same time was a mayor of the petty gentry community, secured 357 Joch and 323 Klafter in 6 parts, which amounted to 83% of the former common.⁸¹ The principle of the priority of economic and farming interests worked to the advantage of the largest user, and although this case was not typical in that it satisfied the community and did not satisfy the tabular owner, the principle used was the same one employed in other servitude cases. In this case it was easy to calculate the actual rights, and the land in question was pasture used for a singular purpose and not forest used for multiple purposes, to which the specific forest laws of the Austrian Empire applied. The tabular owners in Bilyna Velyka were also petty gentry. Although richer than their rustical neighbors, they did not have enough power to lobby commission.

The Case of Lanovychi

The village of Lanovychi is situated to the north of the city of Sambir. Lanovychi was a mixed Ruthenian-Polish community. The Lanovychi case is different from the one in Bilyna Velyka because of the pure peasant character of the community, which had only one tabular owner, and because the conflict between the community and its landlord was a serious one, involving violence on both sides. It was serious enough to receive mention in the already cited History of Towns and Villages of Ukrainian SSR. L'viv oblast'. Cases like the one in Lanovychi were typically called on to describe the peasants' class struggle against the landlords over servitudes.

This is another example of how scholars have tended to put too many different kinds of struggles under the same rubric of servitudal struggle. Most often the communities that engaged in violent conflict with their landlords had a history of grievances going back to the era of subject-dependency. The Lanovychi case, which involved violent protest as well as its violent suppression, was not only about servitudes. The story begins with the landlord appropriating the common, as in the case with the ill-famed Horzhanna Velyka, where the landlord took part of the common pasture in 1801, and in 1820 forbade the usage of the forest as

⁸⁰ TsDIAL, f.146, op.64, spr.8750, ark.7. In the reports from elections published in the Ruthenian press in the 1870s Piotr Lityński figures as Polish agitator.

⁸¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8750, ark.17-49.

well.⁸² There were two common pastures, *Dolishnie* (Lower) and *Bloto* (Swamp) in Lanovychi. Already in 1811 half of the *Dolishnie* pasture had been taken away by the landlord, who had dried it out and turned it into arable land.⁸³ Then, in 1841, a new landlord bought the estate and turned the pasture called *Bloto* into arable land.

Again, this was a very typical situation in the first half of the nineteenth century – new landlords looking for the ways to make their estate economies more efficient often forcibly changed the terms according to which commons could be used, which, in the cases when it was part of the dominical property, were regulated solely by custom. New landlords did not feel bound by informal agreements between former landlords and the peasants, and made good use of their property rights. In the Lanovychi case, there was not enough pasture left for the peasant cattle after this appropriation, and in the spring, until Pentecost, the peasants had to pasture their cattle on the swampy parts of *Bloto* (a practice obviously tolerated by the landlord and recalling a practice accepted on the land-plots of the community's members).⁸⁴

As in all of the other cases, there had previously never existed any limitation on who was allowed to pasture cattle in the common – everyone from the village had been allowed to send their cattle either to *Dolishnie* or *Bloto*.⁸⁵ And again, as in the case of Bilyna Velyka, despite this common right to pasture, the community insisted on excluding local Jews from those having the right to pasture. When the list of those having the right to pasture was composed, the community asked that the Jew Berner be removed from it and Iakiv Fialk be added instead. They claimed that Berner had built his house on community land without having any right to it and that he did not own any land and only rented plots from other peasants.⁸⁶

In the debate over the common, Stanisław Koszowski, Lanovychi's landlord, explained the estate's position on the issue. He argued that the peasants only had a right to the part of the *Dolishnie* pasture which was not ploughed. The estate was tolerating peasants pasturing their cattle on both *Dolishnie* and *Bloto*, without any legal or customary right to do so, in a “silent mode” (*milczącym sposobem*) only because of the poor conditions of the subjects. The landlord rejected all of the peasants' claims to *Bloto*, which had been dried out in 1841, claiming that prior to 1816 peasants had paid a price of two chicken per year for the right to pasture

⁸² Feodosii Steblii, “Selians'kyi rukh u Skhidnii Halychyni v 1846 rotsi,” in *Z istorii Zakhidnoukrains'kykh zemel'* (Kyiv: V-vo An URSSR, 1960), 40.

⁸³ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8925, ark.14.

⁸⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8925, ark.6-7.

⁸⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8925, ark.14.

⁸⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8925, ark.16.

their cattle on *Dolishnie*, but that since half of the pasture had been converted into arable land they had not paid anything at all.⁸⁷

An investigation was conducted, and an expert finalized his conclusion on 22 August 1860. His expertise was guided by the publicly proclaimed motto – not to let “economic relations suffer.”⁸⁸ On the basis of this expert’s conclusion, the servitude commission of the Viceroy’s Office decided on 7 November 1861 that the part of the *Bloto* pasture that had not been dried out before 1848 could not be used as a common pasture because the ground was too wet. In exact accordance with the landlord’s argument, he declared that the peasants had the right to pasture their cattle only on part of the *Dolishnie* pasture. This decision was protested and renounced as based on false facts by 75 villagers, who “signed” their petition with crosses and appointed plenipotentiaries Mykola Zaiats’, Frank Iatsyshyn, Martyn Kul’baka, Tomko Il’iashchyshyn and Vavryk Borsuk to represent their interests.⁸⁹

During the subsequent investigation, witnesses from other communities were heard, all brought to the commission by the Lanovychi plenipotentiaries. 68 years old Ivan Vysots’kyi from Khlivchytsi recalled that before *Bloto* had been restricted and dried up, subjects from both Lanovychi and Khlivchytsi used to pasture cattle there. Lanovychi cattle quite often crossed into the territory of the Khlivchytsi community, Khlivchytsi cattle crossed into the lands of the Lanovychi community, and no one had ever objected. When the witness was twenty years old, he had pastured his father’s cattle on *Bloto* together with other youngsters from his village. However, he was unable to give the names of those who had pastured on *Bloto* from Lanovychi because he had “never asked their names.” Investigators asked how peasants could possibly pasture their cattle on a marsh, and Vysots’kyi answered that in the dry period they were able to pasture on the whole of *Bloto* while in the rainy periods only on its edges.⁹⁰

Ivan Gudzii from the Kavs’ke community came to testify despite the fact that Lanovychi’s plenipotentiaries forgot his name and called for Fed’ Gudzii. He testified that from a distance he had regularly seen community cattle pasturing on *Bloto*. When asked how he knew they were community cattle, Gudzii responded that he had assumed it from the fact that there had been many shepherds with the cattle while in the case of the manorial cattle there had always been only one.⁹¹ Mykola Kozak from Lanovychi testified that the landlords enclosed and dried up part of the swamp and that was why the peasants could not longer use the dried

⁸⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8925, ark.18-21.

⁸⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8925, ark.75.

⁸⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8926, ark.5-47.

⁹⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8925, ark.34-35.

⁹¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8925, ark.37-40.

part but continued pasturing on the marshy part. Prior to this they had pastured on both parts but had had to pay three kreuzers or a chicken per cow.

These testimonies supported the landlord's argument that payment was proof that the peasants' pasturing was based not on any customary rights but on a contract. We see that the peasants' knowledge of customary obligations was more precise than that of the landlord. Kozak stated that peasants had pastured their cattle on *Bloto* since time immemorial but had stopped doing so on the dried-out part of the swamp twenty years ago only because the landlord "rejected by force [our right]."⁹²

The part of the *Bloto* common which had not yet been dried out consisted of 57 Joch and 552 square Klafter,⁹³ of which 28 Joch and 1007 square Klafter were given to the community as compensation. Basically, the community got half of the common, which would not have been so bad if not for the fact that the governmental commission did not grant any compensation for the common dried up before 1848 and converted (from the peasants' point of view unrightfully) into arable land. When, on 18 May 1864, the commission arrived to divide the common, the community would not permit it and came out in protest to the common with all their cattle. The landlord complained that the peasant wrecked 24 cubic Klafter of his dry grass on that day.⁹⁴

On 31 July 1864, the commission cut the already decided upon equivalent down to 17 Joch and 480 square Klafter. The community continued to petition the commission, asking for the whole common and explaining that 523 [!!!] cows, not counting geese and pigs, could not be pastured on the equivalent the commission had granted. The conflict escalated. Not only was the landlord unwilling to compromise, he dried up a pond in the vicinity of the pasture and thus cut the peasant cattle's access to water.⁹⁵

According to testimony by the peasants from Lanovychi, more of their cattle had been grazing on *Bloto* than on any other community pasture.⁹⁶ It also appeared that peasants had previously used this common not only as pasture but also as a meadow (the swamp provided winter fodder for their cattle as well).⁹⁷ As in so many other cases, the peasants were not able to translate their usage of resources into measurable amounts and could not offer any alternatives to the conclusions of the experts. As their plenipotentiaries stated: "Although we are not able in any way to provide a measure for the profit taken from the *Bloto*

⁹² TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8925, ark.43, 47.

⁹³ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8925, ark. 94.

⁹⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8927, ark.8-9.

⁹⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8928, ark.2.

⁹⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8927, ark.32-33.

⁹⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8927, ark.36.

pasture because we cannot calculate it, in the end everyone was allowed to send their cattle either here or there.”⁹⁸ According to the expert’s calculations, the pasture produced 90 *Zentner* of dried grass (two to four per Joch),⁹⁹ which the expert found insufficient to sustain the number of cattle peasants claimed to be supporting there.

The community’s struggle continued into the 1870s. In new proceedings, the community also added the case of a forest called *Turok*, to which the community also claimed rights of usage.¹⁰⁰ A letter from 7 June 1870, signed by Anton Borsuk (Lanovychi’s mayor), Martyn Kul’baka and Huska Trach, (councilors), explains the community’s position and its grievances:¹⁰¹

The grievous injustices committed against our former Manor Lanovychi, for which our community, represented by the signed plenipotentiaries, was unable to receive any satisfaction or justice, force our community to apply once again to the High K. K. Viceroy’s Office and to ask for mercy and the arrangement of a new investigation.

In this petition the peasants stressed that the party they were arguing against was the former manor and not the current tabular owner, despite the fact that in everyday speech they did not differentiate between the two. The community’s letter also stressed that the *Dolishnie* pasture was used by the community together with the priest, while *Bloto* was used exclusively by the community. Even the reclamation of the pasture conducted by the landlord had been the result of the community’s economic activity: “only when our ancestors and contemporary villagers had gradually dried up this *Bloto*, the manor at once started drying up parts beyond the limits of its land and taking it into its usage.” The community had been unable to resist “because at that time, the community as a whole as well as its individual members had been given to the Manor in body and spirit, they had to listen to its order and could not resist, otherwise punishment would have followed punishment.”

When the community received only 17 Joch and 480 square Klafter, it “felt that centuries of abuse were continuing... because to the manor, which since time immemorial and up until the time that part of this pasture had been dried up, had never made any use of it and had never paid taxes on it, nothing at all belonged.” Because the community had felt itself in the right, it decided to finally offer some resistance, “but what happened – the army was sent in, the community was totally destroyed by the army, 13 important farmers were taken to prison, and the

⁹⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8927, ark.37.

⁹⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8927, ark.54.

¹⁰⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8928, ark.80.

¹⁰¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.8928, ark.49.

community that was left could not claim its rights to these pastures.” Among other rights the community had lost, the petition also mentions one pasture at the centre of the village. The community claimed that all the neighboring communities got equivalents for the forest and only Lanovychi hadn’t. Some farmers still were paying taxes on these parts of the forest, which in fact had been added to the state forest. Later in this letter the Lanovychi community states that the neighboring communities had gotten in general what they had claimed, and only the Lanovychi community was left unsatisfied. After all the turbulences in the mid-1860s:

the last owner of the estate promised the community a reward in the form of a mutual agreement, but last year [1869] he died and the community was not rewarded with anything, and it looks as if he promised an agreement only to delay our rightful claims – [hoping that] the term would pass to make a community claim, knowing that the community had been ruined and scared since the army’s assistance and would not be in any condition to make further claims and protests.

It is clear that the peasants felt cheated by the landlords, that they had responded with a violent protest and that the army had been called in to suppress it. But it is also evident that in this case the peasants’ appetites had grown with time. It seems also to prove that the communities’ protests and plenipotentiaries’ action discouraged landlords from compromising and that, in the end, the community had to settle for less than the landlord had offered in the beginning. Also, the peasants thought they would be able to receive compensation for the land the landlord had appropriated back in the first half of the nineteenth century, but in this case as well as in many others involving violent protests, this was not the case. No peasant rights still in force in 1848 in this case were rejected and no community land was appropriated by the landlord. Moreover, the landlords changed several times, and the new landlords bought the estates as they were, that is, together with the land to which the community believed they had a right.

The Morozovychi Case

It is interesting that the villagers from Lanovychi mentioned neighboring communities, which had been successful in securing their claims for servitudes. In the 1880s Ivan Mykhas claimed that a certain mayor M. in the village of M. successfully organized neighboring state villages with the help of a parish priest in order to claim their rights to the state forest. I believe that Ivan Mykhas was talking about his own father Mykola and his native village of Morozovychi. The case differs from the two previously considered in several aspects. First of all, the village of Morozovychi was a state-owned village and did not have a private landlord. Second, here we have to deal with forest and not with pasture. Moreover, we have to deal with a forest mass that was quite distant from the

village and could not be used as pasture, as was quite often the case with other Galician communities' claims to forests, but only for timber and fuel.

The problem with forests was that their usage had been regulated back at the end of the eighteenth century by a special forest statute, which restricted forest usage and set the preservation of forests as a foremost priority. The management and preservation of forests was thought to be impossible on small parcels. The forest statute of 1852 specifically mentioned servitude forests and insisted on the application of an "economic plan" for their usage. This statute caused resentment among forest owners but was difficult to enforce.¹⁰² While privately owned forests suffered from devastating cutting practices, community forests had a further problem – no regulations could stop the partitioning of forests among peasants, which doomed all attempts at rational foresting.¹⁰³

On 15 November 1858, a list was composed of 64 farmers from Morozovychi of all those with the right to cut wood in the state forest.¹⁰⁴ The case was investigated in 1860-1861, at which time Mykola Mykhas was mayor.¹⁰⁵ The plenipotentiaries from the village of Morozovychi in this servitude case were Iakym Dunik (community scribe and the only one able to sign his name), Vas'ko Sarahman, Petro Sarahman, Petro Zavads'kyi and Mykola Mykhas. The behavior of these plenipotentiaries indicates well-organized action remarkably different from any we find in other communities. In 1861, for example, we have a request from the plenipotentiaries of Morozovychi to postpone a session because the plenipotentiaries of the community had acquired new information and wanted to consult the citizens of Morozovychi. The other side, represented by the local state forest office, agreed to this request.¹⁰⁶

We do not know if it was the shrewdness of Mykola Mykhas, the presence of a literate person among the plenipotentiaries or the character of the community, but Morozovychians were able to negotiate with the commission in adequate language and according to the commission's procedures, while many other communities simply withdrew and would not cooperate with investigators. The testimonies of the witnesses the Morozovychi plenipotentiaries brought before the commission were also carefully prepared. Peasants from Morozovychi were

¹⁰² Bujak, *Galicja*, t.2, s.7.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 7-8. It also seems that at least in the last decade of the 19th century the situation in landlords' forests was better than in those owned by the communities: "There is not a single district about which we could say that community forests at least somehow are preserved and cultivated, instead from everywhere we hear about total devastation, licentiousness in administering common wealth, illegal changes of culture." - Tadeusz Pilat, "Własność ziemi i stosunki posiadania," in *Powszechna Wystawa krajowa i sily produkcyjne kraju*, t.II z.6 (Lwów, 1898), 49.

¹⁰⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9027, a.57.

¹⁰⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9031, a.64.

¹⁰⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.93-94.

able to give detailed and extensive information on many issues crucial for determining the value of compensation.

These peasants claimed the unlimited right to pick up dry branches for fuel and to take whole dry trees if they were not thicker than five to six *Zollen*.¹⁰⁷ The two main kinds of wood the peasants claimed the right to take were from fir and beech trees, but they insisted they took beech more often than fir (although it was largely a fir forest). They were unable to say exactly how many carts per year the average farmer took:

but we insist that every farmer with rights went to the forest every day to take designated wood and even those who did not have their own draft animals hired transport in neighboring villages and went for wood minding neither bad road conditions nor work in the field.¹⁰⁸

This is a nice example of a counter-attack by the peasantry, of a switch to the imposed mode of discussion. Morozovychi peasants presented themselves to the commission as users trying to maximize profit, as those already living according to the capitalist ethos. Reality was, perhaps, very different. Even almost twenty years later, as Ivan Mykhas shows, peasants by and large missed the opportunity to profit from the timber trade, preferring to keep both themselves and their horses safer by not going into the forest as often as they could.¹⁰⁹

The Morozovychi peasants claimed rights to two forests belonging to the forest offices in Sprynia and Zvir. Besides fuel, they also claimed the right to use timber from those forests for the construction of houses and farming buildings, describing their houses and how many timber logs they needed to build them. State forest office tried to reduce the amount of building materials they claimed to need by pointing out that peasant houses did not have wooden floors and that even inside walls were made of branches and clay and not from whole timber logs.¹¹⁰

The procedure for getting building materials was as follows. Peasants first had to write a request to the cameral estates office indicating what kind and what size of wood they needed, and then the office would send a special commission to check the request and either reject or accept it. The office provided a list of those who took timber for construction between 1836 and 1845, but Morozovychi's plenipotentiaries claimed this list was incomplete. The community stated that in

¹⁰⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.95.

¹⁰⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.96.

¹⁰⁹ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.12, 13.

¹¹⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.97. Servitude cases include interesting descriptions of houses from various regions of Galicia as well as different types of houses built in the given village. The cases remind us that so-called "traditional material culture" of peasantry was configured not just by tradition but also by power relationships.

1844 eight and in 1845 ten houses in the village had burnt down and had had to be rebuilt, but those houses were not on the list. They therefore requested an expert to calculate their needs and establish the amount of wood they could take from the forest “because the amount of building materials we have the right to take from the state forest was limited only by the needs of those who had the right.”¹¹¹ Morozovychi plenipotentiaries stressed that, since 1848, timber for their needs had not been provided at all, resulting in great hardship for the villagers. Many had had to leave the village; some of those who had chosen to stay and had seen their households burnt down could not rebuild them because of the closed forest.¹¹² Here we have an interesting moment – it appears that in 1848 not only did private landlords close their land to community usage, the cameral estates did as well. Such closures appear to have been the rule and, indeed, a patent from 17 April 1848, mentions that in the places where the servitude rights of the subjects to the landlords’ lands were not abolished by mutual agreement, the subjects would have to pay for these servitudes.¹¹³

The state office did not reject peasant rights to fuel and timber outright but did not agree with the amounts the peasants claimed. The cameral estates’ office stressed especially that it was impossible for every villager to go to the forest in disregard of the weather and the workload on their own farms. The officials argued that the villagers’ right to the wood was in reality very seldom used because the forest, to which the village had the right, was located far away from the village. Peasant statements about hiring someone else to bring the wood back had no credibility whatsoever because the cost of such hiring would be higher than the cost of the fuel brought.¹¹⁴

The cameral estates’ office provided a list of 26 villages, in which 2,492 farmers had rights to use the forest. Morozovychi was one of these, and the office wanted to consider its case with the 25 others in one proceeding. All those who had houses in Morozovychi and paid one Gulden a year had rights to eight areas in the forest. There were 56 farmers with these rights in Morozovychi (all the Morozovychi farmers).¹¹⁵ The office favored an equal settlement for all these farmers. However, it did not believe that the kind of wood taken most often was beech because the forests in Sprynia and Zvir were largely fir.¹¹⁶ It also did not agree with the peasants’ claims to the right to pick up broken trees and all trees which could be cut down with the help of an axe alone. According to the office,

¹¹¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.98-99.

¹¹² TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.100.

¹¹³ Franko, “Panshchyna ta її skasuvannia,” 82.

¹¹⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.101.

¹¹⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.118, 119.

¹¹⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.102-3.

peasants only had the right to wood which could be taken without an axe. They had never had the right to cut down trees; all trees broken and uprooted by storms the office claimed for itself.¹¹⁷

It was true that after 1848 the office had stopped granting peasants wood. This was a response to the fact that, in accord with the decree on the abolition of *robot*, peasants had stopped paying house *chynsh* (1 Gulden a year).¹¹⁸ According to the office, timber for construction was given only when a subject's house burnt down or fell down due to normal wear. Timber was never given in other cases or for the renovation and repair of buildings. The lists of the timber given to the villagers in Morozovychi were correct.¹¹⁹

The Morozovychi community insisted on all the points it made. As proof, the community's plenipotentiaries invited four witnesses from the neighboring community of Vaniovychi.¹²⁰ Morozovychi also compiled their own list of those whose houses had burnt down in 1844 and to whom the office had granted timber but who were not reflected in the list prepared by the estates office.¹²¹ The cameral estates' representatives objected to the statements made by the peasants. First of all, the community's witnesses were not legitimate because they were too young. To prove its point the community had to demonstrate that the forests had been being cut down by its members for at least the last 40 years and therefore witnesses at least 70 years old were required. The oldest witness brought by the Morozovychi community was only 50 or 52 year old in 1848, while the peasants needed one who was at least 58 years old by that year. But even if the Morozovychi villagers provided legitimate witnesses, their testimony would not be worth much – even 40 years of illegal practice would not make it right. And witnesses from Vaniovychi in particular were not valid because the community of Vaniovychi had the same rights to the state forests as the village of Morozovychi.¹²²

The peasants responded to these objections. There was no way to find older witnesses because no one of the age required by the estates office was alive and this was not the village's fault. They replaced the witness Toma Sarahman who was indeed too young with four new witnesses from Vaniovychi and two from Torhanovychi. The plenipotentiaries also explained that witnesses from Vaniovychi would not profit from any forest the community of Morozovychi would receive, and that their testimonies should therefore be seen as objective; in

¹¹⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.103.

¹¹⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.104.

¹¹⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.104-106.

¹²⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.107-108.

¹²¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.109.

¹²² TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.110-111.

addition they provided witnesses from the community of Torhanovychi, which was not a state village at all.¹²³ Both communities were in fact Morozovychi's closest neighbors in the agglomeration of villages on the road between Sambir and Staryi Sambir.

Indeed, the testimonies of the peasants from Vaniovychi do not show any signs of following any suggestions the Morozovychi plenipotentiaries might have made. One of the peasants testified that peasants from Morozovychi took freshly cut as well as dry wood from the forest but covered it with dry branches. His personal opinion was that the freshly cut wood in question was taken illegally.¹²⁴ Another witness testified that when peasants took wood from the forest, the forest guard checked their carts for forbidden wood.¹²⁵ Another witness from Vaniovychi testified that when one cut trees at the root (not branches but whole trees) and was caught by the forest guard one would be arrested and detained.¹²⁶ Witnesses supported the claims of the Morozovychi community that villagers took whole dried trees, but these witnesses did not know if this was allowed – they had never seen this being done in the presence of a forester.¹²⁷ The community's plenipotentiaries requested:

that not the rights of every individual having the right to the forest be evaluated separately but rather that all those having such a right from the village of Morozovychi be considered as a whole and the rights applying to individuals be considered as applying to the whole community.¹²⁸

The cameral estates' office agreed, and an equivalent was granted to the community as a whole. Such an approach required that the calculation of lumber be modified. The houses of those with rights to the common were not of equal size and therefore could not be evaluated according to the same measure. The community stated that their houses could be grouped into three classes:

1) 28 peasants lived in houses with a living room (*izba*), storage room (*komora*) and hall (*siny*). These houses were 18 ells long and 15 ells wide under one roof. These households also included a stable (*stainia*) and a barn (*stodola*) under one roof, which was 26 ells long and 17 ells wide and built and covered by wood. These were the best houses.

¹²³ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.111-115.

¹²⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9037, a.99.

¹²⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9037, a.106.

¹²⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9037, a.108.

¹²⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9037, a.109.

¹²⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.119-120.

2) 18 peasants had houses 15 by 12 ells with the same parts as in the first class and stables with barns 12 by 8 ells.

3) 10 peasants had houses 12 by 8 ells without any stables or barns.¹²⁹

It also seems that this housing differentiation (which is not reflected in the official statistics on housing tax – there is no difference among the three categories in the number of rooms) can also serve as a guide to social differentiation in the village. Ten farmers, whose households did not have even a barn obviously represented the lowest strata of the community, those without cattle, horses, and, perhaps, their own land as well.

Later peasants stated that besides the buildings mentioned, additional barns attached to some buildings in the second class should also be included in the measurements, and that houses in the second class with these additional barns should be counted as belonging to the first class. Mykola Mykhas' household was among these second-class households which the peasants proposed should count as first class.¹³⁰

The community could calculate how much lumber they needed, but they could not transform it into metric measures. They also argued that their buildings used to last longer but now were not as durable because the timber was softer.¹³¹ The estates office said that peasants' estimates for the fuel they were taking from the forest were wrong: to get a cord of wood, a peasant would have had to work in the forest for two or three days. The office agreed with the division of the houses into three classes but insisted on having a special commission check the number of houses in each class. It did not agree with the peasants' statement that houses on average lasted for 40 years and instead proposed taking an average of at least 80 years.¹³² Besides this, the estates office stated that its own buildings – churches, schools and parish buildings – had first priority to the timber from these forests, and that the total of the amounts claimed could not exceed those allowed by the forest law.¹³³ The estates office also provided lists of those who had harmed the forests by breaking the contract on wood-cutting.¹³⁴ To this the community replied that although the other side's argument was true, the size of the forests was so extensive that it would cover all the needs of both the cameral estates and the peasants. When the estates office wanted to construct its own building, it had

¹²⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.122.

¹³⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.139.

¹³¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.123.

¹³² TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.123-124.

¹³³ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.128.

¹³⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.129.

the first right to do so, but it could never obstruct the right of the peasants – they only had to wait a bit longer.¹³⁵

The estates office offered to pay for the rights of the community in indemnification obligations (indemnity payments were paid to the landlords by state for the abolished *robot* while extracted from the peasants as additions on taxes), arguing that the community did not really need the forest – since 1848 the community had not had any access to the forests, and its economy was still intact.¹³⁶ The community declared that to such an offer “it can agree in no way because our existence would be threatened by such a buying off because we are in such poor shape we cannot even afford to purchase wood for fuel and for houses.” The private forests to which the cameral estates office pointed in its proposal were indeed closer than the state forests to which the community had right, but the peasants could not afford to pay to use these forests.¹³⁷

The plenipotentiaries of the Morozovychi community continued to disagree with new projects for the purchase of servitudes.¹³⁸ In 1862, an expert calculated these rights as being worth nine cords of fir and two cords of beechwood for fuel per farmer per year. It was explained to the community that this was equal to about two carts of wood, and the community said that that was not enough. Despite the fact that the community disagreed with the expert’s calculations, it did agree with the words of witnesses on the basis of which the expert had made his calculations.¹³⁹

In the files I checked I discovered that other state communities received forest in 1865: Kul’chytsi (rustical) received 15 Joch, Morozovychi – seven Joch 765 Klafter, and Berezhnytsia – 13 Joch 632 Klafter. Berezhnytsia protested this decision, claiming 30 Joch more. Berezhnytsia was a much larger community than Morozovychi and was situated much closer to the forests, while Morozovychi was separated not only by distance but also by the Dnister river, which had to be crossed either in Sambir or in Staryi Sambir. Berezhnytsia claimed that there were 154 and not 95 farmers having rights to the forest in their village. Morozovychi protested the decision as well, but it seems that its villagers did so simply *pro forma* and were satisfied with the decision of the commission.¹⁴⁰

The behavior of other state communities while servitude rights were being regulated was very different from that of the village of Morozovychi. For example, the communities of Kul’chytsi and Berehy did not show up for their

¹³⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.130-131.

¹³⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.134.

¹³⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.135-36.

¹³⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.145.

¹³⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.146.

¹⁴⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9041, a.7, 40, 108, 110-111.

investigation and so no amount of fuel was calculated for them.¹⁴¹ The behavior of the Vaniovychi community was not that smart either. Some witnesses from that community testified that the forests were too far away from the village to be used at all, and that fulfilling the right to them “would never pay off.” The commission concluded that obviously they were satisfying their needs for fuel by buying it from the neighboring private forests.¹⁴² That the peasants were rather making illegal use of the neighboring forests does not seem to have crossed their minds.

The rustical community of Berezhnytsia chose plenipotentiaries who refused to sign the protocols (to put the sign of the holy cross below the text that was read to them).¹⁴³ This was typical behavior. On 5 October 1865, Petro Lelych, the mayor of Kul’chytsi, told the commission that:

I cannot give the names of these four farmers from Kul’chytsi who came here with me and now, when the goal of this commission and content of the list given by the Sambir cameral estates’ office was explained to all of us, left the office, because the whole community is afraid, although I do not know of what, and most strongly ordered us not to sign, and if I give you the names of the four farmers who left the office just now, although I have brought them so that they could hear what was going on, the community could get angry and could harm me when I get back home.

The mayor Petro Lelych after giving this testimony also refused to sign.¹⁴⁴

Such behavior on the part of communities shows how much they relied on the tried and older methods of dealing with power – on the community’s anonymity which was used back in the era of *robot*. The communities remained powerful in the 1860s, and actually became more powerful after 1856, with the abolition of patrimonial jurisdiction over them from the estates (*dominia*). In the meantime, this closing of ranks by communities was very useful to the landlords, who could use communities’ passivity and unwillingness to participate in the regulation of the servitudes to their own interest. The program of establishing new property relations in the countryside stopped on this community level as well. Although the landlords’ lands were protected from common usage, the authorities had to leave community land intact and conduct negotiations with whole communities. The goal of the communities during negotiations in most cases was to leave things “as they always had been.”

Communities resisted change and believed that their non-participation in negotiations could stop regulation. Kul’chytsi’s mayor claimed that he passed on

¹⁴¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.149.

¹⁴² TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9037, a.37.

¹⁴³ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9037, a.127.

¹⁴⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.2.

information about the commission proceedings to the community, but the community “already twice because of some suspicion did not want to elect plenipotentiaries for this negotiation.”¹⁴⁵ The mayor himself, the only person the authorities could identify, was not a plenipotentiary, as he stressed. Nevertheless, his answer shows that his testimony supported the position of the estates office: “I only have to give information that rightful members of the village Kul’chytsi had never taken wood for fuel from state forests” because these forests were too far away from them. Peasants used these forests to build their houses, although he did not know how the community would like to organize this practice in the future. The mayor also refused to sign his statement.¹⁴⁶ And here is another interesting moment which could help to explain why communities tried to avoid the negotiations. They believed that providing true testimonies would hinder their winning the case; they hoped that one day all the forests and pastures would be transferred to the communities anyway, with an important exception of the communities that would have already received an equivalent. Quite often the landlords spread rumors to this effect.

This not signing of the protocols obviously continues the pattern of 1848 and was paralleled by the mass non-participation of peasants in the 1860 Diet elections. By not signing the pre-election protocols, peasants were not simply displaying their density but were interacting with ideas about democratic participation. Their non-participation was intended to render the protocols invalid. They claimed their own separate status vis-à-vis the rest of the society.¹⁴⁷ These communities were avoiding procedures, believing instead in their “rights” and in the “Emperor’s justice.”¹⁴⁸

The behavior of the Berezhnytsia peasants in 1865 was the second stage in the process of regulating servitudes. In this case the community’s withdrawal from the negotiations followed an attempt to participate. In 1863, the Berezhnytsia community was more sincere than the Morozovychians. They were not making much use of their rights to the forests in Sprynia and Zvir and were ready to exchange them for a small forest near their village, to which they did not have any rights at all but which they, perhaps, made regular use of to satisfy their need for wood. In 1863, we see the plenipotentiaries from this community testifying that community members who had the right to take wood were ready to give up this right under the following conditions:

- 1) the cameral estates office gave up all the fees it charged
- 2) it gave up all the help and payments it had rights to

¹⁴⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.3.

¹⁴⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.4-5.

¹⁴⁷ Putek, *Pierwsze występy*, 26.

¹⁴⁸ Franko, “Panshchyna ta ii skasuvannia,” 104.

3) a small forest near the village became community's property
If the office did not agree to these conditions, the community would request the forest, to which it had right, being measured according to the number of houses.¹⁴⁹ They did not agree with the experts' measurements "because we cannot understand a measurement [and it] could result in our rights not having any value." The value of the wood decided on by the experts was very low. (According to the experts, all the peasants' rights were estimated to be worth 120 Gulden.)¹⁵⁰ In the end, Berezhnytsia received an amount of forest which, in proportion to its population, was smaller than the compensation Morozovychi got.

The Case of Nedil'na

Nedil'na, a village in the Sambir mountains on the southern border of the Staryi Sambir district, had rights to the forests Pryslip, Dulishiv, Nedil'na. In 1854, these forests were calculated as consisting of 1331 Joch, 145 Klafter.¹⁵¹ The community selected its plenipotentiaries: Hnat Mennik, Stefan Zdians'kyi, Ivan Pikhota, Senio Oleniak, and Hryts' Ianik. 56 citizens from Nedil'na signed a request (two of them, Hryhorii Turians'kyi and Ivan Lopushans'kyi, with their own signatures) that all the information concerning the issue of servitudes that the authorities had should be given to Hnat Mennik.¹⁵²

As in so many other cases, Nedil'na's plenipotentiaries were suspicious of the activities of the commission. For example, when a map of the forests had been charted, the peasants agreed that the map was correct but still did not want to sign it.¹⁵³ In 1868, the commission acknowledged the right of 82 peasants in Nedil'na to 1741 Joch and 627 Klafter of forest, for which they were assigned an equivalent of 49 Joch 876 Klafter.¹⁵⁴ And in this case the amount of forest given to the community was not that bad, but the problem was that the peasants were used to enjoying rights to all the forests around. These forests, which had been royal or private property in the times of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and during the first half of the nineteenth century, were of little value to their owners and no one ever considered putting obstacles in the way of the peasants using them. In the conditions of the mountains substituting rights of usage with

¹⁴⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.25.

¹⁵⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.9035, a.33.

¹⁵¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.10008, a.6.

¹⁵² TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.10008, a.16.

¹⁵³ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.10008, a.21.

¹⁵⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.10009, a.3-4.

the determined equivalent meant complicating the process of getting wood for the badly dispersed peasant households.

According to the protocol from 20 February 1868, the plenipotentiaries of the community testified that no one outside their community had ever taken wood for fuel from these forests and that they could not accept any agreement because the community ordered them not to agree to this in any way. "We also insist that as was earlier the case and for the future taking of wood for fuel, timber and farming instruments be left [to the community]." The plenipotentiaries then refused to sign the protocol.¹⁵⁵

On 16 March 1868, an equivalent of 49 Joch and 816 Klafter called Ostryi Verkh (literally it means "Sharp Peak" and the name itself says much about how inaccessible this mountain was) was assigned to the community. The peasants complained that this forest was too difficult to make use of and was not the one they had been using for years. The commission argued that this forest was in the midst of the peasants' land-plots and thus was best suited for their usage. On 20 March 1868, the plenipotentiaries agreed that Ostryi Verkh was situated among the peasants' plots, but they insisted that the old system of taking wood be preserved and refused to sign the protocol.¹⁵⁶ On 25 April, when the commission arrived in the village, the community still was not satisfied with its decision and was not prepared to accept it. Part of the community complained that the equivalent was too small, others that they wanted it in three different places, and still others that the equivalent was assigned in a place which was difficult to get to. And then there were those who maintained that the equivalent, was in fact, currently in use as a community pasture.

Because of this stand, no one from the community would help the commission, and the community did not provide workers to help delimit the equivalent in the forest. An entire day passed without any results and the commission sent to Staryi Sambir for gendarmes. They waited another day, but the gendarmes did not arrive. The commission again called upon the mayor to proceed and delimitate the forest together with commission's members, but on their way they encountered a crowd of people reprimanding the mayor; he became frightened and allegedly was too afraid to carry out the commission's order. With tears in his eyes the mayor explained that he was afraid that after the commission left, he would be subject to reprisals for any action he took. With a handful of people from another village the commission managed to cut through the forest, and to proclaim that the peasants of Nedił'na as of this day had lost any right to the forests they used.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.10009, a.316.

¹⁵⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.10009, a.17-18.

¹⁵⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.64, spr.10009, a.25.

Finally, examples of voluntary agreements between landlords and communities should be noted. We have an example of such an agreement in the Sambir area. In Baranchytsi and Baranchyky a voluntary agreement was reached between the communities and the landlords in 1867. 138 households with rights to 616 Joch and 1595 Klafter of forest, and to two pastures 206 Joch 358 Klafter and 157 Joch and 860 Klafter, in which pasturing was free and they had to pay six eggs from the cart to access the forest, were given 23 Joch and 289 Klafter of forest, 37 Joch and 369 Klafter of arable land and 157 Joch and 860 Klafter of pasture.¹⁵⁸ We should remember that, besides the description of the servitude struggles in his "Forests and Pastures," Ivan Franko wrote a work of fiction dealing with the issue of servitudes, which portrays a voluntary agreement between the community and its landlord.¹⁵⁹

The case of Baranchytsi and Baranchyky is especially interesting because the peasants voluntarily agreed to get as equivalent only about 3.8% of the forest, to which they had rights of usage. This proves once again that they were more concerned with rights of usage and not with ownership. These communities, as well as all the state villages thus far mentioned, never claimed that the Sprynia and Zvir forests, to which they had rights, were theirs. The case was different with the common pastures appropriated by the landlords in the first half of the nineteenth century. Peasants hoped for justice and the revision of these cases, but the regulation process was not meant to deal with this kind of cases. I also believe there were other cases where landlords used their connections and influence and tried to influence community decisions, but I still think that the most important thing was the character of the process of regulation and not the evil intents of some landlords.

The Galician Diet and the Issue of Servitudes

These cases show what the regulation of servitudes looked like at the level of the individual communities and the extent of rifts between these descriptions and myths about servitudes created in historiography, such as that "'forests and pastures' were the only topic in which Polish and Ruthenian communities were interested."¹⁶⁰ Now I would like to look at the debates over the servitudinal issues and attitudes of the Ruthenian movement to this problem. The regulation of servitudes took place at the same time as a general revitalization of public discussion, with the founding of periodicals and the establishment of the Galician Diet. From its very first session and throughout the 1860s, the Galician Diet was

¹⁵⁸ LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.20.

¹⁵⁹ Ivan Franko, "Velykyi shum."

¹⁶⁰ Józef Putek, *Pierwsze występy polityczne włościanstwa polskiego, 1848-1861*, (Kraków), 24.

the stage of heated debates on the question of servitudes, which are as telling of the process in general as of the concrete servitude cases. Oddly enough, this Diet discussion rarely figures in the scholarship on servitudes and has never been analyzed in detail – only some excerpts of speeches are cited without any larger context provided. Because of this lack of attention and because this discussion imposed its interpretation of events and attitudes on the process of regulation itself, it is crucial for our understanding of the discourses and is described next in some detail, before I turn to the position of the Ruthenian movement.

First of all, Polish landlords in the 1860s claimed, just as the Ruthenian movement had in 1848, that peasants were now citizens just like everyone else. At the opening of 1861 Diet, Count Adam Potocki stated:

The law due in our land does not know the division of society into classes; in the face of it we are all equal. ... If the thing itself does not exist, and no one can talk about the return of these relationships or about the return of *robot*, why then does its ghost still wander in this land, revived by those inimical to the land, who want to the harm of this land to maintain strife between the owners of greater estates and the peasants.¹⁶¹

These words, corresponding very well with the liberal discourse of the time, provide us with a key to understanding the landlords' power and the febleness of the Ruthenian discourse on the question of servitudes. Privileges and patronage of particular social groups now had to be abolished; the new keystone of social relationships, as an indicator of one's abilities and value, was property.

As Robert W. Gordon puts it in his article on the eighteenth-century concept of property, the discussion was about "not property of any and every kind, but a peculiar form of property: property as individual absolute dominion..." This concept of property, he continues, had many sources:

Yet in general political rhetoric these very different sources promiscuously intermingle, tending to converge however sloppily in the modal form of property as absolute individual right, the legally guaranteed security of private possession, disposition and alienation required for individual happiness, self-government, political stability, and economic improvement.¹⁶²

It is interesting that landlords at this time were speaking the language of economic efficiency, property rights and legal procedure, while peasants referred to custom and tradition. When the Austrian government came to Galicia at the end of the eighteenth century, it was the Polish landlords who spoke about customs and defended the system for which there was no legal basis. In 1798, the Galician Estates' Diet wrote a memorial on serfdom, which insisted that

¹⁶¹ Putek, *Pierwsze występy polityczne*, 31.

¹⁶² Robert W. Gordon, "Paradoxical Property," John Brewer and Susan Staves (eds.), *Early Modern Conceptions of Property* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 95.

relationships based on dependency and on either natural law or any contractual basis, nevertheless had a source of legitimacy: “that source was nothing else but custom, i.e. *usus*, as old as society, grounded in mutual (*polubovnych*) agreements.” This custom was represented as the will of the people founded on voluntary agreements between landowners and settlers in newly founded villages. And although some villages were older than serfdom, they were said to have become depopulated at a certain point, after which new settlers came in on the condition of subject-dependency.¹⁶³

Just like the peasants in the servitude cases, the landlords were puzzled when pressed to explain the origin of *robot* and their right to it. Franko noticed that there were several interpretations to the origin of *robot*. One stated that peasant landholdings were originally the property of the landlords, another that this was the compensation peasants paid for the defense nobility provided, while yet another argued that it was a “natural right.”¹⁶⁴ With the exception of the second point, the two other interpretations were also used by peasants in their explanations of the origin of their rights to pastures and forests.

The change of framework and switch to the language of legalism, procedure and some axiomatic principles on which society rests did not occur overnight. We saw some developments in this direction in 1848. In the 1860s the ascendancy of the Polish landowning gentry to political domination in the province occurred against the backdrop of constitutionalizing and liberalizing. It presented itself as the rise of a political system based on a vibrant public sphere and built against the machinations of a corrupt imperial bureaucracy, as a triumph of liberal universalism over obscurant particularism. In this new framework the election of peasant deputies, deprived of critical reasoning, was questioned together with the election of many Ruthenian activists, both being presented as obedient tools of the tyrannical government.¹⁶⁵ It is interesting that in questioning the right of some peasant deputies to be elected, the landlords referred, as they had in the case of the servitudes, to the absence of proper documents proving the possession of property in given communities by these peasants (this was the case with Jan Siwiec and Antoni Błaż).

The question of servitudes, it was emphasized, was not about one’s economic well-being but rather involved principles of the social order. Prince Sanguszko said:

¹⁶³ VR LNB, f. Alexander Czołowski, op.3, spr.2431.

¹⁶⁴ Franko, “Panshchyna ta її skasuvannia,” 13.

¹⁶⁵ Compare the discussion on the elections of Jan Siwiec and Ioakym Khomins’kyi.

This question at first appears to be an economic question. Applauding or approving cannot influence the Diet's decision in this case because it is about the verification of the right of property, which requires cold consideration.¹⁶⁶

Prince Sanguszko questioned peasant claims that landlords had taken the amount of pasture and forest they had – “is it plausible that so much peasant land could come illegally into the hands of estates, i.e. landlords?”¹⁶⁷ Moreover, Prince Sanguszko pointed to the communities' inherent propensity toward unruly and dangerous behavior:

There are some respectful individuals, who would not steal millions if these were entrusted to them, but let's acknowledge that when they come in a crowd/community (*u gromady*) their heads get formally muddled and they raise demands which are illogical... When they come with their community's pretensions, they do not consider the law only their own convenience.¹⁶⁸

In this context Sanguszko uttered a famous parable comparing communities with children who whine when they do not get the sweet they want. In 1878 Rev. Naumovych referred in the Diet to the servitude discussion from the 1860s and criticized this metaphor, which he believed Deputy Ziemiałkowski had used. Rev. Naumovych reminded the Polish deputies of the hundreds of complaints coming to the Diet in the 1860s from the communities, which had been discarded by the “minister-compatriot,” who said about a matter vital to peasant survival: “Communities are like children; when a child sees a sweet in someone's hand, it cries because would also like to have it; communities wish to get forests and pastures and cry because no one gives them to them.”¹⁶⁹

It was easy for Rev. Naumovych to criticize the 1860s in the 1870s, when usury, pawning and the sale of peasant land, combined with an agricultural crisis, made the pitiful situation in Galician villages obvious. Back in the 1860s, however, the comparison between a peasant and a child in the Galician Diet had at first been made not by Prince Sanguszko but by the Ruthenian activist, priest and writer, Rev. Mohyl'nyts'kyi, who claimed to represent peasants unable to speak on their own. Rev. Mohyl'nyts'kyi stated:

¹⁶⁶ Sprawozdania stenograficzne z posiedzeń Sejmu krajowego galicyjskiego we Lwowie, odbytych od dnia 15 do 26 kwietnia 1861 r. (Lwów, 1861), 306.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid. 1861, 308.

¹⁶⁹ Kil'ka besid russykykh posliv dumy derzhavnoi i soima kraievoho (L'viv: nakladom Ivana Nakonechnoho, 1878), 7.

We, all the village deputies here, took upon ourselves great duties and burdens to speak for them and say what is aching them. They are infants, and sometimes just like little babies cannot communicate the source of their pain.¹⁷⁰

As we shall see, Rev. Naumovych himself would use the same language and the same comparisons in the 1860s. Of course, there was a difference between the Polish and the Ruthenian positions: the Ruthenians emphasized the need for mainly the state to continue providing paternalist protection for the peasants, while the Polish landlords represented such protection as spoiling the peasants. Sanguszko's speech on the servitudes ended with a statement against the proposed courts of mutual agreement (half peasant and half landlord), and in favor of some third party resolving these cases not on the basis of mutual agreement but on the basis of law.¹⁷¹

Rev. Pavlykiv spoke against Prince Sanguszko (back in 1848 he had been the one to bring the peasants from the Berezhany circle to the sessions of the Supreme Ruthenian Council):

I have cognized the peasant, cognized his misery and misfortune; I speak in his name, standing behind the village man and speaking in his defense... how can these people who for centuries have been feeding and clothing us with the sweat on their foreheads, how can they be exposed to injustice and ridicule, how can it be allowed to say of these poor peasants: this is a beast, a snake (oh! oh! hissing and general indignation in the Chamber: 'no one says that, to order! No one and never!)...

At this point Rev. Pavlykiv was reminded not to go astray but to return to the matter at hand. He called for the Diet to establish a servitude commission but did not have any concrete proposals except that he agreed with the Chamber that these disputes should be ended one way or another. It also appears that the person keeping the protocol consciously distorted Pavlykiv's speech by making it harder to understand, as was often done with peasant speeches.¹⁷²

After Rev. Pavlykiv, Count Dzieduszycki said:

Do not be mistaken, this is not a question of servitudes' this is about what is mine and what is yours... and therefore should be left to those who know the law. Gentlemen, respected deputies, and priests have talked about injustices committed against peasants. I too was not brought up in the city, I live in a village and know that peasants want justice, [but] a question of this kind is a question of property; this is not because of ill will or envy.

Questions of property should be based on court [decisions] and court [decisions] – on the law. And where is this law? In 1848 the peasants spoke, saying, 'return to us the

¹⁷⁰ *Sprawozdania ... 1861*, 304.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 309.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 311-12.

forests, return the pastures'; now they are saying the same thing, and waiting for a decision to be made in their favor!¹⁷³

Last to speak was the representative of the Ruthenian peasants, the famous deputy Kovbasiuk (after whom for some time all Ruthenians were called *kovbasiuky*, *kovbasa* in Ukrainian means sausage):

I am asking our Most Enlightened Monarch and High Prince Speaker and saying: our gentlemen are good – we want good in a good way. We have been wronged; the land, and pastures, and forests were taken from us.

I have my own land, I am paying for it – not just I but everyone is – there is a bush on my land – and when I, mowing the grass, cut the bush with a scythe I am fined by the landlord!

I cannot do what is legal on my own land, although there is a metrical book of the land. There are trials – from the Circle to the Governor's Office, from the Governor's Office to the Minister – and they reached a resolution, but at home the District was in charge of carrying it out, and in the end our forest was not returned. Please report this to the Most Enlightened Monarch; we have metrical books from the year 1786 – what is the community's is the community's – and what is the landlord's is the landlord's; please end this at once. That is why we are each other's enemies: us against the landlords and the landlords against us; there are good landlords but there are evil ones [as well].

We are like sheep cut short before Christmas and placed in the yard – they sleep but barely, still alive but breathing heavily. The landlords grew forest on the communities' own fields, where our grandfathers and fathers plowed. [They] took everything! When cattle go there, [they] come back without a horn. When they catch [one, they] order us to pay, and if there is nothing to pay with, they take us to the Jew and declare it a fine. Now there is much stuff that came from the Ministry and from the Governor's office and it is held in the Districts at home. Trials are conducted, but people cannot find any recourse, and the landlords keep using the land. The landlord pays; it is easy for landlords to conduct trials because landlords use the land. But among us a farmer, who conducts a trial has nothing [left] to conduct it with now. That is why we ask God, the Most Enlightened Monarch and the Lord Prince Speaker, to have mercy on us and bring about an end in this case. What is the community's should be the community's, and what is the landlord's the landlord's, to end it at once.¹⁷⁴

We see that Kovbasiuk is here arguing for a return to the situation indicated in the Josephinian cadastre; he is also hoping for help from the central government, whose decisions are allegedly kept in secret by the local administration. He is also using some obviously false arguments – as, for example, about landlords sowing forest on former peasants' landholdings. However, Kovbasiuk also argued that the peasants should be given the full right of property to their land, which would be the final emancipation of the peasantry so glorified by Słomka.

Another Polish deputy, the Latin priest Rev. Ruczka, talked about peasants having respect for property and slowly starting to lose their distrust of others,

¹⁷³ Ibid., 313

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 316-17.

which had been so characteristic of them previously. He spoke in favor of the fastest possible solution to the servitude question and asked about the possibility of transferring the investigation of the servitude problems from the administrative to the court authorities.¹⁷⁵ Like other landlords, Count Wodzicki blamed the Austrian system for the plight of the land's economy and the chaos of the land registers, pointing to 80 years of purposeful complication of land relations. The solution he proposed was to start with the abolition of the right of recourse. He saw servitudes as "rights based partly on use and partly on abuse [on the peasants' part], tightly connected with subject-dependency relationships, which going through various stages on such a chaotic scale, especially in the forested areas, that in fact no legal basis for relationships could be strictly defined."¹⁷⁶

As was correctly noticed by Józef Putek, the landlords were the first to discern a kind of primitive communism in the peasants' argument. But in fact peasants' argument was, just as the landlords', conduct in terms of the delimitation of property – the question was only which cadastre to use. Peasant deputy Zahoruiko said: "What [is due] to the communities – to the communities and what [is due] to the landlords – to the landlords, and then we shall be together."¹⁷⁷ Another peasant, Starukh, also said "what is the communities [should be] the communities, and what is the landlords [should be] the landlords."¹⁷⁸

Speaking about servitudes, the Ruthenian deputy lawyer Borysikevych divided cases from a legal point of view into two classes: 1) servitude cases proper; and 2) cases about land-plots and pastures, which in turn could be divided in two – those about communities' lands and those about individual landholdings. Borysikevych blamed the old system, which made it impossible for peasants to obtain the documents they needed to establish their rights and properties. He argued in favor of allowing peasants to make oral petitions so that they would be liberated of the necessity of depending on half-literate corner scribes, and also of returning all vacated rustical land parcels (because of the death or migration of their owners) to community management. However, the important thing is that, as a lawyer, Borysikevych agreed that the inventories of 1820 should be taken as the basis for regulation. He also said that the servitudes landlords freely granted to the community could not be simply transferred into their money equivalent and that for these a special commission should be established.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 318—320.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 322-324.

¹⁷⁷ Józef Putek, *Pierwsze występy polityczne*, 33.

¹⁷⁸ Putek, *Pierwsze występy*, 54.

¹⁷⁹ *Sprawozdania ... 1861*, 326-330.

The peasant deputy Zahoruiko supported the proposal to establish special commission but said:

that among the people the consensus is for the Josephinian rights from the year 1786, to stop in this year and to decide on this basis, because there is much injustice about taxes. Because then it was written when people were ignorant, not able to write and read; and the judge called for farmers who wrote as they understood and knew how to but did not know what they were signing, that is why communities owed so much and are still in debt. Thus our communities, which sent us here, wanted it to be according to the Josephinian rights and according to these, return to the landlords what is the landlords and to the peasants what is ours, and then there will be no dispute.¹⁸⁰

Ziemiałkowski, to whom Rev. Naumovych referred in his speech on servitudes, blamed the pre-1848 system for discriminating against the landlords. While peasants had patrons in the Circle administration, the landlords did not have any, and peasants, “seeing that they had a patron in the Circle, thought they would always find right even without having it.” This system was guilty of the unlawful claims peasants were making to their landlords’ property:

I myself [in my estate] had acts about villagers being beaten up by foresters who caught them with an axe in the forest. After two years [the peasant] said that he had the right to gather branches in the forest.... In four years [same problem] he demanded construction timber, and his son claimed that this forest was his own. And he had a reason to – this case was expensive. He went to testify before the commissions, wasting time and cattle, then just like a losing gambler, had to double his stakes to get back his losses: the subject did the exactly that, two to three years on a trial doubled his claims so in the case of victory he could pay for the trial’s expenses (applauds). About the resolutions, there was a law that every resolution was right and there was no appeal: however, according to the subject’s patent there should have been. And these trials did not cost [peasants] anything; there was no need in paid attorney because the Circle was a free attorney...¹⁸¹

According to Dzieduszycki, all these endless trials resulted in the situation “that no one knew any longer what belonged to them; ideas about property got mixed up totally: the thing that yesterday was mine, today becomes yours, and after tomorrow can be mine again.” Then he turned to the peasant demands:

Some speaker proposed here going back to the Josephinian law. And if I would propose going 200 years back? What was done and was once decided is sanctified, otherwise if one thing could be overturned, we could overturn the second and the third resolution, and so we would come back to the times of Adam and Eve and ask them, by which right did they possess this land, and they would not have any documents (laughter).¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 330.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 333.

¹⁸² Ibid., 334.

Then he pointed to the fact that servitudes were connected with subject-dependency and given by the landlord to his subjects. However, while 100 years ago a village had 20 or 50 houses, now it might have 100 or 150 – the burden on the landlords' property had increased (the speaker preferred not to mention *robot* obligations and how they increased over time). But the biggest problem for Dzie duszycki was the peasant attitude:

Our peasants cannot understand the difference between property and servitude. A peasant, if he can pasture cattle on a pasture, if he can take wood from a forest, as a simple person, cannot differentiate that the pasture, on which he has right to pasture, that the forest, from which he can take fuel and timber, are not necessarily his property: from this lack of adequate differentiation between property and servitudes, long and burdening disputes were born.¹⁸³

For Polish landowners all the speeches of the peasant deputies served as proof that the peasants had to be taught about the idea of property, they had to realize that property was untouchable. Similarly, it was said that indemnification, the compensation for the abolition of *robot* added to peasant taxes, had been introduced by the Viennese parliament because of a concern with peasant morals; they had to learn the “idea of property rights.”¹⁸⁴ Peasants were once more accused of having a propensity to dispute, which was said to be becoming a real disease, and Ziemiałkowski, the leader of the Polish “democrats” in Galicia at that time, proposed to cure peasants of this disease. The discussion in the Diet also shows how far Polish politicians and reformers departed from the ideas voiced in the early 1840s by reformers. Back in the 1840s some people had blamed the nobility of excessive consumption, which forced them to expand estate lands and to cut forests, which were vital for the existence of the peasantry.¹⁸⁵

After Ziemiałkowski peasant deputy Starukh spoke:

I was sent here by the communities and that is why I am asking Mr. Speaker and this Honest gathering to listen to the injustice which goes on from the reasons which my forerunners mentioned. Some pastures and forests were taken away which peasants and landlords had made use of for a long time, and we do not have wood for material, for fuel and for construction as we used to before the abolition of *robot*, and then all these things were refused to us... and from that time it stopped. Now I should also say something about the community works, how they work to buy material for construction, and if farmer's house burns, he lacks everything and must go begging. Some things some people will give him, but no one will give him anything from the forest. And

¹⁸³ Ibid., 334-5.

¹⁸⁴ Franko, “Halys’ka indemnizatsiia,” 98.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 89. He refers to Hieronim Łodyński and his brochure “Projekt stopniowej zmiany stosunków włościan w Galicyi,” published in L’viv in 1845.

landlords acknowledge that an injustice is being done to them: they want to plow but do not have [animals] with which to do it; they ask to work but he [the peasant] does not have any tools, neither a plow nor a harrow, nor a cart; and if he does not go, the landlords say: they are insolent and disobedient. But how are they supposed to, if everything has been closed to them? Even our lands as it will be told were not left unchanged...

Revoke this gentlemen, so that the mercy of the Most Enlightened Lord can do justice, otherwise, as everyone will prove, everyone will leave and go (*porozkhodiat i porozlaziat*).¹⁸⁶

The Ruthenian priest and writer Rev. Ustyianovych spoke about the difficulties in finding solutions, about the virtual impossibility of finding solutions that would satisfy both sides. Then he emphasized the importance of this issue for the peasants' existence and said:

I know that many higher citizens [landlords, *obyvateli vyższyj*] and many communities would willing fully shake each other's hands if there only was some influence from above. Gentlemen! The public virtues of the Polish nobility are known all over the world. We are happy that our peasants do not know yet the teachings of Prudhon [sic!]. Gentlemen! Our Ruthenian people are as good as Polish peasants, as nice. Ruthenians have faith, have God's wrath and love of their neighbor in their hearts. It [should be] easy to reach an agreement with these people in what is good.¹⁸⁷

Rev. Ustyianovych asked for mutual agreements between landlords and peasants, saying that the peasants were ready for this and as tired of the servitude trials as the landlords. Ivan Franko also says that in the 1860s' servitude debates the peasants favored "mutual agreements" and commissions, which would consist of an equal number of landlords and community representatives. As deputy Shpunar explained: "we do not need any attorneys, by way of mutual agreement we shall reach an accord sooner." The landlords opposed this fiercely. They had no recollections of happy patriarchal times of harmony. They argued against "idyllic rhetoric" and applauded cases when "cold reason" ruled. The question of servitudes was a question of property and had to be decided by the cold law.¹⁸⁸

Many peasant deputies also took a hard stance on this issue, accusing the landlords of illegal appropriating and possessing peasant land.¹⁸⁹ This discussion was one in which peasant deputies were the most active. They always complained about landlords' closing commons and forests, which started even before 1848 but after that became total, about coercion used to force subjects to work for

¹⁸⁶ *Sprawozdania ... 1861*, 336-38.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 341-2.

¹⁸⁸ Ivan Franko, "Materialy dlia izucheniia obshchestvennykh idealov ukrainskogo naroda v Galitsii," *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.44 kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 134-135.

¹⁸⁹ Deputy Hebda, *Sprawozdania ... 1861*, 343-4.

landlords and so on.¹⁹⁰ Deputy Kravets' also mentioned the "patronage" other deputies offered peasants: "I have heard you talking here about patronage – when we approached this patron for advice, you laughed at us when we were leaving." He also blamed the whole system, that landlords ordered excessive work and peasants did not work properly, and pointed to other countries, "where people care about better order."¹⁹¹

When the peasants Protsak and Bielewicz were talking, the noise in the chamber did not allow their speeches to be properly recorded in the protocol. Peasant Bielewicz mentioned the servitude commission in his village in 1857:

At this commission I was present in person and [there] was great dispute. We were told that everything should be paid for, although some perhaps did not have property but [just] sat on the land. The community had general lands, but now they were brought to the servitude commission. All asked and still hope that the commission would be withhold [a commission can't be withheld... its decision can be overturned though] so that proof could be established. We hope that here in the Diet even the smallest thing will be brought to the rule and that an agreement will be reached in our land. Because one village is quiet, and another one has a trial for the forest, yet another for the meadow, and yet another – for servitudes...¹⁹²

Another Polish peasant, Czechura, said that servitudes "died in 1848" and asked why the peasants did not have propination rights as well. Finally he asked, as many other peasant deputies had, for the landlords to acknowledge what was the communities and to return to them these lands.¹⁹³

Then an unknown peasant deputy said from his seat:

...when I was being elected to the Diet in three districts, [people] told me to ask the Speaker and High Chamber: first about suspension and lightening of the burdens, which are known; second, to ask gentlemen to be merciful and bring to the Government the petitions of all people, to return to us the forests, pastures, lands and emptied farms, which already earlier during the French Wars, and later, during the hard times, were turned into the landlords'.¹⁹⁴

The same leitmotif of returning the communities' land was expressed by almost every peasant deputy speaking. It is interesting that while the landlords insisted that they discuss only burdens on others' usage of one's property, the peasants spoke of general conflicts between peasants and landlords. Peasant deputy Hebda

¹⁹⁰ Deputies Lapichak, Andreichuk, and Koroliuk, *Ibid.*, 346-47.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 348.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 349-50.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 350-51.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 352-4.

explicitly spoke not about servitudes but about landlords' violations of peasant lands and the appropriation of individual peasant land parcels.¹⁹⁵

The talk of peasant deputy Shpunar appeared to the stenographer so dangerous that he left most of it out of the protocol and recorded only the ending of Shpunar's speech:

With a clear conscience I am thinking about [our] other rights, for example, to the forest. We consider the forest to be the highest good because without it we shall not be able to heat [furnace], to build, and indeed, gentlemen, the forest is a public good! (laughter). It is true that there are landlords who gave us cut forests (*wręby*) back in the times of the Polish kings, but there are also other gentlemen, those who sue a man in court even for a roof-sill or roof-spar (*lada platew lub krokiew*) (the speaker cannot be heard, great noise in the chamber). Similar things happen with pastures and [arable] land that communities possessed in the times of *robot*. But everyone knows about this. Or what happens with emptied farms? It is not even worth talking about it.¹⁹⁶

Shpunar's speech forced this reaction from Count Adam Potocki, who had opened the Diet with a declaration of the will for mutual love and solidarity:

I have the courage to state that in the whole of Europe there is no land where the stuff told here could be even dreamed of.

Heavy responsibility and God's punishment will fall on the law, under which such a monstrous thought could be spread as the one just expressed by Deputy Shpunar.

Deputy Shpunar considers the forest to be public property. Do you know gentlemen what that is? This is the abolition of the right to own property, the abolition of the foundation of all the societies. This deputy thinks that he stood up in defense of the interests of his village: I am saying that statements like this would be the destruction of his village, and of the whole country. If they want to abolish ownership of the forest because it is not in the hands of those whom we call villagers, then let them not forget that the villagers' rights of possession will also be lost. If they rise against property, what would they say when cottagers [landless villagers, *kebalupnyky*] join them with demands of their own to their property? (Applause.)¹⁹⁷

In fact, in proclaiming forest to be a "public good," Deputy Shpunar was speaking in the spirit of the Austrian forest law, which imposed limits on the usage of forests in private ownership. Adam Potocki described servitudes as an integral part of the patriarchal system, when relationships were based not on law but on the "needs of the heart." But if now "we have already passed that epoch," mercy and goodness should go into the sphere of private life, while public life should be based on law and justice. He then went on to explain the difference between the Diet and the courts, with the Diet not having the right to apply the

¹⁹⁵ Putek, *Pierwsze występy*, 52.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 53.

¹⁹⁷ *Sprawozdania ... 1861*, 356-7.

law to separate cases or even to check the correctness of such applications.¹⁹⁸ Similarly, Deputy Krzeczunowicz said that the complaints of the peasant deputies seemed to indicate a wish to get not only what was due to them according to the law, but also things that were not due to them. If the latter was true it would mean a threat of destroying the entire concept of property.¹⁹⁹

I believe that the discussion above proves the impossibility of any kind of rapprochement between the peasants and the landlords in the 1860s. It also shows that mastery of the languages of liberalism was key in the landlords' success. The point was not just to win a majority in the Diet but to represent the establishment of this domination as connected and contributing to the end of absolutism and the establishment of responsible government, democracy and the rule of law. The Ruthenian deputies could not build an effective defense of peasant interests precisely because the Diet majority used language they believed to be valid. The only thing left for the Ruthenians was to resort to calling for the paternalist patronage and benevolence of the landlords. The Ruthenians still relied on the central government but the central government was withdrawing from province's politics and was not going to protect them anymore.

I should also mention that the regulation of private property in the 1860s was not limited to the issue of servitudes. In 1868, a question concerning the peasants' land was raised during Diet sessions. A majority in the Commission of Diet established for considering this issue decided in favor of the unlimited divisibility of peasant landholdings. The Latin priest Rev. Stempek spoke out against it, arguing that such a law would lead to never-ending partitions and pauperization. The Ruthenian deputy Koval's'kyi argued that divisions of peasant landholdings should be left to the resolution of the community council. In this he was supported by the peasant Oleksa Koroliuk (a member of the Diet commission), who said:

The community knows best and understands and can make sure that no injustice is done to any family, as I have had an opportunity to ascertain for five years. I think that communities know their traditions and customs best, know to whom land belongs and who is the owner, who is right, I have already on many occasions ascertained that the community knows this the best, and when one went to the court or to the political administration it did not necessary end well, but those who referred to the community council always agreed that it should be given under the supervision of the community council...

For this reason I think that the time has not yet come in our case for the freedom to divide land. We should consider our people – our village people are not enlightened, they should be given more schooling, so they could advance and build upon this education. We were given a little bit more of this so-called freedom, but we should take care not to suffocate that freedom (bravo). That is why I am of the opinion that community

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 358-360.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 361-2.

councils should have this right, so that these councils can take care of the divisions, the whole council and not only the mayor or assessor.²⁰⁰

The most important thing was that the minority of the commission was in theory also in favor of the divisibility of peasant landholdings. They simply felt that at the moment it had to be modified. They therefore countered the opinion of the majority, expressed by Deputy Krzeczunowicz, when he stated that any condition put upon divisibility:

...is an essential limitation of individual freedom. We have an example individual freedom being limited on behalf of communities, when their activity is controlled by *ispravniki* in Moscow; we are not going to take our examples from there. (Applause). There is despotism, there is the destruction of individual freedom, they have no riches, no industry, and neither material nor spiritual powers develop there. (Applause). Let's look what the practical result would be of such a demand to need the permission of a community for the division or sale of one's landholdings. We live in villages and know that in communities personal interests play an important role. If the mayor or one of the councilors would like to buy the whole landholding, he will not allow for its division. (Applause). But let's assume that there is no personal interest at stake, how then would this end? – It would end with the community council going to the tavern, and the one who would like to get permission treating the others to vodka or beer; the villager selling his piece of the land out of necessity will also be forced to pay for the vodka and beer...²⁰¹

Finally, Deputy Krzeczunowicz stated that the indivisibility of landholdings was a remnant of the times of serfdom slavery that they wanted to abolish.²⁰²

Not all the Polish deputies were in favor of the unlimited divisibility of peasant landholdings. Maurycy Kraiński who studied agrarian relationships in Galicia extensively and who worked in the commission of the Estates' Diet on the abolition of *robot*, was in favor of limitations being placed on the division and sale of peasant landholdings. Countering arguments about individual freedom and freedom of property, he advanced an argument about the common good, or interests of society and mentioned examples from other European countries which introduced limitations on peasant landholdings.²⁰³

The peasant Kovbasiuk, interesting enough, at first was going to vote in favor of the commission's majority but changed his mind and joined the commission's minority, speaking out in favor of Koval's'kyi's resolution proposing community councils to supervise the division and sale of land, with family and community

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 293.

²⁰¹ *Stenograficzne sprawozdania galicyjskiego Sejmu krajowego w drugim okresie [1868]* (Lwów, 1868), 294.

²⁰² Ibid., 294-5.

²⁰³ Ibid., 295-8.

having priority of purchase.²⁰⁴ It is worth noting that Count Wodzicki defended the resolution that the commission's majority proposed, undermined the argument made during the discussion and basically repeated Shpunar's words, saying that the forests were not comparable to other kinds of property; they were a sort of public good.²⁰⁵

In the end, the divisibility of peasant landholdings was accepted and they became unlimited hereditary property with their owner having the unlimited right to divide and sell this property. The issue of servitudes was transferred to administrative commissions and courts. The idea of establishing courts of peace, which would lead to mutual agreements, was finally rejected in 1863 – the Diet stated that the peasants were unwilling to reach voluntary agreements with large landholders,²⁰⁶ but in fact the Diet majority had argued against it since the first Diet session. It was against continuing the “old patriarchal ways” and in favor of more modern solutions to conflicts through legal procedure and administrative commissions.

Polish peasant deputy Jan Siwec, to the contrary, especially insisted on the establishment of these peace courts. Jan Siwec, who had served in the army for ten years and once had an audience with the Emperor and even worked for the district captaincy, was hated by nobility and proposed to solve servitude disputes through courts of mutual agreement, one per district with three representatives of the communities and three of the greater landowners. Where communities' demands were found to be just, the demands had to be satisfied and where unjust, the communities had to withdraw their claims. Siwec's second proposal was for the immediate resolution of all servitude disputes.²⁰⁷ The landlords, however, preferred to forget about these and continued to present peasants as procrastinators still placing their hopes in the arbitrary decision of the Emperor.

We have seen that Polish landowners took great pains to show that it was not an issue of their own private interests but of private property, law and justice in general, of the interests of society as a whole. One of the most famous representatives of the Polish nobility in the Galician Diet, Count Alexander Dunin-Borkowski, a deputy from the Sambir circle and a noble democrat (the so-called “red”), stated in a speech of 25 October 1869, that property had existed since pre-historical times. He explained its origin as follows: at first there were a few people and a lot of land, but this later reversed and stronger men started taking over others' land, therefore property:

²⁰⁴ Ibid., 299-301.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 301-302.

²⁰⁶ Inglot, (ed.), *Mauryczego Kraińskiego rejesty*, 47.

²⁰⁷ Putek, *Pierwsze występy*, 38-9, 49-51.

at the very beginning was a voluntary take-over, then – a privilege and now, from the point of view of contemporary education, property is a victory over matter by man's will, the expression of his work.

As with propination, it is not just a feudal privilege; even if it used to be it was now connected with property, was property itself. And because it was property, any agreement with the opposite side would mean a compromise, and it was impossible to compromise in fundamental matters such as property. Dunin-Borkowski said:

The compromises we make in the name of progress under the auspices of the common good will never end, therefore finally we shall need despotism to reintroduce, at least, partially, security of slavery.²⁰⁸

All these discussions in the Diet were not unconnected with the concrete servitude cases. I would like to conclude this section with a quotation from Franko's play "Great Noise." Franko describes a German official trying to make money from the abolition of servitudinal rights. He speaks to the landlord as follows:

[This is] patriarchalism, dear sir, old antiquated patriarchalism. Now it is time for new views. You can go far with peasants on communism, and the more peasants there are the greater will be your injustice. Now we have a new law: what is mine cannot be given [to anyone else]! Only on this basis is a rational economy possible.²⁰⁹

While speaking to the peasants from the Hrushatychi community he uses totally different language:

For your well-being, all the old forests and commons described back in the Josephinian cadastre should be returned to you. All the land that was later "emptied" and occupied by the landlords and inventoried by Gauer as the landlords' property shall be returned to you. What more do you need? You do not wish the landlord's [land], but what you have legal right to you can claim in legal and illegal ways. This is my advice for you. The sooner you take to this, the easier it will be able to reach your goal because once other villages move, it will be too late.²¹⁰

²⁰⁸ [Alexander Dunin-Borkowski], *Mowy Leszka Dunina-Borkowskiego (1867-1887)*, (z przedmowa Stanisława Schnür-Peplowskiego) (Lwów, 1897), 66-68.

²⁰⁹ Ivan Franko, "Velykyi shum," 288.

²¹⁰ Franko, "Velykyi shum," 302.

Servitudes and Ruthenians

In the discussions in the Diet we have already seen a certain ambivalence in the attitudes of the Ruthenian activists to the question of servitudes. On the one hand, there is a sincere concern with the plight of the peasantry; on the other – a certain impotency. No Ruthenian deputy directly supported the words of the peasant deputies; none even referred to them. One Ukrainian scholar remarked of this position by the Ruthenian movement that:

The problem was that contemporary Ukrainian elites did not have a deeper understanding of social causes; they did not understand the importance of education and the organization of popular masses and therefore were not able to conduct adequate work.²¹¹

I would not only agree with this but go even further. We should keep in mind that, besides the conflict between peasants and landlords, the issue of servitudes also involved the institutionalizing of capitalist property relationships in the countryside. As I have shown with the example of the Diet discussion, the Ruthenian deputies could not counter the overall framework of Polish liberal reform, of double emancipation, in which the personal freedom of the peasant was accompanied by the freedom of the peasant property. They could not counter this framework because they shared in it. Their ideas about private property were the same as those of the Diet's majority. They did not want to preserve servitudinal rights because these were thought to corrupt the idea of private property, and a stricter separation of the communities from the estates was in their interest.

As far back as 1834, in a statute concerning a conspiracy among Greek Catholic theology students at L'viv seminary, a statute which was very close to that of the *Stowarzyszenie Ludu Polskiego*, the seventh paragraph read as follows: "The private property of peasants is unlimited; *robot*, *daniny* and various obligations are abolished."²¹² We should notice that private property and not *robot* is mentioned first. Similarly, Maurycy Kraiński's letter to the estates Diet in 1842 proposed transforming rustical landholdings completely into the property of the peasants. A peasant would be able to borrow money against his landholding to guarantee his debts, and *robot* would be mortgaged on that land as well.²¹³ Kraiński's project to abolish *robot* also included the abolition of commons and the buying off of the "burdens" on the land.²¹⁴

²¹¹ Vytanovych, *Ukrains'ke selianstvo*, 8-9.

²¹² Łopushański, *Stowarzyszenie ludu polskeigo*, 132.

²¹³ Ivan Franko, "Panshchyna ta її skasuvannia," 57.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 62.

The actual abolition of *robot* was motivated first and foremost by the same need to establish proper property relationships among the peasantry. It is worth citing the patent Ferdinand I signed on 16 April 1848, abolishing *robot*. The patent is in the same language, in which the abolition of the servitudes was represented:

We have recognized as harmful to the advance of the country the fact that the legally acknowledged kind of possession of the most numerous stratum of landholders, the estate of dependent subjects, was not guaranteed according to general civil law, and therefore these landholders could not have access to the benefits to which property rights and mortgage allow.²¹⁵

As late as the 1890s the Ruthenian movement felt it necessary to remind peasants that: "Every honestly conducted farm first of all should have exactly defined boundaries."²¹⁶ In the 1890s the Ruthenian movement found ways to represent the behavior of the Polish nobility as based on the simple class interest of an outdated feudal class of big landowners most to blame for the province's miserable conditions. Back in the 1860s it was harder; the era of liberal reforms had just started, and the Polish nobility with its Enlightenment and revolutionary traditions could easily represent itself as the vanguard of progress.

"Forests and pastures" was the slogan ascribed to the Ruthenian movement to ridicule it, to present the whole Ruthenian cause as populist demagoguery playing with the peasants' senseless demands.²¹⁷ While studying at the gymnasium in Drohobych, Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi spent his vacations in the village of Limytsia in the Rohatyn district; he was invited there to tutor the children of the local Jewish landlord Apfl. There he once received a notice to pick up a letter waiting for him at the postal office. The letter did not have sufficient postage on it, was without a sender's address and unusually large. Intrigued, Zubryts'kyi decided to pay the required 10 Kreuzer for it. Upon opening the letter he found inside only a small piece of paper, on which the phrase "FORESTS AND PASTURES" was written in large letters. The oldest son of the Apfls, a first-year law student, had played a joke on him. As Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi recalled, "We sometimes talked about various things, about the Ruthenian cause among other things, and that is where this unpaid letter came from."²¹⁸

In 1862, Rev. Iosyf Lozyns'kyi from Peremyshl' published a brochure under the cryptonym L. called Thoughts about Property or Ownership in Consideration of the Current Relationships of Our Communities to the Great Landowners (*Hadky o vlasnosti yly posidaniiu s vozzhreniiem na teperishnii otnosheniia nashykh bromad ko bol'shym*

²¹⁵ Franko, "Panshchyna ta її skasuvannia," 79.

²¹⁶ Ivan Nehrebetskii, "Sprostovanie mezhy," *Dilo*, 1893, No.4.

²¹⁷ Jan Zacharjasiewicz, *Święty Jur. Powieść współczesna*, t.1 (Warszawa, 1886), 13-16.

²¹⁸ VR LNB, f.206, spr.922, p.27, a.10.

podiateliam), which was confiscated by the Viceroy's office. This was one of the most radical treatments of the servitudes issue at the time. Rev. Lozyns'kyi was known for his radical position in social matters, being, perhaps, the most radical Ruthenian writer in 1848 and the pre-1848 era.²¹⁹ He was also the one to propose introducing the Latin script into the Ruthenian language. Despite confiscation and accusations in communist agitation this was the most successful work of Rev. Lozyns'kyi. He himself described the immense popularity of this brochure among Polish and German politicians, knew Polish and German translations of this and believed that there were also translations into French, English and Italian. According to Rev. Lozyns'kyi, translation of this brochure into Polish and distribution among Polish deputies caused its confiscation.²²⁰

Lozyns'kyi's brochure describes the origin of property simply. At first the right of ownership came from primacy of usage as there was plenty of free land, on which people could settle. Besides this, "the power of [one's] spirit was another foundation for the acquisition of property and power, which happened through the succession and was transferred to offspring."²²¹ These stronger men with "the power of spirit" were those who defended the communities, and for this service the communities made certain sacrifices on their behalf.

This part of the book was no different from the way the nobility presented its traditional history. Lozyns'kyi describes the great landowners' origins in exactly the same way they themselves represented them. The original part of his argument begins with the following statement

However great the sacrifices made by the community on behalf of its defender and manager, the community could not, being of sober mind and free will, give up all its rights to its meadows, forests and pastures because its very existence required them, because without them agriculture would not be possible.

According to Rev. Lozyns'kyi, the communities could not relinquish their right to resources absolutely necessary for their survival. He advances the argument that survival is the foremost human right, which could not be renounced in any political system. The liberal postulate about the inalienability of property is modified by the equally inalienable right to live. The right of the communities to forests and pastures were "natural and eternal, which community could give up partially but never totally."²²²

²¹⁹ Hryhori Herbil's'kyi, *Rozvytok prohresyvnykh idei v Halychyni*, (L'viv: Vydavnytstvo L'vivs'koho Universytetu, 1964).

²²⁰ Iosyf Lozyns'kyi, "Avtobiohraficheskii zapysky" (Materialy k istorii Galitsko-russkoi slovesnosti B. A. Didytskoho), *Literaturnyi sbornik*, 1885, 114-115.

²²¹ TsDIAUuL, f.146, op.4, spr.1307, a.52.

²²² TsDIAUuL, f.146, op.4, spr.1307, a.53.

The brochure speaks about the rights of communities “to the pastures, forests, and meadows.” The author shared the idea that the ownership of property was the only rational form of its usage, the only way to organize means of production. The brochure represents the rights of peasants not as rights of usage but as rights to the resources themselves. His solution is therefore to adequately compensate peasants with property. This was a very different position from that of the majority of the communities, which in concrete servitude cases insisted on preserving the old ways of usage, wishing “to leave things as they always had been.” Despite the fact that, in the 1860s, the Ruthenians in the Galician Diet had a larger representation than at any point later in the nineteenth century, Rev. Lozyns’kyi says that, just as in 1848 with *robot* labor, community hope lay not in the Diet “but only in God and the Emperor.”²²³ He hoped that the intervention of the highest non-celestial authority, the Emperor, could revise existing relationships and turn the clock back to the situation of 1789. In this, his position resonates with the position of the peasant deputies in the Diet. On behalf of the Ruthenian movement, he refused to acknowledge even the possibility to negotiate the issue with the landlords.

Lozyns’kyi also discusses the position of Polish press in the brochure, which generally represented the requests of peasant communities as attacks on others’ property, drawing attention to the peasants’ insatiable appetites, their communism etc.²²⁴ Rev. Lozyns’kyi rejects these accusations by referring to the high moral standards of peasant communities, but at the same time stresses that “On the other hand, we hope that the communities will wait in patience and peace, abstaining from any illegal acts.”²²⁵ Rev. Lozyns’kyi’s position was the most radical in the spectrum of positions expressed by the national movement, but even here we encounter a wariness of peasant action and a hope for the intervention of the central government. Most importantly, Rev. Lozyns’kyi shares the idea that the only solution to the existing conflicts is the delimitation of private property.

To conclude this chapter, I would like to consider the last servitude case I am going to discuss here, that on the village of Stril’che. This village was the residence of a famous Ruthenian activist and allows us to look at his participation in events important for the village community. In 1869, the majority of citizens in the village of Stril’che (in the Horodenka district) were accused of and interrogated for participating in a riot, which took place in their village on 18 June, when a commission arrived to delimitate the equivalent assigned to the community after its servitude trial.

²²³ TsDIAUuL, f.146, op.4, spr.1307, a.56.

²²⁴ TsDIAUuL, f.146, op.4, spr.1307, a.57.

²²⁵ TsDIAUuL, f.146, op.4, spr.1307, a.59.

Hryts' Skakun, the mayor of Stril'che, offered the following testimony. He had been informed by the district captaincy that the commission would arrive on the day in question. That morning he had gone into the field to sow buckwheat; from his field he could see the road leading to the village and could keep an eye on the situation. He noticed the commission arriving and went to the village common, ordering the *desiatnyky* to call in the community's deputies (councilors). On his way he had heard a bell and seen people running. Usually, such a bell-ringing signaled the collection of taxes or called councilors to a session of the community council or children to school. This time the reason for the bell-ringing was none of these; as it later turned out, it had been agreed on ahead of time "by the whole community," not including the mayor "because neither I nor the councilors were listened to." The mayor identified a certain Ivan Zablots'kyi as the one who had rung the bell and a certain Lytvaniuk as the most important instigator. The district authorities had ordered every man and woman in the village to stay in their houses when the commission arrived. The mayor knew about this order but could do nothing to prevent its violation by the villagers.²²⁶

Iakym Protsiv, or Lytvaniuk, 56 years old, whom the mayor accused of inciting the unrest, claimed to have been drunk on the day when the commission arrived for the first time (15.06), and to have been standing to one side so that he did not hear what they were talking about. When the commission arrived for a second time (18.06), he had been even more drunk and had gone "to the place of governing, to the common." The captaincy may have ordered that when the commission arrived for a second time no one except the community councilors should be there, but Lytvaniuk said that he had not heard anything about this. The investigators accused Lytvaniuk in being the leader of the riot and of shouting to the commission that "the community will not allow the common to be taken from us." The investigators could not believe that he had been drunk because if this had indeed been the case he would not have been able to run to the common. Lytvaniuk insisted on having been drunk and said that despite the fact he had only had two glasses of vodka, he had such a "weak head" that he usually did not know what he was doing even after drinking that little. Therefore, he concluded that he could rush at (*porvatsia*) the commission without knowing what he was doing but could not possibly have incited anyone else.²²⁷

Vasyl' Myroniuk, 50 year-old, was one of the community councilors. His testimony on the "riot" was as follows. When the commission arrived, the councilors had come out, and both male and female peasants had gathered behind them. When the commissar explained the purpose of the commission's visit, the community members started saying loudly that they did not want any division of the land, "that they wanted everything to remain as it was before." If

²²⁶ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.1-2.

²²⁷ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.3-6.

the landlord Janocha had been there when the commission arrived for the first time, there would have been no insurgency at all. Myroniuk himself had not been there on 18 June – he had left for the town of Horodenka.²²⁸ Similarly, other councilors, such as Semen Ostapiuk, a former soldier, and Dmytro Hrehoryns'kyi, had not been present during the event.²²⁹ 60 year-old Iakiv Myroniuk had also heard about the order not to go to the commission. He had not been in the common but had heard that the community wanted everything left as it was before. He explained the event as an act of some “irresponsible people [who] did not respect order.”²³⁰

The authorities tried to represent the event as a riot and find as many testimonies as possible for that purpose. The investigators made out to be stakes (*koły*) what the peasants testified only to as the walking sticks of older people.²³¹ The case is also interesting because not only men but also women were accused and interrogated. While, for example, in the investigations of 1846 events discussed in Chapter II no female villagers were interrogated. Vasylyna Kuzyk, who was over 50, was one of the accused who denied even being present on the common at the time.

While the investigation was being conducted, the community was burdened with the billeting of an army detachment. The mayor decided to use this situation to reinforce his authority and, perhaps, to retaliate against some of the community members for the problems the “riot” caused him with the authorities. The mayor had a bone to pick with 44 year-old Ivan Panasiichuk in particular. Panasiichuk testified that on the 22nd of June councilor Ivan Moroz had ordered him to prepare horses for transport duty. Panasiichuk had answered that he would come with the horses after he had watered them. Then the mayor had also come and asked why Panasiichuk was still there. Moroz explained, and, according to Panasiichuk, “the mayor grabbed my hair and started beating my face with his fist, tearing my shirt.” Panasiichuk’s wife came out of the house, and the mayor also starting beating her with a stick. While the mayor was occupied with his wife, Panasiichuk locked himself in the stable. The mayor broke down the door of the stable with a stone and started pulling Panasiichuk out onto the road. Panasiichuk had not wanted to go, of course, so the mayor had thrown him on the road and gone to the landlord’s estate to send an army patrol, which had arrested him and taken him to prison in the nearby town of Horodenka.

The commission was told by the mayor that Panasiichuk had been inciting people and publicly accused the mayor of bringing the army to the village.

²²⁸ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.9.

²²⁹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.18-19.

²³⁰ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.12-13.

²³¹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.16.

Panasiichuk rejected the mayor's accusations. He explained that when the army arrived he had been drunk and did not remember what he was talking about. He had been on the common when the commission arrived, and there had been no resisting or rioting; people had just told the commissar that they wanted to continue keeping common pasture together with the landlord's estate, just as they had since time immemorial. This was during the first visit by the commission, about the second he had nothing to say because he had been transporting landlord's potatoes to the town of Tluste and so had not been present.²³²

43 year-old mayor Hryts' Skakun was brought in for another interrogation. He gave a more detailed account of events as well as testimony about Lytvainuk. He said that when he went for the first commission's visit he had met Iakiv Lytvaniuk, who had told him that the community would not agree to any division of the common. There had been around 150 people present, complaining to the commissar, but the commissar had said that his decision was final and the case could not be resolved in any other way.²³³

On June 18, when the commission arrived with three gendarmes and a representative of the landlord Janocha, the bell started ringing and around 200 people had come out. There had been a lot of loud lamenting, older people had had their walking sticks, as usual, and the entire crowd had been trying to get at the commission. Except for their sticks they had not had any other weapons; only Vasylyna Kuzyk had had a mattock – she had been drunk and lamenting loudly. With the help of estate workers, the commission had already built one border marker. On someone's call, all the women and children had run in and destroyed all the delimitating construction. These tactics had been effective. The commission and the gendarmes could not do anything and left. However, on June 21 the army arrived and, on the district captaincy's order, was billeted in the village.

Then a letter arrived from Antoni Janocha, the landlord, who usually resided in Obertyn. It seems that, having heard about the unrest, he was prepared to offer a compromise. In the letter Janocha offers to give his part of the common to the community, if the community agrees to build a school there. In return, he asked them to grant him the right to cut stones on some of the community's land. The community did not agree to this offer. On June 24, the commission visited the village for a third time, and everything was quiet – the army was still in the village. The mayor concluded:

As can be seen from the whole event, the whole community did not take part in the violent conflict, but only those who, partly through drinking, partly, maybe, through

²³² TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.37-38.

²³³ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.43.

foreign instigation and in general – through an ignorance of the law, allowed [themselves] an act that deserves punishment.

The mayor could not say, or did not want to say for sure, who had been lamenting during the commission's second visit. Nonetheless, he named Ivan Lytvaniuk as one of those calling upon community not to allow the construction of the boundary mark. The wife of the local teacher said in her testimony that Ivan Zablots'kyi had asked the sexton "Why do not you go and ring the alarm?" The sexton answered: "Go ahead and ring a misfortune for yourself." Then Zablots'kyi rang the bell himself. Ivan Lytvaniuk explained this bell-ringing as one calling children to school, but the mayor said that this was not true because for school purposes the community used a different, quieter ring. The mayor's conclusion was that this bell-ringing had been an agreed-upon alarm signal, to be given upon the commission's arrival.²³⁴ Anna Liginovych, the wife of the local teacher, testified that she did not hear Zablots'kyi persuading sexton Stefan Demus to ring the bell. He just asked him "Why do you not go to the common?" Demus answered, "Go, go, and you will pay a Gulden."²³⁵ Stefan Demus testified that Ivan Zablots'kyi had indeed rang the bell.²³⁶

Then the mayor testified about the incident with Iakym Panasiichuk. When the army arrived in the village, Iakym Panasiichuk had approached the mayor and asked, in the mayor's words:

by which right I could let the army into the village without a prescribed route-letter, and when I showed the written order from the Gentleman Captain, he answered that it wasn't right because an order like that must be printed, which he knew as a former military man.

Panasiichuk had also apparently said that there was no need for the army and that the community was not afraid of the army. Panasiichuk had been drunk, and the mayor did not continue the discussion. Two or three days later, the fight between the mayor and Panasiichuk happened. The mayor claimed that Panasiichuk had started abusing him and then assaulted him.²³⁷

According to 37 year-old Ivan Moroz, Panasiichuk had not done any community transport duty for more than a year. "When he started showing up and abusing the mayor, the mayor hit him once, then Panasiichuk jumped at the mayor, threw him on the ground and broke his stick." Moroz himself ran to the estate, where the patrol was sent from.²³⁸

²³⁴ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.45-56.

²³⁵ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.54.

²³⁶ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.58-60.

²³⁷ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.45-56.

²³⁸ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.64.

The investigators asked the mayor about the reasons why an army detachment was housed in the village. The mayor explained that the army had been brought in in the order to punish those most guilty of resistance: two to three soldiers had been assigned to some houses, while others (even some not guilty – the landscape required the army to be stationed compactly) got one soldier. Iakiv Lytvaniuk had three soldiers stationed in his house, Ivan Zablots'kyi – two, Vasyl' Kasiian – two. Others had also had to billet soldiers although the mayor was not absolutely sure of their participation in the protest. About Iakiv Protsiv's testimony he said that he was a real drunkard and that it was impossible that he could get so drunk from two glasses of vodka that he lost the control over what he was saying or doing.²³⁹

Most of the peasants interrogated about the “riot” claimed that they had not participated in it but had been elsewhere. 24 year-old Roman Catholic Antoni Lis, a gendarme from Horodenka, was one of three gendarmes who had participated in the commission's visit on June 18. He testified about the event, the bell-ringing, and the crowd that had gathered and leveled the mound. He had not recognized anyone because he did not know the local peasants, but even if he had it would have been difficult to recognize anyone in such a crowd.²⁴⁰ District Council secretary Józef Kratochwil (41 years old, Roman Catholic) testified that when they were tearing up the boundary mound Ivan Lytvaniuk had said: “Your work is a waste (*durna vasha robota*).” Later he modified the statement to say that he could not say for sure who had said those words but that he had seen Lytvaniuk among the leaders of the riot and that he had not appeared to be drunk.²⁴¹

38 year-old Antoni Mistecki, a landlord's butler, testified that on 18 June he had been standing next to one of the delimitating mounds and had seen Iakiv Lytvaniuk and Vasyl' Hreholins'kyi shouting that there was no need for the mound, that this common had always been a common and they wanted it to remain one. When the commissar went to another mound there was a shout of “let's not give in” and Hreholins'kyi, together with Vasyl' and Fedir Kosovans, were appealing to the community to get rid of the border mounds.²⁴² Antoni Busch, a 39 year-old retired k.&k. lieutenant-major residing in Obertyn, testified that Vasyl' Hreholins'kyi and Lytvaniuk had not resisted the commission but had simply presented their cause to the commissar.²⁴³

Very interesting was also the testimony of Rev. Ivan Naumovych, 43 years old and father of six children. This Greek Catholic parish priest in Stril'che was also a

²³⁹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.45-56.

²⁴⁰ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.66-67.

²⁴¹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.72-74.

²⁴² TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.82-83.

²⁴³ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.87.

Diet deputy and famous Ruthenian activist already then contemplating some new ways to work with the peasants. Rev. Naumovych testified:

About this case I know only the following. After the events in Horodenka, which happened for the same reason, namely the return of the equivalent, rumors reached me that villagers from Stril'che had praised these cases, being in the misconception that the deputies (plenipotentiaries) of Horodenka had been bought off by the landlords and somehow betrayed the community.

Hearing these rumors and knowing about the [upcoming] delimitation of the equivalent in Stril'che I felt it my duty to protect ignorant people from the fatal consequences of any possible resistance. I had to enlighten them about the real meaning of the equivalent, and on the day the first commission was set to arrive, knowing that people would have a council, I went to the meeting place near the local school and found around 20 farmers there.²⁴⁴ I tried to present, in words they could understand, the proper meaning of the commission and appealed to them not to resist the commission, describing the fatal consequences of such resistance from the examples I knew. The older farmers understood me, but there were also those who did not like my explanations.

He could not give any names of those participating in the riot because “was not [participating] in this case at all.” But he said that in his opinion the main reason for the entire disturbance was that:

the Commission had not explained the proper meaning of this ruling (*uriaduvannia*) to the people in a way they could understand, and besides, another circumstance contributed to these disturbances, namely the fact that many years ago, when the landlord had sent his servants to plow that common the peasants had kicked them out and temporarily been in possession of the common. Now, thinking that the case was about usage, as in the previous one, they mistakenly thought that no harm would come from any resistance this time either.²⁴⁵

The peasants understood this case to be like earlier cases from the times of serfdom, when the landlords had forcibly tried to change the rules according to which the common was used. Unlike his flock, Rev. Naumovych knew that this time mutual usage had to be transformed into “unburdened” property, and this did not contradict with his views of the question, delimitation was necessary, legal and there was no way to avoid it.

The commission could not gather enough facts to consider the behavior of individual peasants. The community was still anonymous, and in the 1860s it was no easier to penetrate than it had been back in the 1840s. The estate was more

²⁴⁴ This number is comparable with the community meeting which we described in Vysots'ko Vyzhnie in 1846 and stands in striking contrast with the number of villagers participating in the disturbances in Stril'che.

²⁴⁵ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.88-89.

separated from the community than ever; the state authorities now had to rely more on the authority and cooperation of the communal council rather than on that of the landlord's estate.

This time, however, differentiation inside the peasant community is also quite visible. Newly formed district authorities in the province, which was becoming autonomous, were looking for new inroads into these communities. The semi-independence the village communities had enjoyed since 1848 was about to end. Village governments consisted of the peasants most often in the contact with the district authorities, most dependent on them and who most often cooperated with them. By the 1890s, peasants were comparing their current mayors with predecessors and believed that the earlier mayors had been better, being "harder" both in dealing with community members and in defense of community interests; while current mayors were too weak and agreed readily with everything proposed by the authorities.²⁴⁶

While in the case of Stril'che the mayor and councilors cooperated with the government, tried to negotiate and blame some unreliable elements in the community, there was strong popular resistance to them. Those not participating in the "riot" included not only the village "establishment" but also the village "bottom" that had no interest in common. 28 year-old Vasyl' Didych, for example, who had served four months in the army and been sent back home due to the landlord's intervention, had not heard that there was an order forbidding going to the common; on the contrary, he had heard that people had been forced to go there. He had not heard anything about a conspiracy to organize a riot "because as a poor man I do not have any farm, do not belong to any council, and this case is not my concern."²⁴⁷

While Vasyl' Didych remained indifferent, for poorer farmers and wage-earners trying to keep if not proper farms then at least some cattle, the common pasture was of vital importance. These small farmers constituted the "unruly element," endangering the authority of the mayor and organizing the community against him. Prots' and Zablots'kyi were a case in point. Another was Vasyl' Hreholins'kyi, 48 years old and the owner of two Joch of land. He testified that when the commission arrived, he had gone to the common because the *desiatnyky*, or to be more precise, Ivan Zablots'kyi, had ordered everyone to go there. There had been many people there, all of them lamenting, and it had been unclear what it was all about. When he saw workers from the estate, he had asked them: "Why are you digging?" but "without any evil intent because I did not have any part in the case of that common and did not have any reason to offer resistance."²⁴⁸ Ivan

²⁴⁶ Jan Świątek, *Brzozowa i okolica Zakliczyna nad Dunajcem. Obraz etnograficzny – zbiór z lat 1897-1906*, t.3, (Archiwum etnograficzne, t.36-III) (Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, 1999), 130.

²⁴⁷ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.146, a.119.

²⁴⁸ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.147, a.1-3.

Zablots'kyi, whose bell-ringing was established, was the only one found guilty of unrest, and it came out that he was not an independent farmer but a wage-earner.²⁴⁹

People pretended they had not been warned about the commission's arrival and had run to the common only because of the bell-ringing. They were taking advantage of the fact that the common was a usual meeting-point for the whole community.²⁵⁰ The authorities, perhaps, continued looking for an organized conspiracy because it was the parish of the well-known Ruthenian activist, Rev. Naumovych. Abraham Merl, the estate miller, was questioned because the commission had been informed that meetings had taken place near the mill, after which peasants had gone to the common. Merl testified that some farmers had been present but there had been no meeting and that no bell had been heard in the mill.²⁵¹

Only a few peasants admitted participating in the disturbances. Dmytro Kosovan was one, testifying that he had known about the order not to come but, not trusting either the mayor or the plenipotentiaries, had come to the common despite the order.²⁵² The investigation ended with a court trial which sentenced Ivan Zablots'kyi to 14 days of imprisonment, while Ivan Lytvaniuk Protsiv, Vasyl' Gregolins'kyi, Mykola and Vasyl' Petriv-Kosovan received one month of "heavy prison" each.²⁵³

It is interesting that Rev. Ivan Naumovych had been personally invited to this parish by the local landlord Dr. Janocha, who had proposed Rev. Naumovych to his parish without being acquainted with him personally – just on the basis of having read his speeches in the Diet.²⁵⁴ Rev. Naumovych, a prominent "populist" in the 1860s and the most prominent representative and organizer of "clerical populism" in the 1870s, did not enjoy any particular love from his parishioners.²⁵⁵ A letter Naumovych wrote to his brother shows him to be a typical village priest. He complains about his "problem being all the same – too many children and no money" and that he was working like "ox in the plow" but did not have anything except his bee-garden.²⁵⁶ His testimony to the interrogators about his involvement

²⁴⁹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.147, a.62.

²⁵⁰ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.147, a.7

²⁵¹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.147, 29.

²⁵² TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.147, a.32-33.

²⁵³ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.147, a.112.

²⁵⁴ Osip Monchalovskii, *Zhyt'ie i diiatel'nost' Ivana Naumovycha* (L'vov, 1899), 68.

²⁵⁵ Ivan Franko, "Chy vertatys' nam nazad do narodu?" in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.45 (Kyiv: "Naukova dumka," 1986), 147.

²⁵⁶ VR LNB, f.Narodnyi Dim, 126/p.15, a.17.

in the case is a good example of the relationships between village Ruthenian activists and village communities in the face of the servitude trials.

But Rev. Naumovych was also the one to report on the Stril'che case in the Ruthenian newspaper Slovo. He mentions that Viceroy Gołuchowski had recently proclaimed in the Diet that the issue of servitudes had generally been resolved to the mutual satisfaction of the parties involved. Rev. Naumovych writes that soon the same could be maintained of the Stril'che area "because people have learnt the consequences of resistance and will give up everything without complaint"; only Stril'che was unfortunate enough to be one of the earliest examples of a punished community.

Rev. Naumovych cautioned his readers that he was not defending peasant resistance or favoring illegal peasant action. However, he went on to note that there was a difference between theory, which made everyone equal in front of law, and reality, in which peasants and landlords appeared in the same courts: "a child having no weapons, except its natural instincts, against a man, well-armed and experienced in fight."²⁵⁷ This metaphor about inexperienced peasants unprepared for emancipation would serve as the motto of Rev. Naumovych's entire populist movement.

Rev. Naumovych also mentioned the grievances of the peasantry, which saw its own lands appropriated by landlords and longed for them to be returned. This was the case in Stril'che as well. In the first half of the nineteenth century it had had a landlord-tyrant, and because of whom 35 families had left the village and emigrated to Romania. Their land had been added to the landlord's lands:

It is interesting that people who have no idea about the law and only follow their instincts still consider these parcels as the community's (!) and hope that sooner or later they will be returned to the community (!). Obviously these people do not differentiate between the community's land as such and rustical land, and think that the community has the right not only to the community's but also to rustical land.²⁵⁸

In this Rev. Naumovych sees the source of current misunderstandings and the communities' attitude in the disputes about the land. The community thinks that now, as before, the landlords want to take the community's land away from them and the community does not know what to do about this, except offer violent resistance despite its not very promising track record. Rev. Naumovych complains about the lack of effort to explain this situation to the peasants. The source of the problem was that since 1848 the peasants had been considered mature citizens, and therefore no one took care to enlighten them on these issues: The matter of servitudes is very clear for any enlightened person, but it needs to be explained to the simple people so that they will understand: 1) that it cannot

²⁵⁷ [Ivan Naumovych], "Iz Stril'cha (Sprava servitutov)," Slovo, 1869, No.57.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

continue to be as it used to be, 2) that the equivalents assigned to the estates and to the communities are based on just foundations.²⁵⁹

Rev. Naumovych then describes the servitude dispute process:

Servitude cases are conducted by the learned landlord himself and his attorney; officials do not dine with the peasants but at the estate; on the other side blind citizen-peasants stand and to all the questions and proposals of the agreement respond: the community does not accept this, let it be as it has been since time immemorial. The community's plenipotentiaries do not sign the protocol because they are threatened with death if they do; then the protocol is written without their signature and the equivalent is calculated according to the law. The law sides with those who can make their cause fit the law.

The community did not know the law on servitudes and still does not know it. The plenipotentiaries say: do not be afraid, the common will be ours, we did not sign anything. But one fine morning a letter arrives from L'viv that the community should give to the estate so-and-so much of the common. The community shouts 'the *lenipotenty* betrayed us!' [They] sold the community! And they sentence them to death. Another fine morning a letter arrives that an engineer will come to hand the land over to the landlord. The community does not know yet what is written in the *Reichsgesetzblatt* about servitude equivalents and shouts whatever slips from their tongues, and the *lenipotenty* don't sleep at home anymore but in the beets and ravines. And the official comes with an engineer to measure, but the community has no idea by which right they can measure land that has been theirs since the time of their ancestors. And the community does not allow any surveying or digging, and a telegram follows, and 150 [army] men arrive and the legal order is renewed, and the community pays and the inciters are subject to a criminal investigation, and those in prison as well as those released from prison still do not know anything about the Emperor's law on the unburdening of the land in the *Reichsgesetzblatt*, and only sigh and say: There is no justice in the world, the landlords hold hands with the officials and do whatever they want to us.²⁶⁰

Rev. Naumovych saw the peasants as victims of the nobility, the Jews and "everyone superior to them in knowledge, wealth and dexterity." But the situation was a result of the withdrawal of governmental patronage in the aftermath of the 1848 reform.²⁶¹

Rev. Naumovych also points to a difference between "Slavic" and landlords' ideas about law. The Slavic community, because of its character, would never forbid anyone from using its common. But after German laws had been applied to this community, it appeared that it was not longer the community's common. (Here we see Naumovych's "Slavophilia," which would come into full bloom in the 1880s.) A landlord was eager to claim his right to a common he had used. But when the peasants had servitudes in the landlord's forest, not the right but the practice of its fulfillment counted; moreover, this practice was evaluated cheaper than normal. The community followed its natural instinct to survive. The one

²⁵⁹ Ibid.

²⁶⁰ Ibid.

²⁶¹ [Ivan Naumovych], "Iz Stril'cha (Sprava servitutov)," *Slovo*, 1869, No.67.

guilty of the disturbances was the government, which “equaled unequal, and not giving just patronage to the communities left them to be a victim of those stronger.”²⁶²

Rev. Naumovych did not acknowledge this, but Severyn Shekhovych, another Ruthenian activist and his personal enemy, did. He explained the issue of servitudes in his newspaper for peasants Pys'mo z Hromady back in 1865, referring to the situation “in which because of the unburdening of land various true and uncertain rights and wishes were forwarded.” He taught that to conduct successful servitude trials the community had to have a solid basis. Most often people lacked such a basis and referred to oral tales (*peredan'ie*) about community lands transferred to the landlord's property during urbarial measurements, when peasants not deriving any income from this land did not want to pay taxes for it. “Then, if they have no better basis for their rights peasants should not claim them,” because the landlord could prove his ownership of these lands with documents. Only if the community could prove with trustworthy witnesses that it had been using these lands for 30 years without having been bothered and hindered by anyone did it have any chance in a trial. Peasants should not elect stubborn people and shouters as their plenipotentiaries but should rather go to an attorney, as a trial would in any case be very expensive.²⁶³

Establishing the hegemony of the greater Polish landowners in Galicia was one large pedagogical process, education via experiencing “freedom.” By and large the authorities were not at all concerned with the communities' internal affairs. The great landowners successfully separated their property and their jurisdiction from that of the communities, proclaiming the end of paternalism and “patriarchal life.” This abandonment of the peasantry was lamented by the Ruthenian movement. Being cut off from the “enlightenment,” or rather being dropped into “enlightened” life without any preparation for it, the communities were said to have no choice except to shut out the outside world, turning to drink and other vices. For unprepared peasants, freedom meant the freedom to drink oneself to death, to sell or pawn one's land, and to destroy everything, on which coming generations could try to build a better life.

The 1860s were indeed a time in which village communities enjoyed unusually extensive autonomy. Between 1867 and 1873, the community of Dobrivliany, for example, did not turn to the state courts at all; the community council resolved all its cases, including criminal ones. In these six years the community processed 146 cases, and only when the book of records was accidentally discovered by a district official did the state authorities intervene and put an end to the practice.²⁶⁴ This

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ L. z Ia., “O protsesakh hromadskykh,” Pys'mo z Hromady, 1865, No.29.

²⁶⁴ Franko, “Hromada Dobrovliany,” 199.

was also the time when Ruthenians became concerned with the ruling practices inside communities. They would agree with Duncan-Powell, who said that:

I think, that corporate village community in general – with widespread participation in decision-making, a high degree of equality in the distribution of wealth, and a highly developed sense of 'we/they' communal solidarity – is thoroughly permeated with authoritarian and coercive practices as far as the resident individual is concerned.²⁶⁵

But these coercive practices became “authoritarian” only in the context of the 1860s and its individual-centered liberal discourse. The Ruthenian movement realized that the language of liberalism had been appropriated by others; it also realized that it was starting to lose its influence over the communities, new administrative networks did not rely on priests as much as the former circle administration had, elementary education was taken from Church control and the administration was about to use the peasantry against parish priests – Ruthenian activists. All this forced the patriotic clergy to rethink its position vis-à-vis the communities. But the clergy’s new position was in no way to side with the communities against the law. The law was good; the problem was that the peasants were unprepared for it and landlords took advantage of them. Thus the new program could involve nothing else but working with the peasants and bypassing state and provincial institutions, working with the peasants despite the system and using its liberal laws. This was the beginning of clerical paternalist populism.

In 1869, the year of the disturbances in the village of Stril’che, Rev. Stefan Kachala published a brochure entitled “What is destroying us and what could help us.” This was the brochure that gave birth to the whole genre of popular publications flourishing in Galicia in the 1870s-1890s. I believe that the conceptual basis and agenda of paternalist populism can best be understood against the background of the discourse of property discussed above.

The brochure starts with the discussion of the freedom received in 1848, freedom the former serfs were not in a position to benefit from much. This helpless position of the peasants was determined by their ignorance.²⁶⁶ But as we shall see in the next chapter, the assumption was that this ignorance was not limited to literacy or education – peasant ignorance was an ignorance of the rules by which the advanced part of the world lives. When Rev. Kachala specifies the manifestations of peasant ignorance, he starts with the problem of peasants being not too eager to earn money.²⁶⁷ Like the entire school of twentieth-century

²⁶⁵ John Duncan Powell, “Electoral Behavior among Peasants,” in *The Process of Rural Transformation, Eastern Europe, Latin America and Australia* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1980), 199.

²⁶⁶ [Stepan Kachala], *Shcho nas hubyt' a shcho nam pomochy mozhe*, (Pys'mo dlia rus'kykh selian, No.7) (L'vov, 1869), 4.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 5.

anthropology, Rev. Kachala differentiates a peasant ethos from its capitalist counterpart. Peasants did not try to maximize their profits. These were the conflicting ethoi that manifested themselves in the servitude cases: customary usage against the economic efficiency promised by the landlords. While in most of the servitude cases (in our account Morozovychi is an exception) the peasants did not argue in terms of profit or enterprise and emphasized survival and customary usage, the clergy in the 1860s embraced the spirit of “romantic capitalism” and a belief in stable economic growth, provided that the right attitude and behavior were developed.²⁶⁸ In his brochure Rev. Kachala suggests that parish priests should try to extend such an attitude towards their flock: while the landlords claimed to educate the peasantry about new attitudes through action, saying that some bumps and bruises were necessary, the priests would try to prepare the peasantry for the new order through teaching.

Kachala’s next point in the discussion of peasant ignorance is vodka; peasants did not know where to stop in its consumption: “The poor drank as much as the rich. And should they be well after that?”²⁶⁹ Rev. Kachala provides fictional dialogues explaining his position. The first dialogue supported his point that vodka was the origin of all the evil in the village and the peasants’ lack of prudence was the source of their vodka-drinking. According to Kachala, ignorance and drunkenness went hand in hand. Again, drunken conditions here are not represented as amoral behavior inappropriate for humans, offending God. The connection emphasized is one between drinking and economic well-being. Peasants spent too much on vodka and it hindered their productive capacities. Starting with the 1880s the radical critique ridiculed this discourse, arguing that the priests were more concerned with the effects than the real roots of the problem, that they provided religious recipes for economic problems. But the point is that this was not a religious but a capitalist recipe.

In Kachala’s second dialogue, vodka is shown to profit the landlords and the Jews at the peasants’ expense while the third dialogue shows that the right of propination (to make spirits) was hugely profitable for the landlords, who were entrenched in the Diet and had political power at their disposal. The Jews were said to simply stick with the stronger side. The brochure advocated a simple way out of the relationships of the exploitation propination legitimized – the peasants had to stop drinking vodka. Once they made this decision, which would indicate a growing consciousness of human self-respect, they would be able to prosper. The Ruthenian movement believed that the general improvement of the peasantry should start at the individual level. As in 1848 they believed that the

²⁶⁸ For such an attitude of Greek-Catholic clergy in the 1860s see my diploma work *Material'ne stanovyshche hreko-katolyts'koho dukhovenstva Halychyny u druhii polovyni XIX st.* (diplomna *robo*ta, L'vivs'kyi Derzhavnyi Universytet imeni Ivana Franka, kafedra istorii Ukraïny, 1997).

²⁶⁹ [Stepan Kachala], *Shcho nas hubyt!*

peasants should be remade into self-conscious citizens; the only difference was that now the clergy were disappointed with the state, they were taking this task upon themselves.

Further dialogues touched upon issues of contemporary politics. In one of the dialogues a peasant says that he heard that gentlemen were not doing anything useful in the Diet but just arguing about language, so he asks “And why should we so insist on the question of language? Let them write in Polish and in German, if only they write justly and truthfully. That is how I see it.” To this the priest replies:

Whose language is in the house that one is a master: Ruthenian, Mazur or German. Similarly in the government, – the one is the housemaster in this land [whose language is in the government.]... Should Ruthenians to remain slaves in their own house?...²⁷⁰

That is why priests request in the Diet in L'viv that among us, on the Ruthenian land [there should] Ruthenian [should be the official] language, then officials will be Ruthenians as well and those of one kind (*svii svobo*) will understand easier and judge more justly.²⁷¹

Rev. Kachala makes the point that in the new conditions of constitutionalism, autonomy and liberal rights, language has lost the innocence it had back in the absolutist era. Language has become a matter of power and in the world of free individuals the language in which these individuals communicate becomes of the foremost importance.

The fourth conversation indicates ways, in which the Ruthenians could be saved from the impending disaster, ways out of ignorance. These were science (education), work and thriftiness. Rev. Kachala points to the generation of the peasants' fathers who “did not drink as much as you drink, did not spend as much time in the tavern, did not sign bills of exchange with the Jews and did not spend [i. e. sold] their land.” He prefers not to mention that their parents had been in a condition of subject-dependency and had not been able do any of these things even if they had wanted to; some had been forbidden and some not in the interests of the landlords.²⁷² He preferred to mention only the oppressive features of the old system.

According to Kachala, *robot* and the Jews had previously kept peasants ignorant but now, after emancipation, education (science) was necessary.²⁷³ Science did not distract peasants from their work, to the contrary – it facilitated diligent work necessary for doing well under the new conditions. Science would help the

²⁷⁰ [Stepan Kachala], *Shcho nas hubyt'*, 24-25.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 26.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, 30.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, 35.

peasants organize their lives in the communities and create peasant institutions like community loan departments and granaries.²⁷⁴ According to Rev. Kachala, education and science would not harm peasant religiosity. In the tradition of Josephinism, he thought it would be good if peasants understood the mechanisms of natural phenomena, like thunder and lightning, and through that cognized God better.²⁷⁵ Finally, Rev. Kachala gave some basics of the national creed, pointing to the 13,000,000 Ruthenians across the border in the Russian Empire.²⁷⁶

To conclude, in this chapter I have reconsidered the character of the so-called struggles over servitudes. Up to now these struggles have been seen by scholars as rooted in the feudal era – a conflict between peasants and landlords. I would prefer to stress its newness and see this conflict as characteristic of the 1860s, which were characterized not only by the ascendancy of the Polish landowning nobility to political hegemony in the villages but also by the establishment of the hegemony of liberal discourse. The strength of the Polish landlords' political hegemony lay not so much in their landholdings as in their appropriation of liberal discourse. Speaking this language allowed them to co-opt the Polish democrats; it became an effective tool to be used against the peasantry and the Ruthenians.

The issue of servitudes was conducted not in the language of class interest but in the language of liberalism, of individual freedom and the freedom to own private property. It was represented as sweeping away the remains of the era of *robot* and absolutism, clearing the way for the development of capitalist relationships. The rhetoric of “the common good” or “society’s interests” was an integral part of it. This was the very language which the Ruthenian movement strived to command, and which it failed to appropriate for itself in the aftermath of 1848. The Ruthenian movement did not have and did not see any alternative to this hegemonic discourse, except a return of the old system. It still hoped for an alternative solution to provincial autonomy coming from the central government, and for the division of the province – obtaining a sphere of its own to conduct a particularly Ruthenian experiment in liberalism.

Like the Ruthenians, the communities also had no alternative to this discourse. To succeed they had to act according to the rules of this new framework. For peasant communities in general, servitude cases were their first experience with the new political hegemony established by the great Polish landowners, their first experience of Galician autonomy, when the circular authorities “abandoned” their mediating role and became an instrument in the hands of the great Polish

²⁷⁴ Ibid., 40-41.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 51.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 45.

landowners. Such a situation brought new divisions and differentiations within the communities. Communities lost their links with the estates and relationships with the district authorities became central instead.

Ruthenian priests, in turn, because of sharing in the liberal discourse of the 1860s were unable to mobilize peasant support and provide peasant with successful political lobby. However, in the 1870s the things will change. Faith in liberal capitalism will be questioned against the background of Viennese stock exchange's crash in 1873, and peasant reeducation through the introduction of "proper" property relationships will bring massive sales of pawned peasant landholdings, loss of interest in Diet politics on behalf of peasants, finalization of the political hegemony of great landowners and failures of Ruthenian politics. This will be dealt with by reconsideration of the attitudes, reformulations of the strategies and formation of the new mode of Ruthenian politics. We shall discuss these developments paying more attention to the Ruthenian politics and Ruthenian identities in the next chapter.

Chapter 5

THE POLITICS OF PATERNALIST POPULISM, OR ON PRIESTS, PEASANTS AND TEXTS

The old [generation] had and still have an immediate influence on people; they are largely rural people and know more about relationships among common people – the younger [generation] does not have time to look into these relationships from beyond its tears – they [(the old generation)] know the everyday needs of people better, their good and evil, strong and weak sides, and they in fact exploited people for their fantastic, unclear and usually dishonest goals; when they needed to appeal to people and make people to follow them, they manipulated people's weak points, flattered their superstitions; they promised people golden mountains, if only people followed their politics... and people believed them and carried on just as they still do.¹

A Vagabond from Hrushiv

In October 1863, a tramp knocked on the door of a peasant house in the village of Styniava (a large village in the foothills of the Carpathians west of the road leading from Stryi through Skole to Hungary), and asked for permission to spend the night in the household. Permission was granted, and he stayed overnight. The next morning the peasant who had agreed to shelter the tramp overnight, brought him to the village mayor. It appears that the peasant decided to hand the tramp over to the authorities after he had heard his story. Once the village mayor had also listened to this story, he sent the tramp to the town of Skole, which was at that time the center of the court district in the Stryi circle. This tramp was Tymko Holyk from the village of Hrushiv. In 1863 he was 20 years old and, having no fixed occupation, lived by begging and vagrancy. At one point he had been a guide for blind vagabonds, but since then he wandered by himself. In 1857 he had been punished in Sambir for vagrancy and received two and a half months in prison. Later he had been found guilty of pretending to be dumb; he had been

¹ Ostap Terlets'kyi, *Moskvofily i narodovtsi v 70-ykh rr.*, (Naukovo-literaturna biblioteka ch.37) (L'viv: z drukarni NTSh, 1902), 57.

punished three times in Drohobych for vagrancy with a prison sentence and twice in Medenychi, with flogging.²

In Skole his testimony was written down, and it made him out to be something more than just a usual vagabond. He claimed that one day he had gone to the village of Voloshcha to beg for change and food. There, in Voloshcha, a gentleman “baron” had given him eight Gulden and “enlisted (or registered – *zapysav*) me with the Poles.” He claimed to have stayed at the baron’s place until nightfall, when five “Poles” had come and taken him to the forest. There they had lived eight days on bread and birds hunted by the Poles. Then they had moved to another forest, near the village of Hai, where they had joined a larger group of “Poles” numbering around fifty people. All of them had then moved to the forests near Skhidnytsia. In these forests Holyk had deserted, leaving his weapons and the uniform behind. Holyk had gone to Hrushiv, where he had lived on day-to-day work. After two weeks of such a life, he had gone to Drohobych where he had met unknown “students,” who had recognized him and took him with them to the forest, where around 400 people were stationed. After a week of staying there, he had deserted once more with three other Ruthenians. After burying their uniforms and weapons, they had parted company, and the route he had taken had finally brought him to the village of Styniava Nyzhnia.³

When Holyk came up for court proceedings, he was asked if he knew why he was there. He answered: “Most probably I am here because the baron from Voloshcha enlisted me with the Poles but, as I already said in Skole, and then in Medenychi, I was not with the Poles but only wandered forests in Hai and Skhidnytsia.”⁴

He gave more detailed testimony and was questioned more thoroughly. This time he said that the baron, whose name he did not know, at first had given him vodka and bread and then three Gulden. Holyk thought that the baron had hired him to work as a stable boy. On the second day five Poles had come on their own cart with their own horses and taken him to the Vroblevychi forest. There had been 15 people in that forest. Then they had moved to the Hai forest. Holyk also explained why he had deserted: “They told me that I had to go with them to Warsaw, which I did not want at all.” But when Holyk came to Hrushiv the son of the local cantor told him:

If you enlisted with the Poles, then even when you run away you must go back to them because papers would arrive for you similar to the *Vorladung*

² TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.64, a.19.

³ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.64, a.2-9.

⁴ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.64, a.14.

from the *Bezirk*, and if you do not respond to their call, then they will send gendarmes for you.

(This is an interesting moment – the Poles are thought to have the power to command gendarmes). Tymko Holyk claimed to have stayed in Hrushiv for two to three weeks but, being afraid of the Poles, he had decided to leave for the mountains or to search for a service job elsewhere.⁵ When he had passed Drohobych and walked for another quarter mile, he had met some strangers, who had approached him asking “Is this how you keep your word?” These strangers had taken him to the forest once more. They had waited until nightfall and then went to the Skhidnytsia forests, where they had met around 40 people gathered together. There Holyk had been given trousers, a hat, coat, small saber and a rifle. They had lived on potatoes and corn, stealing them from the nearby fields. Holyk had managed to run away once more. At first he had gone to Kropyvnyk, where he had stayed at the local manor as a vagrant, and from there he had gone to Styniava.⁶

There were numerous contradictions in Holyk’s testimonies. At first he claimed the baron had given eight Gulden and then changed it to three. Similarly, he at first stated that 400 people had gathered in the forest but later changed this number to 40. He blamed these contradictions on mistakes by the scribes, but no one believed him. Most suspicious was Holyk’s statement that he would not recognize the baron from Voloshcha, and that he had not seen anyone from his family or service while staying at his estate. All this perhaps proves that this journey of Holyk’s was an imagined one. I could imagine that the story he told was made up not for the authorities but for the peasants, perhaps at first for the peasants in Hrushiv, and then again in Styniava. Quite possibly Holyk used this story in other villages as well. Holyk’s problem was that the peasants in Styniava took his words too seriously and decided that his testimony could be important for governmental action against Polish insurgents.⁷ Holyk’s account obviously appeared very plausible to the peasants. We know that there indeed were attempts to recruit people for a Polish insurrection in the Russian Empire and that some people indeed volunteered.⁸

At the end of his final testimony, Holyk made the following statement:

⁵ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.64, a.15.

⁶ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.64, a.16-17.

⁷ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.64, a.19, 20, 24. We meet the community of Styniava already in 1849 among the communities supporting with funds the organization of the festivities commemorating emancipation. *Zoria Halytska*, 1849, No.41.

⁸ For the account on Ruthenian volunteers from Galicia see S. M. Trusevych, *Suspil'no-politychnyi rukh u Skhidnii Halychyni v 50-70-kh rokakh XIX st.* (Kyiv, 1978), 102-114.

I ask to be freed from prison as soon as possible and declare that I do not want to serve the Poles because I am a Ruthenian, and my will is to go to the k. k. Austrian army and serve our Most Enlightened Monarch.⁹

As we see, Holyk distinguishes between Poles and Ruthenians. In the 1830s only educated people could make such a distinction, hoping that it would make a difference, as Michał Popiel did while on trial to prove his non-participation in the Polish conspiracy.¹⁰ By the 1860s even a vagabond like Tymko Holyk could use his Ruthenianness while facing the authorities and manipulate it while dealing with peasants in his quest for survival. This also shows that to say that understanding of ethnic difference between the Poles and Ruthenians in the 1860s was limited only to the priests and their families is a gross exaggeration.¹¹

The Polish insurrection of 1863 was important for further “writing” of the difference between Ruthenians and Poles. In 1863, unlike in 1846, the distinction between Ruthenians and Poles was well articulated and could not be avoided; the categories so flexible back in the 1840s now looked more stable and were widely used. As late as the 1890s in the Stare Misto Mountains an older peasant told Rev. Zubryts’kyi a story about Russians castrating all the Polish insurgents they caught in 1863. While recounting this story the peasant “was enjoying it and laughed at this misfortune, and the other [peasant] participants at the dinner joined in.” Rev. Zubryts’kyi believed that the Russian victory over the Poles was one of the sources of the sympathy peasants quite often expressed for Russia in the 1870s and 1880s.¹²

During the Polish uprising of 1863 in the Russian Empire, Ruthenian peasants in Galicia found themselves by and large in opposition to it. The events were evaluated in terms of quite firmly established national differences. In the case of Ruthenian Galician volunteers, participation in the insurrection seems to have been an outcome of a conscious decision, unlike in 1846. In the Sambir area, recruitment seems to be limited to petty gentry, among whom some texts circulated and from whom some volunteers were recruited.¹³ The defeat of the insurrection and the fates of the plebeian volunteers, who had driven into the

⁹ TsDIAuL, f.152, op.2a, spr.64, a.22.

¹⁰ Zborucki, Proces studentów samborskich, 17. According to Zborucki, the same tactics was used by several other conspiracy members.

¹¹ This is the view, for example, of Alexander Borkowski, who believed that even the most famous Ruthenian peasant Diet deputy, Kovbasiuk, when speaking about *naroda*, meant the population of his village and not a nation. See [Alexander Borkowski], Pierwszy sejm słowiański we Lwowie 1865-1866 przez naocznego świadka Leszka Borkowskiego (Lwów, 1884), 16-17.

¹² Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi, “Halyts’ki sviashchenyky v Kholmshchyni,” ZNTSh, t.84 (L’viv, 1908), 179.

¹³ Most of our knowledge about this comes from Ivan Franko and memoirs about him, see Bass and Kaspruk, Ivan Franko, 16.

insurrection on the basis of promises and then been abandoned by their upper-class patrons, no doubt contributed to the decline of pro-Polish attitudes among the rustic gentry.¹⁴

Hrushiv: Background

In Holyk's account, the peasants in Hrushiv appeared quite knowledgeable about the Polish revolutionaries and their methods. Unlike the peasants in Styniava, who trusted their political administration, those in Hrushiv saw a connection between the Poles and the authorities, something which could possibly be due to the fact that the parish priest in Hrushiv was Rev. Ivan Korostens'kyi, the former secretary of the Sambir Ruthenian Council. Rev. Korostens'kyi is a key figure in understanding what was happening in the area in the 1860s and the 1870s. In the 1870s he was a central figure in the local Ruthenian movement and an unchallenged authority on everything Ruthenian. Even Ukrainian national-populists at the beginning of the 1880s mentioned Rev. Korostens'kyi with respect.¹⁵

The 1860s, however, were a quite difficult time for the Greek-Catholic clergy in the area. Their authority was contested and, for the first time on a large scale, they became the object of various administrative investigations and had to defend themselves in legal suits. Rev. Korostens'kyi himself was frequently involved in legal action with the mayor of Hrushiv, Illia Zhyvchyn.¹⁶ Many other Ruthenian priests-patriots found themselves in similar situations. The state administration kept its eye on Rev. Ivan Drymalyk in Voloshcha, who was supervised by the gendarmerie outpost in Luka, Revs. Skorodyns'kyi, Chapel's'kyi and Khomins'kyi.¹⁷

Because Hrushiv was such a large parish that it could not be administered by only one priest, Rev. Korostens'kyi had an assistant, Rev. Khomins'kyi. Claiming to speak on behalf of whole community, the mayor brought a court action against them both, accusing them of "abolishing religious customs which have existed since before anyone can remember, and in the whole area, properly speaking in the Przemyśl diocese, nowhere do you see the kind of goings-on that are happening in Hrushiv." One of the things the peasants disliked most was the long length of these two priests' hair.¹⁸ The peasants referred to a so-called

¹⁴ Ivan Franko, "Dovbaniuk," *Zibrannia tvoriv*, t.16, (Kyiv, 1978), 107-108.

¹⁵ *Bar'kivshchyna*, 1888, No. 6.

¹⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2539, a.66.

¹⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2540, a.7.

¹⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2542, a.42.

“ritualistic” movement among the Greek-Catholic clergy, many of whom were attempting to purge the eastern rite of their Church of Latin “innovations.”¹⁹

Because of the political subtext, this affair was investigated thoroughly, and there are extensive protocols of peasant testimony in the materials in the Viceroy’s office. Illia Zhyvchyn alerted authorities to the fact that Rev. Korostens’kyi was organizing meetings. The authorities wanted to know about these meetings in more detail to be sure that the priest was not discussing only parish or school matters at these gathering, which would have been legitimate. The mayor answered:

I cannot say more precisely why Rev. Parson Korostens’kyi called people together and wrote complaints in their name because the Rev. Priest forbids people to reveal this to me. I know only that he does it not in the interests of the parish or school but is concerned with community affairs most of all, in which he intrudes without being invited and only incites people. If the people mentioned in my report are called to the protocol, they will disclose everything. The priest wears his long hair combed back, and people wonder about this very much because most priests don’t.

The mayor also reported on Korostens’kyi’s assistant, Rev. Khomins’kyi:

He forbids the bells to be rung while we are coming out for the Liturgy, and if anyone should ring them he looks at them angrily. During *Izbe kheruvymy* he does not turn to the people; the liturgy ends near the altar and not in the *Tsars’ki vrata*. During the prayer after the acathist he does not allow people to kneel; after the Vespers instead of supplication he introduces 60 *Hospody pomylui*. And because earlier these changes did not exist people grumble and call upon me to request the return of the old customs and services.²⁰

Obviously, a nexus occurred between the mayor’s interests and those of the district administration. Rev. Korostens’kyi was accused of changing the ritual and of practicing corner-scribing. A church commission came to investigate and the Revs. Korostens’kyi and Khomins’kyi shaved off their beards; later on Rev. Korostens’kyi also cut his hair. However, the changes in the Liturgy were preserved. Moreover, according to the farmer Iurko Fenchak:

From the pulpit Rev. Khomins’kyi forbade praying during the service from the prayers’ book and demanded that people only listen to the Liturgy. Iurko Dudych, Ivan Tsapovs’kyi, Ivan Kondur used to pray from the book, but now do so only secretly so the priest does not see.

¹⁹ For the beginnings and first phase of the movement, see Iaroslav Hordyns’kyi, *Do istorii kul’turnoho i politychnoho zhyttia v Halychyni u 60-tykh rr. XIX v.*, 63-89.

²⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2542, a.38.

At the end of his testimony Iurko Fenchak declared: “I endorse my testimony with the addition that I gave here only facts without any knowledge if it should be like this or not, if it was ordered from above or was done without such an order.”²¹ As we know such an uncertainty was truly justified and reflected uncertain position of the hierarchy on these matters.

It is interesting that a certain Mykola Didiuk, who signed his testimony with a cross, said that he usually prayed with the book, and that is why he did not pay attention to what was happening near the altar.²² Nevertheless he had noticed that there had been no supplications and that *Hospody pomylui* had been said 72 times instead. “About the prohibition of reading books I know nothing. Perhaps, this is directed only to those people, who stand closer to the priest near the altar.”

Vasyl’ Tsapovs’kyi, who was the only farmer to sign his name himself, testified: “I do not know about more important changes to the ritual during the service. Moreover, I can say that liturgies are now served more solemnly and nicer than ever.” Later he acknowledged that there had been some insignificant changes “but these do not represent anything and can be noticed only by those who are well acquainted with the service in our rite.” He also supported the testimony that the priests had prohibited the reading of books, but “this is only during holy mass, before and after the mass no one forbids reading.” Ivan Urbanovych, a cantor and teacher in the parish school, said that he knew the ritual very well and supported the mayor’s testimony accusing Rev. Korostens’kyi of changing it.²³

Iurko Dudych, who was a supervisor in the church in Hrushiv Horishnii, testified that Rev. Khomins’kyi had deprived him of this office because he had resisted the changes the priest had introduced. Rev. Khomins’kyi had actually dared to pin the chime that had been used in the church to his own sleigh, and the parishioners had been upset about it. Rev. Khomins’kyi then asked them if it was so sacred that it could not be used for other purposes.

Other changes surprised Iurko Dudych even more. Rev. Khomins’kyi had ordered that a smaller altar be taken from the sacristy, where he prayed earlier, and placed beyond the main one. Dudych told Rev. Khomins’kyi “that people will always talk a lot about these changes and I do not like it.” Rev. Khomins’kyi apparently replied that in the Latin rite priests could pray in the sacristy, while in the eastern one – everything should take place near the altar. Dudych refused to do so and suggested to Rev. Khomins’kyi that he replace the smaller altar himself. Then Rev. Khomins’kyi ordered that there was to be no reading from the book during the Liturgy, and Dudych answered that in his opinion there was no harm

²¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2542, a.28.

²² One wonder how many others were able to read Old Slavonic but unable to sign their names. Usually, up to the 1870s, those peasants able to sing their names were signing them in Latin script and not in Cyrillic.

²³ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2542, a.28-9.

in such readings because he personally could both read and listen at the same time. Rev. Khomins'kyi became angry, kicked Dudych out of the rectory and soon, in Dudych's words, "together with Rev. Korostens'kyi, deprived me of my office."²⁴ Iurko Dudych also said that changes had also been introduced into various other ceremonies besides the Liturgy, for example in Easter processions. For the peasants it was obvious that certain priests were trying to introduce new rituals while others were content with the old practices. Dudych signed his testimony himself and identified Rev. Chapel's'kyi from Dobrivliany as another priest close to the priests from Hrushiv.²⁵

The state authorities kept a separate file on Rev. Chapel's'kyi for quite a while. Both Res. Chapel's'kyi and Khomins'kyi were seen as those who propagated "return" to the eastern rite in the area. In 1865 the landlord Emilian Głowacki and the peasant Ivan Mishturiak complained about Rev. Pavlovykh from Rolliv, who had worn a beard for two years, "changing it in various ways but never fully shaving it off."²⁶ This was the case until the commission of Dean Rev. Haponovych from Stebnyk came, then he shaved his beard and even allowed chimes in the church to be rung. But after that, on a parish holiday, Revs. Chapels'kyi and Khomins'kyi came to Rolliv, both with full beards, and served "in a totally Orthodox (*szyszmatycki*) way." Instead of giving a sermon, Rev. Chapel's'kyi "had held a speech containing his teachings about new rituals."²⁷

Rev. Pavlovykh did not give up. Soon after this commission left, he invited Canon Hynylevych, Rev. Sozans'kyi from Rakiv, and a priest from Horozhanna to Rolliv to lead a "*Soborna* Service," which the mayor of Rolliv, Andrii Vedmid', described as "unknown in our rite." It is interesting that in Rolliv, just as in Hrushiv, the mayor sided against the priest. When Andrii Vedmid' had come to Rolliv in 1857 or 1858 after serving in the army, the priest had forced him to work "*robot*." If any peasants refused this work, the priest would expropriate their property – this happened to Vedmid' in 1860. In 1864 the priest offered Vedmid' an exemption from this labor duty if he agreed to supervise other villagers doing this work. In this conflict Vedmid' found support from the local Polish landlords and administration.²⁸

Ivan Mishturiak, who in 1865 was 26, explained that the so-called *robot* requested by the priest was part of a deal the community had made with the priest: he would collect the community taxes, and the community would do this service to him in labor:

²⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2542, a.30-32.

²⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2542, a.32-33, 17.

²⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2544, a.50.

²⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2544, a.75.

²⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2545, a.23.

Despite the fact that the community, led by the mayor, resisted, the priest found influential allies inside of the communities, who inclined community members to fulfill this labor during the hottest field work.²⁹

He also disclosed some facts about the intra-community power struggle. Rev. Pavlovysh persuaded his own supporters to organize re-elections for mayor. According to Mishturiak, this was without success because the community did not wish to have a mayor:

better than the one governing now, who is not compromised by anything, and, being a retired soldier, manages to maintain order; even his enemy, Rev. Pavlovysh, has nothing to reproach the mayor for because except for beer the mayor does not drink alcohol. And because no tavern-keeper in Rolliv keeps beer, our mayor cannot get drunk.³⁰

These testimonies were supported by other members of the community council, such as 65 year-old Hnat Lysyi, who felt offended by the fact that he had to work for the priest despite being a councilman.³¹

We do not know how these conflicts were solved at the local level. Rev. Korostens'kyi obviously managed to uphold his authority among his parishioners; the fact that he became a dean in the Mokriany deanery must have contributed to this. In 1867 the only one still complaining about him was the local landlord Emilian Głowacki, who said that Rev. Korostens'kyi had not celebrated the Pope's jubilee in 1865.³² The coalition between the local landlords and the mayor was based on joint action against the priests. The village leadership wanted to get rid of the parish priests' patronage while the district authorities wanted to penetrate the communities, bypassing the village priests. In these circumstances the priests also started acting to try to reestablish their authority and influence in the villages. Rev. Khomins'kyi openly incited the community against the mayor:

Honest community, I can no longer tolerate such disorder – the mayor is making deals only with landlords and Jews, and we should have our own mayor, elect three people from the community as candidates, take care that they were honest and rich, and I'll make it so that the government will have to approve one of them.³³

²⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2545, a.26-27.

³⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2545, a.28.

³¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2545, a.28-31.

³² TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, spr.2546, a.65.

³³ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.4, case 2545, 23.

All these intra-community power struggles, the triangle of priest, mayor and district authority, were interwoven into the growing national conflict. If we try to trace back these local conflicts in the 1860s and the beginning of national animosities on the level of everyday life, we arrive at the same starting point, 1863. This was the year, when “cats’ music,” the ostracizing practice of urban charivary from 1848, was revitalized, when mourning on the Polish side was accompanied by Ruthenian celebrations, and when Greek Catholic priests were boycotted in public places.³⁴

The Latin priest Jakób Filar complained about Rev. Ivan Drymalyk from Voloshcha, another pillar of the ritualistic movement in the region. Rev. Ivan Drymalyk allegedly offended Rev. Filar during the celebration of baptism in the family of a Horozhanna Ruthenian priest, offended him in front of the parishioners, and did not allow Ruthenians to marry Poles. Having found out that a peasant was working for a Polish priest, Rev. Drymalyk was alleged to have said: “you are a Ruthenian, and you should not work for a Latin priest,” and ordered the peasant be punished with 20 cudgels. The consistory requested Rev. Korostens’kyi to investigate the issue, and Rev. Korostens’kyi conducted this investigation with the help of Rev. Ivan Ropyts’kyi, parish administrator of Volia Iakubova (the one praised by Atanasii Mel’nyk in the 1880s). Not surprisingly, he did not find Rev. Drymalyk guilty of anything.

The peasant in question was Mykola Hvozdiak from Mainych. Hvozdiak himself during the investigation organized by the consistory said that 10 years ago (1854) he had married a Pole; they had decided to have the wedding announcements in the eastern rite church and the wedding itself in the Latin rite church, and the Ruthenian priest had ordered that Hvozdiak be punished. A sexton or cantor had beaten him, not with 20 cudgels, only several. He told this story to the Latin rite priest but said that he did not intend to complain; the Latin priest simply asked him to tell his story. He did not know what exactly he was punished for, but he thought that it had something to do with his cutting an oak for the Latin priest, which had angered Rev. Drymalyk. Rev. Drymalyk had never given him any kind of compensation for the beating he had suffered.³⁵

Rev. Drymalyk testified that Hvozdiak had been going to marry in 1857. He explained that Rev. Pavlo Podlus’kyi, his predecessor in the office of the Voloshcha parson, did not want to marry Hvozdiak, who had no idea about catechism and could not even pray properly. That is why the latter married only at the age of 34. Hvozdiak was punished by Vasyl’ Stebel’s’kyi on the mayor’s and not the priest’s orders. Vasyl’ Stebel’s’kyi testified that Hvozdiak was “skipping catechism lessons while helping his bride in her work for the Latin priest” and

³⁴ Oleksandr Barvins’kyi, *Spomyny z moho zhyttia*, ch.1 (L’viv, 1912), 42-43; “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1863, No.74.

³⁵ APP, ABGK, sygn.3609.

Rev. Drymalyk talked to the mayor. Stebel's'kyi claimed not to know the content of this conversation, but it seemed that the priest complained about Hvozdiak's behavior and the mayor decided to punish Hvozdiak.

Rev. Filar also accused Rev. Drymalyk of being at fault in a fight with peasants from Kornalovychi. Rev. Drymalyk explained that this had happened back in 1863. The peasants from Kornalovychi had found two barrels of weapons being brought on two carts for Polish insurgents, and after this incident were stopping all travelers to check for weapons. Two drunks stopped Rev. Drymalyk's cart and one of them hit Drymalyk's child in head with a stake, while other peasants gathered near the tavern, helped the priest and detained these two drunks. The whole denunciation Rev. Drymalyk characterized as:

A wild and angry fantasy of Rev. Filar and all the restorators of Poland like him because at the time he and his *Consoles* proclaimed that the Kornalovychi peasants did not just beat but killed me – while in the meantime no one laid as much as a finger on me.

Rev. Filar himself in 1863 allegedly sent several lads to the Polish insurgency, helped them with money and blessed them with a nice trip. But Rev. Drymalyk did not want to report this to the authorities and become a denunciator of his brother in Christ.³⁶

The Voloshcha connection shows that Holyk's story was not as fantastic as it appeared. Baroness Brückmann de Rennstrom owned Voloshcha after the death of her husband. Rev. Filar convinced her manager, Deputowicz, to sign a complaint accusing Rev. Drymalyk of leading an amoral life, but Deputowicz disappeared and his complaint could not be checked. The Voloshcha manor was known for other shadowy dealings as well, and, perhaps the peasants in the area knew about its shaken reputation with the state authorities. The late landlord of Voloshcha, Baron Brückmann, together with local dominical gentry, had allegedly organized a mass printing of false banknotes. When the authorities tracked the enterprise down, the village was surrounded by the army and only the timely destruction of the printing press and other *corpus delicti* saved him from prison.³⁷

It is interesting that the increased attention paid to Ruthenian priests was not limited to known Ruthenian patriots. In the 1860s Rev. Luka Turians'kyi, who had been a priest in Bilyna Velyka since 1839, had various disciplinary cases started against him by Marcin Korosteński, a petty landlord who had come to the village in 1856. The priest was accused of having publicly abused the landlord, of not wanting to christen the illegitimate child of his servant – “you work for a dog, perhaps that dog made you a child,” – and of not wanting to marry the estate

³⁶ APP, ABGK, sygn.3609.

³⁷ “Woloszcza. Wieś w powiecie Samborskim,” *Gazeta Samborska*, 1906, No. 28.

servants – “you work for a dog, let him marry you.” The conflict started because of a land boundary the landlord had overplowed and other services the priest expected from the landlord which he refused to provide. The landlord, however, presented the whole case as based on the priest’s authoritative rule in the community, where the priest had his own party and his clients, governing the community.³⁸

The 1860s were also the time when the priests for the first time resorted to some kind of a populist politics. At the end of the 1860s, the group of ritualists around Rev. Korostens’kyi in the Morkiany deanery supported Shekhovych’s attempts to publish Pys’mo do Hromady. The community councils under their control subscribed to the newspaper.³⁹ This could signal that the authority of these priests so seriously challenged at the beginning of the constitutional era was being reestablished by new methods. The 1860s showed the priests how precarious their position was in the new era of Polish-dominated and secularizing autonomy.⁴⁰ The 1860s witnessed a crisis in the old methods the parish priests used to exercise and uphold their authority in village communities and forced the clergy to rethink and modify them.

The crisis of the 1860s forced the priests to reevaluate their parishioners’ knowledge about the Ruthenian cause. The majority of parishioners simply would not accept the changes in the ritual so important for the patriotic priests. These priests realized that the Ruthenian nationality of their parishioners did not mean automatic support of all their initiatives. The visions of the meaning of ethnic difference priests and peasants had remained different. The loss of the community’s trust appeared to be especially dangerous in light of the attempts the new administration made to get the communities under their own firm control. The 1860s forced patriotic priests to turn to their own communities. This was also the time when the distance between the Greek Catholic priests and the landlords’ estates grew. The Greek Catholic clergy was excluded from both the upper classes’ social life and the bureaucratic vertical. Even in terms of the priests’ income, the importance of profit from farming and parishioners grew while their state-paid salary declined. And all this against the background of growing intervention into the life of village communities of the district administration.

Starting with mid-1850s and, especially, in the 1860s the state builds up its bureaucratic presence in the districts, which has to compensate for the abolition

³⁸ APP, ABGK, sygn.3608.

³⁹ VR LNB, f. Osyp Markov, 335, p.9, a.3.

⁴⁰ The introduction of Galician autonomy coincided with the so-called Austrian *kulturkampf*, which in Galicia had also strong anti-Ruthenian connotations. See Jerzy Pałosz, “Sprawy kościelno-polityczne na forum Galicyjskiego Sejmu krajowego w okresie “austriackiego kulturkampfu” (1861-1874),” Studia Historyczne, r.28, No.3, 363-380.

of patrimonial jurisdiction over peasants. This bureaucratization of the province is quite often overlooked in the discussions of the 1860s by the historians. To apprehend the change, let's look at the following numbers.

After the reform of 1782 circle administration consisted of a captain, three to four commissars, secretary, two clerks, one or more trainees and two messengers, later replaced by several provincial dragoons (*Landsdragoner*).⁴¹ This did not change much till 1846. In 1845 administration of the Sambir circle with the population of more than 300,000 people consisted of the captain, four commissars, one secretary, one recorder, one accountant, one registrar, five clerks, and two trainees – altogether 16 people. Some of these positions were vacant. No wonder that Polish conspirators in 1846 were able to develop such a formidable network and the action taken against them in the south of the Sambir circle was accomplishment of the employee of the state estates and not of the administration proper.⁴² By 1866 the circle, still existing as the administrative unit, was divided into Sambir, Luka, Stara Sil', Stare Misto, Turka, Rudky, Pidbuzh, Medenychi, Komarno, Drohobych, and Borynia districts with the population ranging from 16,175 (Luka) to 37,519 (Sambir). Each of these districts had its own administration employing from seven to thirteen officials.⁴³

Most priests in the “ritualistic group” I have described regained the support of their respective communities, and in the 1870s their position appeared to be firmer than it was in the 1860s. Paradoxically, the strengthening of the Polish position and the finalization of Galician autonomy contributed to this. Once the authorities had secured their political hegemony, they were no longer as interested in anti-clerical action as they were in the 1860s, when they tried to use the peasant card against the priests to split the formidable opposition they were facing in the Galician Diet. Now, in the 1870s, as long as they could control the elections, they left the communities alone. Many patriotic priests made use of this situation and became their communities' most important patrons and benefactors. When Rev. Korostens'kyi died in 1888, the community of Hrushiv was the largest benefactor of his will. He left 4,000 g. to the school in Hrushiv and another 2,000 g. to the fund for Hrushiv's poor citizens in addition to numerous stipends for students from Hrushiv and so on.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Wacław Tokarz, *Galicja w początkach ery józefińskiej w świetle ankiety urzędowej z roku 1783*, (Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1909), 39.

⁴² *Provinzial handbuch der Königreiche Galizien und Lodomerien für Jahr 1845* (Lemberg, 1845), 56. Of course this does not take into account personnel of the courts, financial service, circle doctor, engineer and so on.

⁴³ *Provinzial handbuch der Königreiche Galizien und Lodomerien für das Jahr 1866* (Lemberg, 1866).

⁴⁴ *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1888, No. 6.

The Party of St. George

The 1860s were characterized by the establishment of a constitutional and parliamentary regime. The most important political events in this decade were the elections to the Galician Diet in 1861 and 1867. A delegation from Galicia to the parliament in the 1860s was elected by the Diet, and that made Diet elections even more important. The 1860s were also the time when Galician autonomy was established, which went together with the formation of the landowning Polish nobility's political hegemony.

As I have shown in the previous chapter, the non-participation of the Ruthenian movement in the servitudinal struggles should be attributed not to its weakness but to the fact that the movement shared the agenda of establishing capitalist property relationships in the countryside. In fact, the Diet representation of the Ruthenian movement in the 1860s was numerically not weak at all, especially if compared with the decades to follow. In the 1860s Ruthenians had a larger proportion of Diet deputies than in the 1870s-1900s.⁴⁵ These deputies were largely priests, and Poles spoke about Ruthenian political activists as a St. George's party (taking the name from the St. George's Greek-Catholic cathedral in L'viv, the site where the hierarchy of the L'viv Greek Catholic archdiocese resided and worked).

If we look at the Galician Diet of the 1860s, we see that the most important divide in it was the one separating the Ruthenian and Polish political camps, with the Greek Catholic clergy dominating the former and large landholding nobility, with some admixture of urban politicians of plebeian origin, dominating the latter. In the 1860s the Diet was a place of fierce battles between these two camps. At the beginning of the 1860s Ruthenians were supported by the province's administration, but by the end of the 1860s it became clear that a compromise between the throne and the Polish nobility would be the long-term state policy. This brought about consternation and transformed Ruthenian politics into oppositional politics. From this oppositional perspective the distinction between central and provincial government was slowly disappearing. Such a turn would also bring about the decline of the St. George's party connected with the decline in the importance of Church hierarchy for the Ruthenian movement and the coming into prominence of rural populist priests and secular intelligentsia critical of St. George. These developments made of the 1860s the golden times of the St. George' politicians.

⁴⁵ During the first term (1861-1866) Galician Diet included 50 Ruthenian deputies, in 1867 their number decreased to 36, in 1877 – to 18, in 1883 – to 15, in 1889 it was 21, and in 1895 – 18. Calculations of Ihor Chornovol in his *Ukraïns'ka fraktsiia halys'koho krajevoho seimu, 1861-190*.

Ruthenian politics in the 1860s manifested a strong continuity with 1848. Rev. Mykhailo Kuzems'kyi, the canon of the L'viv Chapter and, later, the bishop of Chelm in the Russian Empire, personalized this legacy of 1848 by remaining in charge of Ruthenian political life. While in 1848 the activities of the Supreme Ruthenian Council were centered around him, in the 1860s he coordinated the Central Ruthenian Electoral Committee, which, in the absence of any stable political organization claiming to represent the interests of Ruthenian population, was the only body that coordinated Ruthenian political activities. In the absence of Ruthenian political organizations, the Greek-Catholic hierarchy assumed the function of speaking on behalf of Ruthenians. Ruthenian political life was highly centralized – there was one electoral committee, a single list of Ruthenian candidates and a single political newspaper, *Slovo*.

From the documents left by the electoral committee we see that complaints by Polish politicians about the Ruthenian movement being a creation of the Greek-Catholic Church were well grounded. Church structures were indeed used for political purposes. As an example we can take the selection of Ruthenian candidates. For the elections of 1861 there was a “meeting of the deputies of both dioceses of the Greek Catholic clergy,” which decided that Iulian Lavrovs'kyi would be appointed for the Sambir rural electoral district, and for the Sambir-towns – Rev. Iosyf Lavretskii.⁴⁶ Lavrovs'kyi, an attorney and Sambir resident, was one of very few Ruthenian secular politicians, an older Ukrainophile, who influenced student *bromada*-s of national-populists, and wrote the 1869 Polish-Ruthenian compromise proposal, while Rev. Lavrets'kyi had been the chair of the Sambir Ruthenian Council in 1848.

It is quite clear that without the support of the Church, the Ruthenian movement would never have achieved the prominent results it did in fact achieve in the 1860s. Electoral agitation was organized almost exclusively through Church structures. The involvement of the Church hierarchy in politics is reflected in the pastoral letters from the 1860s. Rev. Toma Polians'kyi, the bishop of the Przemyśl diocese, published a letter from 28 February 1861, to “the venerable clergy and all the faithful of the Diocese.” The letter stressed the important of the Diet and of elections in general. Besides generally encouraging participation in the constitutional life of the state, Bishop Polians'kyi advised the faithful on whom to elect: “It must be a righteous Ruthenian, a wise, honest and knowledgeable man, who knows your and the land's needs.” In this pastoral letter nationality appears as natural; one was expected to vote for a candidate of the same nationality as a matter of course.

The second part of this pastoral letter consisted of paragraphs addressing particularly clergy, and was not supposed to be read aloud to the parishioners. The bishop said that priests had always been known for their love of the people

⁴⁶ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.31, a.1.

and their loyalty to the dynasty. They were encouraged to continue working from this double position:

We make it your duty to internalize the knowledge of Your high vocation and of the holy duty of the righteous Ruthenian, to support with Your teaching, Your advice, Your respect [newly] made citizens in the present electoral struggle.

The first part of the letter, addressing the general public, had to be read by the priests in the churches on the Sunday immediately after they received the letter.⁴⁷ No wonder that Ruthenians were quite often accused of using the church for electoral agitation, quite often during the Liturgy. There are reasons to trust these accusations.⁴⁸ The Church was used not only for indoctrinating parishioners but also for routine organizational purposes.

In 1861 Rev. Mykhailo Kuzems'kyi, who was chair of the electoral committee, sent a recommendation/appeal on the elections to his 432 agents in the province.⁴⁹ Kuzems'kyi's correspondence provides us with a list of his agents-correspondents, to whom this recommendation was sent. In the Sambir and Saryi Sambir political districts, Kuzems'kyi's agents were: Rev. Lavrets'kyi in Sambir, Rev. Kunevych in Berehy, Rev. Aleks. Nestorovych in Mistkovychi, Rev. Petro Vitoshyns'kyi in Vovche, Rev. Turchmanovych in Stril'bychi, Rev. Harasevych in Stare Misto, and Rev. Ivanovs'kyi in Rakiv.⁵⁰

For the 1867 elections, the documents of the committee on Ruthenian agitation start with Kuzems'kyi's appeal from 8 January 1867, stating that:

An unenviable fate has given us numerous and powerful enemies, whom we can try fighting morally only with the weapons of our mind – solidarity, and persistence; only with this kind of power and with God's help, relying on the justness (*slushnost'*) of our cause can we emerge victorious in the end, and win for our nation an adequate position.

This appeal-recommendation was addressed to all “who are righteous and honest Ruthenians,” but sent only to Kuzems'kyi's agents. The letters sent to the agents were personalized and included the name of the particular candidate the addressee was asked to support.⁵¹

⁴⁷ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.31, a.12

⁴⁸ Ostap Sereda, “My tu ne pryshly na smikh': uchast' skhidno-halyts'kykh selian u seimovykh vyborakh ta zasidanniakh u L'vovi (60-i roky XIX st.),” in *Lwów: społeczeństwo, miasto, kultura*, t.IV (Kraków, 2002), 165-186.

⁴⁹ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.32, a.151-157.

⁵⁰ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.31, a.2.

⁵¹ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.32, a. 175.

Besides Kuzems'kyi's agents and deputy Iulian Lavrovs'kyi, Sambir had in the 1860s another prominent Ruthenian resident – the judge Mykhailo Kachkovskii. His letters to Kuzems'kyi differ from the letters of other correspondents from the province in that they display very little concern with local politics. Even in the case of national politics he had very little to say.⁵² We do not know how Kachkovskii came to be a Ruthenian patriot, but perhaps an encounter in his youth with an impertinent and lawless Polish landlord was a factor. Of all places this encounter happened in the village of Horozhanna Velyka, whose landlord Antoni Dulski also had an estate in the Russian Empire and was said to have committed a murder there. Young Kachkovskii was sent to Horozhanna Velyka to investigate the case and was caught by the landlord, who threatened him with murder and promised him money if only he could prevent Dulski's being turned over to the Russian authorities. Kachkovskii barely escaped through a window at night.⁵³

In 1867 Kuzems'kyi wrote to Kachkovskii complaining that the Central Ruthenian Electoral committee did not have any concrete information and worrying about the success of three candidates – Lavrovs'kyi, Rev. Pavlykiv and Rev. Kuzems'kyi. These three were seen as the leaders of the Ruthenian movement, and Rev. Kuzems'kyi hoped that “the compatriots will not allow their leaders to fail.”⁵⁴ Kuzems'kyi's correspondence, however, shows that such an absence of local information was partly the result of the organizational structure of the Ruthenian movement. The St. George's party centralized Ruthenian politics and was not concerned with the opinion of the local electorate. Not local sympathies or preferences but the interests of the movement in general, as understood by the Committee, were decisive for the selection of candidates. The deputies were considered to represent, first of all, the movement and then the nation, and not the interest of any concrete electoral districts. This, perhaps, contributed to the resentment felt towards the candidates the Ruthenian committee imposed. At least there are some indications of this in Kachkovskii's answer to Kuzems'kyi.

In his response to Kuzems'kyi's letter, Kachkovskii states that the Poles had sent paid agents to make sure Ruthenian candidates failed, “to prove that Galician Rus' does not want the same thing we do and that we are, in fact, Muscovite agents.” The attorney Volosians'kyi, born and residing in Stare Misto, ran in these elections as an independent candidate. From other sources we know that he was consciously Ruthenian, but that did not prevent him from going against the Central Ruthenian Electoral Committee. Kachkovskii also mentions the

⁵² For example, see his letter from 23.01.1867 – TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.32, a. 78.

⁵³ APP, ABGK, sygn.9447.

⁵⁴ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.32, a. 77.

“renegades” Terlecki, Popiel, and Rev. Wiszniowski (a parish priest in Koniushky), who were proposed as candidates in Sambir. Regarding Kuzems’kyi’s concern with the Ruthenian leadership, Kachkovskii advised that Rev. Kuzems’kyi, Lavrovs’kyi, Pavlykiv and Naumovych be named as candidates in at least two districts to increase their chances of victory.⁵⁵ It is interesting that Kachkovskii, besides the leaders listed by Rev. Kuzems’kyi, also mentions Rev. Naumovych, considering him to be of great importance for the movement, while Rev. Kuzems’kyi, a representative of the hierarchy, omits him.

From the very beginning Rev. Naumovych had uneasy relations with the hierarchy, for whom he was too radical in his russophilism and in his populism (based on a slavophilism of Aksakov’s kind). The generation of Kuzems’kyi, to which people like Lavrets’kyi and Kunevych in Sambir and the majority of the hierarchy in the 1860s belonged, never reconciled itself totally with the more radical russophilism and ukrainophilism gaining in strength during the 1860s. Kachkovskii also belonged to this generation, but perhaps his contacts with younger students of both orientations, whom he sponsored and some of whom resided in his house, made him more open or rather more blind to these trends than was the case with the majority of Ruthenian activists of his generation.

According to the decision of the Central Ruthenian Electoral Committee on 27 January 1867, the attorney Lavrovs’kyi was appointed for the Sambir – Stare Misto – Stara Sil’ electoral district and Rev. Kmytsykevych for the Turka-Borynia district. The letter notifying the local clergy of this decision said that the committee had not had time to negotiate this matter with the “honorable brothers,” but having the consent of the Przemyśl consistory Rev. Kuzems’kyi asked local priests to support these candidates.⁵⁶

We have the answer of two priests from the Turka district to this letter of Kuzems’kyi’s. The letter reports on pre-elections in the village of Lyp’ia, after which the commission would go to Mshanets’. In Lyp’ia the local community unanimously elected Rev. Kurylo, its parish priest, as an elector.⁵⁷ The priests wrote: “we hope that the same will happen in Mshanets’ tomorrow.” In Mshanets’ the local parish priest Rev. Atanasii Nazarevych had to be elected as an elector. They assured Kuzems’kyi that they would try to work as he requested them “but it remains a big question mark whether we shall be able to win against the enemy’s agitation.” Especially difficult for them was to agitate for Rev. Kmytsykevych because he was not known in the region. Another problem was that Mshanets’ was in the Staryi Sambir electoral district, and they did not know

⁵⁵ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.32, a. 81.

⁵⁶ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.32, a. 126.

⁵⁷ Elections in peasant curia consisted of the two stages – at first on pre-elections electors were elected, and those on the elections proper these electors were electing a candidate.

whom to elect there.⁵⁸ This technical problem was a small part of the larger problem with the Church-based political organization. In this particular case, the ecclesiastical boundaries did not coincide with the administrative ones, which is why the priests did not know the Ruthenian candidate for Mshanets' – Rev. Kuzems'kyi had sent an invitation to elect the same person to all the priests belonging to the Zhukotyn deanery, while Mshanets', in fact, belonged to a different district.

It is also interesting that the priests did not have a centralized list of all the Ruthenian candidates but relied on the information sent to them personally by Rev. Kuzems'kyi. Later on all candidates would be listed several times in the major Ruthenian newspapers. In Turka-Borynia district in 1861, a certain Szymon Tarczanowski, the mayor of Khashchiv, won the election. On the one hand, this election reminds us of the elections of the chairman of the local Ruthenian Council in 1848: in both cases peasants were elected contrary to the wishes of the local Ruthenian clergy. On the other hand, it could be an example of the tensions between the priests and the peasants being skillfully manipulated by Polish politicians.

The St. George's party became seriously concerned with the conflicts between the priests and the peasants. The peasants in the Ternopil'-Skalat and Terebovlia electionary district were reported to have said to the local priests: "we do not trust priests, you exploit us (*my ne maïem zaufania do sviashchenstva, vy nas derety*)."⁵⁹ The priest who reported these words, an agent of the Ruthenian electoral committee, said that there was much truth in the peasants' statement. He himself had some relatives, who were – priests and behaved just as the peasants described.⁵⁹ We have already seen how complicated the priests' position in the villages became. The situation called for changing traditional attitudes and politics, but the change came not from the hierarchy but from the patriotic parish priests themselves. In response to the situation, a new clerical populism arose. But this clerical populism also meant the end of the St. George's party's influence. The basis for the populist priests' political power was not the Church structure and organization but their personal influence and their work with the communities.

The leaders of the St. George's party realized that the current political system discriminated against their constituency. Rev. Mykhailo Kuzems'kyi calculated that large landowners in the Sambir circle paid 62,248 g. 69 kr. land and house tax, plus 2,250 g. income and wage tax, for a total of 64,498 g. Small landowners (peasants) in the same region paid 216,797 g. 84 kr. land and house tax, plus 22,000 g. income and wage tax, for a total of 238,797 g. At the same time, large landowners had three deputies in the parliament while small landowners had five.

⁵⁸ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.32, a.127.

⁵⁹ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.32, a. 53.

Kuzems'kyi's conclusion was that justice required that small landowners have five more deputies.⁶⁰ As we see, Rev. Kuzems'kyi accepts a curial electoral system based on property differentiation as just. This differentiation reflects the uneven contributions of various strata to general well-being. His problem is not the principle itself but its unjust materialization in concrete situations.

It is not clear what kind of Ruthenian identity "St. Georgians" had. Was their Ruthenian nationality just Habsburg (limited to Ruthenians in Galicia, Transcarpathia and Bukovina), closer to Ukrainian, or did they imagine a larger East Slavic national community? During the 1860s the divide between Ukrainophiles and Russophiles grew. This growth of Russophilism and Ukrainophilism occurred despite the position of the hierarchy and was accompanied by the decline of its influence. From recent research it appears that all these trends were already present in the Ruthenian movement in 1848.⁶¹ It has also been argued that the identity of the St. George's party was still far from a modern national identity and that they identified more with supranational communities.⁶² It seems that the leaders of the St. George's party were not concerned with these kind of questions. Accusations of being Russophile angered them, and they were unhappy with the suppression of fellow Greek-Catholics by Moscow. But they did not like Ukrainophiles either, and what they saw as a democratic demagogy and glorification of the plebeian masses.⁶³

We do not have enough material from the region to state that this position of the Church hierarchy was shared by St. George's agents in the area. It is noteworthy that that Rev. Iasenys'kyi, a Sambir catechist and very influential person with clear pro-Russian sympathies, was not among Rev. Kuzems'kyi's correspondents in the area. Some prominent Russophiles from the area that appeared in the 1860s are absent as well. At the same time, some people accused in Polonophilism, like Rev. Nesterovych, were also not on the list.

It seems that the St. George's activists of the 1860s saw themselves as the rightful heirs of the 1848 movement and still hoped for a positive solution to their problems in the Habsburg constitutional system. For them the victory of the Ruthenian cause in Ruthenian Galicia was determined by natural development; in time progress would do justice to Ruthenians' natural rights. The proof of this was in the Ruthenian movement's almost miraculous revival from nothing to great prominence in 1848, and in the important position they had in the 1860s:

⁶⁰ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.31, a.21.

⁶¹ Oleh Turii, "Konfessino-obriadovi chynnyk u natsional'nii samoidentyfikatsii ukrainsiv Halychyny v seredyni XIX st."

⁶² Olena Arkusha, Mar'ian Mudryi, "Rusofil'stvo v Halychyni v seredyni XIX – na pochatku XX st.: heneza, etapy rozvytku, svitohliad."

⁶³ See correspondence between Iosyf Sembratovych and Mykhailo Malynovs'kyi. VR LNB, ND-134/19.

In the end God's power and love over me reveals itself. Our WORD thunders strongly in the capital of Lev, the beautiful, lightly built national temple fills with the sound of new joy...⁶⁴

The manifestation of this nationality was something not easy to describe in purely rational word, because of the inner spiritual nature of the nation: "Faith and language are now the most important subjects of the Galician Rus'... The power of our national faith or greatness of its outer revelation cannot be described exactly and with dignity in words."⁶⁵ Just as in 1848, the St. George's party hoped to silence ideological differences and represent a unified Ruthenian movement and nation. For St. Georgians, the nation did not have to be imagined precisely; it was more important to cherish the Ruthenian spirit and with time that spirit would fill the form that fit it best.

By 1870 this view was more and more difficult to sustain. The establishment of Galician autonomy and the domination of the large Polish landlords contributed to this greatly. But open confessions and declarations of national russophilism and ukrainophilism were also very important. Numerous Ruthenian patriots of the older generation were becoming openly Russophile, while the perceived need to maintain the unity of the movement precluded the St. George's party from confronting the problem directly. This stance made suspicions about the hierarchy's Russophilism plausible and fostered the appearance of a distinctly secular Ukrainian movement. This also allowed the Russophiles to pretend to be part of the mainstream Old Ruthenian tradition.

The national community as conceptualized by the St. George Party was not overly concerned with its social composition or plebian character, perhaps even less so than in 1848. The most important thing was the delimitation of Rus' as a separate national entity from the Poles. Just as in 1848 slavery was blamed for the weaknesses of the movement: "Our inability in everything was brought about by circumstances. This is the consequence of our long slavery; it came about through the taking over of Rus' by a related nation living outside of its boundaries."⁶⁶ With St. George struggling to maintain its control over increasingly nationalizing rural clergy, new strands in the movement grew in importance and made inroads into the countryside. These were Ukrainophilism and Russophilism. Because the history of these two orientations have been and is being written, I'll discuss below only their peasant politics.

⁶⁴ [Venedykt Ploshchanskyi], *Halytskii Rusyn pered i po 1848 h. Obrazok nachertan cherez 1/3 000 000* (L'vov: Izdatelstvo Institutu Stavropihiiskoho, 1863), 5.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 14.

Good Books Reach Galician Villages

Borys Hrinchenko once published an observation on the reading habits of the Ukrainian peasants in the Russian Empire at the beginning of the twentieth century. As was the case in many other alphabet or semi-literate societies, reading was mostly a collective affair, collective entertainment. Peasants read books during evening gatherings. One of them would read aloud and the rest would listen to the reading attentively. In this kind of reading the texts would spread their influence even to illiterate peasants, who would pick up on what they heard. Some of these alphabets would catch themes and ideas more eagerly and with better apprehension than those who possessed the technical skill to read the written text. As an example of these well-read alphabets Hrinchenko chose a certain Mykola:

In his head you can find almost everything: legends from the lives of the saints mixed in his head with the legends about Mohammed; the theory of creation on the basis of Biblical information intertwined with the microscope and Revelation of St. John ... he thinks that the Earth is held in space from four sides by four "magnets." When asked what these magnets are he answered that it was a kind of force, it was invisible but it held the land from four sides.⁶⁷

This article represents peasant reading as the active construction of meaning barely attached to the structure of the text or to the intention of the author. Hrinchenko is not too happy with this; he describes the situation in order to find ways of changing it. Peasants paid very little attention to the aesthetic side of texts, and they would totally miss authors' points. Hrinchenko's article is matched by Franko's report on Galician peasants, which was published in a Russian periodical thirty years before Hrinchenko's:

Reading newspapers and brochures of our "scholastics," people do not acquiesce at all to the ideas and trends of the editors, quite often do not even notice them, and select only facts, then weave them, sometimes in an amazing way, into their own sophistry, or use them to support their own hopes.⁶⁸

Franko was describing peasant hopes placed in the Russian tsar, which were sparked by the beginning of the Russo-Turkish war. Both authors pointed to the gap between the peasant understanding of the world and the discourse of the educated elites but missed the fact that peasant readings supplied them with a

⁶⁷ Cited in Ivan Kryp'iakevych, "Knyzhka na seli," *Dilo*, 1908, No. 32.

⁶⁸ Ivan Franko, "Krest'ianskie stremlenia i mechtaniia; rasschety na voinu s Rossiei," *Zibrannia tvoriv u 50 tomakh*, v.46/1, 302.

repertoire of images and themes very important in themselves, notwithstanding any reshuffling and reinterpreting by peasants. The peasants picked up not only “facts” but also representations. Hrinchenko, for example, shows that although peasants did not like the texts in which swear words were used (like Kotliarevs’kyi’s *Eneida*),⁶⁹ they were especially fond of histories. Peasants perceived all the fictional characters in them as taken from real life.⁷⁰ Franko in another passage was happy with the eager reception by peasants of the newly created popular newspaper and was not afraid that they would get it wrong.⁷¹

I am inclined to see the printed production of the Galician “scholastics” and its influence on peasants in more favorable light than Franko did. First of all they were a new phenomenon, something the Ruthenian movement had not tried to do in 1848, the 1850s or even throughout most of the 1860s. These popular publications distinguished the activities of Ukrainophiles and Russophiles from the activities of the St. George’s party. Moreover, I suggest that careful analysis of the texts produced by two competing enlightening societies, which advocated two different national identities for Ruthenian Galicia, namely *Prosvita* and the Kachkovskii society, can disclose significant differences between them, and these discursive differences point towards a larger difference between the two national projects, a difference which was visible from the very beginning. Both enlightening societies were created and acted independently from the St. George’s party and hierarchy. Both societies represented a populist turn in Ruthenian politics, to which St. George had to and did respond with a sobriety campaign.

Prosvita (Enlightenment) society was found in 1868 and was the first group to state the spread of enlightenment among “simple” people explicitly as the goal of its activity. This society was founded by the Ukrainian national-populists and was joined in 1874 by the Russophile Kachkovskii society. The association of these two societies with the two national orientations, Ukrainian and Russian, became so strong that in many cases it determined Ukrainian historians’ attitudes towards them.

⁶⁹ From other source, however, we know that Kotliarevs’kyi’s work, published among other *lubok* books, which correspond to the chapbooks in England and Ireland, were among the most popular. Around 1890 an edition of Kotliarevs’kyi in 12,000 copies was out of print in two years. “Ukrain’sko-ruski vydannia moskovs’kykh lubochnykiv,” *Zoria*, 1890, No.21, 335. Although in this chapter I am dealing only with the popular books read by Galician peasants, and there are no studies of the peasants’ readings in Russian Ukraine, we can see the difference between two. This would be an answer to the question asked by Christine Worobec in her review of Himka’s *Galician Villagers* – Christine D. Worobec, “Galicians into Ukrainians: Ukrainian Nationalism Penetrates Nineteenth-Century Rural Austrian Galicia,” *Peasant Studies*, v.16, No.3, 1989; Galician Ukrainian peasants indeed had a set of readings different from those the rural populations of Western Europe and the peasants in the Russian Empire had.

⁷⁰ Ivan Kryp’iakevych, “Knyzhka na seli,” *Dilo*, 1908, No. 32.

⁷¹ Cited in Arkadii Zhyvotko, *Istoriia ukrains’koi presy*, (Miunkhen, 1989-90), 85.

As a rule conventional accounts of the development of the national movement emphasize *Prosvita's* contribution to the transformation of the Galician peasantry and neglect the Kachkovskii society.⁷² Revisionist approaches in the 1970s discovered *Prosvita's* limited elite membership and in this followed the Radical critique of national-populism from the end of the nineteenth century, arguing that *Prosvita* had started to penetrate the Galician countryside successfully only in the 1880s.⁷³ After this reevaluation of *Prosvita* activities, a second revision came, which placed the emphasis on the allegedly successful activities of the Kachkovskii society and contrasted it with the limited influence of *Prosvita* in the 1870s.⁷⁴ This trend, which was connected with the unveiling of the nationalist prejudices of existing historiography, has received followers in the more recent Ukrainian scholarship. The Kachkovskii society has come to be seen as dominating villages in the 1870s and even the 1880s while the reversal of their positions and the heyday of *Prosvita* is located in the 1890s and 1900s. These statements historians usually support with some kind of statistical data on reading clubs. For example, it is said that in 1876 the Kachkovskii society had 161 reading clubs and *Prosvita* only had six.⁷⁵

The problem is that these revisionist approaches operate with membership, and organizational networks, without having reliable statistics on both members and reading clubs.⁷⁶ Concrete analysis of the textual production and minutiae of these organizations' activities is lacking. This is especially strange because Miroslav Hroch, whose approaches influenced these revisions immensely, defines the B phase (in which these activities fit) as the phase of "patriotic agitation."⁷⁷ In interpretations of the activities of Galician enlightening societies, the essence of

⁷² Stepan Pers'kyi, *Populiarna istoriia tovarystva "Prosvita" u L'vovi* (L'viv, 1932). And also contemporary Hryhorii Dem'ianchuk (ed.), *"Prosvita" i dukhovne vidrodzhennia Ukrainy: materialy i tezy naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii prysviachenoi 125-richchiu "Prosvity"* (Rivne, 1993).

⁷³ Himka, *Polish and Ukrainian Socialism: Austria, 1867-1890*, v.1, 138, 140.

⁷⁴ Paul Robert Magocsi, "The Kachkovs'kyi Society and The National Revival In Nineteenth Century East Galicia", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 1991, 15, 48-87.

⁷⁵ Chornovol, Ihor, *Ukrains'ko-pol's'ka uhoda 1890-1894 rr.* (L'viv: L'vivs'ka akademiia mystetstv, 2000), 17.

⁷⁶ *Prosvita* reports include some data on the reading clubs only starting with 1884. But this society at least has reliable statistics of the membership. Kachkovskii society starting with 1878 claims to have 6,000 members but after that does not report numbers for total membership till 1892, when this number is given as 5,476, and in 1894 it decreased to 5,357. But from the society's report from 1911 it appears that already in 1877 the number was, most probably taken on the basis of the number of copies of books published in the society's popular series. Information on the number of reading clubs appears in the Kachkovskii society reports only starting with the twentieth century. See reports (*Spravozdannia, Zvit, Otchet*) of the respective societies (titles vary).

⁷⁷ Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe. A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*, transl. by Ben Fowkes, (Cambridge University Press, 1985), 22-23, 179-188.

phase B is thought to be the building-up of a network of organizations with a national cultural agenda, while no attention is paid to the mode of “patriotic agitation.” Reevaluating *Prosvita* and the Kachkovskii society in the 1870s, I shall concentrate on their printed production since I believe that in that period these two organizations were publishing houses more than anything else.⁷⁸ At the founding of the *Prosvita* society its task was defined not as organization of Ruthenian people, or organization of Ruthenian peasants but as “waking up the desire to reading” (Andrii Sichyns’kyi) or “bringing simple people to the level of spiritual development at which it will desire to read popular books” (Fedir Zarevych).⁷⁹

Retrospectively, *Prosvita* presented itself as having worked from the very beginning towards the enlightenment of simple people, taking over the task which the generation of 1848 failed to fulfill with its obsolete *Halyts’ko-Ruska Matytsia*. The founders of *Prosvita* allegedly knew that “Our small, intelligentsia composed almost exclusively of dependent people could not give us any guarantee for the future...”⁸⁰ That is why they turned towards the peasantry.

The most influential and in many aspects still the only study of the enlightening efforts of the Ruthenian movement is Mykhailo Pavlyk’s study of reading clubs. I will take this book as the departure point in my analysis of *Prosvita* discourse. In my opinion, all the critics of *Prosvita*’s activities have adopted a slightly modified version of Pavlyk’s view. But there are some contradictions in Pavlyk’s history of the enlightening organizations in Galicia. Pavlyk personally favored the Kachkovskii society, through which he himself entered Galician public life. He argued that *Prosvita* publications were more conservative than those of the Russophiles. *Prosvita* publications allegedly were printed in old Cyrillic script and contained only the lives of the saints and similar religious writings.⁸¹ According to Pavlyk, the greatest shortcoming of *Prosvita* publications was their avoidance of political and economic questions, which allegedly figured prominently in Rev. Naumovych’s (the Kachkovskii society’s) publications. The *Prosvita* society did so

⁷⁸ Not accidentally that already mentioned reports of both societies unlike in the case with membership and reading clubs include detailed statistics on the societies’ publications and their circulation.

⁷⁹ *Spravozdanie z pershykh zahal’nykh zboriv tovarystva “Prosvita”* (L’viv, 1868), 5, 6.

⁸⁰ Ivan Belei, *Dvadtsiat’ i piat’ lit istorii tovarystva “Prosvity.”* (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.166) (L’viv, 1894).

⁸¹ It is interesting that Magocsi later claimed that the etymological orthography of the Kachkovskii society could be among the reasons for its popularity in the conservative Ruthenian peasant milieu. Magocsi, “The Kachkovs’kyi Society and the National Revival in Nineteenth-Century East Galicia,” 58-9. He obviously did not realize that both etymology and phonetics were new against the background of old Cyrillic characters, and that is why popular attachments to *Slovo*, *Pys’mo do Hromad*, and early *Prosvita* books were printed in old Cyrillic characters. After *hrazhdanka* replaced old Cyrillic *Prosvita* in its popular publications used etymology and not phonetics up to 1899.

poorly that it could not even criticize the Russophiles, confronting them openly only in 1886.⁸²

Such a characterization of *Prosvita* can be found in the “evaluative” part of Pavlyk’s book. In the “historical” part, he states that “from Shevchenko’s works a totally different spirit came to us.”⁸³ (And this spirit of Shevchenko’s was propagated by the national-populists, who from the very beginning assigned to Shevchenko the highest position in their pantheon.) Pavlyk also remarks that the first *Prosvita* book published in 1869 was sold in 2,000 copies, and Rev. Naumovych himself praised it; “in remarkably short time all the countryside knew its content.”⁸⁴ Ivan Belei supports this information and provides us with further details: the whole edition was sold in only two weeks and no one got it free of charge (which was often the case with later popular publications, when membership in the society automatically included a subscription to the popular series). Moreover, the publishing activities of *Prosvita* were from the very beginning based on certain theoretical premises, namely on the program from the 22nd of February 1869 and were not conducted chaotically.⁸⁵

There are many things about the *Prosvita* society not mentioned in the historiography. First of all, at the founding of the society, the Church hierarchy refused to serve a Liturgy for the society.⁸⁶ In the case of Marxist historians this would undermine their critique of the society and in the case of nationalists it would spoil the image of both *Prosvita* and the Greek Catholic Church. In 1875 Bishop Stupnyts’kyi in the Diet actually voted against a subvention to the society.⁸⁷

In 1871 Volodymyr Shashkevych, the highly talented son of Markiiian Shashkevych, prepared another program of popular publications for *Prosvita*.⁸⁸ In May 1872 it was decided that the society needed to publish as much as possible and only high quality popular books. For this a person had to be found to be in charge of the network for the sales of books. Agents in the province were supposed to found agencies distributing books, and an agreement had to be reached with Rev. Naumovych to advertise each others’ books. Relations also had to be established with those selling books at markets. A list of all the society’s publications had to be printed on the cover titles of all its popular books.⁸⁹ Iurii

⁸² Pavlyk, *Pro rus’ko-ukraïns’ki narodni chytal’ni*, 163-65.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 85.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 97.

⁸⁵ Belei, *Dvadtsiat’ i piat’ lit.*, 32.

⁸⁶ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.1.

⁸⁷ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.30.

⁸⁸ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.15.

⁸⁹ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.17.

Fed'kovych, the most talented Ruthenian writer of the time, was recruited for 250 Gulden a year to produce 12 printed leaves of popular texts.⁹⁰ In 1875 *Prosvita* decided to start publishing a popular newspaper, for which the society bought appropriate texts from a publishing house in Leipzig – *Volks und Jugendbibliothek*.⁹¹ In 1876 when Rev. Nehrebets'kyi proposed his book *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*, it was criticized by Iuliian Tselevych and, at another session, by Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, because the author “takes a false position towards the concept of history in general, he assigns all the movements to single individuals and not to the people (nation).”⁹² The book was never published by *Prosvita*.

Criticizing *Prosvita* for not publishing books on economic problems is not just. The society published books offering purely practical advice (on farming, household management, bee-keeping, plowing etc.) just as the Kachkovskii society did. However, *Prosvita* surveys showed that this kind of literature was not as popular among readers as the society's other publications, and it therefore reduced the numbers of copies of “economic brochures” it published, waiting for a time when, through other readings, peasants would become more interested in the economy.⁹³ Books of more concrete advices for peasants were not limited to the sphere of economics. At the end of the 1870s, a decision was taken to publish more books of practical legal advises.⁹⁴

Let's look into the first books *Prosvita* published. The first and most famous series of publications was the reading anthology *Zoria (Star)*. The first issue of this anthology series with readings for common people (1869) opened with the article “Something about Literacy.” The article describes the progress of humanity from the “wild people” to the contemporary “machine civilization” showing that language was the tool which helped humanity overcome its “wild” condition. Writing helped humanity to reach an even higher stage of development, that of civilization. Civilization here is defined as “better customs (or order – Ukrainian *poriadky*) everywhere.”⁹⁵ This “better order,” which became a pervasive motif in all the society's published appeals, appears here for the first time; the task of Ruthenian villagers was to reorganize their communities according to the rules of this “better order.” Better order was based on proper knowledge, and literacy was the prerequisite for obtaining such knowledge.

⁹⁰ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.20.

⁹¹ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.28.

⁹² VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.35.

⁹³ Ibid., 50.

⁹⁴ Belei, *Dvadtsiat' i piat' lit.*, 50.

⁹⁵ “Deshcho pro pysmenstvo,” *Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei*, (Vydannia tovarystva “Prosvita,” kn.1) (L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1869), 3.

It was said that even to be a good Christian one had to be literate nowadays; the same was true of one's rights and obligations – an illiterate person would be ignorant of them.⁹⁶ Only literate and well-read people were said to be able to navigate the modern conditions of the world. Germany and Germans were given as an example of a better order and effective civilization. On Sundays instead of drinking literate people would read Psalms just like the Germans did.⁹⁷ These examples should not be seen as naïve, as proposing an obsolete remedy and avoiding the real source of the problems of Galician peasants. These examples propagated new values and emphasized the change in subjective attitudes. They used religion, which had been associated with knowledge and proper behavior under the old order, to bring these values down to the peasants. The article calls for transformation and believes that such a transformation needed be grounded in the change of individual attitudes. The authors of these publications believed that a pretty good liberal legal and political framework already existed and that their task was to make peasants understand this framework.

The story about literacy continued in other issues of *Zoria*. Another article, “Something about Books and Newspapers” (1871), employed the phrase Shevchenko had used in one of his most famous poems, entitled “To The Dead, Alive and Yet To Be Born, My Fellow Countrymen in Ukraine and Outside of It...,” when referring to peasants, calling them a “younger brother.”⁹⁸ The article describes how at first light was hidden from the “dark brother,” how this changed with the invention of the printing press (by Germans), and how books became cheaper and accessible even to the “younger brother.”⁹⁹ However, not all books were said to possess equal value. Just as there are different books for different professions, there were different books for different nations: “these are different for Germans and different for Poles, different for Muscovites and different for the Ruthenians or Ukrainians.” It is interesting that no point is made about the technical inaccessibility of books in other languages to Ruthenian-speaking peasants; reading books in one's own language is presented as one among other moral imperatives. Perhaps for the author it was clear that the peasants were able to read Polish and “Muscovite,” and even German books as well as Ruthenian ones. There are some indications that in many cases reading in Polish was easier for the peasants than reading in Ruthenian.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 4-5.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 7-8.

⁹⁸ In fact, Shevchenko does not specify whom he means when he calls his readers to embrace “the younger brother,” but usually it is interpreted as a call for the intelligentsia to embrace the peasantry.

⁹⁹ “Deshcho pro knyzhky i hazety,” in Volodymyr Shashkevych, (ed.), *Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei*, (Vydannia tovarystva “Prosvita”, kn.5) (L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1871), 5.

Besides books, newspapers and periodicals are also mentioned. From them people can find out about things going on in the world, about current prices and so on.

If you read books and newspapers, you will find there such a right, such a way, that your landholding, your oxen, your cart, your cow, your necklace will come back to you. [(the reference is made to the property peasants most often were loosing to the usurers)] You will also manage to find various methods [to use] against the literate tricksters because, as you will see, the Most Enlightened Monarch and those who draft rights or laws do not mean humans harm, and that is why they have also established laws against those who twist and distort the law.¹⁰⁰

Literacy is said to be very helpful in politics – one could check out what one's deputy was doing, to write a letter to the newspaper about one's own village and to right wrongs taking place there. The article stated that there was an obvious difference between nations, and one could see that Germans and Czechs were doing better precisely because they were literate.¹⁰¹

Another important article from the 1869 anthology is called "Something about Humans." The text explains a hierarchy allegedly existed among humans. Humanity is presented as divided into five species with Ruthenians belonging to the white one. It is stressed that the white species of humans had subdued all the others.¹⁰² Another thing worth noting in this article is the mode the the reader is addressed – the author uses "we" instead of "you" every time he mentions Ruthenians.¹⁰³ While the species are ordered hierarchically, there appears to be a pluralist reality among white people. Not all of them are Ruthenians, and although "we are a great force of 15,000,000," there are other nations as well. Some of these nations are closer to Ruthenians and have a similar language – they are called Slavs.¹⁰⁴

As with the stories on literacy, this story about species and peoples was also continued in the *Prosvita* anthologies. The next installment dealt with the history

¹⁰⁰ "Deshcho pro knyzhky i hazety," 9.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 10-11, 12, 16-17.

¹⁰² There is an interesting moment in this argument. Ruthenian peasants did not have any notion of white skin pigmentation being somehow superior. We know that because in a folk song about serfdom, whiteness was associated with poverty and starvation, and the words "we are white, as day is white" meant "poor, very poor." Similarly, cholera is depicted as "the white lady" (*bila pani*). Now the nationalist discourse was assigning a new value to whiteness. Anatol' Vakhnianyn, "Deshcho pro liudei," *Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei*, (Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita", kn.1) (L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1869), 18.

¹⁰³ In all the program articles like this *Prosvita* would use "we," while Rev. Naumovych and many Kachkovskii publications preferred "you."

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. 23.

of humans. It asserted that all order and society itself began with the introduction of private property. This was also the starting point for various social divisions inside of humanity. One of the first social divisions was the division of humankind into agricultural and nomadic populations: the first one was good and another one was bad.¹⁰⁵ The goodness of the first one derived from its settled character, being the outcome of the possession of property. In another story, the Ruthenian nation was positioned in confrontation with the world of wild and nomadic people. Thus, the more general history of mankind was concretized in national Ruthenian history; the Ruthenians appeared as a nation facing barbaric nomads from Asia and defending civilization.

In this article, there is a description of the settled Ruthenian nation and its land:

as far back as written memory about our area goes, Ruthenians was already sitting in joyous and quiet cities, villages and hamlets, loving its fields and raising bees, a free nation. Our nation was agricultural from the very beginning.

The nation had a joyous and quiet life. Rus'-Ukraine was well known in foreign countries; it was well-ordered. At first there were democratic communities, and then they started electing princes to rule the land. But at certain point this Eden was crushed by a deluge of the "Other."¹⁰⁶ While the historical discourse of 1848 knew only one "Other," the Poles, now this new "Other" was introduced not to strengthen some concrete animosity but to position Ruthenians among the nations with a propensity to civilization.

After this historical excursus, the article turns back to the differences between enlightened and backward nations. It bemoans contemporary Ruthenians, saying that they are not much better from the "wild" nations, which were barred by nature from the benefits of civilization. Ruthenians still needed to become human, enlightened and wise, just as their ancestors in the bygone golden days of ancient Rus' had been.¹⁰⁷ This means that Ruthenians, belonging objectively to the white race and therefore potentially civilized, still needed to make a subjective effort not to slide into barbarity and inferiority, and to overcome ignorance. While the generation of 1848 hoped for slow inevitable change fostered by a liberal state, the new populists emphasized the potential agency of common people.

¹⁰⁵ [Volodymyr Barvins'kyi] Vasy' B., "Deshcho pro pershykh liudei – ta pro vsiaki narody," in Volodymyr Shashkevych, (ed.), *Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei*, (Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita", kn.5) (L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1871), 21-24.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 34.

¹⁰⁷ Ivan Barvins'kyi, "Khto my? Chy narod svityi, chy mozhe taky liude dyki," *Nyva. Chytanochka dlia selina i mishchan* (L'viv, 1872).

According to *Prosvita*, there were some natural divisions in the world, and they were based on differences in climate. The best climate formed the best race, the white one: “The majority of people live in these areas: Englishmen, Germans, Frenchmen and us, Slavs-Ruthenians.”¹⁰⁸ This means that in terms of naturally inherited differences, the Ruthenians were lucky enough to belong to the group of the most fit, to the better part of humankind. What Ruthenians lacked was awareness:

there is a need for a nation to understand what the common good is and attend to it because for people to become enlightened and not dark they need to understand how to govern themselves and to value the common good higher than the good of an individual.¹⁰⁹

Ivan Barvins'kyi developed the story of the Ruthenian nation in another collection of texts for popular reading. In this collection he explains that whatever our “Ruthenian” nation is called – Ruthenians, Little Russians, Galicians, Ukrainians – the fact remains that “we” live in the territory stretching from the Carpathians to the Caucasus and Black Sea. It is interesting that this early Ukrainian popular cultural production still emphasized ancient Rus’ and glorified princely times in line with the discourse from 1848, while we know that the authors of these popular publications belonged to national-populist student groups and styled themselves as heirs of the Cossack tradition as early as the beginning of the 1860s. They wore “Cossack dress” and considered the Cossack times to be the focal point in the development of the Ukrainian nation.¹¹⁰ The key to this contradiction lies in the propaganda of the “better order,” of civilization. The common people were thought not to be ready yet for exposure to the Cossack tradition and had first to be imbued with the ideas of proper civilization and culture.

Besides scientific and historical articles, amusement stories, tales, anecdotes etc. were also published in the *Prosvita* series of popular books, usually with a simple moral at the end. However, even these amusement stories were carefully selected and weighted. If we compare tales that appeared in *Prosvita* publications with the folk tales collected by ethnographers, we find that the published tales offer a totally different set of rules for the behavior of both characters and readers. Old advices from the folk tales could include not to spend the night at a tavern where

¹⁰⁸ Vasyly B. “Deshcho pro pershykh liudei – ta pro vsiaki narody,” 31-32.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 33.

¹¹⁰ For an example of the glorification of ancient Rus’ as late as the 1870s see Vinok, *Chytanochka dlia selian i mishchan*, (Vydannia „Prosvity,” kn. 44) (L’viv 1877). For the Cossackophile attitudes of national-populists in the 1860s see Ostap Sereida, „Hromady rannikh narodovtsiv u skhidnii Halychyni (60-i roky XIX stolittia),” in *Ukraina: kul’turna spadshchyna, natsional’na svidomist’, derzhavnist’. Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu Feodosiia Stebliia*, No.9 (L’viv, 2001), 378-392.

you see an old male tavern-keeper and a young female, not to follow the will of your heart, not to tell strangers where other people are going, not to take faster routes, not to give one's cattle to another without supervision, not to let one's wife go dancing without supervision, to stay overnight where the night falls on you and so on.¹¹¹ When we compare these rules with those propagated in the tales published by *Prosvita*, the moral of the latter appears to be less innocent and outrageously commonsensical. Obeying God's commandments, entrepreneurship, industrious work, honesty and straightforwardness seem to be quite new imperatives for social behavior, especially if presented as a coherent set. The dense peasants that appear in these tales and fables, ethnic jokes, and anecdotes taken from an urban setting introduced readers to a different world, with different values and rules.

There are religious themes in *Prosvita* publications, but this religious aspect is not limited to the "Church fables" despised by Pavlyk. Religion could be connected with nationality as in the story "The Church," with which the third book of *Zoria* starts. The story begins with a description of the building that stands in the center of the village, a building well known to every villager, a building in poor condition and in need of renovation. Then a parallel is drawn between this simple village church and Ruthenian history. It is claimed that simple village churches like this one saved the Ruthenian nation from decline and death. The lives of the saints were published in these books as well, but they did not constitute even a quarter of the publication's space. Most popular saints' lives were connected with Ruthenian history and told the story of Ruthenian saints. Moreover, religious texts went hand-in-hand with various information on nature, explaining that the moon was a satellite of the earth, the principle of gravity, etc.

Quite often religious texts served to introduce scientific discourse. For example, the fourth issue opens with a story about St. Nicholas. This story is followed by a story about sea and ships, about the warmth and need of the thermometer, about volcanoes, potatoes, and compost. Then we have information on the Ruthenian people, "poorest [of those] on earth." There was an article on L'viv and a description of its Ruthenian churches, which served as proof of the city's Ruthenian character. The article ends with a call to join *Prosvita* (whose executive was in L'viv) and to gather under its leadership.¹¹² Among the patriotic verses in this issue we can find a poem by Osyp Markov about the "native land," for which people had yet to get freedom and glory.¹¹³ As far as I know this is the first

¹¹¹ This sample is taken from the old man's advices in several tales from one collection – Iulian Iavorskii, "Pamiatniki galitsko-russkoi narodnoi slovesnosti", in *Zapiski Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva po otdeleniiu etnografii*, t.XXVII, vyp.1 (Kiev, 1915), 176, 178-80.

¹¹² *Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei*, (Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," kn.4) (L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1870), 57-66.

¹¹³ Ibid..

published text of this protégée of Rev. Korostens'kyi's. It is quite remarkable that this peasant son, who went on to become one of the leading Russophile politicians, first published with *Prosvita*. The very cult of St. Nicholas was brought in not to strengthen old religious belief but to introduce the custom of celebrating St. Nicholas' day, with gifts given to children and to each other.

The scientific information in *Prosvita* publications constitutes a completely new block of themes unheard of in Ruthenian Galicia. These scientific texts covered a whole range of topics from the wonders of geography and to the basics of biology. Getting peasants to understand how nature worked and what its laws were was considered to be very important. A peasant, living close to nature, was allegedly predisposed to scientific thinking based on empirical experience. Adding to this empirical, commonsensical experience, publications provided a sound theoretical foundation, arming peasants with knowledge and changing the very structure of their "empirical experience." In separate articles scientific explanations from various fields were intertwined so that the boundaries between physics, biology, and hygiene blurred. Scientific discoveries of the laws of nature were presented with a propaedeutical aim and fostered behavior grounded in scientific knowledge.¹¹⁴

Explanations of the physical world went hand-in-hand with explanations of the modern social world. Popular books explained the social and material worlds with the same authority and truthfulness. Articles on nation went hand-in-hand with articles "On Air" and "On Water." If Hrinchenko's Mykola was mixing together microscopes and saints, his Galician counterparts' blend also included social categories. History itself, together with modern social science, appeared as a necessary part of the modern "structure of feeling," which the peasants were being helped to obtain.¹¹⁵ Hrinchenko said that peasants believed characters they met in literature were real. *Prosvita* publications included plenty of stories "from Galician villages" in which characters' behavior was represented and evaluated according with the prescriptions provided by society's other texts.¹¹⁶

The discourse on nationality in *Prosvita*'s popular publications is different from the discourse of 1848. While in 1848 it was only about tradition and the spiritual community of the nation united and expressed in the Church and the holy Cyrillic script, this time nationality is presented as part of a larger world order, which is impossible to bypass. Nationality is presented as more mundane and because of that – more obliging, as both the way the modern world is organized and a key to get into that world. Moreover, nationality becomes part of the scientifically recognized world order; nationality becomes a reality equal to any

¹¹⁴ V. T. [Volodyslav Taniachkevych], *Pro zhytie* (L'viv, 1878).

¹¹⁵ See my article "Obtaining History" ???

¹¹⁶ Volodymyr Shashkevych, (ed.), *Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei*, (Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," kn.5) (L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1871), 56-7.

other physical reality – like thunder, the moon, the stars, or rain; except that it is more important and requires more complex behavior. Just as peasants were fed scientific explanations of natural phenomena, they could also find scientific explanations of cultural, religious, ethnic and language differences in *Prosvita* publications. Just as in the case of natural phenomena, these were things not unfamiliar to the peasants. But now these differences were explained in terms of racial hierarchies and national classifications, which appeared to be as scientific as the explanations from the realm of the natural sciences. Empirical encounters with difference and the social world now had to be experienced through the social theory provided in popular publications.

Again, it is not true that there was no social discourse in *Prosvita* publications. As an example we can take the novella *Peasant and Lord* (*Muzhyk i pan*) by Volodymyr Barvins'kyi. As in the later radical publications, here we see a social antagonism. It is not yet all-encompassing, it is not represented as a class antagonism the word class is not used even once, but a dislike of the “caste of parasites” is present and seen as well-grounded and just. The peasants in the novella complain that: “These lords were born from Evil; we do not enjoy even a moment of peace with them (*a nam z nymy prosvitku nemaie*).”

There are other differences besides class terminology between this publication and the later social critique of the radicals. While the radicals would say that the poor and the rich, the exploited and the exploiters and the struggle between them were a universal phenomenon, Barvins'kyi has one of his characters, a certain Vasyl' who “has seen the world,” say that peasants and lords are “only in our land.” And not only lords but also other unique “parasites,” like Jews and corner scribes. According to the book, this is a peculiarly Ruthenian plague, which has been allowed to spread “because we do not know our own weight, we do not honor ourselves and do not know how to deserve the honor of others.” Western European countries are seen as having succeeded in introducing the principle of equality. Barvins'kyi says that, in fact, even in the country where Ruthenians live, in the face of the law all are equal. The problem is that people do not value the law and do not care about the opportunities it gives them, preferring (unlike Germans) to waste their time and indulge in drinking. If only Ruthenians behaved according to these three imperatives: “work, thriftiness, science (education),” there would be:

no lords, no peasants, and no Jews in this world because every honest man would be his own lord, and Jewry that lives only on our addictions, drinking and laziness would not survive among honest and working people and would disappear, as well as all other [forms of social] leprosy.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁷ Volodymyr Barvins'kyi, “Muzhyk i pan,” *Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei*, (Vydannia tovarystva “Prosvita”, kn.6) (L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1872), 18-31.

Our next example could be the book Bill of Exchange and Usury as Our Misfortunes (A Lesson On How Our People Should Save Themselves From The Usurer's Hands and Debts on The Promissory Notes and How We Can Protect Our Estates From Disappearance). The book describes the process of peasants signing bills of exchange to Jews, particularly Jewish ways of approaching and exploiting naïve peasants, who did not suspect any treachery and were totally inexperienced in the handling of legal documents. This is presented as a larger problem of integrating the peasantry into the modern world. The peasants are said to live for today while Jews think of the future and use the peasants for their own ends. The brochure depicts Jews as spiders and peasants as flies caught in their webs. Jewish usury enslaves peasants they work only to repay the interest on the debts they have incurred. Jews sell peasant notes to each other, debts accumulate and, as the result, peasant farms are sold by court order. Corner scribes, whom peasants trust and whose help they seek when summoned to court, acquire the rest of a peasant's money without providing any substantial help. The moral of this story was summed up this way:

Remember, good people, do not sign bills of exchange, and do not hand them into usurer's hands, let's work wholeheartedly and help each other like native brothers in difficult times. Let's not forget that only through work, sobriety and reason can we become wealthy; do not forget that thriftiness is the basis of our well-being, and usurers, drinking and bills are our ruin.¹¹⁸

Another early *Prosvita* book, How Taras and Motria Went to Market [(iarmarka)]: A Book for Village People, describes a good-natured peasant family which for some reason could not save any money and in spring always had to borrow grain for sowing from their neighbors. The husband did not drink or incur debts; he had only one habit equal to addiction: the habit of making frequent trips to market. And market was not just about trade; it was also the way for peasants to participate in the life of the larger society. It meant entertainment and a break from the routine of village life. But characters' trip to town as described in the book turn into an arduous ordeal: everyone attacks the peasants, starting with Jews who beat the peasants and steal goods from their carts, and ending with the police, who charge ungrounded fines. During trading, Jews and other urban people attempt to cheat the peasants, and after the market trading is over and the peasants are celebrating the end of the market day in the tavern, the heroes of the story become drunk and suffer even greater losses.

¹¹⁸ Volodymyr Barvins'kyi, Veksel' i lykhva nasha bidal' [Nauka pro te, iaknashi liude maiut' ratuvatys' vid lykhvarskykh ruk i z vekselevykh dovhiv i jak mozhnan khoronyty nashi maietky vid zahlady], (Vydannia Prosvity, kn.35) (L'viv, 1875), 26.

The conclusion of this story was simple, and verbalized by Taras himself: “It would be so good if someone in the village took upon himself the duty of selling scythes, sickles, ... salt and pepper.” The author was saying that the old habit of the peasants not selling to each other but circulating everything through Jewish hands must cease. The peasants should establish a loan department in the village not for the sake of money, but for the sake of a happy life which is a life of work and reason.¹¹⁹ The ideal was to make Ruthenian villages independent of the Jewish towns and Polish administration controlling economic exchange and legal disputes. For this the peasants had to stop being simple producers of agricultural goods and become entrepreneurs. Thus the first contradiction, which is very important for modern Ukrainian history, appears: cities and towns which are the loci of modernization are in foreign hands, and the village has to be protected from their corrupting influence. The only hope for the Ukrainian movement was to modernize the villages to the extent that the distinction between city and countryside with respect to access to knowledge and culture would disappear.

There is a frequently quoted speech by Rev. Iosyf Zaiachkivs’kyi, a patriot of the 1848 generation. At the founding meeting of the *Prosvita* society, he stated that he was speaking on behalf of the “mute village people.”¹²⁰ This part of his speech represents symbolically how the roles were assigned in the “dialogue” between the movement and the peasants. The “people” were presented as mute but not deaf. *Prosvita* was working with the people; the society would assume the function of writing-talking, while the people were supposed to listen until they reached a certain level of consciousness and understanding, and were to provide feedback of their own. Because of the one-sided nature of this cultural exchange based on the objective peasant backwardness, *Prosvita* felt that there was a need to lower the level of discourse and to talk to people in a manner they could understand.¹²¹ This was the solution to the problem encountered by the generation of 1848. People were not expected to fully understand things at once, but this did not have to discourage the movement from its pedagogic activities. Moreover, the peasants’ attainment of a certain level of consciousness and civilization could not be left to itself. The movement had to control the process; otherwise the peasants would become vulnerable to the danger of cosmopolitanism.

It is very important to realize that the “lower” level of discourse in *Prosvita* publications did not mean poor language. *Prosvita* was able to recruit the most talented Ruthenian author of that time, Iurii Fed’kovych, who was from the Sambir district’s petty gentry and whose relative for some time served as local district captain. Fed’kovych wrote the most popular of the 1870s *Prosvita* novellas.

¹¹⁹ P. S. i N. V., *Jak jarmarkuvaly Taras z Motreiu? Knyzhochka dlja sil’skykh liudej* (L’viv: nakladom t-va “Prosvita”, 1871).

¹²⁰ Belei, *Dvadtsiat’ i piat’ lit.*, 110.

¹²¹ Belei, *Dvadtsiat’ i piat’ lit.*, 14-15.

The book was called *Farmazoni*, which is corrupted “freemasons.” One can often find *farmazoni* in Ruthenian Galician folklore – these were people who sold their souls to the Devil in exchange for earthy riches. The theme of this book was recommended to Fed’kovych by Omelian Ohonovs’kyi, professor of the Ruthenian literature at L’viv University, whom the radicals despised as “scholastic” and “obscurant.” This book was a remake of the story originally published in Hungarian. Published on 15 May 1873, (the 25th anniversary of emancipation) in 3,000 copies, the whole edition sold out by the end of the year. In 1874 another edition followed with 5,000 copies, and a third edition came out in 1900 with 8,000 copies.¹²²

Farmazoni is about a peasant who comes back to his native village after having served in the army. Being an enlightened person, he builds a better house, becomes wealthy, for village standards, and wonders how to enlighten his co-villagers. In the meantime a rumor spreads that this peasant is a freemason and that is the real reason for his well-being. Peasants approach him, and he agrees to accept thirty of them to be freemasons for a trial period. One night he organizes a meeting of these thirty peasants with two disguised “freemason leaders.” The peasants take an oath to fulfill ten freemason commandments for seven years seven months and seven weeks. The commandments are: to fulfill all the church rituals and respect clerical authority, to drink only water and milk, to keep their farms clean and in an ideal order, to work every workday without laxness, to attend to their bodily hygiene, to build and furnish better houses, to meet every week to read books and sing songs, to send their children to school, and to celebrate weddings, christenings and burials in small companies without drinking and dancing. The peasants took the oath because it coincided with their ideas about how gentlemen freemasons lived.

They started to live much better, and when the trial period had passed, they discovered that the two disguised “freemason leaders” were their village priest and a Ruthenian working in the state administration. The priest explained that they had made use superstition for the sake of the peasants’ happiness and the salvation of their souls:

Freemasons really exist in the world, but these are not people who sign [a contract] with the Devil, but people who resist the Devil by all possible means, but most of all by not drinking, by respecting God’s Church and Commandments, by not celebrating amusements and dancing, by learning the truth and reading good books. Not distracted by the urge to go to the taverns, they build good houses, live comfortably and find entertainment in work and well run farming, just like you did for seven years, seven

¹²² [Vasyl’ Simovych] V. S., an introduction to Iurii Fed’kovych, *Farmazoni abo iak to trydtsiat’ stibnarivskyykh gospodariv zapysalosia chortovi i iak vony za sim lit, sim misiatsiv i visim nedil’ duzhe zabahatily. Krasna i pravdyva povist’ dlia rozumnykh gospodariv*, Chetverte vydannia, v soti rokovyny persшого redaktora vydan’ Prosvity, (Vydannia „Prosvity,” No. 802(8)) (L’viv, 1934), 6.

months and seven weeks. Therefore you can call yourself freemasons and consider this name an honor for yourself.¹²³

Farmazonny signals several things. According to it, it is not enough to publish books; village communities had to be penetrated. The movement could not rely on state education; the need to organize networks of activists in villages and to co-opt peasants into the movement was emphasized. The obvious figure ideal for such penetration was a priest, although *Prosvita* books had always pointed towards enlightened advanced peasants as promoters of change in the village as well. *Farmazonny* allows for the use of old “superstition” as a means to better ends. It shows that even “wrong,” “mixed-up” peasant ideas can be used for the goal of enlightenment.

The organization in the village as described in *Farmazonny* has definite paternalist overtones. There are guides who lead the peasants in a certain direction without giving them the real reasons for this kind of behavior. It is interesting that the priest is very positive about freemasonry. This would have been impossible at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth century, when freemasonry in clerical Ruthenian discourse was strongly connected with world Jewry and large capital. *Farmazonny* shows how liberal the framework, Greek Catholic clerical activists worked in the 1860s-1870s, was.

Farmazonny started a whole tradition of novellas inventing exemplary villages and showing how these villages had reached a certain level of well being and happiness. In many of them we find the motif of taking some “stupid” peasants ideas and with the help of these ideas making peasants realize the truth and adhere to good behavior. This kind of novella was especially popular in the 1870s. For example, in Ivan Barvins’kyi’s story, the enlightened peasant Maksym Ladan discloses to his co-villagers a way of finding money hidden in the earth in fact a plan to force them to plow deeper. The peasants follow this advice, do not find a hidden hoard but realize the way to capitalize more on the land. The village becomes a place where “sobriety, vigilance, labor, reason, order, and any other way to progress” rule.¹²⁴ Stories like this encouraged smarter peasants to engage in double games, justifying a certain hypocrisy if it served the higher goal of the enlightenment of the peasantry.

It is interesting to see how the discourse of sobriety was integrated into representations of the Galician peasantry in popular accounts of nineteenth-century history. As an example we can take Volodymyr Barvins’kyi’s Thirty Years of Sobriety. The story starts in 1846 and states that, back then, there was a triple misfortune: from the landlords, from the Jews and from the peasants themselves.

¹²³ Iurii Fed’kovych, *Farmazonny* (L’viv, 1934, first edition 1873), 59-60.

¹²⁴ Ivan Barvins’kyi, “Ot vam takyi stato, shcho hroshi z zemli vykopuie,” *Nyva. Chytanochka dlja selina i mishchan* (L’viv, 1872), 4.

In 1846 a priest in one village started a sobriety brotherhood, the peasants took an oath not to drink vodka but it did not help, the Jew switched to arrack, and the peasants continued drinking.¹²⁵ The text shows what determined the failure of the 1840s' sobriety movement. Although there were several reasons, according to the author the most important was peasant laziness. A lot of sincere effort was required to transform a person from lazy to righteous.¹²⁶ Because of this even emancipation itself did not help. It changed the legal and political framework, but subjective transformation was also necessary:

The slavery of our people was hard, and there was no hope among us to liberate our people. Therefore once it is said: "freedom, there is no *robot* anymore, you are brothers and not subjects," the outcome can well be that many people will waste themselves. ... Where will you go after receiving this freedom if you do not even know where you can go and where you should go to become truly free, happy and healthy?¹²⁷

It is just like leaving a sick person outdoors; instead you should provide him with a warm house where he can recover:

And I am saying to you that there is such a warm, healthy and spacious house for our people. This house is not only for our people but for everyone who is dark, ignorant and inexperienced. And this house is called reason, science and enlightenment. And I am telling you that evil fate will not leave our nation until it becomes enlightened, acquires full reason, apprehends light and people, and feels its own power in itself.¹²⁸

After this theoretical and historical introduction, the story itself starts. Of two brothers, the characters in Volodymyr Barvins'kyi's book, Klym is the one who stays in the village. There is no one to guide him along the road of righteousness and soon, under the pressure of his co-villagers, he falls back into drinking. The second brother, Ivan, becomes an apprentice in town and develops successfully.¹²⁹ In this story the crucial difference between Galician national-populists (*narodovtsy*) and Russian *narodniki* can be seen. In the Galician case, there is no glorification of the peasant community (commune). The author acknowledges its coercive powers, which quite often doom progressive enlightenment initiatives. The peasant community is not of much use while it

¹²⁵ Volodymyr Barvins'kyi, *Trytsiat' lit tverezosty. Opovidanie pro te, shcho treba robyty, shchob statysia tverezym cholovikom*, (Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.42) (L'viv, 1876), 16-17.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 52.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 56-59.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 63-66.

¹²⁹ Ibid., *passim*.

remains ignorant and barbarian, so the emphasis is placed on its necessary transformation. Volodymyr Barvins'kyi praises literacy, which allows for knowledge to be transferred from generation to generation and describes it as the foundation of any cultural transformation.¹³⁰

When the two brothers' village gets involved in a sobriety movement once more, in the 1870s, Ivan goes back to the village to help. In this new sobriety movement, he appeals to villagers only with an economic argument, demonstrating to them how much the village spends per year on vodka.¹³¹ This new sobriety movement points towards those who make peasants drink.. Polish landlords and Jewish tavern-keepers benefiting from the right of propination, and is directed against their economic powers as well. But as in the real lives of Galician villagers, there was not much direct contact between peasants and landlords after the end of the servitude struggles, and the animosity between the estate and the village in both folklore and this book is the animosity between the peasants and the estate's servants. In the book the latter are despised as those "who mingling with the community, spreading Polish thoughts and Polish mockery among our peasants."¹³²

To find out if a character in a *Prosvita* publication is a positive or a negative one, the reader may check on how he behaves during elections. Elections serve as a litmus test for village characters: immoral people always vote for Polish candidates. If there are no elections, there are other activities linking evil character with the Poles, their servants and Jews. However, negative characters in these brochures are not the national traitors we find in twentieth-century publications. They are traditional peasant activists, associated with vices like lotteries, fortune-telling, fighting vampires and other superstitions.¹³³ These old ways of false knowledge hinder the acquisition of awareness and prevent people from accepting the scientific revelations of the movement. Their renegade behavior is a result of their backwardness.

Popular books also provided images of famous real men with whom the audience could identify. In the 1870s there were two widely distributed *Prosvita* biographies. The first was the lives of Saint Borys and Hlib, the first Ruthenian saints, and the other was – a biography of Taras Shevchenko, an idol of the national-populists and the greatest Ukrainian poet. This latter popular biography was written by Professor Omelian Ohonovs'kyi and differed remarkably from later canonical biographies of Shevchenko.¹³⁴ Instead of a martyrology, which one

¹³⁰ Ibid., 84-86.

¹³¹ Ibid., 105-107, 112.

¹³² Ibid., 110.

¹³³ Kalynnyk z Hryhorova, "Zhadka za staroho diaka Trofyma," *Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei*, (Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.6) (L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1872), 7-10.

¹³⁴ I am referring to twentieth century nationalist and Soviet traditions.

who has grown up in the Soviet Ukraine of the 1980s would expect from a Shevchenko's biography, Ohonovs'kyi depicted a successful and glorious life, in which a simple Ukrainian peasant rose, emphasizing that this path was open to other peasants as well. Like many Galician peasants, Taras Shevchenko did not attend school, he taught himself to read and write, and despite all this, his texts are so good they leave an impression that "he learned his wisdom overseas." Ohonovs'kyi stressed that people like Shevchenko could be found in our towns and villages, and, "perhaps, you readers, know them,"¹³⁵ and emphasized that the name of Shevchenko, a man born in a peasant house, was more famous than the names of many kings and learned men. Shevchenko had written beautiful poems, and his glory came from them. This glory is based on the fact that his poems are beautiful, and everything beautiful is valued highly in the world. Shevchenko was defending simple people, freedom and enlightenment. The fact that Shevchenko was born across the border did not matter. There were even more Ruthenians in Ukraine, "thus Shevchenko was the same Ruthenian as anyone else among us; he is our true brother and friend, which is why his writing concerns not only Ukrainians but also us, Galician Ukrainians."¹³⁶ Ohonovs'kyi managed in one sentence to apply the term Ruthenians to the Ukrainian population of Russian Ukraine and the term Ukrainians to the Ruthenian population of Austrian Galicia.

I am not claiming that all *Prosvita* products were of a high quality in terms of their explanatory power and contribution to the creation of the new framework.¹³⁷ But they were certainly more purposeful and meaningful than Mykhailo Drahomanov and, following him, Franko and Pavlyk could ever acknowledge.¹³⁸ Even some of the moralizing books that were so often criticized later are very interesting and played their part in the project of civilizing the Galician countryside. An example of this kind of prescriptive literature is The Book of Wisdom or the Life of an Honest Person: What It Should Look Like According to Divine and Human Laws written by Rev. Kyrylo Selets'kyi. The book consists of two parts, or so-called "mirrors." One mirror is for children so that they "grow up in wisdom and fear of God, become rich with reason and science, used to work and are careful of evil," and another one for the middle-aged and elderly, explaining to them "how to be useful to people and pleasant to God."

¹³⁵ Omelian Ohonovs'kyi, *Zhytie Tarasa Shevchenka. Chytanka dlia selian i mishchan* (L'viv, 1876), 5.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹³⁷ Perhaps a good example of these is [Pavlo Svientsits'kyi] Pavlo Svii, *Baiky* (L'viv: Nakladom t-va "Prosvita", 1874).

¹³⁸ Ol'ha Drahomanova-Kosach, Mykhailo Drahomanov, "Russkie literaturnye obshchestva v Galitsii (Korespondentsiia 'V[estnik] Evropy)," in Mykhailo Drahomanov, *Literaturno-publitsychni pratsi*, t.1 (Kyiv: "Naukova dumka," 1970), 230.

Selets'kyi's book stresses that the most important thing is one's own conscience: "a man with a clear conscience has earned heaven while already on the Earth."¹³⁹ We should keep in mind that the new discourse I am trying to describe here and conventionally designate as nationalist, appealed to the conscience and represented the behavior it rejected as incompatible with a clear conscience. That conscience could remain clear only if unspoiled by renegade behavior. The book describes humans' internal spiritual organization. Reason appears as "the most important thing among the staff God gave to a man!"¹⁴⁰ Conscience only aids reason, which determines human behavior. The task of the conscience is to restrain reason according to ethical principles. To function properly, reason has to be constantly nourished with science, without which "it would die out just as fire dies without fuel."¹⁴¹ Literate people know certain basic things and are conscious of their position in the world. For example, a literate person is supposed to know the location of L'viv, Vienna and "the glorious Kyiv with gold-headed churches."¹⁴²

The Book of Wisdom called for special attention to be paid to children: "While children are small, you can make of them whatever you like."¹⁴³ It was necessary to send them to school, but besides this, they had to be educated in everything required to run a successful farm. If one had several children, one was advised to send them into different trades. This was a common topic in 1870s publications in both the Russophile and Ukrainian camps. Strong, rich village communities were not a goal in themselves; they had to procreate biologically and sociologically, penetrating all social strata. National-populists did not imagine the Ukrainian nation as remaining peasant forever: "best is when the son of an honest farmer studies and becomes either a priest or teacher or an official."¹⁴⁴ There was more literature on raising children, which introduced new methods of baby care based on scientific findings and criticized old superstitions, but the bulk of this literature appeared later, starting with the 1880s and then – well into the 1900s.¹⁴⁵ It offered both spiritual as well as detailed practical advice on the right

¹³⁹ K. Seletskii [parokh v Kobylntsi], Knyha mudrosty abo zhytjie chasnoho cholovika, iak ono pislia zakoniv Bozhykh i liudskykh buty povynno (L'viv, 1874), 5.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 9-10.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 24-25.

¹⁴² Ibid., 25.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 21.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 30.

¹⁴⁵ These publications started with the book Deshcho pro zdorovlie, (Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.61) (L'viv, 1881).

way to wrap swaddling clothes, wash, feed and so on, although it is hard to imagine peasants following such advice in the 1870s.¹⁴⁶

Despite all its pioneering experiments, the populism of the 1860s and 1870s shared with 1848 one fundamental aspect: its liberalism and individualism. For the change had to first occur on the individual level, and only then could some greater transformation of society follow. Having discovered the true picture of the world with the help of books and their human patrons and changed their behavior accordingly, individuals would build up a civic consciousness. Once the majority of the villagers acquired it, a civil society could be formed, and a strong and viable nation would appear.

The Book of Wisdom expected youngsters to spend some time in apprenticeship (*cheliadnyky*), which would widen their worldview: “it would be good if you did not stay in the same place, but went to Krakow, to Prague, to Berlin, to Vienna (if at all possible, you should go to France and England as well.)”¹⁴⁷ After this apprenticeship, young men were supposed to come back and start their own independent trades and families. Old people were not supposed to remarry and those too young were not to marry either because if they did, the old people would take potential brides from the younger and the younger would degenerate. These were the “duties of men towards themselves.” There were also “duties towards the community and the land”

You, a kind brother, are a son of the land, of the Ruthenian land, on which all people who speak the same language and glorify God in the same way, who have the same customs and tradition, are in relation to each other, [are] like brothers, and should stand together for their own well-being....¹⁴⁸

Why was this caring and standing for each other needed? “If all people did not care for each other, what would happen in the world? The stronger would oppress the weaker and extract their wealth.” This just community had to be built starting with the lowest level, with one’s own community. These were the new rules of behavior, which had to substitute for the older rules of co-existence in the community, the rules of the civilized society the peasants were joining.

To conclude my description of the *Prosvita*’s printed production, I shall give some numerical data on the publications. Between 1873 and 1877 the editions of *Prosvita* popular books numbered four, five, eight, but most often 10 thousand copies. Only books on the economy or books with practical advice, which were

¹⁴⁶ Vinok. *Chytanochka dlia selian i mishchan*, (Vydannia “Prosvity,” kn. 44) (L’viv, 1877).

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 33-35.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 58.

not received well, were published in 2,000 copies.¹⁴⁹ The following books had editions of 10,000 copies:

Stories About The Forces Of Nature
Stories From The Lives Of [St.] Borys And Hlib
Shevchenko's Life
Short Stories For Children
What Is Supervision (On The Control Of Community Institutions And Organizations)
Stories About Heaven And Earth

8,000 copies: Work Well And Everything Will Be Well
Old Efrem (Fed'kovych's novel)
Songs About St. Nicholas
Book about usury (*Veksel' i lykba nasha bida*)

5,000 copies: The Village of Farmazony (2d edition)
A Sparrow (anthology of readings for children in elementary schools)
Stefan Kachala's What Is Destroying Us (3d edition)
Butterfly (a reader for the people)

4,000 copies: Volodymyr Barvins'kyi's Thirty Years of Sobriety

Between 1869 and 1878, *Prosvita* published 50 titles of popular books, which amounted altogether to 447,660 copies. There was actually a drop in the number of published copies between 1879 and 1888 when only 264,255 copies were published, albeit in 64 titles.¹⁵⁰ Besides these "popular" books, between 1871 and 1876 *Prosvita* published 17 textbooks for Ruthenian schools, amounting to 12,300 copies. Beginning in 1876, the Provincial School Council took over the publication of textbooks from *Prosvita*.¹⁵¹ This meant an end to the hopes of the 1848 generation to introduce changes through state structures and institutions.

Between 27 May 1875 and 15 June 1876 the most popular books, if to judge by their sales, were Bill of Exchange (1,971), Stories about Heaven and Earth (1,436), Songs to St. Nicholas (1,317), Freemasons (second edition, 1,301). In total that year the society sold 22,460 books.¹⁵² Similar number appears in the report from the next year – 22,736. This time most popular books were What is

¹⁴⁹ Ivan Belei, *Dvadtsiat' i piat' lit istorii tovarystva "Prosvity"*, 50.

¹⁵⁰ Stepan Pers'kyi, *Populiarna istoriia tovarystva „Prosvita”* (Naukovo-populiarna biblioteka tovarystva „Prosvita” ch.4, Vydannia tovarystva „Prosvita,” ch.780) (L'viv, 1932), 129.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 121.

¹⁵² *Spravozdanie richne z diatel'nosti vydilu t-va "Prosvita" za chas vid 27 Maia 1875 do 15 chervnia 1876* (L'viv, 1876).

Supervision (1,936), Sister (1,876), Stories for Children (1,758), Thirty Years of Sobriety (1,496), Lives of St. Borys and Hlib (1,100).¹⁵³ The most popular *Prosvita* books from those published in 1874 by 1881 were Freemasons (second edition from 1874, 4,768 copies sold), Perekotypole (4,258), Swallow (published as “reading anthology for Ruthenian people edited by L’viv freemasons) (4,128), Songs to St. Nicholas (edited by Iurii Fed’kovych) (4,275), Work Well and Everythings Will Be Well (4,157).¹⁵⁴ We do not have comparable data for the 1880s because starting with that decade the majority of copies of the books published in popular series were distributed to those paying membership dues.

Having analyzed some texts which are usually discarded as not worth looking at and showing that these texts were not as innocent or stupid as they appear, I would now like to go briefly through some key developments in the *Prosvita* society and to mention some choices made and some strategies employed. As early as 1868, at the founding meeting of the society, Andrii Sichyns’kyi, a student, said:

Every nation trying to gain independence should, first of all, care about raising its lower social strata, the popular masses, to such a level of Enlightenment that this mass could feel itself as a member of the national organism, feel national and civic self-respect and recognize the need for the existence of a nation as a separate national individuality, because no one else but the mass of people is the basis of everything.¹⁵⁵

In line with this statement already in 1870 the society ceased to be both scientific and educational, it delegated the “scientific” part to the newly created Shevchenko Society and defined its sole goal as the “spread of Enlightenment among Ukrainian nation.” A new statute, accepted in 1870, allowed the district organizations and agents to sell the society’s books in the countryside. When the Russophile Kachkovskii society was created in 1874 with membership dues of 1 Gulden yearly, *Prosvita* lowered its membership dues from 6 Gulden 24 Kreuzer to 1 Gulden yearly for peasants and townsmen and 2 Gulden for intelligentsia.¹⁵⁶ Beginning in 1876, each member of the society received a book published by the society bi-monthly for free.¹⁵⁷ Between 1876 and 1879 the *Prosvita* society published the newspaper Pys’mo z Prosvity for peasants, which it ceased publishing in 1879 when the Bat’kivshchyna newspaper was launched, and

¹⁵³ Spravozdanie z diiatel’nosti vydilu tovarystva “Prosvita” za rik administratsiinyi 1876/7 (L’viv, 1877).

¹⁵⁴ Spravozdanie z diiatel’nosti vydilu tovarystva “Prosvita” z 1.09.1879 do 31.12.1880 (L’viv, 1881).

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 20.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 26.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 138.

renewed in 1891 when the society turned towards the mass establishment of the village reading clubs, turning them into the society's primary cells.¹⁵⁸

To comply with the orthography demanded in schools, the society printed its publications in etymological orthography although it accepted phonetics for internal bookkeeping, correspondence and protocols. Even after phonetics were introduced into provincial schools in 1893, *Prosvita* still published in etymology because of the fear of losing its readership to the Kachkovskii society. Only in 1899, when the society's Extraordinary Assembly decided that there was no longer any reason to fear the Kachkovskii society did the *Prosvita* popular series switch to phonetics.¹⁵⁹

Another remarkable thing about the *Prosvita* society is the way its politics was centralized. This centralization is especially visible in the decision-making process and in the establishment of the society's politics, defining the kind of enlightenment needed at any particular moment. Such a centralized enlightenment strategy combined with the remarkable autonomy of the society's collective members, most of which were reading clubs, made the society highly effective. Only the central executive of *Prosvita* could conduct publishing activities; *Prosvita* branches were forbidden to publish on their own.

In the nineteenth century there was only one book published by a *Prosvita* branch, and after this *Prosvita* publicly announced that its publishing activities were reserved for its Central executive. This book was a published speech, which had been made at the founding of the Zolochiv branch of *Prosvita* by the well-known national populist priest (and moving spirit beyond the foundation of student *bromada*-s in the 1860s), Rev. Danylo Taniachkevych. The book is dedicated to the memory of his father and starts with the history of literacy as it is connected with the history of civilization. According to Rev. Taniachkevych, the contemporary era was characterized by the struggle to the make gains of the enlightenment accessible to all people:

With the railways and telegraphs that bring all ends of the world closer to each other, that exchange human thought with human thought, practice with practice, labor with labor, the spirit of Enlightenment encompasses the whole Earth.¹⁶⁰

Paradoxically, in these conditions of the globalizing world, the “natives of the land,”¹⁶¹ should become self-sufficient and able to make everything they needed

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 134.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 120.

¹⁶⁰ Danylo Taniachkevych, Lakhy! Chytana mova, shcho trymay na vechernytsiakh, vypravlenykh vid Fylij tovarystva “Prosvita” v Zolochivi, na ssame seredopistie (7(19)03) 1879 r. (L’viv, 1879), 21-22.

¹⁶¹ it is interesting that he uses the word *tuzemtsi* because later it would be used only to describe the aboriginal populations of the Americas, Africa, Asia and Australasia.

by themselves, not wasting even a single cloth, from which paper could be made. As an example he mentioned Sweden, which had risen to wealth from poverty. The rule that applies to material also applies to cultural capital: just as Ruthenians were supposed not to waste even a single cloth, they should be careful and not to waste their language.¹⁶² This program of modernization and globalization was thus one accepted by the national-populists.

In my opinion, the discourse of the *Prosvita* society even in its early versions was not at all conservative. It is true that there was no in-depth explanation of social conflicts and political economy, but it would have been very strange to find something like that back then. Underestimating the power of words has led researchers to overlook these popular books in their search for more “real,” palpable mechanisms. Unlike these researchers, the intellectual upbringing of the Galician national activists had taught them about the importance of the text. As Rev. Taniachkevych phrases it in his brochure: “everything in the world is a tale, and at the same time everything is true.”¹⁶³ Or as the chair of *Prosvita* society, landlord Volodyslav Fedorovych explained it to more educated audience in 1874:

Starting with the middle of the eighteenth century, since Adam Smith and Hume, the most famous social philosophers diligently proclaim that the solution of social question depends on the enlightenment of people...¹⁶⁴

Now let's take a look at *Prosvita's* most important competitor. In 1874 the Kachkovskii society was founded, and many historians believe that in the 1870s it was far more successful than *Prosvita*. It is associated with the lively activities of numerous rural priests in the 1870s, with the temperance movement, village reading clubs and so on. But it is forgotten that the society never managed to become an umbrella organization for all these activities. As in the case of the *Prosvita* society in the 1870s, the Kachkovskii society was little more than a publishing house with a clearly defined political orientation. Despite the fact that more priests sympathized with the Kachkovskii society than with *Prosvita* in the 1870s, these priests' activities in the communities were not the activities of the society.

The founder of the society and main promoter of its various activities was Rev. Ivan Naumovych. Arguably this man was the only person able to mobilize the rural clergy, the most important source of society's membership, for this kind of a project, but he was also the source of many of the problems the society encountered in its development. Naumovych's personality left a heavy imprint on

¹⁶² Danylo Taniachkevych, *Lakhyl*, 32-56.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 26.

¹⁶⁴ *Spravo zdanie z dilanii "Prosvity" vid chasu zaviazannia tovarystva – 26 lystopada 1868 roku do nainoviishoho chasu* (L'viv, 1874).

the work and ideology of the society. Naumovych's engagement with populist ideas can be traced back to the 1860s, although back then he was better known for his ritualistic struggle than for his populist initiatives.

The society was founded only in 1874, after *Prosvita* had been flourishing for half a decade. At first Rev. Naumovych welcomed *Prosvita* publications but then became disappointed with them because of his different national, political and ideological position. As with many others, Naumovych's Russophilism was not only about national belonging but also about a number of choices between clericalism and secularism, paternalism and democracy, and conservatism and progressivism. Like Ukrainophiles Rev. Naumovych had been complaining that *Matytsia* "was sleeping," and his society was founded to wake it up. The Kachkovskii society was named after Mikhail Kachkovskii, who had left 89,000 (or 60,000) Gulden for the enlightenment of people. And although the society never received this sum, held by the *Narodnyi Dom*, there is no doubt that the society claimed it and that this money provided an immediate incentive for the founding of the society.¹⁶⁵ Rev. Naumovych himself had founded the popular newspaper *Nauka* (Science, Learning) in 1871, and the society was a next step in his populist politics.

It is time to remind ourselves that the attempt to reach the people actually started before either *Prosvita* or the Kachkovskii society were founded. The almost forgotten *Pys'mo do Hromady* was actually the first, more successful attempt to reach out to the peasantry, and the second popular Ruthenian newspaper after Hushalevych's short-lived *Dom i Shkola*. Ivan Svyshch from Kropyvnyk, a peasant friend of Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi's, whom he had met while hiking frequently from the Drohobych high school back home to Kindrativ, wrote to *Pys'mo do Hromady*, asking the newspaper for some books and reporting on the local situation.¹⁶⁶ When for the first time after 1848 in the Sambir district peasant reading was reported to the authorities as suspicious and causing trouble, that reading included this newspaper.¹⁶⁷ In terms of its framework, Shekhovych's newspaper shared the idea that reform had to start with an individual peasant, with his family and his household. Only then could the ideal community be composed out of these conscious individuals.¹⁶⁸ Very important and forgotten in historiography is the fact that the first *bromada*-s of Ukrainophile high school students subscribed to this newspaper and tried to spread it among the peasants.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁵ Ol'ha Drahomanova-Kosach, Mykhailo Drahomanov, "Russkie literaturnye obshchestva v Galitsii (Korespondentsiia V[estnika] Evropy)," 227.

¹⁶⁶ Ivan Svyshch, "Svoieruchne pys'mo gazdy," *Pys'mo do hromady*, 1865, No.36, 187.

¹⁶⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.7, spr.4103, a.72.

¹⁶⁸ "Khrystiianskii dolh," *Dom i shkola*, 1863, No.1.

¹⁶⁹ More on this below in this chapter in the description of the activities of Sambir student *bromada*.

Shekhovych's newspaper was disliked by Rev. Naumovych and his associates as being too secular and too Ukrainophile. Already then Rev. Naumovych was looking for money and materials to start publishing his own newspapers. Shekhovych criticized Rev. Naumovych, Kachkovskii, and other "patrons" of the Ruthenian people for hindering the appearance of popular newspapers and causing problems in his own work with the people.¹⁷⁰

Rev. Naumovych can be seen as a person that conceptualized a specific form of Ruthenian populism as it was practiced in the 1870s. He argued that the main problem of the 1848 generation and of the whole Ruthenian leadership in the 1860s and 1870s was their elitism. While in 1848 the Ruthenian leadership had waited for the peasants to become politically aware enough to join the nation, Rev. Naumovych argued that the peasants needed to be approached "according to the categories of the peasant mind." There was a need for peasants to get involved now, to join the enlightenment and the nation as a part of which they would be able to develop their political consciousnesses fully. In February 1872 he published a letter to *Slovo*, in which he discussed the dissatisfaction expressed by a certain peasant about *Russkaia Rada* and other publications for peasants:

He [the peasant] requests publishing books which could be appropriate for the village reading clubs. I thought over this letter, and it is true, there is no use of talking and writing on reading clubs if there is nothing to buy for these reading clubs. That peasant mentioned a community which paid a 100 Gulden membership fee for *Matysia* and received only a few publications not adequate for popular understanding¹⁷¹

Rev. Naumovych saw the society as a network through which popular publications could be spread. And after starting its publishing activities, the Kachkovskii society actually stole titles of its anthologies from *Prosvita*, which had already been publishing popular books for five years. This theft of titles signals that the peasantry already knew and could recognize *Prosvita's* publications. Examples of such theft are the anthologies *Vinok* and *Nyva*.

The Kachkovskii society started in Kolomyia, a district capital in the mountainous southern-eastern corner of Galicia. Slightly off the beaten track, Kolomyia was a place where several Ruthenian oppositional projects were launched, starting with the Kachkovskii society and ending with radical societies and press (*Prosvita* started in L'viv). The first publications of the society were published at the Bilous' publishing house in Kolomyia. Mykhailo Bilous was a typical "self-made" man, practicing values propagated in the popular Ruthenian publications, the living example for the peasantry to follow. He walked all the way to Paris to attend a world exhibition and get acquainted with the industrial and

¹⁷⁰ „Do Ch. I. Naumovycha,” *Dodatok do ch.5 Pys'ma do Hromady*, 1864.

¹⁷¹ *Slovo*, 1872, No.14, 16(28).02.

scientific progress of the world. Coming back home Bilous settled down in Kolomyia and set up a publishing house there. The existence of this major Ruthenian publishing house, not controlled by the Church hierarchy, was the main reason for Kolomyia becoming the center of the movement Rev. Naumovych launched.

In the Kachkovskii's society's opening publication Rev. Naumovych states that Austrian Rus' is like an old house which is close to collapse because of a rotten foundation. This situation is obvious to any foreign observer, and many of them ridicule Galician Ruthenians for their impotency. This situation needed to be changed, and the task of the newly founded society was to repair the Ruthenian house through "the spread of science (education), reformed customs (*obychainost*), industriousness, sobriety, parsimony, civil consciousness and many other virtues among the Ruthenian people in Austria."¹⁷² Rev. Naumovych identifies the Polish occupation as the main source of all these problems. According to Rev. Naumovych, ignorance, drunkenness and poverty resulted from "our total fall from glory." The Ruthenian had been a "dark slave" for 500 years and everyone thought that Rus' was dead.¹⁷³ Following the rhetoric of 1848 he saw the rise of the Ruthenian nation as foreseen by providence: "But God's will was different. God appointed it [Ruthenian nation] not to be a foot-stool of other nations but to become glorious on its own in the world."¹⁷⁴

There was a crucial difference between Naumovych's rhetoric and that in 1848. Rev. Naumovych emphasized the fact that the Ruthenian nation consisted almost exclusively of peasants. For a long time mighty people did not even consider peasants to be human, "but these days there is another spirit [in the world]. ... The peasant is considered to be not a peasant, a simpleton, but a brother to whom honor and love are due." While learned people had changed their attitudes towards peasants, they also expected the peasants to change theirs. Peasants had to improve: they had to stop swearing and become more parsimonious ("every day is worth money, every hour is money").¹⁷⁵ Being a Ruthenian nowadays as well as a good Christian required a new set of obligations and attitudes. Modern times demanded from peasants, who were already orthodox Christians, that they become consciously Christian. Similarly, the peasants in new circumstances had to become consciously Ruthenian.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷² Ivan Naumovich, *Š Bohom*, (Izdanii Obshchestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho v Kolomyi chyslo 1) (Kolomyia, 1875), 11.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 22-23.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 26, 30.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 60.

At the end of this first book published by the Kachkovskii society was “A message to all Galician, Bukovynian and Hungarian Ruthenians, old and young, learned and unlearned, to all the communities in which there is the Ruthenian faith and the Ruthenian language, to read and to commit to memory and take to heart our national laws so that Rus’ will get rid of all the evil and become glorious in the whole world” written by Rev. Naumovych.¹⁷⁷ In this message he presented his task as being in accord with God’s laws and commandments:

Oh, Ruthenian, you are sanctified in the face of God, spend your whole life in sanctity, in pure, righteous and honest thoughts, words and actions! ... Ruthenian, buy yourself all kinds of useful Ruthenian books, read, study and teach others so that learning spreads among us from house to house, and all our holy Rus’ will become enlightened, renovated and glorious... Everyone, in whose breast a Ruthenian heart beats, in whose veins Ruthenian blood flows, should sincerely love his motherland, holy Rus’. Our Ruthenian land (*zemlen’ka*), with which God endowed us, is an invaluable gift from God, it is our mother, our benefactress, it fed our fathers and all our ancestors, and it feeds us. Every Ruthenian heart should ache when he sees how, because of the sins of our people, because of laziness, neglect, profligacy and drunkenness, our holy Ruthenian land, sanctified with the sweat and blood of our ancestors, on which they had to bear slavery for centuries, is now being transferred into foreign hands!¹⁷⁸

I cite this long stirring passage to show that it would be a gross exaggeration to consider the discourse of the Kachkovskii society as more progressive or more radical than *Prosvita*’s. In fact, Rev. Naumovych did not depart far in his program of reform from Rev. Kachala’s program as expressed in What Destroys Us and What Can Help Us. Distinctly religious rhetoric and an emphasis on the sanctity of the nation’s treasures could also be found in 1848 texts, although back then this rhetoric was not directed towards the people. There is also an emphasis on the land having been lost to foreigners, which would figure prominently in Russophile publications for several decades.

Rev. Naumovych’s religious rhetoric, which was supposed to make his work more popular among peasants accustomed to religious texts, differs totally from the secular and scientific rhetoric of *Prosvita*. Following the rules for sermons, Rev. Naumovych maintains a hierarchical distance between himself and his audience even while acknowledging that they all belong to the same national community and have a common heritage and the same national treasures. At the same time *Prosvita* publications talk about “us” in a way that suggests speaking

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 76.

¹⁷⁸ Ivan Naumovich, S Bohom, Izdaniï Obshchestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho v Kolomyi chyslo 1, (Kolomyia, 1875), 78-80.

from the midst of the people, and masks the texts' propaedeutical goal, luring the peasants into an imagined community to which both readers and writers belong. Rev. Naumovych publishing his S Bohom overestimated prospective popular appeal of this text. It had been published in 10,000 copies but it took 30 years to sell them.¹⁷⁹

The irrational and mystical motives in the Kachkovskii society's publications that angered Ukrainian national-populists can be explained by the peculiarities of Rev. Naumovych's worldview. This was a conservative Slavophilism, seeing Rus' as the mother of all Slavs and a stronghold against the West. Franko says that with time this line of Naumovych's thinking became more prominent and he thought more and more about withdrawing back "into the times of *antiquae educationis* with honest, simple priests extremely limited in their ideas."¹⁸⁰ In the Kachkovskii societies' publications, we see this tension between conservative Slavophilism and recipes of Western liberal reformers.

Translating popular books from German, the Kachkovskii society adapted them very little, but these books were no match for *Prosvita's* masterpieces like Farmazoni or its reading anthologies in either style or the selection of themes. One such translation describes good landlords (albeit German and not Polish) and a peasant, whose problem lies in his character and not in social relationships. The peasant is careless and lazy and even the good estate owner (a German) cannot improve him. It was emphasized that to become a gentleman did not mean ceasing to speak Ruthenian. Enlightenment was presented as a real asset that helped to get rich and succeed in life.¹⁸¹

The Russophiles also published a book by Rev. Ihnatii Hal'ka on the duties and obligations in the community, district, province and state, trying to contribute to the conversion of the peasants into citizens. Like Kachala's book, this one was also written as a catechism in the form of dialogues with questions and answers. In it, the state is defined as a "coercive union of many people for the defense of law and freedom." The task of the Emperor is to hold this union together.¹⁸² There is a hierarchy of states which corresponds to the hierarchy of monarchs: an Emperor, (or Tsar or Caesar), then a king, and finally a prince.¹⁸³ There is no mention of a republic at all, and there is no distinction between the states in respect of their development. According to this classification, Germany, Persia,

¹⁷⁹ Otchet o deiatel'nosti Tsental'nogo Komiteta i Filii Obshchestva imeni M. Kachkovskogo za 1910/1 god (L'vov, 1911).

¹⁸⁰ Ivan Franko, "Chy vertatys' nam nazad do narodu?," 147.

¹⁸¹ F. A. Shtrobl', Prosvishcheniie, (Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Kachkovskoho, ch.2) (Kolomyia, 1875).

¹⁸² Ihnatii Hal'ka, O pravakh i povynnostiakh v hromadi, poviti, kraiu i derzhavi, (Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho v Kolomyi, ch. 3) (L'viv, 1875), 3.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 4.

Morocco and Austria-Hungary are all the same. This contrasts strikingly with the hierarchy of the developed/undeveloped parts of the world and races which we find in *Prosvita* publications. In a similar way the functions of the monarch (who has to see that his state is affluent and functioning) are explained, and the structure of the state itself: “to be short, the State is a huge household...”¹⁸⁴ This kind of description would fit in perfectly with the “catechisms” for peasants from the pre-1848 era and looks strange as part of the cultural production of the national movement.

Nationality appears in the book but only in the description of Ruthenians’ enemies: “Having occupied us Ruthenians in olden times, Poland settled its own Poles and Jews among us.”¹⁸⁵ Then, there is a defense of the Ruthenian language. Speaking Polish is presented not as a simple pragmatic choice but submission to others’ domination: “to speak and write in Polish is required not for my and my Ruthenian relation’s profit but for that of Poland and Polish Jews!”¹⁸⁶ There is also an emphasis on literacy. The propaganda for literacy is grounded in its practical importance for emancipation: “Because of literacy, in at most a week all of us, if need be, can get in touch with the most distant parts of our land and teach each other.”¹⁸⁷

While *Prosvita* featured better-known figures like St. Volodymyr, the Russophiles at first tried to introduce Russian heroes. Among the first glorious men commemorated in Kachkovskii publications, we find Mikhail Kachkovskii himself and the Muscovite prince Dmitrii Ivanovich, who defeated the Tartars on Kulikov field in 1380. The brochure called for a celebration of the 500th anniversary of the battle on Kulikov field but never managed to organize this commemoration. The cult of St. Dmitrii never gained any ground in Galicia. In this case the refrain of the Kachkovskii society’s publications: “Ruthenian, recognize (*piznai*) yourself,” was wasted; the Ruthenian peasant did not recognize himself in the figure of Dmitrii Donskoi.¹⁸⁸

The Kachkovskii society’s reading anthologies were inferior to *Prosvita*’s. In the society’s *Vinok*, for example, we find Rev. Iosyf Levyts’kyi’s speech at the meeting of the Iavoriv branch of the Kachkovskii society. The speech is entitled “On the moral character of the human.” The speaker emphasizes that the right attitude towards things is a “hard” one. This is an attitude, which is grounded in the moral constitution of a person, and this moral constitution seems to

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, 9.

¹⁸⁵ Ihnatii Hal’ka, *O pravakh i povynnostiakh v hromadi, poviti, kraiu i derzhavi*, 51.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 54.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 55.

¹⁸⁸ *Pamiaty slavnnykh liudei*, (Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho v Kolomyi, ch. 49) (L’viv, hruden’ 1879).

determine one's position in all kinds of public and political affairs. We know that this "hard" (*tverdyy*) attitude, initially associated with language (hard etymology against soft phonetics), was later extended to encompass politics as well, indicating a "hard" stance against the Poles. This hardness was also extended to a general attitude towards life, signifying a certain conservatism among the Russophiles. In Ukrainian publications it became associated with stupid stubbornness, becoming a standard referent for Russophiles (*tverdi*). The same anthology also included excerpts from Kachala's The Politics of Poles towards Rus', juxtaposing simple and democratic Rus' with the Polish aristocrats who occupied it, and some excerpts from the lives of the saints as examples of good behavior.¹⁸⁹

It is interesting that the Russophiles published historical accounts by one of the founders of the *Prosvita* society. The Russophile historian Bohdan Didyts'kyi published his Elementary History of Rus' from The Beginning to Modern Times in 1868, in which, following Karamzin, he switches after the princely times to the struggle of the Muscovite princes Ivan III and Vasiliï Ivanovich against the Poles. As Wendland notes, the Russophiles accepted the Ukrainian version of history in their popular publications.¹⁹⁰ Didyts'kyi's history was recognized as unfit for Galician purposes. It has never been republished while Kachala's book (originally published as a polemic in Polish) were republished several times as were excerpts from it. When Didyts'kyi published his Ruthenian [could be understood as Russian] Chronicle for The Ruthenian [or Russian] people in Galicia in 1885, he presented a basic Ukrainian outline of national history. After discussing the princely period, the book turns to the Cossacks, Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and Ivan Mazepa.¹⁹¹

I think it is also important to realize that there was a difference between the Kachkovskii society and the patriotic parish clergy in general. As the society was little more than publishing house, it had no means to supervise the activities of its members in the villages. The great popular temperance movement of the 1870s, which was led by the parish priests, was not organized by the society but spurred by the hierarchy, and in particular by the pastoral letter of the Metropolitan "On the dignity of man."¹⁹² The most popular text of the 1870s was not any *Prosvita* or

¹⁸⁹ Vinok. *Chytanka dlia selian i mishchan*, (Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Kachkovskoho) (L'vov, 1879).

¹⁹⁰ Anna Veronika Wendland, *Die Russophilen in Galizien. Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Rußland 1848-1915*, (Studien zur Geschichte der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie. Band XXVII) (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2001), 311.

¹⁹¹ Iaroslav Hrytsak, „Iakykh-to kniaziv buly stolytsi v Kyievi?...? do konstruiuvannia istorychnoi pam'iaty halys'kykh ukraïntsiiv u 1830-1930-ti roky," *Ukraina moderna*, 2001, ch.6, 86. It is interesting that in terms of finding a place in Russian history the second version of Didyts'kyi's history can also be seen as a precursor of Soviet Ukrainian histories.

¹⁹² The discussion of this letter see in Himka, *Religion and Nationality*, 56-7.

Kachkovskii society publication but the charter of the temperance movement. The first village organizations created during that movement, “Sobriety Brotherhoods,” were not related to the Kachkovskii society.

The Kachkovskii society in the 1870s was different from the 1848 activists in one crucial respect – it turned towards the peasantry. It represented the peasantry as a cornerstone of the Ruthenian nation – it had survived centuries of national oppression preserving its nationality. However, just like the generation of 1848, Rev. Naumovych believed that the peasantry had to transform itself. Russophiles imagined their ideal peasant as learned and self-conscious: “I must tell you that there is no man happier than a peasant if this peasant is enlightened.”¹⁹³ Peasant self-consciousness had to be the consciousness of the citizen. The establishment of Galician autonomy and the withdrawal of Vienna from provincial politics meant a huge blow to the movement but did not transform its ideology. Russophiles were eager not to give their enemies a chance to accuse their movement of social agitation. During a debate on the reform of land tax on 11 May 1878, Diet deputy Iosyf Krasitskii made a speech trying to draw attention to the injustices that had been done to the peasantry and took care to warn the Diet that he was not going to defend any particular estate but would treat them all fairly as citizens with the same rights and privileges.¹⁹⁴

Proclaiming the need for the peasantry’s transformation, Rev. Naumovych did not have much faith in its agency. He delivered a speech in the Diet on 23.02. (7.03) 1878 during the general budget debate, which aimed to show the despair overwhelming Ruthenian politicians since the introduction of Galician autonomy. Rev. Naumovych lamented the plight of the Ruthenian language in Galicia:

The feeling of Austrian citizenship is disappearing among us with every day, when with the help of the Austrian government we are forced to submit to necessity and to get used to life in an artificially organized Polish kingdom.¹⁹⁵

In this speech Rev. Naumovych advocates the same solution as in 1848, the division of Galicia, stating that a single province meant death to the Ruthenian nation.¹⁹⁶ It is interesting that in defending the Ruthenian national community, Rev. Naumovych does not believe in this community’s agency, in its capacities to organize itself and survive despite and against the legal and political framework in which it is placed. The only hope of Russophiles in the absence of some kind of

¹⁹³ Fed'ko muzhyk pys'm., „Pys'mo z Tyshkovets'” *Russkaia Rada*, 1872, No.8.

¹⁹⁴ *Kil'ka besid russkykh posliv dumy derzhavnoi i soima kraievoho*, (L'viv: nakladom Ivana Nakonechnoho, 1878), 37-38.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 4-5.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 4-5.

administrative Ruthenian autonomy was to use as effectively as possible the space provided for national freedoms by Austrian Constitution. Ruthenian political representation in 1873 accepted as its program “to stand strong with the constitution and aid its development and its introduction into real life, and fully introduce rights and freedoms which are granted by state laws to our Ruthenian nation, i.e. to our communities.”¹⁹⁷ This is again very symptomatic: while naming the upbringing of the individual as the most important method to raise consciousness of the nation, the Russophiles referred to the Ruthenian communities just as the old regime had. But these communities were not the communes imagined by the Ukrainian radicals, but rather places in which the paternalist authority of the patriotic priests could be exercised to correct the behavior of parishioners.

It became a commonplace to see the growth of political Russophilism as a reaction to their disappointment with the Austrian state. But somehow it is forgotten that Ukrainian national-populism was also a reaction to the same disappointment. While in the case of Ukrainians there was a clear break with the ideology of 1848, in the case of populist Russophiles there seems to have been more continuity.

A deputy to the same Diet, Rev. Stefan Kachala, one of the early Ukrainophiles, declared that the only way to improve the province’s economy was “the enlightenment of the [simple] people, and rapidly, enlightenment far and wide and radical.”¹⁹⁸ Civilization for Kachala meant both material existence and enlightenment.¹⁹⁹ Unlike Naumovych, Rev. Kachala’s program was based on the independence from state institutions. He advocated changes in the educational system, criticizing the program of village schools, which concentrated on preparing students for higher schools, while in the villages, according to Kachala, the schools had to produce a “complete civilized product”, even if not that learned.²⁰⁰ At the end Kachala remarks that even without the school system for which he argued, “if 500 years was not enough to denationalize us, now more than ever we shall not allow ourselves to be denationalized because we can teach our children in the Ruthenian spirit even at home.”²⁰¹

Rev. Naumovych and his cooperators had a huge advantage in comparison with the Ukrainian national-populists. This advantage was characterized by Ivan Franko as follows:

¹⁹⁷ *Russkii posly derzhavnoi dumy i tykh-zhe klevetnyky. Ot oseny roku 1873 do Maia roku 1879* (L’vov, 1879), 8.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 45-6.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 47.

²⁰⁰ *Kil’ka besid ruskykh posliv dumy derzhavnoi i sojma kraievoho*, 52.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 62.

Naumovych and his friends had one good thing which the national-populists lacked and still lack: they knew how to use moments of popular awakening, were not afraid of the movement and noise, knew, as saying goes, to swim with the current.²⁰²

The Russophiles were able to appropriate for themselves the Church-initiated temperance campaign, to claim exclusive influence in the community through the parish priests, and make themselves into the legitimate successors of the Old Ruthenians and St. George, while *Prosvita*, not having enough parish priests among its members, had to limit itself to reaching the peasants only through its publications. But in the long run this association with St. George and Old Ruthenians would cause problems for the Russophiles, especially when the hierarchy changed in the early 1880s.

Rev. Naumovych's movement was showing signs of failure even before he was accused of state treason and discredited by the Hnylychky affair in 1882. Naumovych failed in his own district in 1879, and this was the beginning of the end.²⁰³ A biographer sympathetic to Rev. Naumovych says that he enjoyed popularity among his parishioners and that Stril'che parishioners in particular were crying when he left.²⁰⁴ Ivan Franko counters this, claiming that Rev. Naumovych was disliked by his own parishioners in both Stril'che and Skalat, and they distrusted him: "perhaps this happened to everyone who got to know this man closer."²⁰⁵ In the Stril'che affair discussed in the previous chapter, no traces of closer relationships between Rev. Naumovych and his parishioners or his influence on them could be found.

In the 1880s Mykhailo Pavlyk, criticized the attitude of the intelligentsia in the 1870s to their people:

By and large it considered people as not deserving the whole truth, even theoretically; it considered them to be thoughtless children, who were not supposed to get real secular science, or drunkards and lazybones, poor only because of their own laziness, or even bandits and beasts who must be kept on the church chain because otherwise they would get loose and slaughter the intelligentsia.²⁰⁶

I have tried to show that this description does not apply to *Prosvita* discourse and simplifies the activities of the Kachkovskii society as well. But of the two the

²⁰² Ivan Franko, "Ivan Naumovych," *Khliborob*, 1891, ch.6 and 7.

²⁰³ Ibid.

²⁰⁴ Monchalovskii, *Zhyt'ie i diiatel'nost' Ivana Naumovycha*, 67-8, 73.

²⁰⁵ Ivan Franko, "Ivan Naumovych," *Khliborob*, 1891, ch.6 and 7.

²⁰⁶ Pavlyk, *Pro rus'ko-ukraïns'ki narodni chytal'ni*, 168.

Kachkovskii society was the one that relied more on the hierarchy of status and on benevolent parish priests exercising paternalist patronage over the peasantry .

The cultural production of the Kachkovskii society was permeated with religious references, while *Prosvita* publications were more secular and scientific.

Seldom have the activities and fates of societies resonated as well with their names as was the case with the *Prosvita* and Kachkovskii societies. *Prosvita* meant enlightenment, enlightenment as a process and not the Enlightenment as a period (*Prosvitnytstvo*). It glorified enlightenment, progress and human society. In *Prosvita*'s publications, these categories figured not only in "scientific" texts and fiction but also in the poems.²⁰⁷ In them, one can find images of linear time, time as progress, as a train Ruthenians must catch up with.²⁰⁸ The Kachkovskii society was named after a local patriot, a man of unclear national identity with an unfriendly attitude to other people, a man whose thriftiness and deviations were the stuff of many rumors and who died on a trip to Russia.²⁰⁹

Between 1875 and 1878 the Kachkovskii society allegedly had 1645, 4791, and 6123 members, respectively. In 1868 *Prosvita* started with 72 and by 1875 had 344 members. In 1873 *Prosvita* had among its members only two peasants and two reading clubs. The first peasants were accepted into *Prosvita* in January 1871, with a specially lowered membership due of 50 Kreuzer a year.²¹⁰ The first peasant woman to become a *Prosvita* member did so in 1878.²¹¹ In 1875 the society had 58 peasant members, which is not a small number if the fact is taken into account that the total membership of the society was not expanding. Even in 1877-78 *Prosvita* had less than 1000 members. As I have already mentioned earlier numbers for the Kachkovskii society are actually the numbers of copies of published popular books. But these books were not sent to the members directly. They were sent to the society's agents and branches and then distributed among the peasants who instead of simply buying books would pay "membership dues."

These numbers seem to indicate that the Kachkovskii society secured a much stronger position. In fact, the documents left by the Kachkovskii society do not support this number. We can state for certain that for many peasant members of

²⁰⁷ Vinok. *Chytanochka dlia selian i mishchan*, (Vydannia Prosvity, kn. 44) (L'viv, 1877).

²⁰⁸ Barvins'kyi, *Trytsiat' lit tverezosty*, 66.

²⁰⁹ See the memoir of Józef Doboszyński in Irena Homola, Bolesław Łopuszański (eds.), *Pamiętniki urzędników galicyjskich* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1978), 379. See also manuscript memoir of Hryhorii Zaryts'kyi, who lived at Kachkovskii's house together with other poor Ruthenian students. – LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.57.

²¹⁰ VR LNB, f.Maykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.10.

²¹¹ VR LNB, f.Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.50.

the Kachkovskii society, the organization was represented by their priests.²¹² There was no strict system of discipline, and membership dues were collected occasionally by local priests. Having no control over its extensive membership, the society in the 1870s represented mainly a publishing house, a network for the distribution of publications and a space in which the interaction of local patriotic clergy took place. At the same time, in the 1870s *Prosvita* seems to have acquired as members all the prominent peasant activists. We have already met peasant members of *Prosvita* in connection with the Dobrivliany affair. In the mountainous area around Mshanets', Vasył Segan (Segin') was accepted as a *Prosvita* member in 1877.²¹³ Similarly, Teofil' Kostraba, another peasant activist from the 1870s and a member of the Kachkovskii society, with whom local priests, members of the same society, were not happy, joined *Prosvita* in 1878.²¹⁴

As far as publishing was concerned, *Prosvita* did much better than the Kachkovskii society. In 1875-1877, the Kachkovskii society had 46 branches and 22 formal distribution agencies, while *Prosvita* had 91 agents in 75 places. Although *Prosvita* only founded five reading clubs in the 1870s, its publications had greater influence. When we compare the list of the reading clubs and distribution agencies, we find that most reading clubs (100) were founded in areas where agencies of both societies existed, 20 reading clubs were in places where only the Kachkovskii society had agencies and 40 were in places where only *Prosvita* agencies existed.²¹⁵

Prosvita's publishing was conducted on a much larger scale than that of the Kachkovskii society. It is true that in the 1870s *Prosvita* did not place any emphasis on the founding and support of reading clubs. But the same was also true of the Kachkovskii society. However, already in 1874, the year in which the Kachkovskii society was created, *Prosvita* accepted the first village reading club as its member.²¹⁶ It might appear as though the Kachkovskii society was doing much better because Rev. Naumovych was able to publish *Nauka* and *Russkaia Rada*, which enjoyed more subscribers than *Pys'mo z Prosvity*. However, we must remember that periodicals were much more expensive to publish than regular series of popular books. Publishing periodicals was always connected with generous financial support, at least in the beginning.

²¹² Even in the 1880s some peasant members of the society coming to the town of Sambir for the market wondered where the popular books came from. Ivan z nad Dnistra [Ivan Mykhas], "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.48, 303.

²¹³ VR LNB, f.Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.49.

²¹⁴ VR LNB, f.Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.56.

²¹⁵ Rusin, "Czytelnie ludowe ruskie w Austro-Węgrzech," *Głos*, 1887, No.31.

²¹⁶ Ivan Belei, *Dvadtsiat' i piat' lit istorii tovarystva "Prosvity"*, 52.

When Rev. Naumovych started Ruskaia Rada, the son of Rev. Ivan Korostens'kyi, who had worked with peasants for quite some time, had serious doubts about its prospects. In a letter from 21 January 1872, Teofil' Korostens'kyi asked Iosif Markov if Ruskaia Rada was going to be published that year and if it would hold on till the end of the year: "Because I think that this paper will not manage to stay around."²¹⁷ Rev. Naumovych produced most of the material published in his newspaper himself. He also constantly had problems with his another newspaper, Nauka, whose technical editor was always messing things up, not proofreading articles and introducing unneeded changes. Naumovych was so angered that his writing about him is full of elaborate Russian curses, which one never finds in Ruthenian Galician writing.²¹⁸

Both Nauka and Ruskaia Rada had from 1000 to 1500 subscribers, most of whom were priests). In terms of popular books the Kachkovskii society lagged behind *Prosvita*. Kachkovskii's society books were published in the following numbers: 1875 – 1645 copies, 1876 – 4791, 1877 – 6123.²¹⁹ Pavlyk's own data on Nauka show that it did not go to the entire communities or to reading clubs but only to private peasants in 66 locations in Galicia. Later these places would become more prominent, but not necessarily in connection with the Kachkovskii society. In the Sambir area in 1873 it was sent to a subscriber in Dobrivliany, Ivan Petriv, and to Stupnytsia where Rev. Iuliiian Chaikovs'kyi subscribed to it.²²⁰ There is evidence that in the 1870s the peasants used the volumes of popular periodicals just as they read reading anthologies and popular books containing several different thematic texts.²²¹ The virtual absence of peasant correspondence in Nauka can be taken as proof that it did not function as a newspaper, in the sense described by Benedict Anderson. There was no simultaneity, no "ephemeralism," no imagined community of the similar readers, with whom one could communicate by reporting to the newspaper.²²² According to Pavlyk:

Nauka was usually read by the person who could read most fluently, and because of that, it is not strange that the good-natured style of *Nauka* influenced listeners most strongly: it simply tickled people's ears, attracting them like a magnet.²²³

²¹⁷ VR LNB, Osyp Markov, 335, p.9, a.16.

²¹⁸ VR LNB, Narodnyi Dim, 126/p.15, a.29, 40.

²¹⁹ Pavlyk, Pro rus'ko-ukraïns'ki narodni chytal'ni, 110.

²²⁰ VR LNB, f.Pavl., 154, p.6.

²²¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.7, spr.4103, a.72.

²²² Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism (London, New York: Verso, 1991), 34-36.

²²³ Pavlyk, Pro rus'ko-ukraïns'ki narodni chytal'ni, 100.

It could be that the peasants found the more complicated language of Nauka, with its many borrowings from Church Slavonic and Russian, more authoritative. However, this kind of language was virtually closed to the more modern concepts, which could be found in the *Prosvita* publications. The “learned” language of the Russophiles resembled older religious texts more, but *Prosvita* publications were fit better for the dissemination of modern concepts and ideas.

Despite the fact that the Kachkovskii society was oriented towards individual subscriptions, in practice it sent all its publications to the person in charge of a location (usually a local priest), who in turn distributed them among local subscribers.²²⁴ *Prosvita* at first sold its publications through volunteer agents, not only in the villages but also at marketplaces, etc. Only in the 1880s did *Prosvita* switch to shipping directly to individual members.²²⁵

The publication of books and newspapers targeting a defined audience had another backlash. The growth of publications meant neglect of the reading clubs. It was not profitable to work with the reading clubs, which would subscribe to only one copy of the newspaper instead of having several individual subscribers in the village. Supporting the reading clubs at this stage meant a decrease in the number of subscribers, who would use the one copy received by the reading club.²²⁶ That is why in the Kachkovskii society’s activities the priority was given to Nauka and popular books, and the founding of the reading clubs never became a goal.²²⁷ The real shift in this situation occurred in the 1890s when *Prosvita* became a network for the reading clubs, having by that time secured its reading public. This had also tipped the balance of power between the two societies in favor of *Prosvita*.

The publications of the Kachkovskii society were severely criticized by the national-populists, who were angered by the society’s claims that it was closer to the common people. They ridiculed the grandeur of the society, which claimed to have 6,000 members and 20 branches, with the branches’ chairs “taking the place of the old *boiary* and aristocracy.” According to the national populists, the society’s popular books preached about hygiene norms while peasants did not have money even for soap. The society’s publications threatened peasants with arrest for believing in superstitions, while themselves included stories about “God’s Trial,” in which the guilty is uncovered by God. The national-populists insisted that “to popularize science does not mean to popularize catechism and

²²⁴ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.70.

²²⁵ Pavlyk, *Pro rus’ko-ukraïns’ki narodni chytal’ni*, 33

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, 32.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, 157.

empty moralizing.”²²⁸ The Kachkovskii society’s brochure propagating sobriety was said to be full of stupid tales saying that people could “burn” from vodka if the blood was saturated with it, or that it worked as a poison that you could die from at once. The national-populists said that it would be a miracle if even one drunk gave up drinking because of the influence of a brochure like this one.²²⁹ Rev. Ruchyts’kyi’s brochure “Love for the Motherland” imagined this love as a feeling which only highly educated people could experience (well in line with the 1848 line of thinking). The Ukrainians charged that one would expect talk about love for that people, on which a love for the motherland should be based, and without which was meaningless.²³⁰

Support from Russian Empire Russophiles did not go specifically for populist activity, while Ukrainian patriots from the Russian Empire donating money quite often emphasized “popular needs.” Prince Aleksandr Mikhailovich Obolenskii’s donation which sent twenty issues of *Novoe Veche* to poor village communities in 1883 was an exception.²³¹

In the 1880s the scandalous trials against the Russophiles started, and in their aftermath the Russophile populist movement and Rev. Naumovych personally was discredited among the peasants. Contemporary advocates of Russophilism and Orthodoxy glorifying Rev. Naumovych believed that this was not the case, that the trial and excommunication, which followed in the aftermath of the Hnylychky affair, gave him the status of a martyr among the peasants.²³² Obviously they do not know about another scandal, which had an even more direct impact on peasant subscribers to Naumovych’s newspaper and turn many of them against him.

A certain Shcherban’, whom Naumovych got to know in 1874 during the founding of the Kachkovskii society, and whom he hired in 1876 as an executive editor of *Nauka*, was at the center of this scandal. At first Rev. Naumovych was not happy with his editing; there were too many mistakes, which devalued the paper. But in the 1880s, after Rev. Naumovych left Galicia, Shcherban’ started more than 600 lawsuits against *Nauka* subscribers for the costs they allegedly owed to the newspaper, petty suits that ranged from two to four Gulden. In many cases the peasants could not appear in court because the travel expenses would be higher than the costs Shcherban’ claimed. *Dilo* blamed the Russophiles:

²²⁸ Kharko Tarhan, “Izdaniia Obshchestva imeny Mykhaila Kachkovskoho. Chch. 1-12. Za vremia ot 39(15) Maia 1876 do 3(15) Maia 1877,” *Pravda*, 1877, 455-462.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, 493-499.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, 539-547.

²³¹ VR LNB, Osyp Markov, 377, p.14.

²³² N. M. Pashaeva, *Ocherki istorii russkogo dvizheniia v Galichine XIX – XX vv.* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennaia Publichnaia Istoricheskaia Biblioteka Rossiï, 2001), 92

“After this kind of trials our clumsy peasants can lose any desire to read in general and not only to subscribe.” Bat’kivshchyna published letters from angry Nauka subscribers, and Rev. Naumovych replied apologetically blaming Shcherban’. Rev. Naumovych’s apologies actually prove that the golden age of Nauka was 1872-1876, when it earned 7,345 Gulden of pure profit. Under Shcherban’ for six years (1876-1881) it made only 5,000 Gulden. Rev. Naumovych claimed that in 1884-1886 it was allegedly making 2000 Gulden a year again.²³³ This does not seem to be true, as we know about numerous defections of peasants from the Russophile newspapers.²³⁴ They switched to the Ukrainian popular newspaper Bat’kivshchyna, to which the Russophile publications were in all respects inferior.²³⁵

The first conflict between the two societies for the village reading clubs can be dated already by 1876. When the branch of the Kachkvoskii society in Stanislaviv asked *Prosvita* to send its books to the newly created reading clubs in Krekhivtsi and Zahvizdia, the society asked these reading clubs to join *Prosvita* first and then they would receive the books for membership dues and all those that has been published prior to that date as well.²³⁶ In 1877 the first issue of Pys’mo z Prosvity was published in 2,500 copies and the second in 1000.²³⁷ The newspaper was sent for free to the society’s members. In 1879 it was decided that Bat’kivshchyna would not be sent for free, but this was compensated for by the decrease in membership dues from two to one Gulden a year.²³⁸

In the 1870s, when Ruthenian life was dominated by the activities of *Prosvita* and the Kachkovskii society, both societies despite all their differences shared the conviction that it was necessary to work with the common people. This was the attitude that had emerged victorious in the 1860s in the debates that took place within the Ruthenian movement. There was no sharp division between people-lovers and people-haters in the movement, but the crisis of 1848-style politics and the appearance of a younger generation of national-populists made populist tendencies dominant in the public life of the Ruthenians in the 1870s.

An anonymous exchange between older and younger generations that took place in the 1860s gives us a taste of the discussion. A representative of the older generation says:

²³³ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 110/p.4.

²³⁴ The press run of Nauka in 1885 was only 600 copies, compare with 1000 to 2000 copies in the first four years of its existence. See John-Paul Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 68.

²³⁵ In 1885 the press run of Bat’kivshchyna alone was 1500 copies, while Nauka’s was 600, and Russkaia Rada’s – 800.

²³⁶ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.39.

²³⁷ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.46.

²³⁸ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 46, p.2, a.60.

Village peasants, not knowing to read and to write, are the sworn enemy of any change or reform; they will not take from your hands writing even if you give it to them for free ... Mandators from Metternich's time would be the best enlighteners of people if only wanted to occupy themselves sincerely with the enlightenment of people. ... The peasants are demoralized by the current liberal or autonomous legislature. They think that they are allowed everything ... Only now, maybe already too late, have we found that giving liberalism and autonomy to peasants is the same as a knife to a child. They will injure themselves and others.²³⁹

Traces of this attitude could still be found in the activities of some local branches of the Kachkovskii society, but in general this point of view was associated with Old Ruthenians, who were defeated by more dynamic Russophilism and Ukrainophilism, which from the very beginning were styling themselves as populist ideologies

Finally, I would like to end this section dealing with the readings of illiterate peasants by turning to the reading habits of the Polish townspeople in the area with which I am concerned. The situation around 1880 in the town of Sambir has been characterized by a memoirist as follows:

A 'Polish reading club' was founded in Sambir but people there read even less than in the Sambir "casino," mostly novels which were published in the supplement of "Bluszcz." ... Rarely [and only] in the better households could you find novels by Kraszewski or Zacharjasiewicz. A newspaper was a *rara avis*. I could count on the fingers on one hand the households subscribing to Gazeta Narodowa. No other newspaper was known back then. Rev. Barewicz, the high school principal, was the only one in the whole Sambor brave enough to subscribe to Czas. Not only was there no feeling of duty to support journalism but also no need [was felt] to hear what was going in the world, or even in L'viv.²⁴⁰

A Local Version of Enlightenment

The only enlightening organization working in the area in the 1870s was the Sambir branch of the Kachkovskii society. The list of Kachkovskii society members for 1875, unfortunately published, according to localities, only until the letter "K", included the already mentioned Ivan Mashturiak from Dobrivliany together with a certain Holovs'kyi and Shcherbyts'kyi from Vysots'ko Vyzhnie. These were the only three peasants in the entire area of the former Sambir circle

²³⁹ "Z rukopysy z-pered 30 lit, II. Z lystu do molodoho narodovtsia," Dilo, 1899, No.93-4.

²⁴⁰ Władysław Cichocki, Sambor przed półwiekiem. Ku upamiętnieniu 40-cj rocznicy matury zdawanej w samborskiem gimnazjum w czerwcu 1884 roku (Kraków, 1925), 15-16.

(with the exception of the northern Rudky area).²⁴¹ In the 1870s the Kachkovskii society's activity in the Sambir area were organized around Rev. Pavlo Iasenyt's'kyi, local Ruthenian celebrity. Rev. Iasenyt's'kyi was himself part of the official educational system. Despite that, most of his speeches and writings point to deficiencies in the system and express his dissatisfaction with it. The most obvious problem was the language of instruction and Polonization of the school system. Rev. Iasenyt's'kyi's arguments were traditional – that education in the native language was more accessible and more efficient. The Polish language was needed only and as long as it was used by the state and provincial administration.²⁴² Without the Polish language Ruthenian education would advance much faster. It was said by Sambir Ruthenians that:

Children of Polish peasants in western Galicia, who learn only in Polish, are twice as successful in their studies as children of Ruthenian peasants in Rus', who torment themselves with Polish books and wait for the time they will be free of this tormenter forever.²⁴³

At the same time children of the local landlords complained that having to learn Ruthenian as a second provincial language was a serious obstacle in their education. When in 1872 Władysław Cichocki was going to enter straight into the third grade of gymnasium, he could not do so because he did not know how to read and write in Ruthenian, and so had to go to the second grade.²⁴⁴ The majority of landlords' and officials' sons did not have to go through elementary school, as they were tutored in private and then entered the gymnasium straight from their homes.

But there was another problem with the schools besides their Polonization:

Some among us would like peasant children, who are raised at home without any upbringing and education, to develop not only their spiritual powers in schools, starting from an outlook on the subjects around them, having opinion about these subjects and their practical usage, to an understanding of abstract and exact sciences, besides that learning to speak and write in Ruthenian, Polish and even German, in which even some gymnasium graduates fail; they do not want to realize that the majority of them are a bit dim, very slow in understanding, which has its cause in being conceived from parents who drink and in an unwise upbringing in the first years of childhood.²⁴⁵

²⁴¹ Attachment to Ivan Naumovich, S. Bohom.

²⁴² "Ot Sambora," Słowo, 1875, No.65.

²⁴³ "Ot Sambora," Słowo, 1876, No.58.

²⁴⁴ Dr. Władysław Cichocki, Sambor przed półwiekiem, 3.

²⁴⁵ "Ot Sambora," Słowo, 1875, No.65.

In 1876 a new provincial school was built in Sambir with eight classrooms. The city spent 45,000 Gulden on construction, not taking into account the inner decor. However, during the opening ceremony, despite an order from the city's mayor, no Ruthenian colors were hung besides the Austrian, Polish and Habsburg colors. The majority of students in this school were Jewish, while the number of Ruthenians was decreasing, especially after four classes' schools were opened in Turka and Staryi Sambir.²⁴⁶

Most of the reports to Slovo "from Sambir," extensively cited here, were likely written by Rev. Iasenyts'kyi. The same ideas about village schools as expressed in Slovo articles can be found in his Diet speech dated 1880, in which he painted 1848-1860s as the golden age, when schools were founded under clerical patronage and developed harmoniously:

These schools had living power and would develop gradually for the benefit of the Ruthenian nation. But the Constitution emancipated schools from Church supervision, just like a trendy wife emancipates herself from the husband's power, and handed [them] over to the management of the state and province.

According to Rev. Iasenyts'kyi, many new schools had indeed been founded, but they were of little use. They remained foreign to the communities and peasants saw no use in them. When Rev. Iasenyts'kyi tried to persuade an "honest and influential farmer, a Kachkovskii society member" to force the community of 2,000 people to found a school, the farmer answered: "Why do we need a school, look, the neighboring village has had a school for a long time, and there are many drunkards and thieves, while we have honest, pious and laborious people."²⁴⁷

The Ruthenian activists in the 1870s resented the new secular teachers – we have already met a similar attitude in one of the articles on the Dobrivliany conspiracy. They constantly referred back to the old practices when self-or half-educated cantor-teachers became an organic part of the communities. Although not being as knowledgeable as the new secular teachers, they were nevertheless more fit for the purpose of educating village youth.²⁴⁸ One of the reporters ascribed the following complaints to the peasants: when the priests were monitoring the schools, the schoolchildren knew how to read and sing in Ruthenian, and now they knew neither the Creed nor *Hospody pomylui*.²⁴⁹

²⁴⁶ "Ot Sambora," Slovo, 1876, No.95.

²⁴⁷ "Ot Sambora," Slovo, 1879, No.109.

²⁴⁸ "Ot Sambora," Slovo, 1875, No.64.

²⁴⁹ "Ot Sambora," Slovo, 1870, No.56.

Such resentment was not always just. In many villages the role of the first educators was played precisely by the new secular teachers. In 1872 a parish school in Berehy was changed into a state school, and the teacher Ilarion Khrymovych was brought in. He taught between 1872 and 1902 and was considered to be good.²⁵⁰ In 1872 Hryhorii Hordyns'kyi, born in Hordynia's sublet Zakuttia, returned to Hordynia as a teacher after having studied in the Sambir gymnasium and serving in the army for 12 years, the last three years – as a gendarme. After this he could have gotten a better position but chose to come back to his native village. From 1872 to 1897 he taught in Hordynia, and then in Bukova, where he retired.²⁵¹ We saw that in the cases, where communities themselves invited teachers, they did so without any clerical pressure. This clerical dissatisfaction with secular schools, however, helps to explain the prominent position of religious and catechetical texts in the publications of the Kachkovskii society – they had to compensate for perceived deficiencies in the secular schools.

In the light of the resentment to official schooling and dissatisfaction with state education, one would expect the Kachkovskii society to have provided not only additional but alternative education. Adored by his students, Rev. Iasenys'kyi was hardly engaged in popular education; and his only work in that direction was published by the Kachkovskii society posthumously. This work included his ideas about what good and enlightened farmers looked like. These farmers should be “enlightened, literate and reasonable, and know what the great Russian nation and Russian land is.” These farmers were supposed “to understand our Liturgy and know the Church statute.”²⁵² The wife of Rev. Iasenys'kyi's ideal farmer is easily attracted by Polish culture and does not understand her husband's insistence on celebrating “Church New Year” on 1 September, which for her is just a waste of time.²⁵³ A positive character, however, does not pay much attention to her grumblings, but tries to reeducate his wife and teaches his son:

You belong to the glorious and great Russian nation, which all of us should love warmly and of which we should be proud. The Russian land is so huge that the sun never sets on it. Our enemy wants to take it from us, but we shall not let them.²⁵⁴

In 1878 there was a general meeting of the Sambir branch of the Kachkovskii society, summing up the first year of its activities. This branch encompassed the

²⁵⁰ Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv*, 53.

²⁵¹ Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Hordyni*, 13-14.

²⁵² Pavel Iasenyskii, *Hde Prosvishchenie, tam schastie*, (Izdaniia obshchestva Kachkovskoho, 06-07 1883), 10-11.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, 22-24.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 55.

territory of the Sambir and Staryi Sambir districts (the mountainous Turka district had its own branch). Rev. Iasenys'kyi was elected chair of this branch. His speech is very telling of the tasks of the society, which he specifies as: "to enrich the poor and unenlightened Ruthenian people living in Galicia in the material and spiritual goods necessary for civic well-being and the happiness of individual persons as well as of the whole nation." Just like people, the nations are more significant the richer and more enlightened they are. Wealth and enlightenment appear to be so intimately connected in his speech that one cannot get one without the another. The science the society propagated would help peasants to farm better, while history would enrich their souls and inspire them to great deeds.²⁵⁵ Rev. Iasenys'kyi pointed to Mikhail Kachkovskii as an example of a "wise rich" man and to Rev. Naumovych as an example of an educated people-lover.

58 members of the society were present at the meeting. During discussion it came out that all the attempts to introduce reading clubs in 1877-1878 had failed "because of the small number of literate peasants." Mr. Nykolai Lashkevch (a school teacher in town) proposed urging peasants to send their children to the city to learn some craft or trade. As an example he cited two youngsters he had received as servants, whom he taught wood-carving and carpenter's skills. The central talk of that meeting was entitled "Science as a means of enrichment and occupying an adequate place in the society." Some peasants attended the meeting as well. A certain Pikhota (Ferdinand Pikhota from Cherkhava) proposed a resolution to have someone travel to the villages and stimulate literate peasants and their children to read books. One of the peasants, Dmytro Detsyk from Berehy, was elected to the branch's executive.²⁵⁶

In line with the Russophiles' understanding of patriotism, a hierarchy of tasks was established. The Kachkovskii society claimed, for example, that "the most important wish of the Ruthenian nation is to make the so-called 'simple people' into enlightened members of higher strata through education in secondary schools."²⁵⁷ The society claimed that in the years just following emancipation, when the well-being of the peasants improved, half of gymnasium students were of peasant origin. But starting with 1862, as a result of the increasing state and provincial tax burden, the conditions of the peasantry had deteriorated so that in 1870 only 25% of gymnasium students were of peasant origin and three quarters of them desperately needed support. The Sambir branch of the Kachkovskii society started fundraising to help them and planned to open a residency (*bursa*) for them in Sambir.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁵ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1878, No.64.

²⁵⁶ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1878, No.59 and 60.

²⁵⁷ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1879, No.109.

²⁵⁸ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1879, No.109.

The executive of the Sambir branch had also discussed “the material conditions of the peasantry.” It asserted that there were bad harvests but decided that most peasants would make it through the year and did not need additional support. The organized temperance movement was in decline. There were enough state schools, but the educational process was not successful, mainly because of bilingualism. According to a newspaper report, all Ruthenian communities wished that schools were only in Ruthenian but had not been brave enough to oppose the introduction of Polish. The Sambir branch of the Kachkovskii society had 80 members, but Ruthenian civil servants were afraid of joining it. Village enlightenment was reported as follows:

By now in the villages the number of literate farmers is too small, and among the literate only a few have the desire (*okhoti*) to read, which requires thinking, which comes to them with difficulty. However, there are illiterate peasants who eagerly listen to readings and talks on the basis of Kachkovskii society books.²⁵⁹

Rev. Iasenys’kyi held another speech at the opening of the general meeting of the Sambir branch in 1880. He again tried to show how well-being and enlightenment are intertwined and how the Kachkovskii society brought these two together. To benefit from the propagated wisdom the peasants had not only to read the society’s books but also to understand them properly:

The book entitled “A Cow” teaches which cows produce more milk and which stable would be the best for the nourisher of a poor family and source of income for the rich house-wife.

But those among farmers who have only read this book and acknowledged its reason but did not try to take care of their cows the way wise farmers in Holland and Switzerland do, did not get any material benefit from the book and did not enrich themselves from it. Those who read the book *Vinok* [Wreath] about the moral character of the [hu]man did not become wise and did not improve their moral value, on which people’s respect and God’s grace are based, and did not fulfill their duty to spread good customs and temperance as Kachkovskii society members, if they did not try to live this way and behave towards themselves and their fellow men as that rule said to be appropriate for an honest peasant.²⁶⁰

Rev. Iasenys’kyi propagated wise (scientific) labor accompanied by thriftiness which would allow peasants to improve their well-being. According to his estimation, if a peasant owning five Joch of land followed his advice, he should

²⁵⁹ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1879, No.109.

²⁶⁰ “Rich’ o. P. Iasenys’koho...,” *Slovo*, 20.08 (1.09).1880

be able to feed himself, his wife and his four children.²⁶¹ Rev. Iasenyts'kyi in this speech also describes his ideal Ruthenian:

A Ruthenian with character does not sell off the rights of his nation, does not covet money or drink during elections, does not pay attention to flattering words from the enemy because, for him, honor and the wellness of his nation are more important than hoards, so he votes for the honest, learned Ruthenian as for his older brother. Such a Ruthenian has a civil consciousness as a free citizen of a constitutional state.

Every member of Kachkovskii society must have such a consciousness, must be aware and support it among his [sic!] compatriots and thus fulfill the goal of this society.²⁶²

The following peasant members – Dymytrii Detsyk, Atanasii Rybak, Mykhailo Mydliak, and Vasyl' Plaskach from Berezhnytsia – were at this meeting.²⁶³

In the much smaller, much less populated but more ethnically homogenous Turka district there were 103 members of the Turka branch of the Kachkovskii society. The most important difference between Sambir and Turka lay in the fact that the Zhukotyn deanery supported the society's activities. The dean, Rev. Nazarevych from Mshanets', chaired the branch's meetings. This deanery also included Rev. Iavors'kyi, who had been enlightening peasants in Radlovychi near Sambir being transferred to the mountains. The branch's chair was Rev. Salamon Schastnyi, who had been a renowned ritualist since the 1860s. The priests in the mountains felt more independent in the offices of the poorest Greek Catholic parishes and did not hope to receive better ones. The branch's executive bought clover, which was propagated among the peasants to improve the stock of mountainous cattle and horses.²⁶⁴ Rev. Iasenyts'kyi was present in Turka and served a Liturgy. It is not an accident that he was twice elected in the Turka district and not in the Sambir district where he resided.

Rev. Pavlo Iasenyts'kyi claimed to have contacts with the peasants and to have won the trust of many of them. In 1877 he said that a certain peasant trusted him to withdraw 2,000 Gulden from the district credit bank for him.²⁶⁵ After his death in 1883 almost all Ruthenian activities in Sambir stopped. There were no more meetings of the Kachkovskii society's branch, no deanery assemblies, no reports on attempts to found reading clubs. The idea about residency for Ruthenian students was no longer mentioned. Even fundraising for a monument

²⁶¹ Ibid.

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1880, No.93.

²⁶⁴ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1881, No.89.

²⁶⁵ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1877, No.41.

to honor Rev. Iasenyts'kyi could not be accomplished. It was said about Rev Iasenyts'kyi:

We did not value him too much while he was alive. Now we see, know and understand what a loss we suffered with his death and how difficult it is to find among us people someone, who could or wanted to substitute for him.²⁶⁶

Even during Rev. Isenyts'kyi's lifetime there were no local gymnasium students among the members of the Kachkovskii society, and this in the city whose most important scientific and cultural institution was the gymnasium. His own son had belonged to the Ukrainian student *bromada* in the 1860s. We also know that many gymnasium students were members of *Prosvita*. Franko himself belonged to *Prosvita* when he was a gymnasium student in Drohobych, just as Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi had.²⁶⁷ We do not hear anything about reading clubs in the area administrated by the branch, and know for sure that there was not a single one in 1879.

According to Pavlyk, from 1871 to 1878 181 Ruthenian reading clubs were founded, of which 171 were in Galicia.²⁶⁸ Perhaps the Turka branch made several attempts to establish them. According to Pavlyk's information the first reading club in the Sambir area opened on 28 March 1873, in the village of Zadił's'ko.²⁶⁹ In fact, it was in the Turka district; the parish priest in this village was the already mentioned Rev. Roman Pasichyns'kyi. There was also supposed to be an apocryphal reading club in Berehy founded by Rev. Kunevych, but we know about it only in connection with its becoming a member of the *Prosvita* society under the influence of a new priest, Rev. Ivan Mel'nyk, in the 1880s.²⁷⁰

The statistics on reading clubs are very unreliable. While in the 1890s and 1900s reading clubs were created as parts of either *Prosvita* or the Kachkovskii society, they had to exist as separate organizations in the 1870s. Reading clubs were created independently and only later could join a society. It is very difficult to call the established reading clubs the Kachkovskii society's reading clubs. According to Pavlyk's calculations, these reading clubs had around 10,000 members, which must be a gross exaggeration. We have membership numbers for individual reading clubs from a later period, which show that reading clubs without their own buildings could not be that large.²⁷¹ These numbers would be more likely for

²⁶⁶ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1884, No.7.

²⁶⁷ Ivan Franko. *Dokumenty i materialy*, 161.

²⁶⁸ Pavlyk, *Pro rus'ko-ukraïns'ki narodni chytal'ni*, 115.

²⁶⁹ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 63p.3, a.14.

²⁷⁰ Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv*, 39, 45.

²⁷¹ Pavlyk, *Pro rus'ko-ukraïns'ki narodni chytal'ni*, 133. For comparison see Chapter 8 of this thesis.

the membership of the sobriety brotherhoods, which did not require any sustained activity. There are no documents on reading clubs in the 1870s in the Viceroy's Office; perhaps many of them were never registered. When reading clubs were founded in Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova, the impression is that they were founded from scratch. Only by accident were we able to find that an "unofficial" reading club had existed in Volia Iakubova before.

None of the reading clubs in the 1870s had their own space. They were short-lived, and their activities were too centered on the priests. According to Pavlyk, the Kachkovskii society was for the creation of the reading clubs from its founding, but we know that some members of the society were against reading clubs well into the 1880s.

Pavlyk also provides us with the dynamics of the founding of reading clubs in the 1870s.²⁷²

1871 - 1

1872 - 15

1873 - 34

1874 - 51

1875 - 28

1876 - 27

1877 - 9

1878 - 6

Unfortunately, he does not provide any data on the decline of these reading clubs. A report from the Sambir branch of the Kachkovskii society indicates that all attempts to found reading clubs there failed. In 1881 Ivan Franko said there were only several dozen reading clubs in Galicia.²⁷³ The years of the boom, according to Pavlyk's statistics, were the years of the peak of the temperance movement. "Reading clubs" founded at that time could simply be attachments to the temperance movement. We know that Pavlyk's own experience with the Kachkovskii society was not that satisfying. When members of the Kachkovskii's society voted against his proposition to translate the Bible into the vernacular and publish it for the people, the peasants allegedly said to him: "Yes, yes! You are telling the truth, they close our eyes (covering their own eyes with their hands while saying that), they want us to remain blind!"²⁷⁴

²⁷² Ibid., 151-2.

²⁷³ Ivan Franko, "Choho khoche halyts'ka robitnycha hromada?," in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.45 (Kyiv: "Naukova dumka," 1986), 153.

²⁷⁴ Ibid., 154.

From Peasants to Students

The late 1860s – early 1870s were a time when many peasant sons somehow connected with the people around whom my research revolved, were in school. Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi is an obvious example. Others are Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi (the parish priest in Vaniovychi and the enemy of Ivan Mykhas), the leaders of the Radical Party – Ivan Franko and Mykhailo Pavlyk, one of the leaders of the Russophile party – Osyp (Iosif) Markov, and Rev. Korostens'kyi's protégé, Rev. Iosyf Iavors'kyi, a young priest involved in the Dobrivliany affair, and Danylo Lepkyi, born in 1858 in the village of Litnia. Was this intelligentsia of peasant origin somehow connected with the changes that took place in the 1860s, especially in the school system and what did the education of these peasant sons look like? This would be the question with which I am concerned in this section.

During the 1860s the most important educational institution in Sambir and in the Sambir area was Sambir gymnasium. In 1867, of 281 students 155 (or 55.2%) were “Ruthenians,” most probably Greek-Catholics. The Sambir gymnasium was more prestigious than the one in Drohobych run by the Basylian Fathers, which is why many peasant sons studied in Drohobych and fewer in Sambir. Both peasants and petty gentry from the neighboring villages provided their children studying in town with food. Therefore, for the students from distant villages, studying at the gymnasium was virtually impossible. For example, “one poor gentry from Kul'chytsi could bring food every day from the village [to the Sambir gymnasium], which would be impossible if he had had, because of the poor marks, to transfer his son to the Drohobych gymnasium.”²⁷⁵ The high number of Polish students was not only the outcome of the fact that the higher classes of the population with better access to education were Polish but also can be explained by the Polish majority in the town of Sambir and the existence of Polish villages in the close vicinity of Sambir – the result of seventeenth-eighteenth century colonization.

From another source we know that in 1870 students attending this gymnasium divided according to the profession of their fathers as follows: 20% were priests' sons, 23% – officials' sons, 10% – middle gentry (probably, smaller noble landowners), 12% – artisans, 9% – lower governmental servants, 18% –peasants (probably including rustical petty gentry), 3% – teachers, 5% – others. It was said that the “peasants from the area, especially petty gentry ... send their more talented sons here.” These peasant sons were not given more than 30 Gulden every year for living expenses, and food was brought to them weekly.²⁷⁶

18% was still a significant number, especially if we take into account the fact that allegedly already since 1862 through an increase in the tax burden the

²⁷⁵ “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1867, No.53.

²⁷⁶ “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1870, No.47.

number of peasant students in the gymnasium was decreasing. Together with the increasing tax burden went the decrease in the opportunities for additional earnings of the local peasants because the prison in Sambir was taking over municipal works for its prisoners.²⁷⁷ Even 30 Gulden a year was, for the majority of the peasants, an incredibly large amount of money. Only wealthier peasants could afford to send their sons to school. Ivan Franko's father, for example, had 24 Joch, and his stepfather, who continued to support Franko's education, acquired even more land.²⁷⁸ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi's father had 25 Joch of land.²⁷⁹ And the father of Ivan Maksym'iak, another peasant son who made it to the gymnasium, had almost 60 Joch.²⁸⁰

While economically it became more difficult for peasants to get into the gymnasium, the 1860s witnessed a general animation in the system of primary schooling and thus more peasant sons could get sufficient education to enter a gymnasium. At first Ruthenian activists emphasized the need to force peasants to found and attend schools, assuming that they would resist it. This was indeed sometimes the case and as demonstrated in the chapter on 1848, this was the outcome of the existence of a different system of knowledge more useful in the village setting than the one propagated in the official schools. The story of an official who founded a school in a village when the villagers refused to do so, was published in the first Ruthenian popular newspaper:

We: no and no. That gentleman got very angry and started shouting, abusing and swearing, and finally kicked us out of the house. Bad thing! In an hour he called us back and said: see, people, you need a school; if you were literate, you would not allow me to abuse you and throw you out of your own house. Why? Because you would know that according to the Emperor's law you could not be abused in the way I just did, but you do not know that and allow anyone to abuse you. When we heard that, we started thinking this way and that. And decided that it was true!²⁸¹

This article reflects the thinking of the 1848 generation, which assumed that the peasants did not understand the need for knowledge schools provided and had to be forced or tricked to found schools. There are data indicating that, by the end of the 1860s, significant progress had been reached as far as the founding of village schools was concerned. For example, in the Sambir deanery alone eleven

²⁷⁷ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1879, No.139.

²⁷⁸ Bass and Kaspruk, *Ivan Franko*, 7.

²⁷⁹ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "'Lisy i pasovys'ka' (Spomyny)," *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk*, t.52, 1910, 503.

²⁸⁰ See Ivan Franko's letter to Drahomanov in Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.48 (Kyiv, 1986), 350. About his father being a wealthy peasant see also correspondence between Franko and Maksym'iak – VR IL, f.3, spr.1618, a.83.

²⁸¹ "Pys'mo voita Ivana Nepana do redaktsiy," *Dom i shkola*, 1863, No.3.

new village schools were introduced, largely thanks to the activity of Rev. Iosyf Lavrets'kyi and the authority he enjoyed among the peasants.²⁸²

For the most of the 1860s, before the secularization of elementary education, primary schools were under the control of the Church, which was the single authority controlling them. The "visitation" (inspection) of the Sambir school district from 30.09.-14.10. 1866 showed that there were Polish and German schools in the following communities: Povodova, Fel'shtyn, Khyriv, Stare Koblo, Turka, Kaiserdorf, Strilkovychi, Kranzberg, Josefsberg, Ugartberg, Brigadanz, and Königsau. There were Ruthenian primary schools in Babyna, Sambir (3), Voiutychi, Stara Sil', Stril'bychi, Lavriv, Linya Velyka, Khashchiv, Iablinka vyzhnia, Iablinka nyzhnia, Bitlia, Libukhora, Pidbuzh, Opaka, Ulychno, Hassendorf, Limna, Chaikovychi, Strashevychi, Dobrohotiv, Stebnyk, Modrych, Drohobych (2), Nahuievychi, Iasenytisia silna, Tatory, Volia Iakubova, Bolekhivtsi, Hai' Vyzhni, Kavsko, Bronytsia, Bilyna velyka, Dorozhiv, Medynychi, and Komarno.²⁸³

In 1870 Rev. Korostens'kyi composed a list of the schools in his Mokriany deanery together with the number of students in them. There were trivial schools in Bilyna Velyka (56 pupils), Bronytsia (43), Dorozhiv (100), Iakubova Volia (35), Iasenytisia Sil'na (43), Litynia (33), Luka (temporarily had a teacher's position vacant), Nahuievychi (50), Opaka (21), Pidbuzh (63), Tatory (43), and Voloshcha (43). There were "regulated" parish schools in Horodyshche (15), Ozymyna (teacher's position vacant), Prusy (14), and Tyniv (23). There were also schools "with the knowledge and permission of the k. k. government" in Bykiv (24), Ortynychy (16), Silets' (teacher's position vacant), Stupnytsia (29), Tyniv (teacher's position vacant), Urozh (teacher's position vacant); and some schools "without the knowledge of the k. k. government" in Hrushiv Dolishnii (17) and in Hrushiv Horishnii (13), obviously run by Rev. Korostens'kyi himself. In total, the village schools in the Mokriany deanery in 1870 had 733 pupils.²⁸⁴ These numbers obviously show how wrong were journalistic escapades against the school system that developed in the absolutist times, stating, for example, that in the mid-1860s elementary village schools in the whole of Galicia had only 1500 pupils.²⁸⁵ They also prove how unreliable official statistics were. According to them, in 1866 there were only 13 schools with 232 pupils.²⁸⁶ In 1880 all but two parishes in the

²⁸² "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1874, 8(20).01.

²⁸³ Fylypchak, Ivan, *Shkola v Stril'bychakh. Narys z istorii shkilnytstva* (L'viv, 1936), 26-27.

²⁸⁴ APP, ABGK, sygn.8733.

²⁸⁵ Teofil Merunowicz, *Wyniki samorządu Galicji. Z powodu 50-lecia istnienia urzędzeń autonomicznych w Galicji* (Lwów, 1916), 17.

²⁸⁶ *Provinzial handbuch der Königreiche Galizien und Lodomerien für Jahr 1845* (Lemberg, 1845). *Provinzial handbuch der Königreiche Galizien und Lodomerien für das Jahr 1866* (Lemberg, 1866).

Mokriany deanery had schools and Greek Catholic population of the Mokirany deanery was 30,623 people. All the schools from Korostens'kyi's list were intact except of those in Hrushiv, the only new school appears in Dubliany but, perhaps, this school was in Roman-Catholic jurisdiction and therefore not mentioned by Rev. Korostens'kyi in 1870.²⁸⁷

In fact, the data on the Galician elementary schools shows that the the ratio between the schools and population achieved in the 1860s – one school per 1870 people, was surpassed only in the 1890s:²⁸⁸

Table 5-1 “Development of Galician Elementary Schools”

Year	Number of elementary schools	Number of teachers	One school per population of	One school per sq. km.	Population of Galicia	Number of illiterate over the age of six
1846	2257	2490	2098	34.2	4, 555, 477	
1848	2231	2471	2112	34.6	4, 555, 477	
1862	2547	2776	1870	30.8	4,632,866	
1869	2469	3165	2205	31.7	5, 444, 689	
1880	2853	4312	2089	27.5	5,958,907	3, 787, 298
1889/90	3476	5141	1901	22.6	6,607,816	3,727,175
1900/1	4004	8323	1827	19.6	7,315,939	3,387,378

The absolutist government of the *Vormärz* period, and, especially, the government of Bach era, appears in these statistics in much better light than Galician autonomy in its first decades. The introduction of the autonomy and secularization of the education caused even absolute decline in the number of schools. As late as the 1880s, Galician Diet (with no peasant deputy left in it) was cutting the budget of the Provincial School Council and representatives of the Diet's majority spoke against the expansion of elementary education.²⁸⁹

It seems that the schooling activities of the Church became more focused in the 1860s. Many of the parish schools were changed into state trivial schools even

²⁸⁷ *Schematismus Venerabilis Praemislensis ... 1880*. Of course, it should be remembered that Mokriany deanery was exceptional because of Rev. Korostens'kyi. In the same 1880 of 17 parishes of the Sambir deanery seven were reported to have no schools. One would wonder if it was just an accident that Ivan Franko, the most famous nineteenth century son of a Ruthenian Galician peasant came from this deanery.

²⁸⁸ [Stefan Zaleski] *Światłomir, Ciemnota Galicyi w świetle cyfr i faktów, 1772-1902. Czarna księga szkolnictwa galicyjskiego*, (Lwów, 1904), 128..

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 18-19, 38.

before they were subordinated to the Provincial School Council. In 1865, the parish school in Berehy was changed into a trivial one, and a cantor-teacher, Petro Chyzh, taught there.²⁹⁰ In 1865 the school in Hordynia was changed into a trivial school. This was the year Andrii Chaikovs'kyi started attending that school. The teacher was Teodor Prystash, who lived in Bilynka mala but was a cantor in the parish of Hordynia. A graduate of the Institute for Cantors and Teachers in Peremyshl' founded by the Bishop Stupnyts'kyi, he dressed himself in the same way the local petty gentry did. He knew how to write in Cyrillic and dropped the occasional Church Slavonic word, like "*ia zabył, nit, dazhe*," into his daily speech.²⁹¹ Girls attended school in Hordynia as well as boys, had better marks and were not subject to corporal punishment. The local parish priest Rev. Horodys'kyi taught catechism.²⁹² Andrii Chaikovs'kyi recalls:

Interest in the school was significant among the petty gentry as well as among the peasants. Everyone wanted his child to be taught to read in German and Polish: Polish for the offices and German for the army. That is why Prystai's students had to know the whole *Comenius* by heart. But about grammar they did not have the slightest idea. Ukrainian was learnt only for church, and the real achievement was when a student could read the *Apostol* in church. I also noticed that the peasants were more sympathetically inclined towards learning Ukrainian than the [petty] gentry, who were more eager to learn Polish. Rev. Horodys'kyi, although himself a gentry of immemorial ancestry, reproached the petty gentry and complained a lot that they considered learning a Polish prayer to be a sign of a better tone. Because of that, various conflicts were constantly occurring between the gentry and the parish priest, conflicts, which went even to the Metropolitan Consistory.

Petty gentry from Zakuttia, part of Hordynia, finally boycotted the school and brought in a different teacher, Lekusz, from Dubliany,' only then did they realize Prystash's worth.²⁹³ Similarly, we know that not just Hordynia, but, for example, Stril'bychi, with its teacher Bushchakovs'kyi, had a good trivial school.²⁹⁴ These village teachers were quite often remembered as the first enlighteners of their respective communities.

It seems that in the 1860s a more active attitude on the part of the school authorities was paired with a growing interest in schooling among the villagers.

²⁹⁰ Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv Sambirs'koho povitu*, 53.

²⁹¹ Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Hordyni. Narys z istorii shkil'nytstva*, Pedagogichno-metodychna biblioteka, vypusk 7 (L'viv: nakladom tovarystva "Vzaimna pomich ukrains'koho vchytel'stva", 1938), 8.

²⁹² Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Hordyni*, 10.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

²⁹⁴ Ivan Fylypchak, "Z istorii shkil'nytstva na zakhidni Boikivshchyni (1772-1930)," *Litopys Boikivshchyny*, 1931, No.1, 85.

The peasants did not simply wait for the school and the teacher to come. Many villages hired literate people to teach the village children. As an example we can take a certain Kanarek, who came to the village of Lishnia, in the Sanok district. The peasants paid him 40 Gulden a year and took turns cooking for him. He taught the children German, Polish and Ruthenian, read some apocryphal biblical passages, taught religious songs and in the evenings in the tavern told older people about events in the world and various miracles.²⁹⁵

Similarly in Mshanets' the peasants invited a certain Vasył' Sehyn, who taught children unofficially.¹ After teaching in school, in the evenings he would read aloud from books published by the Kachkovskii Society, the newspaper *Nauka*, and sing songs against vodka. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi relates that "this man brought news to the village, new views." He built himself a stone house, and later a village shop and *Prosvita* reading club would be located there. He also bought a mill in Groziova.²⁹⁶ In the village of Ortynychi there was a certain Andrei Horstka who, despite not being gentry (a great deficiency in a petty gentry community like Ortynychi), taught the children of the petty gentry to read and served the community as a cantor. A similar unofficial teacher in 1862 was hired in the village of Morozovychi. This was young petty gentry, to whom peasants paid two Gulden a year per pupil and cooked food taking turns.²⁹⁷

Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi's autobiography gives us an example of the education of a peasant son from a distant mountainous village. Despite, "truthfully believing in various folk superstitions," Zubryts'kyi's father got the idea that Mykhailo should learn "writing" (*pys'mo*). Being quite wealthy for a peasant, "he said that gentlemen very often asked him if he knew how to sign his name and he was humiliated having to answer 'no.'" Other people also maintained that: "it is so good when a man knows at least the numbers; sometimes in the army and in the large city it comes in very handy because you know where to go." Then Zubryts'kyi's father made an arrangement with another peasant, Ivan Adykovets', and having agreed to share the costs of the instructor, they brought in a certain Stefan Il'nyts'kyi from the village of Il'nyk to teach their children to read and write. Stefan was an orphan, homeless, and already middle-aged. He did not know much, and it did not take Mykhailo's father long to figure out that this kind of education would not be particularly useful. He sent Mykhailo to attend a school in the town of Turka, where Mykhailo could live with his aunt.²⁹⁸

Unfortunately Mykhailo aunt's house burnt down, and he had to discontinue his education and pasture the family cattle throughout the summer. In 1866 his aunt

²⁹⁵ Ivan Fylypchak, "Z istorii sela Lishni Sianits'koho povita," *ZNTSh*, t.149 (L'viv, 1928), 106.

²⁹⁶ VR LNB, f. Vasył' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.23.

²⁹⁷ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny I," *Bar'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.50, 312.

²⁹⁸ VR LNB, f. Vasył' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.4.

undertook a pilgrimage, where she happened to meet up with the son of Mykhailo mother's uncle. This son was Rev. Iakiv Neronovych, a parish priest in Rozbir, a Russophile who would become an in-law relative of Iosif Markov. He advised her to send Mykhailo to him. Rozbir was a parish consolidating a few Greek Catholic peasants dispersed in an area with a Polish majority. One of the peasant neighbors back in Kindrativ tried to scare Mykhailo: "You will be among *Mazury* [Polish peasants] there; these are not good people. When they come for a pilgrimage and the disturbances start, they wound our people in the ribs with an awl."²⁹⁹ This was not the only knowledge of ethnic differences little Mykhailo picked up in the village. When on the way to Rozbir they entered a tavern, he ran away, scared by the great number of Jews. Back in the village he had heard many stories about Jews putting Christian children into a barrel with nails inside it and rocking the barrel to mix Christian blood with their ritual bread.

In Rozbir, Mykhailo learned to sing the Liturgy and to read Ruthenian and Polish reading anthologies. He went through the large Catechism published by Metropolitan Levyts'kyi and the Bible. The Ruthenian language in Rozbir was mixed with Polonisms; only a few families spoke Ruthenian at home. It is interesting that in spite of this, village children were taught both languages at school. Having finished this education in 1868, at the age of 12, Mykhailo entered the normal school of the Basilian Fathers in Drohobych.³⁰⁰ When in Drohobych, Mykhailo's father supported him with money for the first two years, but after this Mykhailo had to earn money himself.³⁰¹ Just like Hryhorii Rymar, he was drafted in the army, but because of poor health he did not serve the whole term.

For most peasant children, there was no direct way from the village school to the gymnasium. To enter a gymnasium they had to finish one of the better "normal" or "main" schools. For the Drohobych gymnasium such a school was in Drohobych, for the Sambir gymnasium – in Sambir and, for the southern mountainous region, in Lavriv, the "main" school at the Basilian monastery. Many prominent activists and peasant sons studied in Lavriv in the 1860s. One of them was Mykola Bobers'kyi, born on 21 May 1844, in Lopushanka Lekhnova. In 1860 he finished school in Lavriv and went to the gymnasium in Sambir, which he attended from 1861 to 1868, studying under Oleksandr Borkovs'kyi, who influenced him very much.³⁰² In 1868 he entered the L'viv theological seminary.³⁰³

²⁹⁹ VR LNB, f. Vasył' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.5.

³⁰⁰ VR LNB, f. Vasył' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.6.

³⁰¹ VR LNB, f. Vasył' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.8.

³⁰² Oleksandr Borkovs'kyi is buried with his whole family in the village of Vaniovychi, where Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi was a parish priest.

³⁰³ Ivan Fylypchak; Roman Lukan', *Ts. K. Okruzhna Holovna shkola v Lavrovi*, 121, 164.

Peasant students very often had problems not only in coping with the school and urban environment, which were new to them, but also with their parents. Markov's correspondence with his father, which largely went through Rev. Korostens'kyi, throws some light on relationships between gymnasium students of peasant origin and their fathers. Even when Markov was in the fifth grade of the gymnasium in L'viv, he was supported by his peasant father, with money being sent through Rev. Korostens'kyi.³⁰⁴ In his sixth year, Markov received insufficient grades. Rev. Korostens'kyi promised not to tell Markov's father about this, but in exchange Markov had to give up a relationship with a certain S. (perhaps Shekhovych). He also advised Markov to move back to the Drohobych gymnasium.³⁰⁵ Rev. Korostens'kyi had to defend Markov's father and his dislike of supporting his son's seemingly endless education: "do not wonder about your father's thriftiness because he works hard for every cent."³⁰⁶ Finally, at the end of 1869 Rev. Korostens'kyi got tired of his mediating role. In December he was reading a letter of Iosyf's to his father, as usual in the presence of several other farmers, and the issue of money again came up. The father said: "How long will I keep this up?" Other people tried to convince the father that it was worth it. The letter of Rev. Korostens'kyi to Iosyf Markov with a description of this event ends as follows:

Mister, if you want to write something to Your Father, then write to the hands of the community Mayor, who is in daily contact with your father and can influence him more [than I can], but take care not to offend your father with a careless word, because this is a father, who is an honest man and not without feelings.³⁰⁷

In April 1870 Markov wrote to his father for the sixth time that year and finished his angry letter with the following: "It happened. I am not going to write to you anymore if I don't receive a reply." After that he added: "Maybe something should be mine according to the Emperor's law, then I'll have to request it through the law."³⁰⁸ In June 1870 he wrote: "I did not expect to write you 5-6 letters about *didactrum* and hoped to get money as soon as I requested it." He threatened his father with even more expenses – if the professors did not assign him a grade in the next two weeks, he would have to do another year at the gymnasium. He said that he was spending money writing all these letters and had to promise professors every time that would bring the money the next day. At the

³⁰⁴ VR LNB, f.Osip Markov, 335, p.9, a.1.

³⁰⁵ VR LNB, f.Osip Markov, 335, p.9, a.2.

³⁰⁶ VR LNB, f. Osip Markov, 335, p.9, a.4.

³⁰⁷ VR LNB, f. Osip Markov, 335, p.9, a.5.

³⁰⁸ VR LNB, f. Osip Markov, 218/p.8, a.2.

end Markov wrote: “Nevertheless, you can do as you wish, but I will not be guilty in that case.”³⁰⁹

In the 1860s we witness the appearance of a new category of people – intelligentsia of peasant origin. In the 1850s the first peasant son from the village of Stril’bychi became a teacher. Then a certain Petro Ianiv became a priest, and his brother Ivan Ianiv – a gendarme. Both had graduated from the main school in Lavriv.³¹⁰ Lavriv was the main educational and cultural center for people from the mountainous area in the Staryi Sambir district. Ivan Kopach (born in 1870 in Groziova), whose father was a veteran of 1848 and an invalid, while his mother was the daughter of Mykhailo Stebel’s’kyi, a local cantor, whose two other sons became priests, graduated from the Drohobych gymnasium in 1889 and from university in 1894. He recalled: “whoever in these villages was at least a little ‘learned’ (outside of the priest’s home), brought all this ‘learning’ directly or indirectly, precisely from ‘around Lavriv.’”³¹¹

As the first intelligentsia of peasant origin started to appear, the “learned” people in the villages were still semi-educated cantors and peasants, who had gotten their “education” from religious centers like Lavriv or from service in the imperial army. This would change only in the 1880s when the generation of peasant sons who went through gymnasia in the 1870s would partly come back to the villages as priests and teachers.

Temperance

Although usually the revival of the temperance brotherhoods’ idea is connected with the 1870s and with Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, in fact this revival started in the 1860s.³¹² The authors propagating sobriety at that time pointed to America as the country that had made the greatest leap forward by introducing temperance. Similarly Galicia could become a merrier and wealthier place with the introduction of temperance.³¹³ (In the context of this discourse quite radical “medicine” against drinking was advertised. This medicine was sulphuric acid, which was to be added to the glass of vodka was given to a drunk several times a day. One famous American doctor assured that in three days this medicine would insure that even the most hard-core drunk couldn’t even bear the sight of a glass of vodka.)³¹⁴ What Archbishop Sembratovych did was give rural clergy *carte blanche*

³⁰⁹ VR LNB, f. Osyp Markov, 218/p.8, a.3.

³¹⁰ Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Stril’bychakh*, 38.

³¹¹ Ivan Fylypchak and Roman Lukan’, *Ts. K. Okruchna Holovna shkola v Lavrovi*, 142, 177.

³¹² The first attempt to start temperance movement was in 1845.

³¹³ “O obshchestvakh vozderzhaniia,” *Dom i shkola*, 1863, No.5.

³¹⁴ “Prymichanie do likarstva protyvu p’ianstva,” *Dom i shkola*, 1863, No.5.

to conduct temperance agitation, as well as giving the agitation religious overtones.

“The Charter of the Temperance Brotherhood,” the most popular publication for peasants in the 1870s included the following passage:

With this I recognize and acknowledge that I will not only be guilty to God but also deserve the dishonor of people and even exclusion from this Brotherhood if I ever dare to break this sacred oath, which I give now voluntarily and after careful deliberation.³¹⁵

The oath obliged a peasant not to drink vodka; mead, wine, and beer were allowed, however, if consumed moderately. In other popular publications abstaining from drinking was encouraged largely for the economic benefits it could bring. Some passages in the Charter itself show that the sobriety campaign of the 1870s was part of the project to integrate peasants into capitalist relationships, an integration which was supposed to occur through the subjective transformation and acceptance of the capitalist values:

brothers and sisters of the brotherhood of modesty and sobriety, servants and laborers, will never agree to being paid in vodka, to being paid in a tavern or to working for *toloka* [work without payment followed by a treat] so they will have something from their service and work and will not end with losses and alcoholism.

At the very end of the Charter, there were statements from doctors about the harm caused by vodka.³¹⁶ But this medical discourse was really marginal in the 1870s. After economic interests, individual will and awareness were represented as those affected most by drinking; drunkenness was said to be a form of slavery “worse than serfdom.”³¹⁷ Alcohol clouded one’s reason and deprived man of his dignity. Addiction here is approached not as a medical but rather a social dependency, resulting from a lack of will-power and preventing the transformation of one’s subjectivity.

To distinguish between the Kachkovskii society’s activities and the sobriety campaign is not to deny a certain juncture between the two. Temperance ethics fit into the agenda set by Rev. Naumovych in Russkaia Rada in 1873. The task of the Ruthenian movement was to eradicate the following sources of Ruthenian misfortune, for which Ruthenians were allegedly well-known throughout the world:

1. our ignorance (*temnota*)

³¹⁵ Hramota bratstva vstremezlyvosty zalozhnogo roku 1874, (L’vov, 1885), 4.

³¹⁶ Ibid.

³¹⁷ F. A. Shtrobl’, Prosvishcheniie, 40.

2. our negligence (*neradenie*)
3. our carefreeness/easy-goingness (*lehkodushie*)
4. our poverty.³¹⁸

Rev. Naumovych and his supporters saw the sobriety movement as a way to eradicate these evils. The motto of the Kachkovskii society's publications was "Learn, Pray and Be Sober" (*Mohysia, Uchysia, Trezysia*). The collection of readings for peasants which borrowed its title from a *Prosvita* collection described the world of nations climbing a sort of common ladder, striving for the improvement of their well-being and in this competing with each other. Of all of these nations only Ruthenians were not interested in it. This lack of concern had to be remedied by propaganda about 1) school education; 2) trade and industry; 3) knowledge about better agricultural practices. Ruthenian resistance to foreign pressure and advancing pauperization had to be anchored in the land of their ancestors, sobriety, and science. After this declaration, articles on compost, better agriculture and the temperance movement followed.³¹⁹

The movement was not trying to incite class antagonism with this temperance campaign. It reproached greedy landlords who were concerned only with their own narrow interests and did not care about the larger augmentation of prosperity, which the introduction of sobriety would bring to the province. It is interesting that this sobriety movement met with enthusiastic support among the peasants. The first peasant contributions we meet in the Kachkovskii society's publications in the 1870s appear in the context of the sobriety movement. As an example we can take a poem by Vasyl' Klymchak, a cantor in Beleluia who wrote a poem entitled "Procession to Karliv," the famous Ruthenian village near Sniatyn, where the sobriety brotherhood was founded. People came to the tavern and said:

You will not laugh of us anymore // and call us "goy" // you must know
we are gentlemen and you are "sons of a..." [a substitution for swear
words] " ...And we poor Ruthenians // are house-masters in our land."³²⁰

Many peasant radicals began their public activities within the framework of the sobriety movement. This was the case of Ivan Sanduliak from the village of Karliv, who as a youngster was very enthusiastic about the "introduction of sobriety" in Karliv and had a very high opinion of the priest who did it. A similar case is that of another radical peasant, Pavlo Dumka. I suspect that the popularity of the sobriety campaign was grounded not in the economic benefits it promised to peasants but in its appeal for moral betterment, which resonated with peasant

³¹⁸ "Sama svoia pomich. – (Self-help)," *Russkaia Rada*, 1873, No.5.

³¹⁹ *Nyva* (L'vov: nakladom Obshchestva imeni Kachkovskoho, 1878).

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, 78-85.

ideas about righteous behavior pleasing God, of which abstinence was always a part. The Charter of the Sobriety Brotherhood resembled the so-called “letters from heaven” and, as such, fit very well into the cultural practices of peasants under the old regime – the whole campaign had strong millenarian overtones.

Let’s look at how this temperance campaign occurred in the villages. I shall start with the history of the village of Karliv (the Sniatyn district) as described by the peasant radical Ivan Sanduliak in his book The Vilage of Karliv Earlier and Now.³²¹ The story starts in times gone by:

times of universal drinking, times when almost no one paid attention to the harm that came to people because of the downing of deadly vodka; times when few cared about schools and various arrangements required for people, such as reading clubs, communal granaries, loan departments, shops and other useful things.³²²

The parish priest in these times (the 1850s and 1860s) was Rev. Petro Pidliashets’kyi, a real people-lover, who played violin for them and drank with the peasants in the local tavern. “Nothing was left after him.”³²³ There was a community granary, but villagers had little use of it. The Church brotherhood’s yearly caroling was followed by months of fights, drinking and mutual apologies. Debauchery and dissoluteness ruled, even on Church holidays. This continued until the new priest Rev. Antin Voievodka, “our patron and conqueror of our enemies,” arrived. Rev. Voievodka, unlike Pidliashets’kyi, was a priest of the new generation: born in 1833 and ordained in 1857, he died in 1883. His formative years were those following 1848.

The new priest urged peasants “to introduce among us a new order; otherwise we shall die and there will be no trace left after us.” The first action towards the introduction of this new order was plowing up of the common – the very common, which was so central for any community action and the common usage of which the peasants had insisted during the servitude struggles. Apparently, the common was transformed into arable land and sold to individual peasants in parcels. This action brought 15, 000 Gulden to the newly established community loan department.³²⁴ In the meantime, a struggle against the tavern started. The first stage in this struggle was to force peasants to stop visiting the tavern and

³²¹ Ivan Sanduliak, Selo Karliv kolys’ a teper’, Material podav Ivan Sanduliak. Uporiadkuvala i vydala redaktsiia “Bat’kivshchyny” [bold in original] (L’viv, 1890).

³²² Ibid., 3.

³²³ Ibid., 4.

³²⁴ Ibid., 15-16.

consume alcohol at home. The priest also organized community gatherings, during which he read books and newspapers aloud.³²⁵

Finally, on the eve of Christmas in 1874, the peasants themselves came to the priest and asked if they could completely turn away from taverns:

From this moment a very lively movement started among our peasants in the communities. Immediately after this declaration, the Community Council had a session and decided that no one under the threat of severe punishment dared to visit the tavern for a drink, and our youth had its games and parties under the supervision of parents near the monument of the abolition of *robot* in the center of the village. Another [new] governance was to limit the harmful customs of three and four day weddings to two days, and christening parties to one day. And it happened this way because the whole village supported it.³²⁶

The “spirit” from Karliv emptied all the taverns in the neighboring villages, and as it gained momentum, sobriety was introduced. First the temperance brotherhood was founded. “It was an enchanting minute for peasants. In the middle of the church a small table stood with the Gospel, a crucifix and two burning candles on it.”³²⁷ The ritual is very similar to one we find in *Farmazony*, or to the ritual Polish insurgents organized for peasants in Matkiv in 1846. The main difference is that now this ritual occurs in the church and is sanctified by the religious authority. In this way the first village organization was founded.

On the “Ruthenian New Year” (13 January 1875), the ritual of burying vodka was conducted. At first the district captaincy forbade this public manifestation, but after an appellation to the Viceroy’s office, the “burial” was allowed. A bottle of vodka was placed on a cart and:

Everything looked very solemn. The six best oxen with gilded horns and silvered yokes were harnessed to the cart. A handsome young man as healthy as an oak was chosen as to drive the oxen. He had on a red band banded crosswise and was holding in his hands a large standard. Around him four young men walked as if they were groom’s best men.

Procession and spiritual fathers walked on both sides of the cart, at the very end of which was a band of gunners that consisted of 24 men and was led by Mr. Ivan Sanduliak, a former non-commissioned officer.³²⁸

³²⁵ Ibid., 17-18.

³²⁶ Ibid., 21-22.

³²⁷ Ibid., 31.

³²⁸ Ibid., 34-35.

After a sermon, the bottle was buried by the priests. This was followed by the reading aloud of the charter of the temperance brotherhood, with people taking an oath of sobriety.

There were similar episodes in the Sambir area as well. Very close to the town of Sambir, the village of Radlovychi was tended to by Rev. Iosyf Lavrets'kyi, the Sambir parish priest and dean of the Sambir deanery, together with his assistant priests. It was said that in 1848 this community of 750, "was physically and morally, materially and spiritually in a state of decay." There were no literate and no "rich" among its 150 farmers; no one reached the age of 70. According to Rev. Lavrets'kyi, the cause lay in the numerous taverns and distilleries in the area, which provided plenty of opportunities for drinking. Rev. Lavrets'kyi started with children, "knowing that [old] habits and drives are practically incurable." He forced the community to establish a parish school and provide it with the building, the garden and part of the pasture. The community also raised money for a yearly salary for the teacher of 100 Gulden. Certain Mr. Farylo, who came in as a teacher, made of this school "an example of the development of Ruthenian schooling."

There are now thirty farmers educated in the above-mentioned school in Radlovychi. With the help of temperance, laboriousness, dexterity and parsimony, they have elevated the, poor and neglected farms they inherited to a prosperous condition. Their houses are surrounded with fruit and vegetable gardens; their cattle are fat and joyful. When the news about the oaths of abstaining from vodka spread and they found about it from the newspapers and books, they decided to establish a temperance brotherhood and incline drunkards to [join] it.³²⁹

In the introduction of temperance in Radlovychi, an assistant priest from Sambir, Rev. Kornyllo Iavors'kyi, helped the villagers (Rev. Lavrets'kyi passed away in 1873). Rev. Iavors'kyi worked in Sambir between 1870 and 1875 and proved to be a Ruthenian patriot opposed to the pro-Polish politics of the Sambir dean. In 1875 he was transferred to the Turka mountains, and one can assume that his anti-Polish stance was a factor.³³⁰

He preached sermons at Sunday vespers and encouraged 150 parishioners to take the oath of total abstinence; [now] they gather together with school students at 3 pm for vespers, during which under the direction of a teacher they read psalms and sing in two choirs; after vespers they gather near the school where they entertain themselves by singing spiritual and folk songs, reading Ruthenian books and newspapers and adequate books. After this they walk about in the teacher's garden. This garden of one

³²⁹ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1875, No.64.

³³⁰ "Is Sambora," *Slovo*, 1875, No.113.

Joch has more than 2000 grafts, several dozen mulberry trees, good grapes ..., and a bee-garden with 50 hives; the vegetable garden has all kinds of local vegetables and medical herbs. Pupils ask their illiterate fathers to give them part of the barren common, on which they would start cultivating, under the teacher's guidance, a small vegetable and fruit garden. Thus school education becomes a part of their life because it is practicable, taught in the Ruthenian language and is correlated with Church, economic and national life.³³¹

We must note that the village of Radlovychi became a target of the clergy from the city of Sambir because of the virtual absence of any compact Ruthenian community in the town of Sambir. The village-like Sambir suburbs were settled by ethnic Poles, who had settled there after the plagues of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In these circumstances, Radlovychi, because of its proximity to Sambir, was best situated to play the role of the polygon of Ruthenian activities. Radlovychi also gives us a picture of the ideal landscape of a "beautiful" and affluent village, as imagined by the largely clerical activists of the Ruthenian movement. Fruit gardens near the houses,³³² plowed-up "wild" pastures and dumps, roadsides with fruit trees and a particular arrangement of community space with the school, community institutions and a grand, richly decorated church at the center of the village and in close proximity of the rectory – this was the ideal Galician village landscape.³³³ The disappearance of the commons had to be compensated with the sowing of clover.³³⁴ And the worsening economic conditions in general had to be compensated with new attitudes towards labor, earnings and spending.

These exemplary villages contrasted with the landscape of "wild" unreformed communities. These latter villages engaged in debaucheries and promiscuities during traditional festivities, which were the opposite of the solemn, disciplining temperance rituals. These communities, frivolous, bawdy and at the same time oppressive, prevented good individuals to follow the path to the betterment they wanted to pursue. In addition to the rowdy festivities, the ignorant and lazy peasants in these communities insisted on celebrating many unimportant holidays, which, according to the reformers, was just a pretext for slackness. On

³³¹ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1875, No.64.

³³² In response to those who speak about Ukrainians' natural inclination for beauty and surround their houses with fruit gardens, we must say that these gardens appeared in the majority of Galician villages only in the second half of the nineteenth century, except in places like Synievyds'ko Vyznie, which were known for a large-scale trade in fruit. These cultivated symbols of culture and civilization were the concern of several generations of clerical activists.

³³³ There are numerous accounts of travels around Galicia, when the landscape is evaluated and imagined according to this ideal in the Ruthenian press. See, for example "Iz Samborskoho. (Vpechateniia puteshestvennika. Tserkov' v Navarii)," *Slovo*, 1873, No.81.

³³⁴ S. Boiko, "Pys'mo z Boikivshchyny do chesnykh hazdiv," *Russkaia Rada*, 1872, No.3.

these holidays not just work but all transactions, like lending things, were forbidden by stupid tradition.³³⁵ It was said that the peasants wasted their Sundays drinking, quarrelling and fighting. All this had to be changed, and the change had to start with individual dispositions and attitudes, which were the precondition of larger social transformation. Better conditions in Western Europe were thought to be grounded in the peculiarities of individual attitudes and different system of everyday behavior:

It is better in England, where civilization is at its highest point, i. e. where science and all kinds of nice customs are, and on Sunday all the taverns and bars and shops are closed there, and theaters in the cities are closed, and there is not even the smallest trade, and everyone devotes this one day a week to God and goes to church and listen to sermons and reads the Holy Script. That is why the greatest science and the greatest riches are in England.³³⁶

These better customs were based not only on Western European examples but also on the tradition of the local “golden days” peasants allegedly remembered . An article in the Russophile popular newspaper reported that:

earlier, as old people say, they did not sell milk from sheep to Jews in exchange for vodka, as we now do, that Jews eat milk and cheese and for this we should drink stinking vodka ... Earlier, when we were sinning less there was more potatoes in the mountains, but now heaven’s favor has changed.³³⁷

This explanation, which legitimates itself through the tradition, also introduces a quite new anti-Semitism. This anti-Semitism was still located within religious discourse – its emphasis was on the sin of wasting food, transforming it into poison – but the Jews are also presented as smarter people, who sell vodka to “strangers,” while reserving good, healthy food for themselves.

There is extensive proof of the fact that excessive drinking was thought to be sinful, while holiness and learning among peasants were associated with abstinence. Of the various manuscripts circulating in the countryside songs about, or to be more precise – against vodka were very popular.³³⁸ The village of Mshanets’ provides an interesting example of how anti-vodka tendencies arose “from below.” The first attempt to introduce sobriety here dates back to the

³³⁵ D., “Iz sela,” *Slovo*, 1878, No.135.

³³⁶ S. Boiko, “Pys'mo z Boikivshchyny do chesnykh hazdiv,” *Russkaia Rada*, 1872, No.3.

³³⁷ Fedor Dosinchuk, “Pys'mo ot Deliatyna,” *Russkaia Rada*, 1872, No.21.

³³⁸ See various collections of secular and religious songs and poems from the eighteenth – nineteenth century. VR LNB, f.NTSh, spr. 349-370, 726/7; f.ND, spr. 186, p.41.

1840s, when the local priest tried to make peasants take an anti-drinking oath. They were not willing to do so because they were not sure that they could live up to it. Moreover, they were suspicious of the local priest. The bad potato harvest of 1849 was ascribed to the priest's having cast an evil spell on the potatoes. Rev. Minchakevych threatened the peasants that he would not confess those who did not take a sobriety oath. To this one farmer answered: "I'll go to Lavriv, offer to pay two Kreuzer, and they [the monks] will fight for me."³³⁹

In the 1870s when Mshanets' peasants decided to bring a teacher to their village, they found Vasyl' Segan from Groziova, who had spent some time in the Orthodox Pochaiv monastery in the Russian Empire (although he himself claimed to have studied as far as Kiev) and came back with a cassock and beard. Besides teaching at school and reading popular books and newspapers to the peasants, he also taught them songs against drinking vodka. Segan did not drink himself, so his songs were well accepted. Zubryts'kyi describes Segan as a man who "brought news in the village, new views." Segan is an example of a prosperous peasant and of the grass roots of the temperance movement.³⁴⁰ Another example, in whose archive some songs against vodka are preserved, is Teofil' Kostraba, a cantor and the enemy of the local priest.³⁴¹

The temperance movement did not develop everywhere as smoothly as it did in Karliv and Radlovychi. The attitude of the local landlord and, most of all, of the state authorities was also very important. In the village of Radlovychi, the local landlord supported the sobriety movement and actually forced all his estate personnel to take a sobriety oath.³⁴² In the village of Berestiany, where Bishop Snihors'kyi was born, sobriety was propagated by the local priest, a patriot whom we met in 1848, Rev. Ivan Ivanovs'kyi.³⁴³ As in Karliv, the community council decided in one of its sessions "how to advance some indebted farmers, who slave without a break in the two local taverns and not only drink away all their earning but every day leave twice or three times as much as their debt in the pockets of local Jews." The community council's solution was simple: "Whoever goes to work in the tavern will be fined between one and five Gulden; if it is a wage-earner [as opposed to a farmer and unable to pay the fine], he will be punished with two days of arrest." However, local Jews protested and accused Berestiany's mayor, Mykhailo Dudiak, together with the local teacher and community scribe,

³³⁹ VR IL, f.3, spr.4217.

³⁴⁰ VR LNB, f.206, spr.922, p.27, a.23.

³⁴¹ Adriy Zayarnyuk, "Letters from Heaven."

³⁴² "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1875, No.65.

³⁴³ The priest himself was a hard ritualist, who had conflicts because of this not only during his lifetime but also after his death, when the three-shouldered cross on his grave became a source of the conflict. See "Iz samborskoho sela," *Slovo*, 1879, No.119.

Mr. Sokhran, of “inciting a riot.” The district captaincy suspended the community’s council decision and began investigating all its recent decisions.³⁴⁴

In the Berestiany case the sobriety movement was allegedly supported by the local landlord.³⁴⁵ Upon listening to an explanation that drinking was the cause of their farms’ decline, a peasant remarked: “If people do not drink, the honorable lord will lose [money] on propination.” The landlord answered: “I will take this loss willingly because I know that for this God will reward me in something else, because God is pleased with the sober man in the same way any one of us is pleased with a sober son.”³⁴⁶ The movement never emphasized temperance’s anti-landlord aspects, and Teodor Bilous, the brother of the editor Mykhailo Bilous, in his Diet speech stressed that the sobriety movement could be useful for the large landowners as well as for the peasants because people would become more diligent, behave better and work more productively.³⁴⁷ In my opinion, this was not just a tactical remark; Teodor Bilous expressed his opinion sincerely. Just as not all the landlords were against peasant temperance, the Church hierarchy also did not support the movement unconditionally. For example, the application of the renowned Russophile, Rev. Neronovych of Raitarovychi, to organize a sobriety mission was denied. Obviously, the Consistory’s decision must have been influenced by the local pro-Polish dean, Rev. Nesterovych.³⁴⁸

While supporting the sobriety movement, the God-fearing landlord of Radlovychi nonetheless clashed with his peasants later. In 1879, four years after Rev. Iavors’kyi left the area, there were elections to the community council in the village, which the local landlord tried to fix, with the help of the district administration and gendarmes. People explained the landlord’s interest in the community’s affairs by his wish to secure the outcome of the court process, which had been going on for two years, on the division of the common pasture to which he had servitude rights. The peasants did not submit to the pressure and, offended that one of them was arrested, elected anti-landlord candidates.³⁴⁹ This is a rare case of Ruthenian success in the Sambir district, and must be seen as connected with the work conducted in the village by Revs. Lavrets’kyi and Iavors’kyi.

Radical critique of the temperance movement had always located the root of evil in the peasant himself and not in the exploitation of the peasantry. It actually misled the peasantry, presenting socio-economic problems as subjective

³⁴⁴ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1875, No.28.

³⁴⁵ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1875, No.65.

³⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁴⁷ *Nyva*, (L’viv: nakladom Obshchestva imeni Kachkovskoho, 1878).

³⁴⁸ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1875, No.65.

³⁴⁹ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1879, No.64.

deficiencies that could be remedied through individual effort. We should acknowledge that the temperance movement had a huge popular resonance. While between December 1874 and August 1875 45,000 copies of the “Charter” were distributed, it was claimed that only 10% of peasants got them. A fourth edition of this “Charter” in August 1875 had 15, 000 copies.³⁵⁰ We have proof that not only the Charter of the Temperance Brotherhoods but also the Brotherhoods themselves had spread to almost every community in the area.

Take, for example, the temperance movement in the Vysochany deanery in 1877. In the village of Bahnovate the peasants took an oath not to drink vodka in 1875 and 1876, but still some “lovers of drink were still left.” The parish priest reported that “the enlightenment of the people had started in the parish of Bahnovate as well: namely reading of popular books and the populist newspaper Russka Rada, which the village of Bahnovate and two other filial villages subscribed to.” In the village of Borynia, Rev. Venhrynovych, who had been a chaplain there for only half a year, had managed to persuade ten farmers to abstain from alcohol either partly or totally. In the village of Botelka Vyzhnia, many peasants had promised to abstain for many years, “and others [to drink] only when the opportunity comes and only one shot.” In the village of Vysotsko Vyzhnie, there was a separate decision of the community council dated 10 September 1876. All strong liquor was forbidden during celebrations, and only wine and beer allowed. If it was necessary to drink vodka, a special permit of community council was required, but even then the amount should not exceed two liters. In Husne, temperance was reported to have advanced slowly but steadily “because of the obvious conviction of the parishioners that drinking leads to a decline in farming and family peace.” Nine farmers there took an oath of sobriety. In Il’nyk seven peasants did the same.

In the village of Komarnyky, where Rev. Shchanyi Salamon was a parish priest, a temperance brotherhood had existed since 1871. It had 150 members, and all the celebrations in Komarnyky managed without vodka. In the village of Lybokhora two peasants took an oath to drink moderately, three peasants did not drink even without taking an oath, and there were still six drunkards who were beyond hope. The local parish priest did not believe in the powers of the oath of sobriety. “I am convinced that a drunk forced to take an oath most often does not keep it but drinks desperately after that, becoming a hopeless drunk.” In that village the problem was the presence of almost 60 Jewish families, which “lived exclusively from [selling] vodka.” In Turochka ten peasants had taken an oath of sobriety. In Iablonka three peasants had taken an oath of complete abstinence and seven – to drink moderately. The problem was that the Turka district authority did not care about the anti-alcohol law and would not allow any anti-alcohol community policies to be implemented in the town itself. The local parish

³⁵⁰ Pavlyk, Pro rus’ko-ukraïns’ki narodni chytal’ni, 147.

priest did not believe in other ways of changing the situation and did not want to make individual peasants take an oath so that they “would not have to commit two sins instead of one.”³⁵¹

Even Pavlyk, who criticized the missionary movement of the 1870s as “one big rebuke for drunkenness, laziness and other church sins, which in itself was not of any use to the people,”³⁵² nonetheless had to recognize that this movement did better than many others, and people started to drink less.³⁵³ It is difficult to evaluate this kind of movement on the basis of the number of sobriety brotherhoods or amount of vodka consumed. For example, we know that already in 1879 there were only four village sobriety brotherhoods on the territory of the Sambir branch of Kachkovskii society (Turka region had a separate one) and one in Radlovychi was in decline. But in contrast to this, the consumption of alcohol was decreasing; family celebrations became more moderate and quite often alcohol-free.³⁵⁴ However, more moderate alcohol consumption could be attributed to the peasants’ lack of cash and not to the propaganda of temperance.

The problem is that the majority of the researchers writing on the temperance movement have misunderstood it. They have followed Pavlyk, who looked for the decrease of alcohol consumption or numbers of sobriety brotherhoods and did not take the temperance ideology seriously, discarding it as fighting against “Church sins.”³⁵⁵ The goal of the movement was not the creation of organizations but the reform of the individual, teaching the peasants new values. It would be more productive to see this movement as an attempt to foster lasting capitalist values in the countryside, using both traditional peasant associations between drinking and sinning and the support of the Church hierarchy. Even if the movement did not succeed formally, i.e. the peasants did not stop drinking and most of the Sobriety brotherhoods were gone by the 1880s, the ethics associated with this movement left their impact on peasant activists. This was the ethics which figured so powerfully in the texts of the “Dobrivliany conspiracy” members.

Another important moment in the temperance movement was the Ruthenian movement’s ability to get into the communities and influence them via the communities’ self-government and their relative autonomy from the upper administrative body. This is something we do not see in the activities of the ritualistic priests in the 1860s or in 1848. In the 1870s, although the discourse is still dominated by a concern with individual self-consciousness, the practice of

³⁵¹ APP, ABGK, sygn.4510.

³⁵² Mykhailo Pavlyk, *Pro rus’ko-ukraïns’ki narodni chytal’ni*, 148.

³⁵³ *Ibid.*, 149.

³⁵⁴ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1879, No.109.

³⁵⁵ Mykhailo Pavlyk, *Pro rus’ko-ukraïns’ki narodni chytal’ni*, 151.

the movement pushed it towards working with whole communities and using their coercive powers over individual villagers in the interests of the movement. Moreover, the movement in the 1870s found ways to exploit popular attitudes and traditions and to imbue them with new meanings.

Many peasant activists of the 1870s temperance movement later became connected with the Ukrainian national-populists or radicals. For many of them the temperance movement served as an introduction to society, to public life, politics, readings, etc. And this aspect of the temperance movement is usually ignored. Let's take the case of Hryts'ko Zaparniuk, born in 1837 and married in 1860. In 1872, he began work as an assessor for the community council. In 1875 he attended the celebration of the introduction of sobriety in Karliv. After attending this event, he started promoting temperance in his own village and organized the first christening festivity without vodka. Following his example almost 700 people gave up drinking vodka. Zaparniuk also organized the enclosure of the common in his village, and with this background of local activities, joined the Ukrainian national-populists.³⁵⁶

As we remember from the first chapter, Drahomanov hoped that a movement similar to stundism in Russian Ukraine would be sparked by the Dobrivliany conspiracy. But in fact, in order to find a movement in Galicia similar to stundism, we have to go back to the 1870s. Peasant activists in the 1870s in Galicia resembled the stundists in Russian Ukraine in many aspects. Both focused on reading, both sought truth (and justice), both changed their moral behavior, and both separated themselves from the traditional culture of their respective communities.³⁵⁷ The only difference was that in Galicia this occurred within the framework of the official Church and in cooperation with patriotic parish priests. While in Russian Ukraine stundists virtually and literally left their communities of origin, peasant activists in Galicia tried to reform theirs and had the chance to come into power in their villages.

Besides rationalism and reading, both movements also had strong millenarian components. And there were good reasons for Galician peasants in the 1870s to embrace the millenarian mood. The 1870s and the beginning of the 1880s are said to be the most critical years for the Ukrainian peasantry in Galicia. Bad harvests caused starvation in 1872/3 and 1875.³⁵⁸ Sales of peasant land and households escalated in connection with these weather failures and fiscal pressure. Between 1873 and – 1883, there were 23,237 public foreclosures of farms in Galicia (and the Sambir district had the highest number of them –

³⁵⁶ "Hryts'ko Zaparniuk", *Batktivshchyna*, 1890, No.12, 154-5.

³⁵⁷ For the description of the stundists, see Fadei Ryl'skii, "K izucheniiu ukrainskogo narodnogo mirovozreniia," in *Ukraintsi: narodni viruvannia, povir'ia, demonolohiia* (Kyiv: "Lybid", 1991), 25-51.

³⁵⁸ Vytanovych, *Ukrains'ke selianstvo na shliakhu do pobidy*, 14, 26.

459).³⁵⁹ But the bad economic conditions of the 1870s, unlike in the 1840s, were connected with the growth of new economic relations and not with any natural failure. Galicia was spared the most disastrous El Niño effects and was better integrated into capitalist economy by the 1870s than most “third world” countries, in which the crisis of the 1870s became the first modern holocaust.³⁶⁰

Paradoxically, it was the affluent 1860s that were of crucial importance for the clergy being introduced to the capitalist ethos, while for the peasantry the hungry 1870s was the period when it started to embrace this new strategy for dealing with new circumstances and accept the values imposed by the new economic and social relationships. The change was not in the sudden appearance of money in the countryside. Money had always been there. Galician peasants never lived exclusively from the food produced in their own households; they were always buying something. Probably they had even less money in the 1870s than, for example, in the 1850s and 1860s.³⁶¹ What was new was the need for money caused not only by fiscal pressure but also by growing consumption, and the attitudes and ethics accompanying it. Earning money became a daily need. And the opportunities to do so, albeit short-lived, appeared in the 1870s. In 1872 the price of wood increased 300 – 400% in comparison with the previous year because of the railway construction. Railway construction itself provided an opportunity for earnings; lumber companies and the transportation of wood for railway construction and later for export (which itself became possible because of the railways), were others.³⁶²

Finally, it should be said that not all the Ruthenian patriot priests were involved in the temperance movement. For example, in the village of Berehy, Rev. Atanasii Kunevych, who was connected with the leadership of the St. George party and, probably, served as a Ruthenian agitator at local elections, was not active in the temperance movement. Despite this, he left behind a good legacy and was remembered even in the 1930s.³⁶³ In 1870 the landlord of Berehy changed. The new landlord was the Jew Juda Bachmann, a former tavern-keeper who became a landlord of several estates north-east of the town of Sambir. He introduced diversity into the alcohol drunk in the village. It was said that peasants started drinking, there were conflicts and arsons in the village, and the landlord came to own 164 Joch of peasant land. When Rev. Kunevych died, people said that it was

³⁵⁹ Franko, “Pis'ma iz Galicyi,” 353.

³⁶⁰ On this see Mike Davis, *Late Victorian Holocausts. El Niño Famines and the Making of the Third World* (London, New York: Verso, 2001).

³⁶¹ Ivan Franko, “Halys'kyi selianyn,” 503.

³⁶² S. Boiko, “Pys'mo z Boikivshchyny do chesnykh hazdiv,” *Ruskaia Rada*, 1872, No.3.

³⁶³ Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv*, 45.

because he had drunk some suspiciously red at Juda's tavern.³⁶⁴ Bachmann was resented by the peasants. Finally he was shot, and his murderer never found. This community rid itself of its dependency on the landlord and tavern-keeper in a very radical way. Some other villages managed to accomplish this through the temperance movement, which prepared the ground for new kind of village action, one we find in the 1880s.

Being Ruthenian in Sambir

In the 1870s the Ruthenian movement continued to have strong clerical overtones. The concern of the Ruthenian national newspapers with everything clerical was not less than it was in the 1860s. To be concerned with the ritual was dangerous; attention switched to other things, like church buildings. There were only four stone churches in the 17 parishes in the Sambir deanery: in Sambir, Hordynia, Cherkhava and Mistkovychi. Two were wooden but large enough and well built: in Berehy and Chukva. Three parishes did not have a church at all, and the others had "not substantial and decaying wooden churches."³⁶⁵ These church buildings in the representations of Ruthenian newspapers were taken as indicators of the nation's condition:

In the people's (*narodnykh*) buildings, especially in the churches and schools, partly the nation's wealth, partly its moral power, and partly its aesthetic taste are revealed. Grandly built and adequately decorated village churches show the well-being of faithful creators. Among the wealthy nations the traveling foreigner observes stone churches, artistically arranged and provided with rich church vessels; poor nations have wooden churches that are not that artful.³⁶⁶

The churches in the Sambir area were not just testimonies to the nation's situation; they were also barometers of the relationships between the parish priest and his parishioners. And in the 1870s this aspect became very important. The village of Cherkhava, in fact a poor one with the population of 495, was able to build a stone church, for which Rev. Andrii Nyzhankovs'kyi was credited after having worked on it for 30 years. The opening of the new church in Cherkhava in 1873 turned into a great gathering, in which twelve priests participated with Rev. Pavlo Iasenys'kyi holding a sermon.³⁶⁷ This emphasis on the church building is totally absent from the earlier newspaper reports, when the construction of a new

³⁶⁴ Ibid., 38-9.

³⁶⁵ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1873, No.135.

³⁶⁶ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1873, No.133.

³⁶⁷ Ibid.

church testified to the wealth of the landlords-patrons and priests rather than the community's.³⁶⁸ (The village of Cherkhava, by the way, would become the village where the first *Prosvita* reading club was founded in the Sambir district in 1881.)

In late 1860s – early 1870s the town of Sambir was a significant Ruthenian place because of two prominent Ruthenians residing there: Mykhail Kachkovskii and Iuliian Lavrovs'kyi. The presence of Mykhail Kachkovskii in Sambir was not felt in the Sambir countryside. Except of his transactions with peasant women at the Sambir market, with the suspicious orders to deliver purchases to his place fuelling rumors that his purchases from women were not to be limited to food, there was no contact between him and the villages. The same could also be said about Iuliian Lavrovs'kyi. Both Kachkovskii and Lavrovs'kyi were major contributors to the decoration of the Sambir church, which around 1848 had “impressed anyone having a taste for ugliness and extreme poverty.” Both of them belonged to the small but visible circle of the Ruthenian intelligentsia in Sambir, which at the end of the 1870s numbered around 20 families.³⁶⁹ Finally, both of them were interested in Ruthenian students and supported them, Kachkovskii largely with money and Lavrovs'kyi with advice and protection.

There were various manifestations of Ruthenian life, but most of them occurred in town. Occasionally, the town of Sambir was visited by Ruthenian theatrical troops. In the 1870s these visits were not particularly frequent, with one in five or more years. The first visit featured Bachyns'kyi's troupe, in 1868. Then in 1872 the Sambir Ruthenian community enjoyed 13 performances by Molents'kyi's troupe of Ukrainian popular vaudevilles written in the Russian Empire and mixed with some local Ruthenian creations: “Natalka Poltavka,” “Means to Get Girls Married,” “Satan in a Barrel,” “Marriage,” “Marusia,” “Dead Opanas,” “Gypsies,” “Golden Cross,” “Suspicious Groom,” “Harvest Wedding,” “Mountaineers,” “Two Eccentrics,” “Jew in a Barrel,” “First Love,” “Peasants-Aristocrats,” “Menachin Ben Izrael,” “Our Politicians,” “Two Hour Wedding,” and “Ukrainians or Match-Making in Honcharivka.” The turnout from the local public was not too high, and two planned performances were cancelled.³⁷⁰ There were no peasants at these performances.

In 1877 Teofila Romanovych's theater performed a similar set of Galician and Ukrainian vaudevilles. The only different play, “Caesar” (could be some kind of Shakespeare adaptation). As one reporter from the local audience noted:

could not influence the young in a positive way and was not liked by the older crowd, first because all the characters in it were negative, and [second] because the content was too foreign, which was impossible to be

³⁶⁸ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1871, No.78.

³⁶⁹ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1879, No.106.

³⁷⁰ “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1872, No.120.

remade for our folk life as it opened aimless black secrets of the powerful and mighty.

Again no peasants attended; only few village priests and their families came to watch these plays. But this time, in contrast to 1872, the absence of peasants was noticed: "It is amazing that no peasants show up; it seems that there is no one to dispose them to it, although there are excessive numbers of them at the marketplace on Thursdays."³⁷¹

When Romanovych's troupe performed in Sambir in 1879, Rev. Viktor Neronovych of Raitarevychi, a well-known Russophile, brought his parishioners with him to the performances. A correspondent from Sambir encouraged other parish priests to follow Neronovych's example and bring their "best parishioners." It was argued that "the impression which the peasant will get from the drama is in any case important for national, educational and social life."³⁷² But with such poor attendance, it is little wonder that the next time the Ruthenian theater was in Sambir, it put on plays in both languages, Polish and Ruthenians, to the great disappointment of local patriots.³⁷³

For many patriots nationality's most important attribute was language. They summoned their compatriots to follow the dictum of Graf Thun, "*Die sprache eines Volkes ist das Volk Selbst.*" Throughout the 1870s language remained a paramount concern of the movement. But language discussions targeted only elites, which were seen as more prone to Polish assimilation and continued to use Ruthenian only when speaking with the peasants.³⁷⁴ This concern about Polonization did not extend at that time to the peasants, whose main problem was thought to be education or knowledge in general. A correspondent from the Sambir district trying to define patriotism divides the society into uneducated (or lower), half-educated (or middle) and educated higher strata:

About the patriotism of the first two classes we shall talk less; our subject in this short article will be the patriotism of the higher, educated class because that class manages national affairs and sets their direction...

About the patriotism of the common man we shall say that patriotism, with all its properties, quite often and most of the time is in the common man; it is just that these properties are not developed and for a long time remain in an immature condition. Sometimes it happens that higher or middle class people do not speak their mother tongue and easily reject the custom and tradition of their ancestors. To have a clear conscience, they [also] try to forget the history of their ancestors... Only the common man

³⁷¹ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1877, No.53.

³⁷² "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1879, No.36.

³⁷³ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1882, No.39.

³⁷⁴ "Iz Samborskikh hor," *Slovo*, 1878, No.58.

until his very death remains faithful to the remnants of his nation and to all the nation's banners.³⁷⁵

There was no concern with the language the peasantry spoke; the nationality of the common people was still taken for granted. The peasants were said to have been speaking Ruthenian and successfully resisting assimilation for centuries. The point was to transform Ruthenian into a language of value, attractive to educated people as well. Recognition of the national language would raise recognition and esteem for the nation itself. In one of his speeches Rev. Pavlo Iasenyts'kyi explains this as follows:

Every nation, and, therefore, the Ruthenian one as well, has ideal as well as material assets. The usage of these determines a nation's happiness, and lack of or prohibition to use them brings about a nation's misfortune and decline.

Among the ideal assets the most important are nationality and language.³⁷⁶

The privileging of the Polish language in East Galicia and the provincial administration's lack of knowledge of Ruthenian was an injustice to the Ruthenian population, which could therefore not rise from its position as second-class citizens.³⁷⁷ To prove his point about the purposeful discrimination and marginalization of the Ruthenian language, Rev. Iasenyts'kyi reveals what was hiding beyond the façade of a great number of poorly attended Ruthenian schools:

In his History of Civilization in England, the statistician Buckley, with whom I disagree, sided against the Catholic hierarchy and based everything on numbers; even morality and suicide he tries to express in numbers. This is a mistaken premise. Instead of accepting numbers, accepting an outer shell we should find out what is inside, find out why Ruthenian schools are empty, why Ruthenian schools are empty and Polish [ones are] full.³⁷⁸

Rev. Iasenyts'kyi argues that there is a difference in the quality of education they provide, a difference created and maintained by provincial policy. As the majority of gymnasia were Polish and many urban elementary schools were also Polish in

³⁷⁵ "Iz Samborskikh hor," Slovo, 1878, No.56.

³⁷⁶ "(Kraievyyi biudzhet)," Slovo, 1881, No.128.

³⁷⁷ "(Kraievyyi biudzhet)," Slovo, 1881, No.128.

³⁷⁸ "Rich' posla Iasenytskoho," Slovo, 1881, No.129.

character, education in the largely village Ruthenian schools was disadvantageous – entering Polish gymnasia from them was more difficult.³⁷⁹

Rev. Iasenyts'kyi himself was a proponent and practitioner of the “harder” version of the Ruthenian language, for which he was attacked by the Polish professors at the Sambir gymnasium in 1872. This language was even less vernacular than the language of the newspaper *Slovo*, which was a Russophile periodical. However, Iasenyts'kyi's language was found acceptable by Rev. Iosyf Lavrets'kyi, the leader of the Sambir Ruthenians since 1848 and Sambir dean.³⁸⁰ Obviously under the influence of such a dean, the clergy of the Sambir deanery composed a letter at its assembly in 1870 unanimously approving the politics of the Ruthenian Council in L'viv and asking it “to continue being a representative of our national affairs and our leader.”³⁸¹ It describes Rev. Lavrets'kyi, who in 1871 celebrated the 50th anniversary in his priesthood, as:

A hard Ruthenian people-lover, professing, because of an inner conviction based on the history of the Ruthenian people, only one great Russian nation whose vernacular developed in three regional pronunciations with numerous local tones, as happens among other peoples as well. He is a determined enemy of those who amalgamate different popular forces in one political nation for the sake of traditional goals: establishment of the voluntaristic government with the help of foreign aid. He does not agree with those who want to create a separate Ruthenian nation [in original diminutive and pejorative *narodets'* is used] in Galicia [in order] to betray [and doom] it to the service to mighty neighbors if not for annihilation.³⁸²

This would be something we can call “hard Russophilism,” but there were other options available as well. Rev. Illia Hmytryk, born in 1852 in Postoliv in the Lisko district, studied in Lavriv together with Mykola Bobers'kyi. He recalled that back in Lavriv, a teacher-monk showed his pupils the map of Europe, on which Great Rus' was divided into four parts: Great, Little, White and Galician. Later, in the first grade at the Sambir gymnasium, Illia Hmytryk used this knowledge to counter a Polish student, who was showing him how big Poland was in comparison with Rus'. Hmytryk insisted that European Russia was also Rus' and not some foreign “Muscovites.”³⁸³

There was a strange, almost overnight, change in Rev. Naumovych's attitude towards language. While in April 1866 he stated in the Diet that Galician

³⁷⁹ “Rich' posla Iasenytskoho,” *Slovo*, 1881, No.129.

³⁸⁰ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1872, No.43.

³⁸¹ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1870, No.94.

³⁸² “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1871, No.70.

³⁸³ Ivan Fylypchak and Roman Lukan', *Ts. K. Okruzhna Holovna shkola v Lavrovi*, 123, 164.

Ruthenians were Little Russians and neither the Polish nor the Great Russian language would ever become theirs, in December 1866, he stated also in the Diet that the Ruthenian language was similar to the one used in Great Russia and Galician Ruthenians had just taken back what once used to be theirs.³⁸⁴ The event that brought about this change in opinion so dramatically occurred in summer 1866 and was the Austro-Prussian War.

If we turn to the Ukrainophiles in Sambir, we find they were exclusively gymnasium students, with the exception of Iuliiian Lavrovs'kyi. These gymnasium students manifested their identity in their clothing.³⁸⁵ Already in the 1860s the issue of nationality could not be avoided among gymnasium students. In connection with the Polish uprising of 1863, there were in the towns the first manifestations of national conflict in everyday life since 1848. Ruthenians' and Poles' days of mourning and of festivities did not coincide, which served to visualize the conflict. On 17 October 1863, the Poles mourned the death of Fialkowski, while the Ruthenians were supposed not to care. Because of this the Poles cut the dress of a Ruthenian bride and sprinkled ink on the dress of a guest. Then, when one family came to a clerical (Ruthenian) wedding in mourning dress, the youths started teasing women, although it appeared that they did not know about the mourning and were simply following the fashion.³⁸⁶

The article to Slovo reporting on these incidents, and most probably written by Rev. Pavlo Iasenyts'kyi, sympathizes with the victims of nationalization but shows that nationality has become a matter in which indifference was impossible. Other newspaper reports supported this point. A certain gymnasium student in Sambir looking for money got contacts to two prospective sponsors, one described to him as a Ruthenian and the other as a Pole. The student mistook one for the other and did not get money from either.³⁸⁷

The gymnasium students were not passive objects of this process, however. They were the ones refashioning the Ruthenian movement and starting a Ukrainian one. This appearance of clear-cut Ukrainophilism went hand-in-hand with the appearance of political Russophilism, to which the majority of the 1848 generation turned. In the 1860s under the influence of Russian Ukraine (and a movement of the so-called *khlopomany*), gymnasium students organized the first groups of Ukrainophiles calling themselves *bromada*-s (communities or communes); this was the beginning of Ukrainian national-populism in Galicia.

³⁸⁴ Mykhailo Drahomanov, "Halys'ko-rus'ke pys'menstvo (Perednie slovo do 'Povistei' Osypa Fed'kovycha)," in Mykhailo Drahomanov, Literaturno-publitsychni pratsi, t.1 (Kyiv: "Naukova dumka," 1970), 343.

³⁸⁵ Andrii Chaikovs'kyi, "Serenada v navechir'ie Sv. Voitsiekha. Z himnazyial'nykh spomyniv," Ruslan, 1904, No.63.

³⁸⁶ "Iz Sambora," Slovo, 1863, No.74.

³⁸⁷ "Iz Samborshchyny," Vistnyk, 1861, No.94.

Such a *bromada* was founded in the Sambir gymnasium in 1862 and was the first one in Galicia. There is no explanation as to why Sambir was the place in which the first student *bromada* was created. But it seems that the connection with Iulian Lavrovs'kyi was of crucial importance; his own son was a member of the *bromada*.

The founders of the Sambir *bromada* were Volodymyr Stebel's'kyi (pseudonym Bohdan Haidabura), Antin Lavrivs'kyi (Antin Svitydolia), Zaiachkivs'kyi (Neperevodchyk), and Volodymyr Iasenyts'kyi (Mykyta Hukalo).³⁸⁸ From the correspondence of Danylo Taniachkevych-younger I shall cite several letters, which give some idea about what was going on. The earliest letters are dated by 1863 and are written by Antin Lavrivs'kyi. He relates how they received the paper Pys'mo do Hromad from Danylo Taniachkevych, how *bromada* members in the Sambir gymnasium tried to wear “Cossack” dress, mainly caps, and how this caused conflicts with their parents, who considered these caps to be *haidamats'ki* (and the word *haidamaka* here, of course, was used without the positive connotations it would acquire in Ukrainian by the end of the nineteenth century).

Antin Lavrivs'kyi reported that Mykhail Kachkovskii in Sambir had invited students to an evening of declamations but the Ukrainian student *bromada* planned to transform this evening into a demonstration against Russophiles and to read only Ukrainian poets.³⁸⁹ The *bromada* tried to protect Ruthenian students from Kachkovskii's influence and to defend the Ukrainian newspaper Meta against his accusations of Polonophilism. Antin complains “so much for our mother Ukraine! Who knows if she will hear our sincere voice, will hear how the Cossack heart pounds [here] with love to her.”³⁹⁰

At first the *bromada* in Sambir was very small; it numbered five or six students.³⁹¹ But the number of those interested in the Ukrainophiles' publications was not that small. The newspaper Meta in Sambir had 30 subscribers, and there was no single Ukrainian or Russophile newspaper to beat this number until the end of the century. In the 1880s Russophile Prolom had about that many subscribers in the four political districts, in which we are interested. The young Ukrainophiles differentiated between the members of the older generation, separating the obvious Russians among them, such as Rev. Ortyns'kyi, the parish priest in Sambir and a “Muscovite,”³⁹² from a more undetermined “older generation.” They could describe sympathetically some “honest orthodox Ruthenians,” like Rev. Skorodyns'kyi in Sushytsia Rykova near Khyriv (also a Russophile) and did not see other ways of penetrating the villages but through the parish priests. For

³⁸⁸ VR LNB, f.NTSh, spr. 560, a.39.

³⁸⁹ VR LNB, f.NTSh, spr. 560, a.33.

³⁹⁰ VR LNB, f.NTSh, spr. 560, a.36.

³⁹¹ VR LNB, f.NTSh, spr. 560, a.18.

³⁹² VR LNB, f.NTSh, spr. 560, a.35.

example, when signatures for a petition were needed, they would appeal to the village priests.³⁹³ On the other hand, Volodymyr Stebel's'kyi could say that “all the older generation, all the priests” were for Russia.³⁹⁴

The *bromada* grew in size, and after a year of activities had the following members: Volodko [Stebel's'kyi], Tyt Zaiachkivs'kyi, Volod. Iasenyts'kyi, Antin Lavrivs'kyi, Turchmanovych (perhaps the son of the pastor from Stril'bychi), Kypriian Dobrians'kyi, Iustyn Konstantynovych, Hurkevych, Viktor Rastavets'kyi, Hladylovych, Ianykovs'kyi, Kunevych (probably the son of Rev. Atansii Kunevych from Berehy), Mykola Bobers'kyi (later the parish priest in Vaniovychi and enemy of Ivan Mykhas). As Taniachkevych's correspondent reported, there were also others writing in the *kulishivka* but the *bromada* did not trust them yet.³⁹⁵ In 1865 among these sympathetic students there was a certain Humets'kyi, a subscriber of *Nyva*, and Petro Il'kiv.³⁹⁶

Hromada activities consisted in distributing national-populist publications, disputing with the Polish teacher of history, and engaging in literary attempts and festivities. Among the literature *bromada* students read in Sambir, we see Shevchenko, Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko and Marko Vovchok.³⁹⁷ They also read the German idealist philosophers and ended in a conflict with Mykhail Kachkovskii, who accused them in both Polonophilism and anti-governmental activities.³⁹⁸

In the 1870s one had the a choice to join either the Russophile or the Ukrainian party. Both had prominent local names, to which they could to associate themselves with. The Russophiles had Mikhail Kachkovskii and the Ukrainians–Iulian Lavrovs'kyi. Both died at about the same time. When Iulian Lavrovs'kyi died in 1873, the German *Morgenpost* said that he had been a leader of the Ukrainian party: “The Ukrainians, having in their Shevchenko a poet of European renown, dream about a Ruthenian state situated between the Poles and Russians.”³⁹⁹ Citing these words from the German newspaper, *Slovo* agreed with them and made disapproving comments about Lavrovs'kyi's activities, although back in the 1860s and even in 1870 Lavrovs'kyi was seen as a Ruthenian, for whom both Ukrainophiles and Russophiles would vote at the elections, and on whom in the mid-1860s Rev. Kuzems'kyi called to be one of the leaders of the Ruthenians.

³⁹³ VR LNB, f.NTSh, spr. 560, a.48.

³⁹⁴ VR LNB, f.NTSh, spr. 560, a.52.

³⁹⁵ VR LNB, f.NTSh, 560, a.38.

³⁹⁶ VR LNB, f.NTSh, 560, a.48.

³⁹⁷ VR LNB, f.NTSh, 560, a.53.

³⁹⁸ About Kachkovskii's denunciations see Iaroslav Hordyns'kyi, *Do istorii kul'turnoho i politychnoho zhytia v Halychyni*, 58.

³⁹⁹ Cited in “Posmertnyi otzyvy o Iuliani Lavrovskom,” *Slovo*, 1873, No.50.

A group of Russophile students gathered around Mikhail Kachkovskii. He turned his house into a residency for poorer students from the villages. At the end of the 1860s some of these students corresponded with Iosif Markov, who studied at the Sambir gymnasium for a short period of time lodging at Kachkovskii's house, and then left for L'viv. They complained about the growing oppression and the impossibility of wider activities in the gymnasium as well as about poor living conditions and the bad food Kachkovskii gave them.⁴⁰⁰ For some time in the 1860s, up to 10 students lived at Kachkovskii's place in a cold and dark room, having to eat unpeeled potatoes and do their homework in the light of the burning stove.⁴⁰¹ These were students from villages around Sambir (Voitychi, Bilynka Mala, Lavriv and others).

It is interesting that national differences between Iulian Lavrov's'kyi and Mykhailo Kachkovskii seem not to have been as great as among those who retrospectively claimed them for different national orientations. We know that Kachkovskii loved Ukrainian poems and was probably the first one in Sambir (after the students in the gymnasium) to organize singing of the Ukrainian national anthem, the music and words of which he enjoyed.⁴⁰² When Rev. Naumovych printed 2000 copies of his manifesto "to honest and pleasant Galician-Ruthenian nation" in 1873, he also ended it with the stanza from the Ukrainian national anthem: "Our enemies will evaporate // like dew under the sun..."⁴⁰³

The Russophiles of the 1870s were monarchists by definition. Moreover, many of them longed for the days of absolutist rule. When Rev. Iasenyts'kyi said in a speech to the gymnasium students in 1879 that the monarchist form of rule was the most perfect, he was most likely expressing his sincere conviction.⁴⁰⁴ It is hard to say how widespread the nostalgia was for absolutist rule, but it could be found in many newspaper reports from the Sambir area. Perhaps this is also proof that Rev. Iasenyts'kyi was the author of the majority of these reports. In a Diet speech during the general debate on the budget in 1880, he said that spiritual development must be accompanied by its material counterpart; otherwise it would be good for nothing. He pointed out that the constitutional freedoms of the era of Galician autonomy were paired with the increasing economic hardship of the peasant masses. Rev. Iasenyts'kyi drew a parallel between contemporary sentiments towards the absolutist era and the mood among the Jews after their

⁴⁰⁰ VR LNB, f. Osyp Markov, 326, p.13, a.1-4.

⁴⁰¹ LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.57.

⁴⁰² Ibid.

⁴⁰³ TsDIAuL, f.196, op.1, spr.8, a.22.

⁴⁰⁴ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1879, No.43.

exodus from Egypt.⁴⁰⁵ Although this speech did not openly praise the period of post-1848 absolutism and concentrated on what he saw as unjustified provincial spending, his critical remarks about autonomy caused general indignation among the Polish deputies, who understood Isenys'kyi's speech as an assault on provincial autonomy. In his articles to Slovo Iasenys'kyi expressed his sympathies even more frankly.

The problem was that in the 1870s the Russophile movement found itself in opposition to the monarchy. Although never directly questioning its loyalty to the Emperor, dynasty and the state, the Russophiles started to embrace pan-Slavic discourse with its praising of the Russian Empire and project onto it their monarchist sympathies. In line with this pan-Slavic ideology, they represented the Poles as traitors of Slavdom and servants to the Germans because of the compromise the Polish gentry had made with Austria. An unknown correspondent from Sambir warned Poles: "We also served Germans for a long time *als harmlose Ruthenen*, now we have got a *Laufpass* without provision and were ordered to beg the Diet's majority for change."⁴⁰⁶

Reporting to the peasants in Turka on his Diet activities, Rev. Iasenys'kyi explained his ideas to them. He stressed that new schools were not good because they were divorced from the Church and bilingual. It was not the state taxes but provincial additions to these taxes, which amounted to up to 30% of all the taxes that were ruining peasants. While being against provincial autonomy, Rev. Iasenys'kyi was in favor of as the greatest possible autonomy for the communities:

Only free communities can guarantee freedom, while patronage over them, as if over a little child, be it under the old absolutism or in the modern way under a constitution, is harmful absolutism. Even if the communities are now not yet able to govern themselves, the widest possible freedom should be left to them; mistakes and pain will teach them to be wise.⁴⁰⁷

Such a sentiment was obviously an outcome of the priests' engagement in community affairs. The priests realized that if the communities could maintain enough autonomy from the provincial government, that would secure a space for clerical paternalist reformism, even if it went against the wishes of the government. Such autonomy was becoming a necessity given the political opposition to the provincial administration.

⁴⁰⁵ "Seimovyi dila," Slovo, 1880, No.75.

⁴⁰⁶ "Ot Sambora," Slovo, 1870, No.1.

⁴⁰⁷ "Ot Turky," Slovo, 1881, No.85.

Even without engaging in community affairs, the position of the patriotic priest was precarious – receiving a parish in most instances depended on the good will of the landlords.⁴⁰⁸ A teacher could be afraid that borrowing Nauka from the priest would cause the landlord's wrath, and he would not be allowed to pasture his cow with the landlord's herd.⁴⁰⁹ It is no surprise that priests and teachers started to claim that the peasants were now the “most independent of all” – having paid tax, they were their own masters. Being Ruthenian was thought to be most easy for them.

From the peasants' point of view, however, being Ruthenian was not terribly advantageous either. Those who had to interact more with the district authority, like the mayors, could find it dangerous, while others simply did not see any rewards from manifesting their Ruthenianness. Moreover, already in the late 1870s the authorities became concerned with Ruthenian agitation among the peasantry. When in 1877 the authorities started looking for socialist agitation in Ukrainian, a certain Felix Zięba, who was renting an estate in Bukova in the Sambir district, denounced the local cantor, Mykola Tomashek, accusing the latter of “the dissemination of disturbing news about an approaching revolution in social relationships.” The Sambir captain undertook an investigation which showed that Mykola Tomashek owned the following books: Perekynchik bisurmanskii (A Moslem Renegade, 1875),⁴¹⁰ Chytaľnia. Knyzhochka I (Reading club. Booklet, part I, 1875),⁴¹¹ and the convolute of the issues of Slovo do Hromady, for 1869 and 1870. Obviously, there was nothing even remotely socialist in these publications, but the landlords nevertheless connected Ruthenian agitation with its revolutionary counterpart. In his report from October 1877 the district captain writes:

From the investigations conducted it appears that there is no news of such a turbulent nature as indicated in Felix Zięba's report; the fact that they were distributed by Mykola Tomashek was not also proven because the investigation did not find anything except the fact that he lent seventeen issues of Slovo do Hromady collected in one brochure to Iatsko Kvasnytsia ...

However it was discovered that, on the basis of the information he got from Slovo do Hromady Iatsko Kvasnytsia often wanted to conduct discourses with

⁴⁰⁸ “Nadannia prezenty na “parafiiu” u druhii polovyni XIX stolittia: sotsial'ni i dyskursyvni praktyky,” Ukraïna: Kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist', Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu Feodosiia Stebliia, vyp. 9, (L'viv, 2001), 448-64.

⁴⁰⁹ “Ot Sambora,” Slovo, 1875, No.65.

⁴¹⁰ [Pliaton Kostets'kyi] Suskii Vasyl' iz pod Khotsenky, Perekynchik bisurmanskii (L'vov: izhdeveniem A. N. Shcherbana i komp., 1875).

⁴¹¹ Ivan Naumovych, Chytaľnia. Knyzhochka I (Viden', 1875).

peasants on why Jews did not stick together with the Ruthenians but only with the Poles, while living off the peasants and not the landlords – it would be much better for them if they stuck together with Ruthenians and Germans. Moreover, it was discovered that Mykolai Slomyns'kyi actually said to the propinator Kelman Münz “I would rather kill you myself than have Russians do it; it will be easier for you, I have a light hand,” but this was meant as a joke. Finally Mykhailo Liubchyns'kyi from Sambir who was sent to Bukova on official business presented himself to local peasants as a Russian supporter proclaiming a theory about the equality of all the estates in Russia, probably on the basis of socialist propaganda.⁴¹²

There is no doubt that the peasants were trying to make sense of the newly established provincial autonomy and Constitution. The establishment of the gentry's hegemony in Galicia brought about great confusion, not only among the Ruthenian activists but also among the peasants, mixing up their ideas about the difference between the state's and the landlords' power. It was said that:

These landlords sold estates to the Jews, and themselves became judges in courts and offices and do whatever they want, turn it however they like to see it, and the Emperor does not know about it at all, although they report to him that they have a lot to do so that he thinks he knows about everything. And in Vienna all the ministers around the Emperor are *szlachta* as well; if the Emperor ruled himself, it would be better, it would bring more justice to the people.⁴¹³

Rumors circulating among the Galician peasants in the 1870s also show that they saw constitutional reform as an unprecedented growth of the landholding gentry's power. In this context a particular form of peasant Russophilism appeared with peasants placing their hopes not in the Austrian Emperor but in the White Tsar.⁴¹⁴ The peasants reacted in a traditional way, with numerous waves of rumors reported throughout the 1870s and first half of the 1880s to the authorities.

This time unlike in 1846, the rumors were quite critical of central government; it is not an accident that in the 1870s we see a great increase in the number of investigations into abuses of His Majesty. The rumors in the 1870s-1880s can be divided into two kinds, those directed against the gentry landlords which saw the Emperor's power threatened by them, and those which blamed the Emperor, lumping him together with the other officials and landlords. The case of Kornalovychi is an example of the former. A certain Antin Andrushchak from

⁴¹² TsDIAuL, f.146, op.7, spr.4103, a.72.

⁴¹³ Jan Świątek, *Brzozowa i okolica... cz.IV* (Wrocław, 2000), 116.

⁴¹⁴ John-Paul Himka, “Hope in the Tsar: Displaced Naive Monarchism among the Ukrainian Peasants of the Habsburg Empire,” *Russian History*, v.7, 1980, 125-38.

Sambir went to Kornalovychi to look for a job (born in 1817, he had served a full term in the army and then worked as a coachman in Upper and Lower Austria). . He was denounced by Celestyn Sozański, the landlord at Kornalovychi, for saying that the “Minister” (Count Potocki) should be crucified for advising the Empress cut off the Emperor’s ear while shaving him and that anyone willing to watch the crucifixion would get a free railway ticket and gift from the Emperor.⁴¹⁵ Andrushachak was arrested.

There were also numerous cases in the second class of rumors. Ias’ko Spivak from Holodovka was singing *kolomyjka* “Oh Emperor, oh Emperor, you are a great lord, you will herd pigs without your army.”⁴¹⁶ One peasant said that he could govern better than the Emperor because he had more wits.⁴¹⁷ Many times the Emperor was abused in connection with servicemen, soldiers and officials, who were said to serve the same scoundrel as they themselves did.⁴¹⁸ Sometimes the soldiers themselves would abuse Emperor for ruining their lives. Peasants resented new taxes and new trade regulations and blamed the Emperor for introducing them.

Popular Russophilism also figures prominently in these cases about the abuse of His Majesty. A certain peasant woman in the Russian Empire reputedly said at the market:

The local Emperor is a robber, a scoundrel (*galgan*), a womanizer (*kurvii*), and a rascal (*drab*), he robs you here, he is not even an Emperor, simply a rabbit, because he has only a few cities – our Emperor has great lands, he is rich and that is why he does not plunder people like this one.⁴¹⁹

Local Galician peasants also stated that the Austrian Emperor was not as important as the Russian one.⁴²⁰ In connection with the expected Austro-Russian war, the Jews could be threatened, and the Austrian Emperor was said to be Jewish.⁴²¹ Some peasants would openly say that they would get a better Emperor, a Russian one, who would conquer the whole of Galicia.⁴²² The phrase “I am not

⁴¹⁵ TsDIAUuL, f.146, op.4, spr.3984, a.39.

⁴¹⁶ , f.156, op.1, spr.201, a.5.

⁴¹⁷ TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.202, a.24.

⁴¹⁸ TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.202, a.45, TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.202, a.39.

⁴¹⁹ TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.260, a.59.

⁴²⁰ TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.393, a.77.

⁴²¹ TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.396, a.48, or TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.638, a.40. TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.639, a.70.

⁴²² TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.640, a.42, or TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.640, a.46.

afraid of the Emperor” was reported very often.⁴²³ Sometimes the peasants would defend the autonomy of their communities saying that “The monarch has no business giving orders here; he in his own land and we in our village do whatever we want.”⁴²⁴

It seems that the 1870s witnessed the death of unconditional peasant monarchism, which was based on gratitude for the abolition of *robot*. During Franz Joseph’s trip to Galicia in 1881, he was called “Jewish father,” and peasants gave voice to their resentment with the state and the monarch in connection with the closure of state forests to peasant cattle in the sub-Carpathian belt.⁴²⁵

Usually, the administration tried to trace the rumors to one single source. Many from Polish landlords believed that Ruthenian clergy was purposefully spreading these rumors, especially on the eve of the elections. Sometimes a connection between clerical Russophiles and the rumors could be established, especially after the Hnylychky affair.⁴²⁶ But in most cases Russophile priests were involved in these rumors only because of the reputation they had. On 8 May 1886, in Khyriv a certain Ivan Trebal’s’kyi from Tovariany was reported to have said:

Now a law has been issued, let the Russians come and take the Poles, the Jews and the landlords on their spears, and let them come, God, as soon as possible. I would also go with them to take Jews, landlords and Poles on spears, and the Russians will give us a *korets’* of wheat and rye for the Poles.⁴²⁷

These rumors were connected with others about shipments of weapons to arm the local peasantry. The rumors were traced to Raitarovychi, where Rev. Neronovych, a Russophile activist was the parish priest. Raitarovychi’s mayor was reported to have bought 30 scythes and sold them in the Rudky district.⁴²⁸ In fact, it appeared that Rev. Neronovych, as a member of “the People’s Trade” society, in April 1886 ordered 30 scythes from this society for a teacher, Fabian, to distribute among the peasants. Raitarovychi’s former mayor, Mykyta Sirko, had brought these scythes from Peremyshl’ to Raitarovychi, and this trip allegedly set off all the reported rumors.⁴²⁹

⁴²³ TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.394, a.7.

⁴²⁴ TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.262, a.45.

⁴²⁵ Ivan Franko, “Pis’ma iz Galitsii,” 123.

⁴²⁶ TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.640, a.99.

⁴²⁷ TsDIAUuL, f.146, op.4, spr.3989, a.99.

⁴²⁸ TsDIAUuL, f.146, op.4, spr.3990, a.1.

⁴²⁹ TsDIAUuL, f.146, op.4, spr.3990, a.68.

The authorities themselves contributed to the development of popular Russophilism by associating Ruthenian with Russian and prospective state treason.⁴³⁰ Any publication in the Ruthenian language was seen as unusual and suspicious. A gendarme stopped in the house of the mayor in the village of Voloshynova on the eve of St. Mykhail day. By accident he spotted a kurenda of the Ruthenian consistory. Suspecting something dangerous, he ordered the mayor to open it and to read it aloud because the gendarme did not know any Ruthenian. But even after listening to it he was not able to understand it, so he took it with him to the district captaincy.⁴³¹

Just like many peasants, many priests became Russophile in the 1870s. Rev. Klym Turchmanovych, who died on 27 July 1873 in Stril'bychi and held the offices of the district council chairman and the Saryi Sambir dean, became a Russophile in the early 1870s. Rev. Pankovych, a teacher in the Lavriv school, became a Russophile during the Turkish-Russian war, which was covered extensively in Slovo. He was so eager to know the news from the war theater that he sent a special horseman to the postal office in Saryi Sambir to bring him fresh newspapers. All the pupils in the Lavriv school listened to this news, and when the news was good the teacher wept with joy.⁴³² This admiration and idealization of Russia did not mean Russian nationalism. In fact, the main problem of the Russophiles was in transforming their sympathies into a nationalist project. Most Ukrainians would explain Galician Russophilism in the way Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi did. For him it was an outcome of the change in Vienna's policy towards Ruthenians. The leaders of Galician Ruthenians responded to it, but in a wrong way; they:

were not calling on the Ruthenian intelligentsia to turn towards the Ruthenian masses and work sincerely for them to make of them willing and relentless fighters for their own better fate in their own country, but started persuading people without letting up that in their grim situation help could come only from the north, from their related and mighty Slav brother.⁴³³

The Russophiles' Ukrainian opponents did not see their project as a national one. For them any national project had to be based on a belief in the powers of the people, who are the nation. They did not see this kind of conviction among the Russophiles, and when they finally noticed it, it was quite late, and they did not

⁴³⁰ TsDIAuL, f.156, op.1, spr.261, a.44.

⁴³¹ "Ot Staroho mista," Prolom, 1881, No.1.

⁴³² Ivan Fylypchak and Roman Lukan', Ts. K. Okruzhna Holovna shkola v Lavrovi, 108-9.

⁴³³ Zubryts'kyi, "Halyts'ki sviashchenyky v Kholmshchyni," 173.

think that the Russophiles could catch up with the Ukrainian movement.⁴³⁴ The Russophiles could sympathize with the Russian Empire but this Russian Empire itself had a problem with building a Russian nation.

For the Greek Catholic clergy and their relatives, Russophilism was not just a political affair, it was also a matter of everyday choice. In the 1860s and 1870s many Galician priests emigrated to the Chelm diocese in Russia, where they converted to Orthodoxy and were converting their parishioners. Many Galician Greek Catholic priests continued to keep relationships with their relatives and friends in Russia. For example, Rev. Antonii Nazarevych, a parson in Mshanets', corresponded with Rev. Symeon Sal'vyts'kyi, a priest formerly in Holovetsko horichnie who emigrated to Russia in 1875.⁴³⁵ Because of this emigration Galician Russophiles were aware not only of the similarities and advantages of living in Russia, but also of the differences and problems. The fact that the Russian language was not as easy as it appeared to the Russophiles in Galicia, and that the "Little Russian" language was also suppressed there showed up in Rev. Nazarevych's correspondence.⁴³⁶

The conflict between political loyalty, conscience, cultural admiration and contradictory feelings of belonging led to all kinds of fantasies and attempts to find compromises. Some dreamt about a larger union of Catholicism and Orthodoxy, imagining a new world order where Russia, converting Asian pagans, would become a world power, the eastern rite would be as numerous as the western one and one day the Pope would come from the East as he had at the beginning of Christianity.⁴³⁷ An anonymous writer from Sambir expressing these views called himself a "Russophile" but not a "friend of Moscow." Many Russophiles preferred to think not in terms of nations but in terms of cultures, civilizations and religions.

There were developed networks of Russophiles in the Sambir area, established largely through personal relationships. Iosif Markov himself joined these networks in 1887, after marrying the daughter of Rev. Viktor Neronovych from Raitarevychi. A good friend of this family was Rev. Mykola Nehrebets'kyi, a parish priest in Kupnovychi and the dean of Komarno. Viktor's brother, Rev. Iakiv Neronovych, was a priest in Rozbir and a distant relative of Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi.⁴³⁸

In the 1870s it also became clear that while the Ukrainophiles and Russophiles still saw each other as Ruthenians, they closed access to the club for Polish

⁴³⁴ Franko, "Chy vertatys' nam nazad do narodu?" 147.

⁴³⁵ Zubryts'kyi, "Halyts'ki sviashchenyky v Kholmshchyni," 174-5.

⁴³⁶ Ibid., 176, 177.

⁴³⁷ VR LNB, Mark., 479, p.18.

⁴³⁸ VR LNB, Mark.479, p.15.

Ruthenians, those defining themselves *gente Ruthene nationae Poloniae*, who were considered lost to the Ruthenian nation. In the Sambir area some of the most prominent Polish politicians and public figures claimed that they were Ruthenians. This was the case with Michał Popiel and also with Antoni Sozański, one of the largest Sambir landowners and a member of the Sozański kin. Better known as a bibliographer, he had also a range of curious political opinions. He thought that Poles, Ruthenians and Lithuanians constituted one nation; and of these three, the Ruthenians were the most numerous component, numbering 13,625,000.⁴³⁹ His future Poland would have its capital in Krakow, closer to the civilized countries of West and South, while Rus' would enjoy the status of a separate province with its own minister and chancery, "remembering that in the golden times of the Commonwealth Ruthenian was spoken in the Krakowian castle." According to his plans, the Church Union would be abolished, Orthodoxy would have complete freedom, and the center of the Orthodox Church would be located in either Krakow or L'viv.⁴⁴⁰ Obviously, according to this view Greek Catholics would return to Orthodoxy.

Sozański was also sure that in the terms of social order the world has been turning upside down. Life in the village ceased to be as peaceful as it had been in old Poland, and had become most disturbing. The situation in the villages after emancipation brought about the following reflections:

Who knows if, for the Polish nation, the burdening of the peasants [with *roboř*] or at least their dependence on the nobility is not as necessary as religious intolerance for the Ottoman state; who knows if this is not the reason beyond the fact that in the provinces of Poland, where dependency has been abolished, nationality is [also] dying.⁴⁴¹

Antoni Sozański would not accept either the Russophiles or Ukrainophiles, and when, in 1877, the first socialist trial took place in Galicia he prepared a memorandum to the Viceroy's office asking that the arrested Ruthenians be hanged as soon as possible.⁴⁴² Another Polish Ruthenian, Michał Popiel, at the end of his life was looking for a place for an independent Ukraine on the eastern border of a resurrected Poland, or as one Ukrainian patriot put it, "somewhere near the Caspian sea."⁴⁴³

⁴³⁹ [Antoni Sozański], *Bez polityki nie dorobimy się nowej Polski, a dawna Polska ciągle będzie na katafalku* (Sambor, 1880), 17-18.

⁴⁴⁰ [Antoni Sozański], *Rozmowa z dyplomata o Polsce* (Sanok, 1870), 46, 50, 55.

⁴⁴¹ [Antoni Sozański], *Niektóre pisma A. Sozańskiego t.2* (Kraków, 1891), 122.

⁴⁴² Ivan Franko, „D-r Ostap Terlets'kyi. Spomyny i materialy,” in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.33 (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1982), 349.

⁴⁴³ VR LNB, f. Tyt Revakovykh, 39/p.2.

Of all these orientations, the most established was Russophile. In 1881, before Rev. Iasenyt's'kyi died and on the eve of the Hnylychky affair, the Russophile newspaper Prolom was becoming more and more popular and actually managed to unite both Russophiles and old Ruthenians in opposition to Dilo. We have a list of Prolom subscribers from the region, in which we are interested. According to the postal outlets, it looked as follows:⁴⁴⁴

Postal office Borynia:

Rev. Salamon Shchasnyi in Komarnyky
Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi in Botlia (deleted)
Vasyl' Kokotailo in Iablone

Postal office Drohobych:

Rev. Skobel's'kyi in Lishnia
Pavlo Levyts'kyi in Iasenyt'sia Sil'na
Hrytsai in Mykhanevychi
Professor Kaplun in Drohobych
Rev. Pohoretskii in Vatsiovychi
Professor Bolons'kyi in Drohobych
Monastery of Basilian Fathers
Mr. Varyvoda in the Drohobych court
Alekseev in Drohobych

Postal office Dobrivliany:

Rev. Korostens'kyi in Hrushiv
Kushnir family in Hrushiv
Ruthenian reading club in Dobrivliany
Vasyl'ii Banchytskii in Rolliv

Postal office Kranzberg:

Rev. Dmytrii Ortyns'kyi in Hordynia

Postal office Liutovyska:

Rev. Hrushkevych in Dydiova
Rev. Nazarevych in Mshanets'
Dmytrii Kapko

Postal office Luka:

Rev. Ivan Drymalyk in Voloshcha
Rev. Ivan Maliarkevych in Dorozhiv

Postal office in Lomna:

Rev. Kornylii Iavorskii in Lomna
Andrei Hychko in Dnistryk Horishnii

Postal office Pidbuzh:

Rev. Hoshovskii in Smol'na
Hryhorii Kul'chyts'kyi in Storonna

⁴⁴⁴ VR LNB, f. Osyp Markov., 50/p.4.

Rev. Il'nytskii
Rev. Kuryvchak in Pidbuzh
Postal office in Sambir:
Rev. Bryttan in Torchynovychi
Rev. Pavlo Iasenytskii in Sambir
Rev. Berezyns'kyi in Kul'chytsi
Rev. Chaikovs'kyi in Horodyshe
Postal office in Stare misto:
Rev. Boloshynskii in Strashevychi
Teodor Markov, court auscultator in Stare misto
Rev. Bodnar in Strilbychi
Postal office Turka:
Rev. Rudavskii in Shumiany.

Politics

The majority of conscious Ruthenians in Sambir in the 1870s would sign under the proclamation, which the newly founded Ruthenian Council made in 1871 as the political organization of Galician Ruthenians:

Our only aim is to get on legal basis in the family of the Austrian nation such a political position which would give us, Ruthenians, an opportunity to develop our national rights and freedoms, to foster them and preserve their wholeness, as well as having an equally rightful and equally important vote in the affairs of the state and of our eternal Galician motherland.⁴⁴⁵

The position of the Ruthenian camp in the 1870s was much weaker than it was in the 1860s. Not all the Greek Catholic clergy in the Sambir area supported the Ruthenian movement. The old dean, Rev. Iosyf Lavrets'kyi, who had been the chair of the Sambir Ruthenian Council in 1848, died at the end of 1873. Even before he passed away, a new dean, Rev. Aleksandr Nesterovych, was appointed.⁴⁴⁶ The burial of Rev. Lavrets'kyi, who was decorated with imperial medals, was one of the greatest public gatherings Sambir had ever seen. Present were 29 Ruthenian priests and eight Roman Catholic, all the army officers, civil administration, and even Jewish elders. The total of those participating was estimated at around 8,000.⁴⁴⁷ The appointment of Rev. Nesterovych was allegedly

⁴⁴⁵ TsDIAuL, f.196, op.1, spr.7.

⁴⁴⁶ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 8(20).01.1874.

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid.

influenced by the Poles, who had accused Rev. Lavrets'kyi of sympathies towards Orthodoxy, of being quarrelsome and sowing national hatred.⁴⁴⁸

The new dean became very popular with the Sambir public. A Polish memoirist says that Rev. Nesterovych was good-natured and a great friend of youth, unlike his Roman-Catholic counterpart, Smoliński, a parish priest in Sambir who was concerned only with his vocation.⁴⁴⁹ Born in 1817 a son of Greek Catholic parish priest, Rev. Nesterovych traveled even more than his predecessor. After he was born, his father got the parish of Berehy near Sambir. In the 1830s Aleksandr studied in the Sambir gymnasium (during the period when revolutionary agitation flourished there), and after this entered the seminary in Vienna. He knew "all the Slavic languages," as well as Italian, French and English, and this obviously besides German. He tried to spend all the vacations during his seminary studies abroad, visiting Italy, Tyrol, Bohemia, Hungary, Bavaria, Bulgaria, Serbia and Constantinople. After graduation in 1841 he considered doctoral studies but, because of his father's death, had to return to Galicia and take care of his orphaned brothers and sisters. He started his pastoral work as his grandfather's assistant in Hordynia. In 1848 he was a chaplain of an ethnically Italian garrison in Przemyśl. Between 1857 and 1874 he was a parson in Mistkoviichi and Sambir vice-dean. In 1872 he defended Bishop Stupnyts'kyi from Russophile attacks and took a stance against the ritualistic movement.⁴⁵⁰ There were more "good Ruthenians" like Rev. Nesterovych in Sambir. District captain Hordyns'kyi, who did not appear in public much, was himself one of them.⁴⁵¹ He was of petty gentry origin, the brother of Adalbert Hordyns'kyi and thus an uncle of the Ruthenian writer Iurii Fed'kovych, the author of *Farmazony*.⁴⁵²

The pro-Polish attitudes of the new dean surfaced immediately. When the abolition of serfdom was celebrated on 3 May, some priests from the area did not mention this anniversary to their parishioners at all. Rev. Aleksandr Nesterovych actually made it impossible for many priests to organize celebrations in their parishes, appointing a deanery's assembly in the town of Sambir on 3 May. During the assembly in Sambir, nine priests served the Liturgy but it was not advertised and no special commemoration of the abolition of *robot* was allowed. When one of the assistant priests volunteered to give a talk on this topic, the dean said that all talks of this kind had to be approved by him in advance and denied permission. Only the memory of Metropolitan Iakhymovych was commemorated on 9 May, on which occasion gymnasium students showed up in

⁴⁴⁸ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1875, No.114.

⁴⁴⁹ Dr. Władysław Cichoński, *Sambor przed półwiekiem*, 17.

⁴⁵⁰ *Gazeta Samborska*, 1895, No.5.

⁴⁵¹ Dr. Władysław Cichoński, *Sambor przed półwiekiem*, 19.

⁴⁵² Fylypchak, *Shkola v Hordyni*, 15

large number. But even this occasion was celebrated not by the dean, but by Rev. Pavlo Iasenys'tkyi.⁴⁵³

The provincial autonomy was met by the Ruthenian activists with enmity and dissatisfaction:

The good side of the communities' autonomy does not show up in the communities, which by and large do not have educated and honest citizens of stable character who know how to overcome selfish goals and place society's interests above their own... There is enough evidence that the conditions of the communities were much better under absolutism than under contemporary Polish autonomy.⁴⁵⁴

This passage is not characteristic, as it somewhat blurs the distinction between provincial and communities' autonomy. Usually Ruthenian activists argued in favor of the communities' autonomy despite their opposition to the provincial one. And we know that this was connected with the new mode of action they employed for the peasantry. For example, as a member of the District Council Rev. Iasenys'tkyi agitated for as wide autonomy as possible for the village communities.⁴⁵⁵ Despite this, the communities' politics proper was rarely discussed in the Ruthenian press; we see only reports on the elections and on the politics in the town of Sambir.

The Sambir gymnasium remained the site of Polish-Ruthenian antagonism throughout the 1870s. After the death of Rev. Iosyf Lavrets'kyi, the gymnasium's Greek Catholic catechist, Rev. Pavlo Iasenys'tkyi, became the leader of local Ruthenian politics. Rev. Iasenys'tkyi was born on 21 February 1823 in the suburb of Drohobych. He died on 20 June 1882, in Sambir. His mother's maiden name was Kossak, which indicates her connection with the Kossaks from Drohobych. Two members of this family were prominent in the national movement of 1848, and one of them was a hegumen of the Drohobych monastery of Basilian fathers. Pavlo's brother Isydor also became a Basilian monk. He was the one to take Pavlo to study in Buchach in 1833. In 1841 Pavlo Iasenys'tkyi entered the university in L'viv to study theology, and in 1843 moved to theology in Vienna. In 1847 he married Sabina Ivanovs'ka, from a priestly family and, in March 1848, was ordained as a priest., Appointed as an administrator in a small village in Kal'nykiv near Iaroslav, he missed 1848 and only in 1850 was given the position of assistant priest in Sambir and of temporary catechist in the Sambir gymnasium. In 1858 his position became a tenured one. By the time of Iasenys'tkyi's death, his two sons had become court auscultators in Krakow and Sambir, while his

⁴⁵³ "Iz Sambora (Bohosluzheniie v d. 3 r. Maia. Zaupokoinoiie bohosluzheniie 10 maia)," *Slovo*, 1873, No.59.

⁴⁵⁴ "Iz Sambora (Nasha avtonomiia)," *Slovo*, 1873, No.59.

⁴⁵⁵ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1874, No.43.

youngest child was still a gymnasium student. When Archduke Ludwig visited the Sambir gymnasium, he asked Rev. Iasenyts'kyi to give a lecture in German and liked it so much that he honored Rev. Iasenyts'kyi with a special document. Even his political opponent, Diet speaker Mikołaj Ziblikiewicz, allegedly said after Iasenyts'kyi's death that the Reverend had been one of the ablest Diet forces.⁴⁵⁶

The immediate place of Rev. Iasenyts'kyi's activities was the gymnasium in Sambir. In the 1870s the gymnasium's curriculum was increasingly polonized. Polish history was introduced as an extracurricular subject, but unofficially, under the pressure of Polish professors, it became obligatory for Ruthenian as well as Polish students. The only Ruthenian not to attend Polish history class was Rev. Iasenyts'kyi's son.⁴⁵⁷ Similarly two of Rev. Iasenyts'kyi's daughters upset the Roman Catholic priest Hermann Kulisz, the director and catechist of the women's provincial school in Sambir, by not participating in extracurricular Roman Catholic rituals, participation which the director had ordered.⁴⁵⁸ Rev. Kulisz (born in 1832 and ordained in 1861)⁴⁵⁹ was an important person with whom the Ruthenian movement would have a prolonged battle lasting up to the beginning of the twentieth century. Rev. Kulisz was also one of the most influential local figures, owning one of few real villas in Sambir already in 1872.⁴⁶⁰

Rev. Iasenyts'kyi himself was attacked by the gymnasium director for not speaking proper Ruthenian. In 1872, the director, Toma Barewicz, a polonized Ruthenian, blamed him for the introduction of Russian as the language of instruction instead of vernacular Ruthenian. Another charge was connected with this – of not following the ritual exactly, namely not ringing the bells during the Liturgy, one of the changes on the agenda of ritualists since 1861.⁴⁶¹ In 1872 with Rev. Iasenyts'kyi's election to the district council, the conflict entered a new stage. One of his first actions in the council was to propose the election of a peasant to the District School Council. According to Rev. Iasenyts'kyi, it would both raise the level of the elementary village schools and engage the peasants in educational politics.⁴⁶² Such a position allegedly met with the approval of local peasants.

Another instance, in which Rev. Iasenyts'kyi claimed to defend “peasant interests,” was his voting against financial help for the Greek Catholic priests who

⁴⁵⁶ See introduction to Iasenytskii, *Hde Prosveshchenie*, 5-6.

⁴⁵⁷ Andrii Chaikovs'kyi, “Serenada v navechir'ie Sv. Voitsiekha. Z himnazyial'nykh spomyniv,” *Ruslan*, 1904, No.63.

⁴⁵⁸ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1876, No.58.

⁴⁵⁹ *Directorium et Schematismus Universali Venerabilis Cleri Saecularis & Regularis Dioecesis Ritus Latini Premisliensis pro anno domini 1881* (Jasło, 1880).

⁴⁶⁰ Dr. Wladyslaw Cichocki, Op. cit., 4.

⁴⁶¹ “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1872, No.59, 60.

⁴⁶² “Ot Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1872, No.116.

fled from the Chełm diocese in Russia. The enmity between the two groups of Greek Catholic clergy in Galicia and Iasenyts'kyi's own anti-Polish and pro-Russian position are the obvious explanation for this vote. Rev. Iasenyts'kyi preferred to present it, however, as a move in the interests of the peasants who "do not want to support emigrants from Chełm with their taxes."⁴⁶³ The defense of peasant interests in the 1870s was very selective. The very same article arguing for peasant participation in the sessions of the School Council was upset with the presence of peasants in the Diet and Parliament. These peasant deputies, who did not know German, were said to be fools, elected only because of the Polish agitation against Greek Catholic clergy.⁴⁶⁴

The most important events that ultimately testified to the success or failure of local Ruthenian politics were elections to the Diet and, later, to the parliament. Every election was an occasion to reflect on the situation of the movement, the consciousness of its elite and of the peasant masses. Voting for one candidate or another was represented as a manifestation of national consciousness or of its absence. Consciousness of nationality was expected to determine the choice of candidate. Elections were also used by the Ruthenian movement to spread its ideas and to reach the peasantry and in general were one of the few moments when the peasants had to be taken into account, when they were paid attention to and interacted with an urban milieu.⁴⁶⁵

Only a tiny minority of peasants actually participated in the elections in the 1870s . The peasants voted in a particular peasant curia electing 74 deputies (52.3% to 46% of all the deputies).⁴⁶⁶ There were 10,355 valid peasant votes in the 1876 elections. In terms of the social position of the candidates, these valid peasant votes in 1876 and in 1883 elections in percents were distributed as follows: ⁴⁶⁷

Table 5-2 "Distribution of the Peasant Votes for the Candidates According to the Social Position of the Latter in 1876 and 1883 Elections."

Social position of the candidates	1876	1883
Landlords	36.4%	46.6%

⁴⁶³ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁵ See Sereda, "My tu ne pryishly na smikh'," 165-186.

⁴⁶⁶ Grodziski, *Sejm Krajowy Galicyjski 1861-1914*, t.1 (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo sejmowe, 1993), 52.

⁴⁶⁷ Ivan Franko, "Halyts'ka statystyka vybocha z rokiv 1876 i 1883," *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.44 kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 384.

Roman Catholic Priests	5.4%	4.2%
Greek Catholic Priests	9.6%	4.1%
Governmental officials	21.7%	20.8%
Urban intelligentsia	13.2%	16.7%
Merchants and industrialists	1.2%	3.2%
Peasants	12.5%	4.6%

In 1876 the Diet received only three peasant deputies. In 1883 their number dwindled to nil.⁴⁶⁸ Two-step elections in the communities meant that, during the first stage, one elector was elected for every 500 pre-electors in the community, and during the second stage the electors voted for a Diet deputy. Gender, age, settlement requirements and wealth limited the number of pre-electors. Only the richest two-thirds of those paying land and house tax in the community could become pre-electors. 74 Galician peasant electoral districts in 1876 had a population of 5,109,777, and of these only 508,617 had the right to elect electors. In 1876 pre-electors counted for 10% and in 1908 – for 9% of the total population.⁴⁶⁹ Besides the electors elected by pre-electors, petty owners of tabular property paying from 25 to 100 Gulden in taxes yearly automatically became electors from the peasant curia.

The Ruthenians did not do too badly in the 1870 elections. These elections would rather seem to fit the pattern of the 1860s than the pattern of the 1870s when elections were more and more controlled and manipulated by the Polish gentry controlling the district administration. The Sambir and Staryi Sambir districts had two electoral districts: Stare Misto-Sambir and Luka-Medenychi. In the Luka-Medenychi district, to which Rev. Korostens'kyi's Mokriany deanery belonged, the peasant Danylo Ivanyshiv was elected by an absolute majority of 48 of 95 participating electors. In the Stare Misto – Sambir district, a Polish candidate, Michał Popiel, ran against the Ruthenian Iuliian Lavrovs'kyi. Both Russophiles and Ukrainophiles supported the latter. Just after the elections, the commission reported to the Viceroy's office stating that there were 190 electors and Popiel had won with an absolute majority of 94 votes. But the Viceroy's office, with the help of a Ruthenian protest petition, found that for 190 electors the majority would be 96 and not 94. In response to this discovery, a local electoral commission quickly found a man on the list of voters, who did not have the right to vote because he was the fourth co-owner of the tabular land, and added to the votes in favor of Popiel one mis-given vote, that of Sambir's mayor

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁹ Grodziski, *Sejm Krajowy Galicyjski 1861-1914*, t.1 52.

who instead of Michał Popiel said Mikołaj. Thus the total of voting electors became 189, and the absolute majority – 95

The Ruthenians composed a petition which stated that, even with these corrections taken into account, Michał Popiel did not have a majority. A certain Bandura from Ol'shanyk, a certain Karp'iak from P'ianovychi, and a certain Strzelecki were not on the list of those having the right to vote but were counted as electors, who had voted for Popiel. Iulian Lavrovs'kyi got 88 and Popiel 92 votes, but among the spoiled votes was only one which misspelled Popiel's name (cast by Sambir's mayor) and six which misspelled Lavrovs'kyi's, as either simply Lavrovs'kyi (two votes), Illia Lavrovs'kyi (three votes), and even Lavrovyh (one vote). Polish agitators were confusing the peasants on purpose, advising incorrect names, while the peasants found the name Iulian to be strange and difficult to remember.

The Ruthenians also accused Polish agitators of taking peasants on their way to vote for Lavrovs'kyi to the tavern, where they were inundated with liquor under the pretext that the election booths were still closed. A rumor spread that the district administration had ordered people to vote for Popiel, and that this was the will of the government. At the end the Ruthenian petition argued that Diet elections "are not about sheer formality, but about people's will..." According to the authors of the petition, the facts provided led to the conclusion that "village people had been terrorized by suburban agitators and had not been able to express their will freely."⁴⁷⁰ The protest was signed by numerous peasants and Ruthenian priests, largely from the Staryi Sambir district, as well as by peasants from Luzhok, Strilky, Linyna velyka and Linyna mala, Lavriv, Busovyska, Nanchulka, and Stril'bychi. All these villages are close to each other and form a single area in the foothills of the mountains, of which Lavriv was the religious and educational center, and the state estates' administration in Spas – the administrative and economic one.

In the Sambir district this protest was signed by the priests and peasants from Torchynovychi, Strashevychi and Voloshynova. One of the peasants who signed was among those who had gotten drunk in the tavern and not been able to express their will. Although some peasants signed this protest in Cyrillic and some of them were not able to sign at all, the majority signed their names themselves and in Latin script. Among those who signed in Latin script was Stefan Pukach from Torchynovychi, probably the father of late nineteenth-century activist Ivan Pukach. From other sources we know that quite often literate village people did not know how to write in Cyrillic and wrote Ukrainians

⁴⁷⁰ TsDIAuL, f.165, Op.1, spr.299, a.59-61.

words in Latin characters.⁴⁷¹ It is interesting that a similar pattern can be observed among educated Ruthenian women, relatives of the Greek Catholic clergy.⁴⁷²

The records of this election allow us to look into who voted for whom among village electors. Petty gentry by and large voted for Popiel, albeit one Berezhnyts'kyi voted for Lavrovs'kyi. The peasants from Mshanets' (Petro Stetskevych), Morozovychi (Mayor Vas'ko Sarakhman), Berehy (Tymko Detsyk and Petro Kustrys'kyi) voted for Lavrovs'kyi. Many peasants from other villages voted for him as well. Juda Bachmann from Berehy was an elector from Lanovychi and voted for Popiel. Priest-electors – Revs. Davydovych from Blazhiv, Nazarevych from Mshanets', Poplavs'kyi from Luzhok Dol'nyi, Khlopets'kyi from Liashky Murovani, Il'nyts'kyi from Silets' and Turchmanovych from Stril'bychi voted for Lavrovs'kyi as did Vasyl' Segan from Groziova, whom we met earlier in this chapter as an unofficial teacher of Mshanets' peasants.⁴⁷³ Usually there was only one elector from the village; only very large villages had two.

By and large the early 1870s were a time of electoral disappointments for the St. George's party. The hierarchy saw the danger and did not know how to deal with it. The first tensions between the hierarchy and the more populist parish clergy appeared, with neither of them being able to withstand pressure from an administrative body increasingly staffed with supporters of the Polish landowning nobility. One of these tensions developed between the leadership of the only Ruthenian political organization, the Ruthenian Council, and the most prominent clerical populist, Rev. Naumovych. In 1873 the Ruthenian Council was afraid that Rev. Naumovych was using his influence among the peasants in the area of his residency against Rev. Pavlykiv, one of the Russophile leaders and a candidate for the Ruthenian Council from the Zalishchyky-Horodenka electoral district. Rev. Naumovych answered that his travels among the peasants in that area had only one goal – promoting Rev. Pavlykiv as a most worthy and important person.

Rev. Naumovych also expressed his doubts about the success of the elections and advised that Rev. Pavlykiv be put in one of the Podillia districts instead of Zalishchyky-Horodenka. However, if the Committee nonetheless insisted on deciding on the Horodenka-Zalishchyky district, Rev. Naumovych had some advice. This advice allows us to look at the agitation techniques of populist priests. He advised that pre-electoral agitation be conducted following these steps: 1) on 13 October the blessing of the Zalishchyky church was scheduled – Rev. Pavlykiv must come for this event and meet with the priests and peasants; 2)

⁴⁷¹ Illia Homonko, "Selo Korostenko," *Litopys Boikivshchyny*, No.2/26 (37), 1977, 19.

⁴⁷² See, for example, some women corresponding with Rev. Teofil' Pavlykiv – VR LNB, f. Teofil' Pavlykiv, 45/ p.2. Even those who emigrated to and lived for quite some time in Russia were still using Latin script in their correspondence, Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Halys'ki sviashchenyky v Kholmshchyni," 181.

⁴⁷³ TsDIAuL, f.165, Op.1, spr.299.

the very same day Rev. Pavlykiv would have to go to Horodenka and present himself to the electors, “without this you will not succeed. I know these people;” 3) Rev. Naumovych himself would write an open letter, which should be distributed among peasants; 4) on the eve of the election, one should distribute a Ruthenian Calendar printed in Kolomyia. To his letter with the advice Rev. Naumovych added an open letter to the peasants, which said that his wish to serve the people had led him to refrain from putting his person on the list of candidates, but people had to follow the decision of the Ruthenian Council and to vote for the Council’s candidates. The Council decided to follow Naumovych’s recommendations and published his letter in 2,000 copies. Despite all this effort Rev. Pavlykiv lost the elections, and Rev. Naumovych commented on this:

I had foreseen it after having seen the agitations in Horodenka and Borshchiv, I had advising– that I run as a candidate there. If I had failed, it would not have done Rus’ any harm. But now we cannot talk about victory, when Pavlykiv is not among us.⁴⁷⁴

From another source we know that Rev. Naumovych was not at all sure about his own victory in these elections. He had apparently promised to buy Iosyf Markov a Swiss watch if he won the election.⁴⁷⁵

In 1874 the Sambir local elections to the District Council were a disappointment as well for the Ruthenian movement. The Ruthenian list of candidates received only 27 of 130 votes. These numbers were explained by the following electoral math:

Only half of the voters had a consciousness of nationality and knowledge of the District Council’s mission; the other half consisted of uneducated, selfish peasants, guided by outside influence, especially if it immediately benefited their stomachs and throats. [They] were ready to follow the example of Esan and to sell their rights for a paltry price. These latter were cheated by generous treatment and voted for the candidates of our enemy, seduced also by the fact that on that list there were only peasants, half Ruthenian and half Polish, while on the Ruthenian list there were three priests, two gymnasium teachers, three mayors and three farmers.⁴⁷⁶

This time Rev. Pavlo Iasenyts’kyi, who two years previously had been elected to the District Council by almost exactly the same votes, suffered defeat. The author of an article in Slovo explained the difference between these two elections by the fact that two years earlier the peasants had not been bribed and “looking for the treat could not find any.” The root of evil, however, was not in the enemy’s

⁴⁷⁴ VR LNB, f.Narodnyi Dim, 126/p.15, a.36, 60, 61.

⁴⁷⁵ VR LNB, f. Osyp Markov, 286, p.11, a.2.

⁴⁷⁶ Odyn iz vybortsiv, “Iz Sambora,” Slovo, 1874, No.43.

agitation and bribery, but in the weaknesses of the Ruthenian camp. It was said that the enemy's agitation would have failed if only the priests in 15 purely Ruthenian communities had prepared electors with at least a few words. Inexcusable passivity on the part of ten Ruthenian priests was the reason for the defeat. The electors from Bilychi, Vanevychi, Morozovychi, Hordynia, Ol'shanyk, Nynovychi, Maksymovychi, Chukva, Bukova, Liutovyska, Voiutychi, Humenets', Chaplia, Urozh and several others had voted for Poles. According to the author, the problem was that the priests had been afraid to participate in Ruthenian politics. Unlike Ruthenians, the Poles had well paid agitators, among them Ruthenian petty gentry and one village teacher from P. The Polish camp had spent several hundred Gulden on this insignificant district campaign.

The editors of *Slovo* remarked that people in the Sambir district were the same as in the Drohobych district; their enemies also had very similar powers but the Ruthenians had won in the Drohobych district.⁴⁷⁷ This and some other reports show that the peasants had not simply become Polish puppets. To win the election the Polish camp had had to present itself as pro-peasant and to exploit the animosity between the peasants and the priests. In fact, the Ruthenians were able to win municipal elections in small towns even in the 1870s. In 1875 the "war" in Stara Sil' between the Poles and Ruthenians ended with the victory of the Ruthenians, who elected a Ruthenian mayor. The Poles had to divide the community into two, and the Ruthenian part became a separate municipality – Stara Ropa, although there was no natural border between these two communities. A similar Ruthenian victory occurred in Liashky Murovani, but the Poles did not manage to carry out an administrative division of the community.⁴⁷⁸ With the introduction of juries in the courts, peasants got to serve on them. The behavior of these first peasant jurors was approved of in a report to *Slovo*, which stressed that these peasants "were not guided by their respect of the intelligentsia but by their inner convictions; that is why they do not agree with the answers [given] by the intelligentsia whenever their convictions differ."⁴⁷⁹

In 1876 Michał Popiel won in the Diet election, receiving 120 votes. 60 votes came from the *virilists* (owners of tabular land voting in the peasant curia), 21 from the Polish peasant communities, eight from the German peasant colonies, nine from the Roman Catholic priests (all of whom were elected as electors), and the rest from the Ruthenian communities. All the Ruthenian electors from the towns of Khyriv, Stara Sil' and Stare Misto voted for Popiel. The Ruthenian candidate received 78 votes, but 11 of these were eliminated by the commission because the candidate's surname was mistakenly pronounced by the voting

⁴⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁸ Zofia Strzetelska Grynbergowa, *Staromiejskie*, 371.

⁴⁷⁹ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1874, No.68.

peasants. Some priests just stepped back and did not want to deal with the elections at all. Rev. Pliaton Denyshchak, a parish priest in Vaniovychi and Morozovychi, said: "I do not play politics." There were others like him. In the Stryi Sambir district the clergy was more active than the clergy in the Sambir area and, under the leadership of Rev. Paslavs'kyi, they voted unanimously for the Ruthenian candidate, and influenced their peasants to do likewise. When peasant B. was approached by Polish agitators, who offered him a full scholarship for his son to attend Sambir gymnasium, he answered that the lord Poles would do better to decrease provincial taxes so that everyone in the communities would benefit and not just him alone.⁴⁸⁰

The election in another electoral district, Luka-Medenychi, also took place in Sambir on the same day. These elections were also a disaster for the Ruthenians, and the main problem was also the lack of mutual understanding between the peasants and the Ruthenian district committee. The committee appointed the peasant Ivanyshchak (who was elected in 1870), but the peasant electors wanted neither him nor Kravtsiv, another candidate the committee proposed. The peasants would allegedly vote for Rev. Isenyts'kyi from Lishnia, but for some reason the priests did not appoint him as a candidate. Rev. Maliarkevych, a Russophile priest from Dorozhiv, proposed the Dorozhiv peasant, Kost' Mykhalevych, as a candidate. Mykhalevych showed up at the electors after having had a good breakfast with the Polish candidate Piotr Lityński, and that left bad impression among the peasants. After the first round of voting, both candidates had an equal number of votes. In the second round, Lityński won by six votes.

Rev. Hordyns'kyi, a petty gentry from the village of Hordynia, said after the first round, "I shall not vote for a peasant again." Rev. Sozans'kyi from Prusy did not vote the second time either. This failure was not on account of Polish agitation; rather it was the outcome of Ruthenian helplessness.⁴⁸¹ Only in the Turka electoral district did the majority of peasant votes elect a deputy, Rev. Pavlo Iasenyts'kyi. This victory, however, was not due to any popularity Rev. Iasenyts'kyi allegedly enjoyed among the peasants. His electoral campaign was conducted in the following way. At the end of August he undertook a trip to Turka and the neighboring villages. During that trip he saw 13 priests and talked to some peasants. Of the 50 priests in his electoral district, 19 had been his pupils in the Sambir gymnasium, another 20 had children in Sambir schools whom he supervised and therefore were well known for him.

In the Turka mountains the influence of the priests on their peasants was not as undermined as in the lowlands, as Rev. Iasenyts'kyi puts it: "half of these priests enjoy such trust from their parishioners that the latter would elect electors according to their advice." In other parishes he expected varying results but was

⁴⁸⁰ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1876, No.118.

⁴⁸¹ Ibid.

sure that the majority of the electors would consist of “the peasants, who will not betray the national cause.” The election was a test for the Polish administration and the Greek Catholic priests to see whose influence on the peasants was greater. The Polish counter-candidate Michał Czernianski, a vice-president on the district council and a Ruthenian “renegade,” incited the peasants against the priests.⁴⁸²

Rev. Iasenyts’kyi advised the priests not to have mayors elected as electors because these were dependent on the district administration and could be easily manipulated by them. The slogan of the Ruthenian agitation in favor of Rev. Iasenyts’kyi was the following:

We elected a peasant – but he did not do anything; we elected a landlord – only higher additions [to taxes] came. Let’s elect a learned native, who’s a priest of peasant origin to boot.⁴⁸³

Rev. Sembratovych from Turka promised his support, but Rev. Roman Pasichyns’kyi, the chair of the local committee could not be of much help because of his old age. Other activists organizing Rev. Iasenyts’kyi’s campaign were Rev. Salamon from Komarnyky, Rev. Kozanevych from Zhukotyn and several others. Rev. Iasenyts’kyi calculated that a campaign could be run for as little as 100 Gulden spent for treating voters, although for previous elections the Poles had had to spend 500 Gulden.⁴⁸⁴

All the members of the Ruthenian Council from the Turka district asked to support Rev. Iasenyts’kyi were priests: Revs. Roman Pasichyns’kyi (Krasne), Hryhorii Chaikovs’kyi (Botlia), Orest Liatoshyns’kyi (Lybokhora), Iulian Iasenyts’kyi (Vysots’ko Vyzhnie), Shchasnyi Salamon (Komarnyky), Emylian Kornylii Lahodyns’kyi (Bahnovate), Mykhailo Kushnir, and Iosyf Sembratovych (Turka). Besides these, two Council members from neighboring villages in the Staryi Sambir district – Antonii Nazarevych (Mshanets’) and Teodor Kuryllo (Khashchiv) – were mistakenly addressed by the Council.⁴⁸⁵ Rev. Nazarevych said that he belonged to another district while Rev. Kuryllo suggested Rev. Chaikovs’kyi instead of Rev. Iasenyts’kyi, arguing that the peasants knew him from the previous elections and he was very active on the District Council. Rev. Hryhorii Chaikovs’kyi, who “sobered up” peasants in Botlia, was the father of Kornylo Chaikovs’kyi, who would become a well known attorney in the Sambir and Turka area and founder of the reading club in Botlia. Rev. Kuryllo doubted whether the peasants would vote for Rev. Iasenyts’kyi “who is indeed [a] zealous

⁴⁸² TsDIAuL, f.196, op.1, spr.59, a.1.

⁴⁸³ TsDIAuL, f.196, op.1, spr.59, a.2.

⁴⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁵ TsDIAuL, f.196, op.1, spr.59, a.3-4.

[Ruthenian] but little known in this area, and our peasants would not agree to vote for a stranger.”⁴⁸⁶

While the Ruthenian committee in Turka consisted only of Ruthenian patriots and priests, the one in Sambir had to accommodate both those who supported finding a compromise with the Poles, like Rev. Nesterovych, and the peasants. In 1876 the Ruthenian Electoral Committee in Sambir consisted of Revs. Aleksandr Nesterovych, Pavlo Iasenys’kyi, Pliaton Paslavs’kyi (the dean of Stare misto), Petro Vitoshyns’kyi (the dean of Stara sil’), Amvrozii Il’nyts’kyi (Stare misto), Petro Ilyn (Stril’bychi), Andrii Skorodyns’kyi (Cherkhava), Atanazii Kunevych (Berehy), and of secular members Ivan Komarnys’kyi (Sambir), Nykolai Lashkevych (Sambir), Vasyl’ Koblians’kyi (an estate owner in Zarais’ko), Iosafat Stetsyshyn (a cantor-teacher in Baranchytsi) and Vasylii Plaskach (a peasant from Berezhnytsia).⁴⁸⁷

In 1877 there was another election for the Sambir district council. This time the Ruthenian committee’s list was composed of seven literate farmers, two gymnasium professors, two priests and one retired civil officer – in comparison with the 1874 elections peasant representation more than doubled. This time the priests from Kul’chytsi, Silets’, Stupnytsia, Babyna, Berehy, Mistkovychi, Bukova, Ortynychy and Luka managed to win peasant sympathies. They counted for one third of the area’s Greek Catholic parish priests. Another third remained passive, and the last third “did not enjoy the respect of their parishioners.” There were 180 ethnic Ruthenians among the 240 voters. One quarter of the voters were petty gentry, which, with the exception of the Silets’ and Kul’chytsi communities, were “decisively hostile towards the Ruthenian cause.” To make matters worse, many of the petty gentry had guaranteed votes as owners of tabular property.

The election was marked by various scandals, corruption and conducted under the pressure of the authorities. There were some very interesting examples of peasants switching their allegiances. Two peasants who presented themselves as Ruthenian patriots in fact voted for the Polish list. Another peasant accepted a voting card for the Polish list but not finding any money enclosed in it, voiced his indignation and voted for the Ruthenian list. In the end, the Ruthenian list received 70 votes, and this time not Ruthenians passivity and corruption but the large number of Polish and German “colonies” in the area as well as a large presence of petty gentry were blamed for the defeat.

The results of the 1879 election were similar. Only in the Turka district did the Ruthenian candidate gain a majority:

The priests there have the people’s trust; they are concerned with the election, therefore very few Ruthenians allowed various lordlings (*panky*)

⁴⁸⁶ TsDIAuL, f.196, op.1, spr.59, a.5.

⁴⁸⁷ TsDIAuL, f.196, op.1, spr.63.

and silver to pull them to the other side; even the district captain visiting [local] villages during pre-elections with gendarmes did not manage to remove the priests from the election of electors.

Ruthenian townsmen in the Staryi Sambir district again voted for the Polish candidate. Moreover, some Ruthenian priests in the villages of Strilky and Stril'bychi (this was after Rev. Turchmanovych passed away) voted for the Polish candidate as well. Ruthenian electors were cheated by Polish agitators, who on behalf of their candidate, Count Loś, promised to open the salt mine and to decrease taxes. This time many priests in the Sambir district voted in solidarity with their parishioners for the Ruthenian candidate. Even Rev. Denyshchak, who during the previous elections was depicted as completely passive, this time appeared among the Ruthenian activists, who included Revs. Polians'kyi, Il'nyts'kyi, Voloshyns'kyi, Bryttan, and some unidentified "younger priests." The most important problem was again the significant presence of German and Polish "colonists," who constituted one third of the electorate. Of the petty gentry villages, only Silets' – the village where "petty gentry are honest, sober and educated" – sided with the Ruthenians; all others voted against the Ruthenian candidate.⁴⁸⁸ Rev. Il'nyts'kyi, a member of the Sambir Ruthenian council in 1848, was the parish priest in Silets'.

Even the petty gentry in Kul'chytsi, who under the influence of Rev. Berezyns'kyi voted for the Ruthenian candidate in the last election, this time supported Popiel. The gentry mayor in Kul'chytsi did not want to distribute voting cards unless electors promised to vote for Popiel. Responding to a complaint from the peasant mayor, the district captain forced the petty gentry mayor to distribute the cards. In this election, the petty gentry had 14 guaranteed (*virilist*) votes, while in the previous one they had only had four. This change reflected the growing number of sold tabular landholdings, and the petty gentry, just like the Polish peasants in Western Galicia, had reacted to this opportunity more actively than the Ruthenian peasantry. Ruthenian patriots were aware of this tendency and calculated that if it continued, a village paying 2,000 Gulden in tax would have the same vote as a petty gentry who paid 40 Gulden in tax. In the first round, the Ruthenian candidate, Rev. Kostek, received the same number of votes as Popiel while the Count received only 30. But in the second round, Popiel withdrew and handed his votes to the count. Many Polish democrats were upset with this but nevertheless voted for the count. It led Ruthenians to observe that "Poles quarrelling among themselves stand as a wall against the Ruthenians, whom they try to transform into Poles because, in their opinion, Poland will be back only when Rus' is annihilated."⁴⁸⁹

⁴⁸⁸ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1879, No.71.

⁴⁸⁹ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1879, No.71.

Jewish behavior during elections was usually represented in the Ruthenian press as providing paid help to the Polish camp; they were storm troopers for the Polish candidates assaulting peasant electors, getting them drunk, disorienting them and stealing their ballots. By the end of the 1870s, however, Jews figured more and more as an independent nationality. There was an incident in which a priest reprimanded electors standing with a local Jew near a tavern and advised them to go and pray rather than drink at a Jewish place, and the Jew started shouting that this was an insult to the Jewish nation. When the mayor of Humenets' voted for the Ruthenian candidate, a Jew present in the hall exclaimed, "Dog's blood," to which the mayor responded: "you are the dog's blood, I am a Christian." After this exchange, the gendarmes removed the mayor from the hall. For the first time, a Ruthenian report on an election acknowledged some kind of logic in peasant voting, showing that peasants' non-adherence to national belonging was not due to simple bribery or subjugation. As explained to the correspondent by a certain "pragmatic rich, a hard Ruthenian":

I read newspapers and books and see how it is among the people. Simple people do not know who and what can help them; they say: 'we elected a peasant – he did not do any good; we elected a lord, but he did not stand up in the Diet for us; we elected a priest who cares about public matters and often talks according to our wish, but lords do not listen to his truth and they have a majority; now we shall elect a count because people are saying that he does not need anything [he is already rich and will not enrich himself] and has promised us to give everything; maybe he will dispose other lords in the Diet to do some good for us.⁴⁹⁰

This time the peasants did not have much choice. While in the 1860s the Polish nobility preferred the election of peasant deputies instead of the election of Greek Catholic priests – Ruthenian patriots, in the 1870s the situation had changed. Originally the landlords hoped that the peasants in the Diet would not be able to make sense of the debates and that the gentry deputies would be able to successfully manipulate them. As we saw in the chapter on servitudes, this was not the case, which is why there was a counteraction. As Ivan Franko has shown, gentry counteraction ranged from the obstruction of peasant speeches in the Diet to the murder of the peasant deputy Demkiv. By the beginning of the 1880s the peasants were kicked out of the Diet halls completely.⁴⁹¹

In 1885 the Ruthenians lost another election in the Sambir district. The elected deputy, Count Augustus Łoś, spent 6,300 Gulden and defeated Dr. Nikolai Antonevych by 73 votes. This time Dr. Antonevych received 80 votes while in

⁴⁹⁰ "Ot Sambora," *Slovo*, 1879, No.71.

⁴⁹¹ Ivan Franko, "Materialy dlia izucheniia obshchestvennykh idealov ukrainskogo naroda v Galitsii," *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.44 kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 131.

the election in 1879, Rev. Kostek had received only 30. But these elections belonged to a new epoch, one that started at the beginning of the 1880s after the last luminaries from the 1848 generation in the area – Rev. Iasenyts’kyi in the Sambir and Rev. Korostens’kyi in the Drohobych districts had died. There was the usual tumult and disorganization among the local Ruthenian activists. Until the very last minute the Ruthenians were not sure for whom they would have to vote (Berezhnyts’kyi being another possibility.) But this chaos was not identified as the main reason of the defeat:

every foreign observer with a chance to become acquainted with the electorate of the Sambir district, especially the gentry electorate, would have to acknowledge that moral victory was on the side of the Ruthenian electors in these districts. These [petty gentry] are a totally different type of people, not like our Ruthenian Podolian or mountaineer, who, having arrived at self-consciousness, values his Ruthenian name and would never betray the Ruthenian cause. The Sambir gentry is mercenary to such an extent that they would not be at all ashamed of taking bribes from both candidates and would vote for the one who paid several Gulden more. You cannot do anything with an element like this, only buy it as you buy equipment or livestock.⁴⁹²

Most prominent among the Count’s agitators were the petty gentry Piotr Lityński (the mayor of Bilyna Velyka, whom we met during the servitude cases) and Pawlowski. There was also a peasant, a certain Semash, a community scribe from Vaniovychu, who was described as an “oinker of the worst sort, able to take money from both candidates and work for the one who paid more.” On election day, the petty gentry voters gathered early in the morning and waited for bribes, but no one started giving them out. Rumors spread that Lityński and Pawlowski, who took 500 and 200 Gulden from Łoś, intended to keep this money for themselves. The petty gentry would have almost voted for Dr. Antonevych but at the last minute Lityński and Pawlowski started circulating 10 Gulden bills, and this decided the election results in Sambir.⁴⁹³

⁴⁹² “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1885, No.54.

⁴⁹³ “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1884, No.54.

University of Alberta

FRAMING THE UKRAINIAN PEASANTRY IN
HABSBURG GALICIA: 1846-1914 (WITH
FOCUS ON THE SAMBIR AREA)

by

Andriy Zayarnyuk



A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in History

Department of History and Classics

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume 2

Chapter 6: <i>Correspondents</i>	398
New Generation.....	398
Peasant Correspondent.....	401
Reading Clubs.....	409
Petty Gentry.....	419
The Community of Morozovychi.....	423
Politics.....	435
Capitalism.....	448
Interregnum.....	452
Stories of Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi.....	456
In the Tenets of Racial Discourse.....	469
Chapter 7: <i>Stories of Ivan Mykhas</i>	499
Morozovychi, <i>Prosvita</i> , and Mykhas' Revolt.....	499
<i>Prosvita</i> Without Mykhas and Mykhas' Opposition Politics.....	519
Elections of 1897.....	542
Bobers'kyi's Victory in Morozovychi.....	552
Moving to Berehy.....	591
Chapter 8: <i>Sustaining the Nation's Body</i>	639
Reading Clubs in the 1890-1900s: Maintaining the Public Sphere.....	640
The Peasant Class.....	680
Dealing with Petty Gentry.....	714
Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi's Work.....	724
Conclusions.....	759
Bibliography.....	772

LIST OF TABLES

Table 6-1 "Illiteracy Rates for the Galician Population Older Than Six in 1880-1900," v.2, page 427.

Table 6-2 "Distribution of the Communities of Sambir and Stare Misto districts According to the Population's Size," v.2, page 435.

Table 8-1 "Development of *Prosvita* in 1890-1912," v.2, page 641.

Table 8-2 "Development of the *Prosvita* reading clubs in Sambir and Staryi Sambir districts in 1900-1904," v.2, page 647.

Table 8-3 "Reading Clubs of the Sambir *Prosvita*'s Branch as of 1909," v.2, page 659.

Table 8-4 "Reading Clubs of the Staryi Sambir *Prosvita*-s Branch as of 1910," v.2, page 666.

Table 8-5 "Percentage of Land under Selected Cultures in Galicia in 1873-1893," v.2, page 700.

Table 8-6 "Cattle Hold by Peasants and Large Estates in 1907 in the Sambir, Luka and Staryi Sambir court districts," v.2, page 701.

Table 8-7 "Distribution of the Emergency Aid among the villages in Mshanets' area in 1890," v.2, page 732.

Table 8-7 "Voting in the Fourth Curia of the Sambir-Stare Misto-Turka-Rudky electoral district in 1897," v.2, page 740.

Table 8-8 "Voting from the Fourth Curia in 1900 Diet Elections in the Sambir-Rudky-Turka-Staryi Sambir Electoral District," v.2, page 742.

Chapter 6

CORRESPONDENTS

Old enthusiastic sentimentalism, with which Ruthenian youth lived in the 1860s, left one bitter disappointment. That poetic life of our youth was a great political mistake; ... And now when amongst general public disappointment in Galicia we rise to the new work, we do it with the conviction that in a few more years the life like the one we have now in Galicia and our nation will disappear without leaving a trace amongst the enemies prepared to destroy us.¹

New Generation

The 1870s were a time when the first groups of young students, influenced by Mykhailo Drahomanov, appeared in Galicia. This was the beginning of Ukrainian radicalism.² This development, however, was part of larger shifts in the Ruthenian movement. There were political and economic crises of the 1870s, mentioned earlier, and a certain maturing of Ukrainophile national-populism, based around *Prosvita*, leaving Cossackophile romanticism of the 1860s and turning towards “organic” work with the people. This larger shift occurred against the background of great change in the cadres of the national movement. In the 1870s the generation of 1848, which defined, controlled and represented the movement for more than two decades, was dying out. Among the activists in our region, Rev. Lavrets’kyi was the first one to pass away in 1873. He was followed by others, like Rev. Ivan Ivanovs’kyi, who died in 1879.³ Finally, at the beginning of the 1880s two last luminaries left in the Sambir area from the generation of 1848 passed away – Revs. Pavlo Iasenys’kyi and Ivan

¹ Ostap Terlets’kyi’s speech from 1874, when he was elected as a chair of the “Sich” student society. Cited in Ivan Franko, “D-r Ostap Terlets’kyi. Spomyny i materialy,” *Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.33 (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1982), 325.

² Himka, *Socialism in Galicia*, 46-64.

³ “Iz Samborskoho sela,” *Slovo*, 1879, No.118.

Korostens'kyi. Even those who still lived, like Rev. Roman Pasichyns'kyi, were ill and did not play an active role in the movement.

This dying out of the old generation created a space, which allowed a new generation to enter the stage of Ruthenian public life especially forcefully. This new generation was educated in the constitutional era, participated in the student organizations of the 1870s, and was more secular. This was also a generation, which included quite a few peasant sons. It is interesting that radicals of the 1880s in fact came from the student *bromadas* of the 1870s, in which they participated together with the younger generation of national-populists.

Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi belonged to this new generation. Just like most other peasant sons from the area he chose the Drohobych gymnasium instead of one in Sambir. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, despite being born in the same year Ivan Franko, because of several breaks in his education studied several grades below.⁴ While in the gymnasium Franko mentions Zubryts'kyi as one of the three conscious Ruthenian students interested in Ruthenian politics and problems.⁵ Besides Zubryts'kyi, two others were Pavlo Matkovs'kyi and Ivan Franko himself. Franko and Zubryts'kyi were peasant sons while Matkovs'kyi was the son of a priest.

Just like Ivan Franko, Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi acquired close knowledge of the work on the Boryslav oil fields. He worked there in one of the breaks in his studies. Still nothing close to a booming industry, Boryslav oil fields provided an environment different not only from the village but also from the one in Drohobych. In his memoir Zubryts'kyi said that while working on the oil-wells together with workers from Germany, especially from Saxony, he had noticed a great knowledge of history among them. Every German worker knew much about Saxon princes and Martin Luther; "I was greatly surprised and compared them with our peasants working in the same oil wells." The international environment of oil fields exposed Zubryts'kyi not so much to social questions but to the significant differences between the historical consciousness of Western and Ruthenian common people.

Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi at the time was subscribing to *Nauka* and to the student periodical *Druh*. Because of this the manager of the well said to him: "*Sie sind ein Moskowin.*" Zubryts'kyi responded stating that he was a Ruthenian, took the salary due to him and returned back to Drohobych to enter the fifth grade of gymnasium.⁶ As we see, not only the experiences but also the readings of the future priest Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi were the same as those of radical activists; he

⁴ VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.11.

⁵ Franko to Shchasnyi Sel's'kyi, *Zibrannia tvoriv*, t.48, 17.

⁶ VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.10.

was subscribing to Druh, which at that time was the most radical Ruthenian newspaper. At that time Zubryts'kyi maintained close contacts with the countryside, and his contacts with reading clubs in Volia Iakubova and Dobrivliany could be dated back to that time.

This was also a time when Ukrainian leftist intellectuals, still grouped largely in Vienna and Geneva, made their first attempts to reach out to the peasants and published the first popular socialist brochures. In 1877 the Viceroy's Office became concerned with the influx of Ukrainian socialist literature. Steam Machine and Truth were considered to be dangerous because "the main tendency, which the author tries to make especially accessible to village people, is communist and incites against governmental authorities as well as against the more wealthy social class."⁷ Similarly books On How Our Land is Becoming Not Ours and On Agriculture had also penetrated Galicia. The investigation conducted by the Viceroy's Office however showed that these brochures did not penetrate the countryside; they were entering various Ruthenian societies and periodicals, and the authorities found no trace of them in the villages.⁸ We know that these brochures appeared among Ruthenian gymnasium students, who continued to work in *bromada*'s and were sympathetically accepted by at least some future national-populists. This was the case with Evhen Olesnyts'kyi, who being the member of *bromada* read Ukrainian socialist brochures and found them totally compatible with Christian ethics.⁹

It seems, however, that back in the 1870s even those students reading more radical publications and newspapers did not bring them to the villagers. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, for example, did not use Druh in his talks with peasants. He used to go on holidays and vacations from Drohobych back home by foot, taking the route Hubychi-Boryslav-Mraznytsia-Skhidnytsia-Kropyvnyk and through mountains to Kindrativ. In Kropyvnyk he got acquainted with the Svyshch brothers; one of them was a community scribe, all three were literate and all three lived together. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was visiting them quite often and always stopped for a talk.

Of these three brothers Iakym was the most knowledgeable. All three had a bee-hive garden and kept a book on bee-hiving by Liubynets'kyi. They also had some Ruthenian publications from the 1860s and a supplement to the Polish Gazeta Narodowa in which Ruthenians were blackened. The brothers were subscribing to Nauka and Ruskaia Rada, and they also had the books of Prosvita and the Kachkovskii society. We also know that back in 1865 one of the Svyshch brothers sent some letters to Pys'mo do Hromady.¹⁰ The brothers were

⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.7, spr.4103, a.87.

⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.7, spr.4103, a.77.

⁹ Olesnyts'kyi, Storinky z moho zhyttia, ch.I, 93-94.

¹⁰ Ivan Svyshch, "Svoieruchne pys'mo gazdy," Pys'mo do Hromady, 1865, No.36, 187.

complaining about local problems and some conflicts with the local landlord, but it seemed that they were more concerned with his moral appearance than with his exploitation of the community – the landlord had shot a lackey flirting with his lover and run abroad. Another problem was that the Liturgy was served early in the morning and Vespers only on Christmas and Easter, and this had a negative impact on the religiosity and morality of local peasants. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was also exchanging books and periodicals with the brothers, but these were popular publications by the Kachkovskii society and *Prosvita*.¹¹

Zubryts'kyi's gymnasium education was disrupted again in 1877, when he was enlisted in the army. He tried to get out of it because of health conditions, but he could not. He hated drilling and social differences reinforced by the strict hierarchy of army ranks.¹² Finally, when his brother died in 1878 he was freed from the service. At this point the following idea came to his mind:

I thought [about my life] in different ways; sometimes my idea was to stay on the land to work manually for my daily bread, and besides this to help my co-citizens with some kind of education of mine.

Just as in the case with Ivan Franko, this never happened; he returned to the gymnasium, finished the last, eighth, grade and graduated in 1879, still not sure about his future career.¹³ He actually came back to the village, but as a priest, graduating in 1884 from the L'viv Theological Seminary. In the 1880s he was the most prolific correspondent to the Ruthenian press from the Staryi Sambir district, and his correspondences differed markedly from the correspondences of other priest-activists we saw in the 1860s and 1870s. The generation of Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi came into contact with and was matched by a whole group of peasant activists, whose correspondences figure so prominently in the 1880s in the popular national-populist newspaper *Bat'kivshchyna*. Zubryts'kyi's counterpart from the Sambir district, in terms of the correspondences sent to Ukrainian newspapers, was one of these peasant activists, Ivan Mykhas (pronounced as Mykhás, in Polish and German documents figuring as *Michas*, and in Ukrainian (Ruthenian) as either *Mikhas*, *Mykhas*, or *Mykhas'*).

Peasant Correspondent

There were many learned and half-learned peasant sons, who came to the villages in the 1880s. We know better about the priests, who stayed there for quite some time. Among these priests there was Rev. Ivan Mel'nyk, who came

¹¹ VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.12.

¹² Ibid., a.13.

¹³ Ibid., a.15.

to the village of Berehy after Rev. Kunevych's death and Mykola Bobers'kyi, who after being for some time the parish priest of Cherkhava ended at the position of parish priest of Vaniovychi with a filial church in Morozovychi. Some young professors appeared in Sambir in the recently established teachers' seminary, and among them there was the national-populist Teodor Bilen'kyi; Pidbuzh court (in the western part of the Drohobych district and very close to Sambir) received the national-populist judge Tyt Revakovykh. Natalia Chapel's'ka's husband, Rev. Iosyf Iavors'kyi, as well as her brother, Rev. Ivan Chapel's'kyi, belonged to that generation as well.

All these above-mentioned activists made more or less successful careers. Ivan Mykhas, however, got to know the new generation not through them but through a more marginal figure in this new generation. Ivan Mykhas never mentions his early years in his own texts, and we do not know the details of his biography from him. He appears suddenly in Bat'kivshchyna in 1884 as a peasant correspondent from the Sambir circle. But it seems that his connection with Bat'kivshchyna editors was a certain Ivan Maksym'iak, one of the few "peasant" friends of Ivan Franko, who made it to the gymnasium. Ivan Maksym'iak was a son of a rich peasant from the Rudky district,¹⁴ who after studying for some time in the gymnasium became a self-taught socialist, writing poems about socialism and the poverty of the Galician peasantry. He had spent some time in both Austrian and Russian prisons and mysteriously disappeared from the sight of Ukrainians who knew him in the second half of the 1880s.

From 9 March 1884, we have a letter from Ivan Maskym'iak to Vasyľ Nahirnyi, in which he has some requests to Ivan Franko, whose address he does not know at the moment. The letter is sent from Berezhnytsia, a village just across the Dnister River from Morozovychi, the village of Ivan Mykhas. Maksym'iak, who seems to be teaching there, shared with Nahirnyi his idea to found a reading club in the village, for which he had "to prepare people." And that was why he was asking Franko to send him Shevchenko's Kobzar: "I live in the village and for the enlightenment of the people the Kobzar would be very handy."¹⁵ But not knowing Franko's whereabouts, he was asking Nahirnyi to pass his request on to Franko.

We also have a letter, written on 11 September 1884, and apparently by Ivan Mykhas, although the author is identified as "unknown" in the register for this volume of Franko's correspondence. The letter is the earliest known clearly identifiable text by Ivan Mykhas (His first article to Bat'kivshchyna was published in December, 1884.). The letter says the following:

¹⁴ Franko to Drahomanov in VR IL, f.3, spr.1618, a.83. See also Chapter 5 in this thesis on peasants in schools.

¹⁵ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1618, a.357.

The highest under the sun and on the earth Lord (*Pan*) of Rus!
If the Most Respected Sir knows about the whereabouts of Ivan
Maksym'iak, tell him to hide well, because the gendarmes here are looking
for him very much. There is an investigation in the Sambir Prosecutor's
office, they have some poems, and I have been mentioned in the
protocol, and the gendarmes denounced me; later we'll get acquainted
closer, because right now I should sit here and with great impatience.¹⁶

Obviously, the strange way Mykhas uses to address Ivan Franko is part of the game, one played by Maksym'iak, who constantly referred to himself as *A Monsieur Jean Maxymiaque*. This could be a ridicule of noble titles as well as an indication that his French was much better than his German.¹⁷ But Maksym'iak's strange title could also indicate that others in the group of the radicals appearing around Franko had similar titles. By calling Franko "the highest Lord of Rus" Mykhas acknowledges his leading position in that group as well as the hopes of this group to take over the Ruthenian movement. Mykhas' participation in the Dobrivliany conspiracy came most probably from this acquaintance with Maksym'aik and Franko. Another connection could be Mykhas' parish priest, Rev. Pliaton Denyshchak, who was a relative of Rev. Chapel's'kyi in Dobrivliany and visited him there from time to time.¹⁸

Ivan Mykhas was born around 1864, when his father Mykola held the office of Morozovychi's mayor. In 1810 Hryhorii Mykhas, Mykola's father and Ivan's grandfather, owned 9.3 Joch in 8 parcels, already back then being among the richest farmers in the community of Morozovychi.¹⁹ In 1807 22 year-old Hryhorii Mykhas married 21 year-old Kateryna, and their son Mykola Mykhas was born in 1819. It seems that the first wife of Mykola Mykhas was a certain Ahafiiia, the daughter of Vasyl' Soroka and Tatiana.²⁰ After this there is a break in the parish registers, but we can assume that Mykola's first wife died and he remarried, because later in the land registers from the 1860s, Mykola Mykhas figures together with his wife Kateryna. Mykola Mykhas and Kateryna Mykhas owned around 16 Joch of land in 51 parcels in Morozovychi.²¹

¹⁶ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1618, a.633.

¹⁷ About problems with German see his letter from 1883 VR IL, f.3, spr.1618, a.49.

¹⁸ Volodymyr Chapel's'kyi, Op. cit. 140.

¹⁹ TsDIAuL, f.20, op.14, spr.197.

²⁰ TsDIAuL, f.201, op.4a, spr.635, a.28, 37.

²¹ Just like peasant sons entering gymnasia peasant activists seem to be usually sons of wealthier peasants. Ivan Sanduliak's parents (he was born in 1845) had 14 Joch, which was very close to what Mykhas' parents had. Ivan Sanduliak Lukyniv, "Zhyttiepys'," *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1900, No.29 and 30.

There were perhaps several other parcels co-owned by them and others. Morozovychi peasants in total had 541 Joch and 350 Klafter, which were owned by 137 farmers; the parish of Morozovychi had another 51 Joch and 1258 Klafter. And after the parish priest, Mykola Mykhas was the richest landowner in the community.²² Mykhas' household was on the southern side of the main road from Sambir to Staryi Sambir, on two sides of which the village of Morozovychi was situated. The household was just several hundred meters from the church in the direction of Vaniovychi. The core of Mykola and Kateryna Mykhas' landholding was a quite consolidated wide strip of land inherited from Hryhorii and stretching from the house south, to the northern swampy bank of the Dnister River.²³ In 1879 Ivan Mykhas figures as godfather of Pavlo, son of Stefan Sarakhman and Kateryna (maiden name Malyniak).²⁴ From his correspondence to the newspapers, it appears that by 1884 he became an independent farmer, and his father must have died.

By that time Ivan Mykhas had also finished his education. There are no records about this, and we can only guess about it from his other texts. In one of his letters to Franko he speaks about himself as about one "not attending high schools." He seems to refer to the absence of a gymnasium education. His quite well written Ruthenian and the proximity of Morozovychi to Sambir together with the absence of an elementary school in that village make Sambir's *Vydilova* normal school (one that got a great new building in the 1870s) the most plausible candidate for the educational institution in which Mykhas studied. He perhaps learnt to read and to write back in his own village, which hired for these purposes a special teacher, a member of the petty gentry, back in 1862.²⁵ His description of the situation in the Sambir gymnasium under Rev. Pavlo Iasenys'kyi, when "Ruthenian students from the higher gymnasium were keeping Ruthenian periodicals, and inculcating Ruthenianism in younger [students]...", seems to show that he was one of these younger students who had contacts with Ruthenian students in the gymnasium.²⁶

His positive opinion about Rev. Pavlo Iasenys'kyi can be also a proof of closer contact with the catechist, who knew all the Ruthenian students in Sambir and was especially concerned with peasant sons. In 1879 we meet "Ivan z nad Dnistra," which would be Mykhas' pseudonym in the 1880s and 1890s, for the first time. The correspondence to *Hazeta Shkol'na* (Schools' Newspaper) was signed with this pseudonym. It reported about the celebration

²² TsDIAuL, f.186, op.1, spr.5051.

²³ TsDIAuL, f.186, op.1, spr.5052, a.43.

²⁴ TsDIAuL, f.201, op.4a, spr.635, a.45.

²⁵ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny I," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.50, 312.

²⁶ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.48, 303.

in Dubivtsi on 24 April (commemorating the abolition of *robot* in Galicia in 1848). There was a service in the local church, and then the celebration continued in the school. The local teacher explained the reasons for the ceremony and distributed books, which were donated by the local landlord. There were some students from Sambir as well. If Ivan Mykhas indeed studied in the Sambir normal school at that time, he could attend the celebration and with the help of Rev. Iasenys'kyi, a Ruthenian pedagogue renowned at that time, publish a report on that in that particular newspaper.²⁷ The fact that no one, except for Ivan Mykhas, was using the same pseudonym either before or after that, seems to prove Mykhas' authorship. This was also the year when Hazeta Shkol'na was defined as an opposition newspaper by the authorities and the Provincial School Council advised schools and teachers not to subscribe to it.²⁸ It happened that after Rev. Pavlo Iasenys'kyi died Ivan Maksym'iak appeared nearby and, obviously, pushed Ivan Mykhas in a more radical direction.

After Mykhas' death, his so-called "notes" were edited and published by the Radical party. In these notes he speaks about the situation in his own village back then as follows:

Morozovychi was among the darkest communities of the Sambir district. There was no idea about enlightenment, progress and politics. There was only one thing known: the tax is obligatory because this is the Emperor's order, while happiness and misfortune come from God.²⁹

These words fit very well into attempts to create an icon of the Radical martyr and a pioneer of enlightenment. The texts published in the 1880s, however, provide a totally different picture of Mykhas' community. In 1886 someone from the area, perhaps Tyt Revakovich, and most probably on the basis of Mykhas' description, wrote the following:

Among the villages around Sambir the village of Morozovychi obviously stands out. Local peasants farm better than others and therefore most of them do not suffer from lack of food in the spring (*perednivok*). On four or five Joch of land peasants there farm better than in the neighboring villages on 10 Joch. Even the appearance of this village is better [than that of other villages], because every year several nicer houses are built there. There is a good school, about which local people were asking the circle school inspector, and it was the whole community, even those from whom you would never expect it. When one farmer was asked why he

²⁷ Ivan z nad Dnistra, "Z nad Dnistra," Hazeta Shkol'na, 1879, No.11.

²⁸ Hazeta Shkol'na, 1879, No.23.

²⁹ Iarema Hirnychenko, Mizh molotom i kovalom (Obraz z khlops'koi polityky). Iz zapyskiv organizatora Sambirshchyny Iv. Mykhasa (L'viv: Nakladom I. Mykhasa i M. A., 1908), 3.

supported the school if he himself liked to get drunk, the farmer answered: “that is my nature, but I am afraid that my children will grow up to be like this, too.” In general, a nice solidarity reigns there: all as one defend their rights; they can both take a hard stance and conduct their cause smartly. There are around twelve young men, who do not drink any alcohol, although there is no abstinence brotherhood.³⁰

Similarly Mykhas’ descriptions of him becoming a Ruthenian activist, and motivations beyond this move, seem to reflect more his 1900s’ agenda than the one he had in the 1880s. In his posthumously published notes he says:

With devoted thoughts, with flaming love and ardor I ran to [start] sincere work to make the Ukrainian peasant, my native brother, conscious, to raise his spirit at least to the level of our Polish peasant neighbors [*Mazury*]. I thought: “Who can do something wrong to me! They cannot take away my land plot, they cannot transfer me to the Krakow area,³¹ no one can take away my peasantness [*khlopstvo*] and give me nobility, no one can assign me a larger tax – who can do to me anything wrong?!”³²

In this we can easily recognize already mentioned motifs from the Ruthenian discourse about the “independent” position of the peasantry. These motifs were even reinforced in the Ukrainian discourse in the 1880s. The peasants were supposed to provide a much stronger basis for the movement than the intelligentsia could. Only peasant masses, independent producers, being neither in state nor in private service, could guarantee the sustainable development of the Ukrainian nation.³³ The reference to Polish peasants as more advanced in terms of social consciousness and an example to follow is characteristic of Ivan Mykhas, but it also fits very well into the constant comparisons between Ruthenian and more advanced European nations, which we saw in the Ruthenian publications.

The statement Mykhas makes in his “notes” about his motivations – that from the very beginning his activity was propelled by the desire to defend peasants from their exploiters (It is also interesting that among these exploiters only priests are mentioned.) – seems to be more a projection of his later experience:

³⁰ Blyz'kii, “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.28.

³¹ The reference is made to the transfers of Ruthenian state-employed intelligentsia to ethnically Polish Western Galicia.

³² Iarema Hirnychenko, *Mizh molotom i kovalom*, 3.

³³ See last section of this chapter and section on peasant class in Chapter 8.

I wanted to wake people up to self-defense from enemies, especially from that fearsome enemy, who caressing the peasants with sweet Godly words, tears the skin off them.³⁴

In his first correspondence to Bat'kivshchyna Mykhas indeed complains about the deep sleep of the Sambir Rus', but those who sleep "are not so much peasants as Ruthenian intelligentsia." Further on he says again: "The intelligentsia not only does not care about the peasants but sleeps itself."³⁵ Mykhas contrasts these times with the times of Rev. Iasenyts'kyi, when "it was totally different." After the death of Rev. Iasenyts'kyi the Ruthenian spirit in the gymnasium was rapidly deteriorating. Ruthenian schoolchildren stopped singing in the Sambir Ruthenian Church, and many petty gentry sons were ordered by their fathers no longer to attend Ruthenian lessons.

Mykhas saw a similar decline in the activities of the Kachkovskii Society, of which he was a member:

because if earlier there were frequent meetings of the Kachkovskii society in which there were talks and conversations about the decline of Ruthenians and the ways to advance them, the kind of things that happen now makes one feel sad. Members of this society have not known for two years where in Sambir its branch is located, and when they came to the market they asked each other where the books come from. Finally, someone got tired of taking books [of the Kachkovskii society] from the post office and distributing them among the members, and wrote [to the society's executive] to send these books to each member individually by mail, and since then we have not heard anything from L'viv up to now.³⁶

The situation with Ivan Mykhas may be seen as characteristic for many peasant activists - members of the Kachkovskii Society. Usually they were brought to the society by one of the populist priests from the generation of 1848, who patronized them, encouraging their education and bringing readings. With the death of that priest, liberated from his influence, and through contacts with someone from the radicals of the new generation (their peers), these peasants were reevaluating the activities of the society, its other members, and looking for their own way. This was the case with Pavlo Dumka after the death of Rev. Kopertyns'kyi and with Ivan Sanduliak after the death of Rev. Voievidka.

Ivan Sanduliak describes his own situation as follows. After the death of Rev. Voievidka peasants "felt as if they were orphans." Although even before Rev. Voievidka died they had received another priest; Rev. Ambrozii Sichyns'kyi, the new priest, could not substitute the old one: "he lacked the sincerity [of Rev.

³⁴ Iarema Hirnychenko, Mizh molotom i kovalom, 4.

³⁵ Ivan z nad Dnistra [Ivan Mykhas], "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny", Bat'kivshchyna, 1884, No.48, 303.

³⁶ Ibid.

Voievidka] and zeal for the peasants.”³⁷ Somehow, two gymnasium students got in touch with the villagers and with help of one of them, Kyrylo Tryliovs’kyi, a reading club was founded in the village in 1884. On the festive opening of the reading club in the stable, there were portraits of Taras Shevchenko, Volodymyr Barvins’kyi and Rev. Voievidka.³⁸

Just like in the 1870s, in the 1880s the Kachkovskii Society in Sambir was more numerous than the *Prosvita* society. There was no *Prosvita* branch, and the groups of Ukrainophile students, active in the local gymnasium in the 1860s and 1870s, disappeared by the 1880s. However, as we see in the example of Ivan Mykhas, at least some peasant members of the society were exposed to Ukrainian ideas.

In 1886 there was a general meeting of the Kachkovskii Society’s members of the Sambir branch. According to a Russophile newspaper half of around 40 participants were priests and another half were peasants. The task of this meeting was to resume the branch’s activity, which de-facto stopped with the death of Rev. Pavlo Iasenys’kyi. On that meeting Ivan Mykhas was present and actually elected to be a substitute of a branch executive member. Besides him, there were peasants Mykhailo Mydliak from Radlovychi and Vasyl’ Plaskach from Berezhnytsia. The presence of the peasants from these particular villages can be easily explained. Radlovychi was the community “sobered” by Revs. Lavrets’kti and Iavors’kyi, and Berezhnytsia was the community, from which one petty gentry, Teofil’ Berezhnyts’kyi, became quite a prominent member of the Ruthenian urban intelligentsia. At first the founding of the “People’s” or “District Trade” in Sambir was discussed. The organization in question had to be modeled on the L’viv-based “People’s Trade” and could eventually lead to the establishment of village stores. The talk on this was given by Rev. Kozanevych from Mistkovychi, and then the chair “asked peasants to express what they thought in this matter.” Vasyl’ Plaskach spoke in favor of the “Ruthenian Trade” in Sambir, showing the examples of how Ruthenians were cheated by the Jews while buying church candles, sugar and other commodities.³⁹

After Plaskach, Mykhas spoke about the establishment of village reading clubs. He pointed out that the Sambir district in this respect had lagged beyond other Ruthenian areas. He called on the newly elected executive to engage in this activity and refuted objections about the impossibility or precociousness of it “with such an ardor and patriotism that [the people] present enjoyed this speech of the peasant-patriot.” Mykhas was supported by Plaskach and Rev.

³⁷ Ivan Sanduliak, *Selo Karliv kolys’ a teper’*, 46, 50.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 56.

³⁹ “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1886, No.69-70.

Maliarkevych, a Russophile priest from Dorozhiv, who founded the reading club with 70 members in his parish. Finally, a resolution was accepted to establish reading clubs, where it was possible.⁴⁰

The report on this event appeared in a Ukrainian popular newspaper and specified the numbers mentioned in the Russophile publication. It appeared that in the Sambir district the Kachkovskii Society had among its members 13 priests, two members of the secular intelligentsia and 10 peasants (among them five from the village of Morozovychi, including two who were only fifteen years old). Two others were Mydliak from Radlovychi and Plaskach from Berezhnytsia, and three more, perhaps, were from the parishes of Rev. Kozanevych and Rev. Malliarkevych, who were the most active Russophile priests. From this we see that Ivan Mykhas recruited half of the peasant members of the society. The peasants were excluded from the presidium, and two of them, Mykhas and Mydliak from Radlovychi, were only substitutes of the executive's members.⁴¹

Reading Clubs

As of 1884, in the Sambir political district, which was the territory of the Sambir branch of the Kachkovskii Society, there was not a single reading club founded by the society. In total in the early 1880s there were three reading clubs in the Sambir district, one of them was an urban casino-like club in Sambir (*Rus'ka Besida*), and two others – village reading clubs in Cherkhava and Stupnytsia founded by Ukrainian national-populists. The Staryi Sambir district had three reading clubs, of which two were in towns (Stare Misto and Khyriv) and one in the village of Groziova.⁴²

While arguing for the founding reading clubs in 1886, Mykhas saw it as the task of the movement, the duty of the patriotic intelligentsia. When he approached some “important person in Sambir” and talked about awakening Ruthenian life in the area, that person answered that peasants should establish reading clubs themselves. To this advice Mykhas answered in his article in Bat'kivshchyna:

Good advice, no doubt, but the Ruthenian intelligentsia would have to help us, because alone we go into enlightenment as if groping, just as walking a narrow footbridge without railing. Because many of our villages do not even have schools, and if they have, in the best case they produce

⁴⁰ “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1886, No.69-70.

⁴¹ Blyz'kii, “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.28.

⁴² VR LNB, f.Mykhailo Pavlyk, p.6.

only community scribes. The priests in our area do not want to engage in enlightenment and do not care about founding reading clubs.⁴³

Mykhas mentions a village reading club in Stupnytsia as the only one in the petty gentry villages and “*Rus’ka Besida*,” a club-like reading club for intelligentsia in Sambir, which does not show any activity. And even the reading club in Stupnytsia had its “home enemies.” Mykhas implies that the Stupnytsia reading club had problems because it was a petty gentry village, but we know that this was the case with almost every village reading club, especially in this early stage of its activity. Let’s take a closer look at the Sambir reading clubs.

As I have already mentioned there were only three identifiable reading clubs in the Sambir district in the early 1880s. Was the Sambir district somehow belated in this? I have already mentioned that reading clubs from the 1870s are very illusory, and I was not able to reconstruct Pavlyk’s calculations of reading clubs for the 1870s on the basis of his notes, taken from the newspapers *Nauka* and *Ruskaia Rada*. We know that in the Sniatyn district, in the village of Karliv, very active in both sobriety and, later, radical movements, the first reading club, one of *Prosvita* was founded by Ivan Sanduliak with the help of then gymnasium students Kyrylo Tryliovs’kyi and Mykola Keivan in 1884.⁴⁴ And this was despite that fact that the sobriety movement in the village started in 1875. In the Dolyna district by 1885 there were seven reading clubs, but there were other districts that did not have even a single one.⁴⁵

There is another proof that Pavlyk’s numbers were an exaggeration. Iosif Markov’s newspaper *Novyi Prolom* stated that for all the years prior to 1884 there were 116 Ruthenian reading clubs founded in Galicia (Compare this with Pavlyk’s 171 founded between 1871 and 1878 alone.). This is also close to Franko’s calculations mentioned in the previous chapter. The number 116 in this article is used as a background for 119 reading clubs founded in 1884 alone. There is also a list of the reading clubs founded that year, with only one in Sambir-Staryi Sambir districts, in the town of Khyriv, but three in the neighboring Drohobych district – in Hai Vyzhni, Dorozhiv and Lishnia, all three founded by priests - prominent Russophiles. (Dorozhiv was actually on the territory of Sambir district but in this case mentioned as part of the Drohobych one).⁴⁶ Besides these Russophile activities we also already know about village clubs in Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova.

⁴³ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, “Pys’mo z Sambirshchyny”, *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1884, No.48, 303.

⁴⁴ Petro Tryliovs’kyi, (ed.), *Hei tam na hori “Sich” idel.. Propam’iatna knyha “Sichei”* (Winnipeg, 1965), 118.

⁴⁵ “Z Dolynshchyny,” *Dilo*, 1885, No.112.

⁴⁶ *Novyi Prolom*, 16(28).01.1885.

Russophiles provide the minimal numbers of the reading clubs, while the radical wing of national-populists, placing great hopes in the development of these village societies, gives the largest numbers. In 1887 Pavlyk was stating that there were 600 Ruthenian reading clubs in Galicia.⁴⁷ In 1883 Franko counted Ruthenian reading clubs in Galicia as numbering 200, and co-existing with around 1200 abstinence brotherhoods.⁴⁸ In 1884, when Bat'kivshchyna, just like Novyi Prolom, celebrated unusual progress in the founding of the reading clubs, the newspaper article talked about 324 reading clubs and 50 choirs.⁴⁹

All these statistics despite great differences in numbers agree that there was a great advance occurring in the 1880s. On the basis of this information and of my reading of Russkaia Rada throughout the 1870s I am suggesting that the founding of the reading clubs, connected with the societies and different from the gatherings of villagers to listen to what their priest would read them, which started to spread in connection with the temperance movement, should be dated by the 1880s. This founding of the reading clubs went hand in hand with the appearance of peasant correspondents and with a general turn to the "social" in Ukrainian and Russophile discourses.

We also witness growing concern with the reading clubs and not with the individual peasants in the activities of the *Prosvita* society. Already at the beginning of the 1880s *Prosvita's* executive stated the need to spread enlightenment among peasants not only with the help of books and *Pys'mo z Prosvity* but with the live word and establishment of reading clubs.⁵⁰ In 1885 *Prosvita* had more than 1600 members of whom 1360 had paid their membership dues on time. That year the society published six books in 13,000 copies in general. But its publishing activities were now matched by an emphasis on membership, the membership of reading clubs in particular. Of 324 new members in 1885 there were 99 peasants, 30 townsmen, 14 elementary school teachers, 29 priests, 47 members of the secular intelligentsia, 5 church brotherhoods, 6 societies and 94 reading clubs.⁵¹

In 1881 the reading club in the village of Cherkhava was founded. To the best of my knowledge this one could be called the first reading club in the Sambir district.⁵² It was the initiative of newly arrived priest Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi.⁵³

⁴⁷ Pavlyk, Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni, 1.

⁴⁸ [Ivan Franko] Myron, Rozmovy v Dobrovi'lskii chytal'ni, 11.

⁴⁹ "Shche ne vmeral Ukraina", Bat'kivshchyna, 1884, No.33, 201.

⁵⁰ Barvins'kyi. Spomyny z moho zhyttia. Ch. I, 181.

⁵¹ VR IL, f.3, spr.2663, a.4.

⁵² I make the reservation here that there is some data on other "reading clubs" allegedly founded back to the 1870s in the Sambir region, which I already mentioned in the 1870s.

⁵³ H., "Ot Sambora," Prolom, 1881, No.25.

As we know the village of Cherkhava since the 1840s was under the patronage of Rev. Andrii Nyzhankovs'kyi, a priest from the generation of 1848, who was able to raise money for the construction of a stone church despite the small size of the village. Probably, because of him Cherkhava also had more literate people than other villages did. It was said that even children pasturing cattle were reading popular books there and this was under the influence of local priest, Rev. Nyzhankovs'kyi.⁵⁴

However, the reading club in the village was founded not by Rev. Nyzhankovs'kyi, but by Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi, whose sympathies were Ukrainian, and who was a member of the Sambir gymnasium's student *bromada* back in the 1860s. Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi, just like Ivan Mykhas, was the son of a village mayor. His father spent in this office almost 20 years. Both his parents could write and read. He graduated from the "main school" in Lavriv, and then from the Sambir gymnasium. Already in the theological seminary Mykola Bobers'kyi was noted for his eloquence. Upon graduation he married a Ukrainian teacher, and he was ordained in 1873. At first he was appointed to the Turka mountains as a cooperator in Bitlia, where became famous for his sermons. He spent the 1870s being transferred from one position to another and moved through Dobrohostiv, Zavadka, Krynytsia, Hordynia, and Stril'bychi. From 1879 to 1883 he was a parish priest in Cherkhava. In 1883 he moved out of the Sambir area to come back in 1888 as parish priest of Vaniovychi. In Vaniovychi he stayed till his very death in 1918.⁵⁵ Rev. Bobers'kyi was a relative of Tyt Revakovich.⁵⁶ Being one of numerous Bobers'kyi kin, Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi seems to be well connected with the local Ruthenian elite.

A certain "peasant" reported to Bat'kivshchyna about the founding of the reading club in Cherkhava. The correspondent visited his friends in Cherkhava on the occasion of St. Mykhailo Day, whose saint was the patron of the village church. The village celebrated this so-called *kbaram* or *praznyk* with the peasants from neighboring villages visiting local peasants, and neighboring priests, relatives, and friends visiting the local pastor. The correspondent found that customs (or order) – *poriadky* – in the village were very different from those he saw there the year before. There was a stone church and a new school building, with the old one turned into the community house (and we know that the stone church appeared here before Rev. Bobers'kyi came in). This community house housed a chancery, granary and detention on one side and reading club on

⁵⁴ "Iz Sambora," Slovo, 1878, No.64.

⁵⁵ o. Ir. Nazarko, ChSVV, "Chil'nyi sviashchenyk z Boikivshchyny," Litopys Boikivshchyny, 1976, No.2/24 (35), 38-42.

⁵⁶ TsDIAuL, f.664, op.1, spr.7, a.3.

another. This organization of space was not accidental; plans for this kind of the communal order could be found on the pages of popular newspapers.

The new order in the community had two sides, the first one was administrative, connected with surveillance and the community's welfare, and the second one was that of civil society. The reading club had to be located in the community house, close to the administration of the community, so that the latter would be always under control from the reading club. This newly founded reading club had 100 books, four Ruthenian newspapers and 40 members who gathered there on Sundays and holidays, while in winter even on weekday evenings, staying there till late at night.

This reading club changed the way *praznyk* in the village usually went. Usually it was the Liturgy in the church and then parties in the houses. But this time around 6 pm there were shots from firework cannons signaling people to gather in the reading club. The evening in the reading club started with performances: a comedy, "The Drunkard," translated from Serbian by Vasyl' Koval's'kyi (well known Ruthenian activist of the older generation) and performed by Mykhailo Pelekhan and Ivan Sarakhman, a comedy, "The Recruited Bride," and a recitation of poems by Iurii Fed'kovych, "The Happening" and "The Recruit." A certain V. Chaika wrote and recited the poem, "The Drunkard," and also the poem, "Native Language" (most probably one by Sydir Vorobkevych), was recited.

Those who had gathered sang "*Myr vam brattia*" and "*Dai nam Bozhe dobryi chas*," as well as "*Mnobaia lita* (Long Life)," to the Emperor for the freedom he gave to his people. The report on the founding of the reading club ended with an appeal: "Reading clubs, communities – found reading clubs! And as soon as possible, and you will recover your sight and realize where your good lies and where your demise [is]."⁵⁷ We do not know how the "peasant" writing this correspondence to Bat'kivshchyna was. But I would guess that he was a guest not of local villagers but of Rev. Bobers'kyi, who remained a friend of his gymnasium teacher Oleksandr Borkovs'kyi (later buried in Vaniovychi by Rev. Bobers'kyi) and was a good friend of Tyt Revakovych.

The report about this event had also appeared in the Russophile newspaper. The Ukrainian orientation of Rev. Bobers'kyi did not prevent this newspaper from praising his activities. After half a year of its existence, the reading club was reported to have almost 50 members; these members gathered in the club there and spent evenings in reading, talking and entertaining themselves. The tavern was empty because the peasants switched to the reading club. It is interesting that the Russophile newspaper mentioned a law student, Davydovych, who had a speech (or recitation) at that evening, while the Ukrainian popular newspaper Bat'kivshchyna presented the whole celebration

⁵⁷ Selianyn, "Pys'mo z pid Sambora", Bat'kivshchyna, 1881, No.24.

as organized exclusively by the peasants.⁵⁸ Davydovych, a relative of Father Davydovych from Blazhiv, had obviously come for the *praznyk* party at the local priest's place.

Cherkhava was used as an example for other communities in the correspondences from the villages in the Sambir district. One such a correspondence was describing evil behavior of the mayor and of the village scribe, both of whom drank and stole things from their co-villagers. These two community leaders refused to found a reading club justifying this by the fact the village was too dispersed. The author of this article was appealing to other "honest and literate" villagers in that community to follow Cherkhava's example. The basis for the reading club was said to have already existed in the sobriety movement and communal loan department established by Rev. D. According to the author of this article, the same could be expected from the villages of Horodyshche, Mokriany and others.⁵⁹ It seems that the village in question was the village of Vaniovychi, whose community scribe, a certain Semash, was already mentioned in the previous chapter. Rev. D. would be Rev. Pliaton Denyshchak. This critique of the Vaniovychi village could be somehow connected with then 18 year old Ivan Mykhas.

The first life of the Cherkhava reading club was not too long. The reading club was dissolved because of the musical-recitation evenings and amateurish performances taking place there, and this kind of activity was not in the reading club's statutes. Instead of the dissolved reading club, a new one was registered as "Crafts and Farming Reading Club" (*Promyslovo-hospodarska chytal'nia*).⁶⁰ Although the new reading club was founded, all the books remained confiscated by the regional school council for an investigation, and they were not returned by 1883. The new executive of the reading club was elected exclusively from peasants. It was chaired by one of a few known peasant activists in the area from the 1870s, Ferdinand Pikhota. Obviously a Ruthenian, Pikhota was christened Ferdinand by Rev. Nyzhankovs'kyi. It would be a plausible guess to connect this non-Ruthenian name with the Emperor Ferdinand, in whose reign *robot* was abolished, and to place Pikhota's birth either in 1848 or close after that. The vice-chairman of the council was Mykhailo Hvozdiak, a village mayor. On the holiday of Epiphany the new executive organized the first recitations' evening of the renewed reading club.⁶¹ Exclusively peasant leadership of the new reading club seems to indicate that Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi being reprimanded for non-statutory activities of the former reading club decided to cut formal links with the new one.

⁵⁸ G., "Ot Sambora," *Prolom*, 1881, No.25

⁵⁹ Priatel', "Pys'mo vid Sambora", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1882, No.4, 30.

⁶⁰ *Novyi Prolom* 1883, No.7.

⁶¹ Z vydilu promyslovo-hospodarskoi Chytalni, "Pys'mo vid Sambora", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1883, No.5, 29.

The reading club was dissolved once more by the order of the Viceroy's Office because some school children appeared to be its members. Ruthenian newspapers were saying that children were attending the reading club together with their parents, who were members. But against the fact that some members of the Kachkovskii Society from Morozovychi were fifteen years old, it seems quite plausible that some youth legally still defined as children were among the members of the Cherkhava reading club as well. Besides that, the school inspector from Sambir, the Roman Catholic Rev. Kulisz, found two books in the reading club's library, which were labeled by him as "immoral."⁶² These two books were Winter Evenings published by the Kachkovskii Society and Not a Pilgrimage But Dissoluteness (*Ne otpust a rozpust*) published by Mykhailo Bilous. These two books were determined to be harmful to children by the provincial school council, and that is why the attendance of the reading club by children became an offence.⁶³ Pressure from the administration obviously had contributed to the decline of the reading club activities, but this also coincided with the departure of Rev. Bobers'kyi.

The story of Cherkhava proves that the reading clubs could not remain outside of politics; from the very beginning the district administration saw in them an intrigue of the Ruthenian movement, which in the administration's opinion was becoming more and more radical. The captaincy dissolved the reading club, and the dissolution was interpreted as a political move, caused by the fear that "such an exemplary reading club could awaken dark people from the centuries-long sleep that leads to spiritual death." The movement also saw reading clubs as a means to change the political balance both inside the communities and in districts. The reading clubs were supposed to exercise pressure on the administration of the communities, pressure that would outweigh the influence of the district administration. And networks of the reading clubs would be able to change the balance of power in elections.

As we have seen, the first attempt to found such a reading club in the Sambir district was not too successful; the reading club declined, and after the departure of Rev. Bobers'kyi Cherkhavites did not lead the exemplary life the national movement hoped from them:

Instead of gathering in the reading club and, after consultation with the local priest, deciding whom to elect, so that in this way they could hold together and not give their enemies preponderance in voting, Cherkhavites allowed themselves to be manipulated and to change the already elected council completely by electing people, from whom there would be no good for the people.

⁶² "Z Sambora," *Dilo*, 1883, No.28.

⁶³ *Russkaia Rada*, 1884, No.4. See also "Z Sambora," *Dilo*, 1883, No.86.

The same article contrasts the situation in this community with the one in the last parliamentary elections, when even Jews from Cherkhava were voting for the Ruthenian candidate, although they did it not “from their conviction but from calculation.”⁶⁴

Despite the fact that the Cherkhava reading club was reestablished, it was not showing much life. Tyt Revakovich described the following problems with this reading club:

There is a house for the reading club, and the priest is willing to contribute with all his energy to the enlightenment and well-being of the citizens, but the goodwill of the reading club members' cooled down... Even when they gather together recalling old times the enemy shows up. On St. Mykhailo Day, when there was a *praznyk* in the village, the mayor closed the reading club down.

The mayor was said to push the community in Jewish hands, despite the fact that he himself took an oath not to drink vodka. Revakovich suggested that the mayor, perhaps, was compensating it with beer and arrack. When one peasant found a treasure of old coins and the priest wanted to buy them out and send them to the scientific society in L'viv, the peasant requested more than thirty Gulden, while later he sold them to the Jews for ten. The ending was: “Cherkhavites, recover your sense not to become a laughing stock for other people.”⁶⁵

In 1884 Mykhailo Pavlyk sent a questionnaire to make a survey of the reading club. Two reading clubs from the Sambir district responded - those in Sambir and Stupnytsia. The answers to these questionnaires are interesting and encompass up to 100 reading clubs from all over Galicia. The questionnaires had several questions about Church brotherhoods so that they could be compared with the reading clubs and prove the superiority of the latter. Many answers indeed were stressing their decay; in many places either there were no brotherhoods or they did not have an influence on the community, and in some others the brotherhoods existed only because of the priest's support.⁶⁶

Some reading clubs were explicitly stressing that their goal was not only cultural but also political. It is interesting that the reading clubs from the 1880s were not less anti-Semitic than the temperance campaign of the 1870s. A response from the village of Zadvir'ia said:

the aim of our reading club is not only to bring enlightenment among people, to sober and warm up patriotic feelings, thus preparing people for

⁶⁴ [Tyt Revakovich] S.T.R., “Pys'mo z Sambirskoho,” *Bar'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.32.

⁶⁵ [Tyt Revakovich] S. T. R., “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bar'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.49.

⁶⁶ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 64, p.3, a.2, 3, 4, 8.

future elections, but also our society took as its task to uproot all the Jewry, which became well-rooted here, from our village.

To fulfill this task, and to get eleven Jewish families out of the village, one of the reading club's members, Iulian Pelekh, founded a shop himself hoping to leave the Jewish shop without customers.⁶⁷ It is interesting that one of the few peasant letters to the Presidium of the Kachkovskii Society also emphasizes the reading club as a site established against drinking, Jews and landlords.⁶⁸

The reports also had a number of complaints about older peasants who were against reading clubs and scared other peasants with "protocols" and "prisons" that would wait for them in case they agreed to found reading clubs. They complained that lazy youngsters wanted to teach respectful farmers and compared the reading club to a society of prostitutes.⁶⁹ This was homegrown opposition to the reading clubs from inside the community, which was there even without the pressure from the district administration.

An interesting report about the Ruthenian reading club in the city of Sambir allows us to compare village and urban reading clubs. The Sambir club was founded in 1881 and called *Ruska Besida* (Ruthenian Talk). There were 50 members in 1881, and the same number was reported in 1884. The entrance fee was one Gulden and yearly membership dues were either 12 or six Gulden; non-members paid six Kreuzers for the privilege to use the club's collections. Because of the high dues only about half of the members paid the required amounts. Many members of the Ruthenian intelligentsia entered the Polish casino and left *Besida*. The club subscribed to Dilo, Slovo, Nauka, Hospodar, and Ruska Rada and two Viennese newspapers. In 1883 the society had two general meetings, two parties with dances, one talk on Shevchenko and one on Ruthenian history.⁷⁰

In 1883 a reading club was also founded in the town of Staryi Sambir, which did not respond to Pavlyk's questionnaire. It was founded by local townsmen.⁷¹ Unlike the Sambir reading club this one was closer to the village reading clubs, just like Staryi Sambir townsmen were closer to the peasants than the Sambir Ruthenian intelligentsia. Mykhas himself had also praised the virtues of these Ruthenian townsmen. Ruthenian social life here was quite vibrant and was centered around the St. Nicholas Brotherhood of the former furriers' guild.

⁶⁷ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.646 p.3, a.10.

⁶⁸ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.5, a.65.

⁶⁹ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.64, p.3, a.28. On the generational conflict in the villages connected with the founding of the reading clubs see Himka, Galician Villagers, 97-99.

⁷⁰ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.64, p.3, a.50.

⁷¹ Dilo, 1883, No.88

Rev. Kyrylo Chaikovskii, who wrote the history of the reading club in the 1930s, said that the Ruthenian consciousness of the townsmen of Staryi Sambir was strengthened by the judges of the local court, who were Ruthenian during the Constitutional era. In 1885 the reading club's building was raised on the parish land. The reading club was founded by the judge Baranovskii and its choir was founded by the Polish teacher Mysicki. Later the reading club was transferred to the central town's square, where the new building was built on the land bought specially for this purpose.⁷²

In contrast to these urban establishments village reading clubs, as we saw on the example of Cherkhava, were doing much worse. In the early 1880s there appeared also the first Polish reading clubs, so called "Agricultural circles", and by the mid-1880s they outnumbered Ruthenian reading clubs in the Sambir district. In 1882 there were four "Circles" in the Sambir district – in Sambir, Horodyshe, Susidovychi, and Vykoty, and one in the Staryi Sambir district, in the town of Fel'shtyn.⁷³ As we see this number is almost the same as the number of the Ruthenian reading clubs.

The only village club responding to Pavlyk from the Sambir district was one from the village of Stupnytsia. This reading club was founded in August 1883 by the local priest Rev. Aleksandr Iavors'kyi and two visiting seminary students – Iosyf Iavors'kyi and Ivan Iavors'kyi, both born in Stupnytsia. Ivan Mykhas also mentioned a teacher Iakiv Horodys'kyi among reading club's co-founders, but the teacher was not mentioned in the answered questionnaire. There were 13 members when the club was founded, and the club had 47 members in 1884. Of them 30 were married men and 17 were single men. The reading club was not buying books and had only few in its library because of insufficient funds. Instead of buying books the reading club subscribed to the newspapers Ruskaia Rada, Dilo, Bat'kivshchyna and the Kachkovskii Society's series of popular books.

The chairman of the reading club was Ivan Iavors'kyi; the reading clubs had two meetings during the first year of its existence, one evening party and one talk. There were two things slowing down the reading club's development. The first one was the absence of a community house, in which the reading club would have had a space of its own. The second one was the absence of other reading clubs in the area. Local church brotherhoods were said not to be real organizations, and their activities were limited to caroling, during which funds for the church candles and lights were raised. While neither reading club nor church brotherhood had membership dues and their own funds, the parish church had 1238 Gulden 82 Kreuzers in its treasury. The priest and two peasant controllers from the Church Brotherhood were lending this money. There were

⁷² TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.95.

⁷³ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 66p.3.

94 peasants from the village of Stupnytsia and 47 from belonging to the same parish village of Kotovania, who borrowed money from the treasury. The amount of a single loan ranged from one to 37 Gulden with the average of 10 Gulden. Interest on these loans bought in 1883 was 100 Gulden 4 Kreuzer. There was also a community loan department affiliated with the District Council, but there was no Jewish or urban banks' usury in the village.⁷⁴

Petty Gentry

So by the time Mykhas was writing his first articles to Bat'kivshchyna in 1884, Cherkhava's reading club was no longer an example, and one in Stupnytsia remained the only one to flourish in the area. But Stupnytsia was a petty gentry village. The irony was that the only reading club active in the Sambir district in 1884 was one of petty gentry and founded by Rev. Iosyf Iavors'kyi, who was about to become Natalia Chapel's'ka's husband and the enemy of Ivan Franko, Mykhailo Pavlyk and their radical peasant friends in Dobrivliany.

As I have already showed in the section on politics in the 1870s, Ruthenian negative opinion of the petty gentry was hardening and the petty gentry was blamed for the failure to elect Ruthenian candidates. One can find similarly harsh judgment on the petty gentry in Mykhas' first article to Bat'kivshchyna describing problems of the Ruthenian movement in the Sambir circle:

And besides that, there are many gentry villages in our Sambir area, [gentry] who do not consider peasants to be God's creatures and fraternize with the Poles because, as they say, 'Rus' is of no significance'.⁷⁵

It is interesting that the concern with petty gentry became such an issue in the 1880s. The strongest criticism of the petty gentry appeared, an explanation for its behavior was sought and solutions were suggested. This also seems to fit into a larger change in the Ruthenian discourse already mentioned. Ivan Franko provided the traditional explanation for the petty gentry's behavior. He said that in the pre-emancipation period the petty gentry, not obliged to work *robot*, did much better than the peasantry, and the distance between two estates was great. After the emancipation this difference in wealth was disappearing, but the memories of pre-1848 were still alive among the embittered gentry and fuelled the antagonism with the peasantry.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 64, p.3, a.20.

⁷⁵ Ivan z nad Dnistra [Ivan Mykhas], "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny", Bat'kivshchyna, 1884, No.48, 303.

⁷⁶ He proves this on the basis of the sums paid for weddings: in 1816-1818 petty gentry was paying to the priest eight to 12 Gulden for wedding, while peasants only one to five Gulden, see Ivan Franko,

Although peasants on the average have not become richer, and in some places become even more impoverished, the conditions of the petty gentry deteriorated even worse; it not only became equal with peasants economically, but in some places fell even lower from the latter and with sorrow remember the old days when a grandfather dead by now could pay five *ducats* for a wedding.⁷⁷

For the historiography, which explained the strength of the Ukrainian national movement as grounded in the existing class differences, the petty gentry was a perfect proof of its thesis. Petty gentry became engaged in the national movement belatedly, and its estate consciousness reflected the heritage of the feudal era. The memory of feudalism had to erode before the petty gentry could be integrated into the national movement. However back in the 1880s, the legacy of the feudal era determined the position of the petty gentry – with the Polish nobility and against the Ukrainian movement.⁷⁸

The existence of the Stupnytsia reading club seems to challenge such an explanation. There are some other examples as well. We know that the village of Silets' since 1861 was with the Ruthenian movement thanks to the parish priest of Silets' – Rev. Iliarii Il'nyts'kyi. In the 1880s the village of Silets' still figured in the Ukrainian discourse as an example of the wise community with an exemplary order. Retired official Vasyl' Silets'kyi returned to the village and was elected its mayor. He regulated the usage of the 300 Joch of community's land, divided them into sections and established shifts for gathering wood for fuel. Moreover, the community shop was established, which took goods from the branch of "People's Trade" in Sambir. Profit from the operation of the shop was assigned for the building of a new church.⁷⁹ Similarly, the village of Kul'chytsi under Rev. Berezins'kyi voted for Ruthenian candidates. Moreover, among the Ruthenian clergy and intelligentsia we can find a significant number of those who were born among the rustic petty gentry.

In the previous chapters I tried to show that the separate consciousness of petty gentry has been exaggerated in the historiography; intermarriages between rustic gentry and peasants although not a rule were something more than an exception, petty gentry status was worsening during the whole Austrian rule and not only after 1848, and there were conflicts between the petty gentry and the landlords as well. We have seen in Zubryts'kyi's memoir that there was no

"Prychynok do piznannia ekonomychnoho pobytu nashoho sel'skoho dukhovenstva v pershii chetvertyni scho stolittia," *Dilo*, 1884, No.109.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ Himka, *Galician Villagers*,

⁷⁹ I. S., "Z Sambirshchyny," *Dilo*, 1890, No.30.

unsurpassable barrier between the two in the years of his childhood. Actually, already at the end of the eighteenth century parish registers of Vaniovychi show that marriages between petty gentry and peasants were not an uncommon thing.⁸⁰ They were not the rule, but they were something more than just merely an exception. Actually, the very example of Sarakhman-Stebel's'kyi from 1846 proves this. Ivan Franko himself was an example of such "mixed breeds" as well.⁸¹ Perhaps, the difference between the petty gentry and state peasants was easier to cross than between the petty gentry and privately owned peasants. But the area of concentration of the petty gentry was also the area of the largest state estates. Another thing facilitating mixing between the petty gentry and the peasants was the absence of separate petty gentry communities in the pre-1860s era. Places where petty gentry families were simply an enclave in the peasant community and did not have administrative autonomy seem to be the places where intermarriages were most common.

Similarly, it seems that the conflict between the peasant and petty gentry, or at least this conflict's dramatic representation, was a characteristic feature of the 1880s and not the remains of the older antagonism. I believe that the representations of the antagonism, and perhaps, the antagonism itself at this particular stage were an outcome of the change in the discourse and practice of the Ruthenian movement. In 1889 describing the defeat in Diet elections of Teofil' Berezhnyts'kyi, himself a petty gentry, *Bar'kivshchyna* explains this defeat by the fact that he angered the Poles. The newspaper goes as far as stating that petty gentry are Poles: "people there are still ignorant, and besides that there are many Poles, especially the so-called petty gentry."⁸²

If we look more closely at the arguments advanced against the petty gentry, we shall find that they as a rule appear after elections, in which the petty gentry "sells" its votes and does not support the Ruthenian candidate. This led to such statements as the one that appeared after the 1885 elections, that the petty gentry "is a totally different type of people, it is not our Ruthenian..."⁸³ There is no doubt that the Polish agitators were using the rhetoric of common gentry interests, and were inciting animosity between the peasants and petty gentry. But this is also the time when Ruthenian newspapers started praising Ruthenian peasants despite the fact that many peasant electors behaved not better than petty gentry. It is against the background of corrupt petty gentry that good Ruthenian peasant electors are identified. No doubt that some peasant correspondents readily accepted this role.

⁸⁰ TsDIAuL, f.201, op.4a, spr.635.

⁸¹ Roman Horak, Iaroslav Hnativ, *Ivan Franko. Knyha persha. Rid Iakova* (L'viv: Misioner, 2000), 105-120.

⁸² *Bar'kivshchyna*, 1889, No.35.

⁸³ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1885, No.54.

Mykhas is definitely negative about the petty gentry. He accuses it of building alliances with the Jews against peasants. There had to be some kind of “union” in the village of Berezhnytsia consisting of the Jews and petty gentry, who were wheedling the land from peasants. From one orphan they bought land for 140 Gulden and later sold it for 320. Petty gentry in Vaniovychi had built more than 20 taverns, and the peasants in that village had been extremely impoverished. However, Mykhas is happy to notice that in some places “peasants go up and the gentry disappears without a trace.”⁸⁴ At this phase the Ruthenian movement seems to see no need for a change of attitude. It helps to win the peasants on the movement’s side, but the movement does not close access for the petty gentry; it is just that this petty gentry has to realize that its gentry status is nothing but a fiction used by the Polish landlords to manipulate them. This was something educated Ruthenians of petty gentry origin had already realized.

In 1887 the play by Hryhorii Tsehlyns’kyi Petty gentry. A Comedy in Four Acts was published.⁸⁵ The author came from the petty gentry himself. The book describes a petty gentry village on the eve of a community council’s elections. Some people in the village start a conspiracy against the current mayor, which is said to be usual among petty gentry quarrelling and conspiring against each other, unlike their peasant counterparts, whose communities show greater solidarity. The political intrigue is complicated by a matrimonial one. The current mayor (*prefekt*) was married to a peasant woman, and they had a beautiful daughter, whom a negative character, a petty gentry of the old style, wanted to marry. Another candidate for the husband of mayor’s daughter is a positive peasant.

The old mayor, Rozumovs’kyi (from Ukrainian *Rozum* for “reason”) reasons as following:

Nowadays people lose the last plot of the land they still have. Instead of working and figuring out how to save each other, because we have the same faith and the same language, they place hope in their “honors” and that some kind of Messiah would return former privileges. But as of now, Chaskel [a Jew] grabs and appropriates as much as he can, while Gentleman, Madam, [*pan* and *pani* here stand for the petty gentry, who were reserving this kind of address for the gentry] and their children go into his service.⁸⁶

The mayor would like to see his daughter marrying an industrious and enlightened peasant, but his second wife, who had grown up as a servant on the

⁸⁴ Ivan iz-nad Dnistra [Ivan Mykhas], “Pys’mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1886, No.3.

⁸⁵ Hryhorii Tsehlyns’kyi, *Shliakhta khodachkova. Komedija v IV diiakh* (Literaturno-naukova biblioteka, ch.147) (L’viv, 1911), Second edition (the first one – 1887).

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 22-23.

landlord's estate, objects to this misalliance. The petty gentry together with the Jew sue the mayor, but the peasants, organized by the peasant candidate for mayor daughter's husband, support him, and help to endure all the cowardly moves of petty gentry conspirators. Finally, the village gets better government, and Ostap Skyba [*skyba* in Ukrainian is a piece of earth turned up between two furrows, which frequently stands for arable land, land in general or land plot], the mayor's stepson and a representative of the new village intelligentsia, which has attended schools and served in the army, becomes a community scribe.

The play states that the objective social interests of the peasants and the petty gentry are the same – they both constitute the same class of Ruthenian peasants. The petty gentry, just like the Ruthenian peasantry, preserved its nationality, faith and religion. This was actually the reason why it was marginalized in the old Poland and never was seen as equal to the greater nobility. The petty gentry had to remain proud of its nobility, of its descent from the Ruthenian *boiars*, and should not be ashamed of being a part of the peasant class. Thus the incorporation of the petty gentry into the Ukrainian nation was envisioned as occurring together with the formation of the peasant class, together with the re-defining of the peasantry. The fact that the second edition of this book came out in 1911 is not accidental; it was around that time that the integration of the petty gentry into the national project on the foundation envisioned by the play was actually realized.

The Community of Morozovychi

As I already mentioned the very first articles by Ivan Mykhas tend to blame local intelligentsia rather than the peasants for the sleepy state of the Ruthenian movement in the Sambir area. The articles written two years later maintain a similar tone. According to Mykhas, there was only one reading club, in Cherkhava. And all the Ruthenian patriots in the area could be counted on one's fingers. Among the intelligentsia Mykhas knew only six "sincere patriots," one in Sambir proper and five in the surrounding area. Besides these, there were eight others "who do not speak that loudly and zealously but read Ruthenian newspapers and are interested in Ruthenian affairs."⁸⁷

The description of his native village Morozovychi contrasts sharply with the way this village is represented in his "memoirs"; it does not look as a place sunk in darkness and ignorance. Mykhas actually contrasts sharply the vibrant life of the village community with the still life of the Ruthenian intelligentsia in the area. Just like many other peasant correspondents did, Mykhas was distancing himself from the village he described and took the position of an outside

⁸⁷ Ivan z nad Dnistra [Ivan Mykhas], "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.48, 303.

observer speaking from the third person. When Wincenty Witos wrote his first article to the Polish peasant newspaper Przyjaciel Ludu in 1893 he also wrote it anonymously because he “did not want anyone to know that it comes from me.”⁸⁸

Giving short background information on the village Ivan Mykhas describes one dynamic and open to the outside world community, reacting to the economic changes and influences of the outside world. In the 1860s almost a quarter of the community’s population moved to Podillia region and sold its landholdings to Jews. We know that similar migration was characteristic for many villages of the Sambir region. Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi describes a similar exodus from Mshanets’ occurring in the 1860s.⁸⁹ As we see there was nothing particularly wrong about selling one’s land, selling it to Jews, and moving several hundred kilometers away. However, it is interesting that by the 1880s the Jews in Morozovychi were left with only about three Joch of land. Mykhas does not describe what happened, but we can guess that the land was partly bought out by the peasants, who were coming back from Podillia, and partly by those who stayed in the village, while Jews slowly switched to tavern-keeping in the neighboring Vaniovychi on the lively road from Staryi Sambir to Sambir used by every one traveling from the mountains to Sambir. There were several dozens of taverns in Vaniovychi, and their Jewish population grew steadily. We do not know about the temperance movement in Morozovychi and Mykhas suggests that there was no organized “temperance brotherhood” there. Thus there obviously was no “ideology” connected with this decline of the Jewish population.

Morozovychi, just like Mshanets’, Volia Iakubova and many other villages in the region, belonged to the state estates in the times of *robot*. Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi argued that the obligations of the state peasants were heavy and the exploitation of these peasants by the state was not much lighter than one of the landlords’ peasants.⁹⁰ On the other hand the same Zubryts’kyi stated the huge difference between state and landlords’ peasants.⁹¹ When in the 1830s Rev. Hrechans’kyi denounced a Polish conspiracy among the students of the Greek Catholic seminary in L’viv, the thing which allegedly catalyzed his action was his first-hand knowledge of life in state-owned villages. He got his position in one of them and realized that peasants there were doing much better than in the

⁸⁸ Wincenty Witos, Moje wspomnienia, t.1 (Paryż: Instytut Literacki, 1964), 211

⁸⁹ Zubryts’kyi, “Tisni roky.”

⁹⁰ Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi, “Do istorii halyts’ko-rus’koho selianstva: Pro panshchynu v seli kolo Staroho Mista,” Zhytie i Slovo, 1894, kn.5, 271-3.

⁹¹ [Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi], “Pys'mo z Staromiskoho,” Bat'kiyshchyna, 1887, No.9.

villages owned by those, who shared with him their ideas about the future of Poland.⁹²

Mykhas gathers a whole array of facts, which were to prove that Morozovychi was a good community. There was only one tavern (formerly owned by the state) in Morozovychi, but even that one was in decline. The village consisted of 50 poor farmers and two Germans, who lived in the village's proximity and were celebrating Ruthenian holidays. It is not clear if these Germans were assimilated or if they were simply showing their respect for other villagers. The Germans must have been the descendants of colonists from the end of the eighteenth century; many of them were settled in the Sambir circle with waste state-owned lands. Despite the fact that there was no school in Morozovychi, more than half of the villagers knew to read and to write. We see that the difference between the 1860s and the 1880s is significant (Among the plenipotentiaries of Morozovychi in the 1860s servitudes' case, only one peasant, community scribe Iakym Dunik, was able to sign for himself.)

Ivan Mykhas describes how the villagers reached this level of literacy:

Our first writers were obtaining an education 22 years ago from one gentry lad, whom people hired to teach their children in their homes for two Gulden yearly from a boy and for meals.

Further in his article Mykhas talks about prominent figures, who were the product of the village's self-enlightening efforts. One of these was a certain Iu. M. Because there were no surnames starting with M. in Morozovychi, except for Mykhas, there is a good chance that he was talking about his own brother. That "Iu. M." served with the military in Krakow, and with the help of the city's Ruthenian priest (Krakow had a Greek Catholic parish.), he started there a church choir. At the time this article was written, Iu. M. was taking exams in Kraków to enter the field gendarmerie. If our guess about Iu. M. as a relative of Ivan Mykhas is correct, the former's career in the gendarmerie helps to explain the connections Ivan Mykhas later had with the gendarmes, as well as the fact that Ivan Mykhas was the sole inheritor of his parents' land plots.

There were no reading clubs in the village of Morozovychi, but there were books and newspapers. It is interesting that the parish priest figures as a positive character here. Among the newspapers to which local peasants subscribed Mykhas mentions Novoe Zerkalo (a satirical periodical published by younger Ruthenian activists; among the contributors Ivan Franko figures quite prominently) and Bat'kivshchyna. From the priest, Rev. Denyshchak (who died in 1886) peasants also had Dilo and Zoria to read. Both newspapers indicate the national orientation of the priest as Ukrainian and also help to explain his

⁹² Łopuszański, Stowarzyszenie ludu polskiego, 140.

ambiguous appearance in the elections as described on the basis of the correspondences to Slovo in the previous chapter. It is interesting that there were already then quite different orientations between the moderate priest and the more radical Ivan Mykhas, who obviously was subscribing himself to Bat'kivshchyna and Novoe Zerkalo. Ivan Mykhas also mentioned a peasant, who had a library of 60 books, not taking into account popular brochures published in the regular series by the Kachkovskii Society. That peasant was lending his books to everyone in the village. And this peasant again most probably was Ivan Mykhas himself.

Enlightening efforts of the village were institutionalized and crowned by the establishment of an elementary school. The story of this school is told as follows. When the neighboring village (It must be Vaniovychi, to which parish Morozovychi belonged.) decided to build a school, Morozovychi did not join the enterprise and decided to build its own. As the main reason for Morozovychi's decision Ivan Mykhas provides the following: Vaniovychi school would be attended by the petty gentry, Poles and Jews, it would not be exclusively for the Ruthenian peasants, and the peasants from Morozovychi did not want their children to mingle with children of petty gentry, Poles and Jews. Nonetheless, it seems that this was a justification provided for the Ruthenian newspaper and what was really at stake was the pride of a small community; perhaps the community's relative homogeneity also contributed to it. But in the case of Morozovychi this pride was added by people's grievances of not having a parish of their own. We know that a situation like this fueled numerous conflicts, including political affairs like Hnylychky and Nedil'na.

After the province took over the control of elementary schools from the church, their number steadily increased. In 1862 there were 2547 elementary schools, while in 1880 – 3476.⁹³ The majority of the province's elementary schools were Ruthenian. In 1884 there were 870 Polish, 1462 Ruthenian, 36 German, 90 Polish and Ruthenian, one German and Polish and one German and Ruthenian school.⁹⁴ In the 1880s the proportion of illiterates among the Galician population was decreasing at a rate higher than in the 1890s:⁹⁵

⁹³ Jerzy Potoczny, Oświata dorosłych i popularyzacja wiedzy w plebejskich środowiskach Galicji doby konstytucyjnej (1867-1918), (seria "Galicja i jej dziedzictwo," t. 10) (Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wysszej szkoły pedagogicznej, 1998), 36.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 79.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 86.

Table 6-1 "Illiteracy Rates for the Galician Population Older Than Six in 1880-1900."

Specifications	1880 (%)	1890 (%)	1900 (%)
those able to read and to write	13.96	22.67	30.20
those able to read only	9.25	9.01	6.0
analphabets	76.79	68.32	63.80

But these were numbers for the whole of Galicia, and in Eastern Galicia things were much worse than in Western; in most Eastern districts the number of illiterate people older than six years oscillated between 70 and 90%.

In 1882 a one-grade school was opened in the village of Kul'chytsi.⁹⁶ In 1882 the school in Hordynia was changed into a state school. The new teacher became Hryhorii Hordyns'kyi, who took an active part in community life and became a member of the community council. He was the founder of the local reading club and community granary, and he supplied popular publications to the villagers. He instructed the peasantry on better agricultural techniques and "awakening their national consciousness." For these activities he had problems with the administration, and Rev. Kulisz used his influence to withhold four to five salary additions, to which Hryhorii Hordyns'kyi was eligible as the father of 12 children.⁹⁷

Hryhorii Hordyns'kyi with his Ruthenian activism, however, was rather an exception among the teachers coming to the villages in the 1880s. The 1880s were the heyday of the landlords' domination of Galicia, and many teachers, who came to the Sambir area in the 1880s, were ethnic Poles. In 1883 Strzetelska, a Pole, came as a teacher to the village of Stril'bychi, replacing Ruthenian teacher Bushchakovskiy loved by local peasants. She was a sister of Sofia Strzetelska-Grünbergowa, also a teacher and, besides that, an amateur ethnographer working in the village of Topil'nytsia, in the Staryi Sambir district as well. Because of conflicts between the teacher and local peasants, the village of Strilbychi got an unflattering description in Sofia's monograph on the district, although we know that this village had a long tradition of education and belonged to the more "enlightened" in the area. Later, she was replaced by Karol Mielnik who, despite being a Pole, lived on good terms with villagers and Ruthenian political activist local pastor Rev. Ivan Iavors'ky.⁹⁸ Similarly, the village Korostenka in the 1880s had a Polish school.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ Ivan Volchko-Kul'chyts'kyi, *Istoriia sela Kul'chyts' i rodu Drago-Sasiv* (Drohobych: "Vidrodzhennia", 1995), 73.

⁹⁷ Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Hordyni*, 13-14.

⁹⁸ Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Strilbychakh*, 29-30.

⁹⁹ Illia Homonko, "Selo Korostenko," *Litopys Boikivshchyny*, No.2/26 (37), 1977, 19.

Ivan Mykhas comments on these Polonizing trends:

There is no one to hinder the advance of aristocratic Poland. Priest inspector Kulisz flourishes freely and spreads his power not only over his lambs but over the whole Rus'; and gentlemen Poles praise his deeds, that he gives Ruthenian teachers positions in the Polish villages, and to the Ruthenian villages he assigns Polish male and female teachers, who understand only little Ruthenian and speak to children in Polish. And from this comes misfortune, [which is] that Polish male and female teachers do not work with people and Ruthenian teachers in Polish villages cannot have any influence on local citizens. And instead of Ruthenian books children receive books from *Wydawnictwo Ludowe* [a Polish publishing establishment of popular books]...¹⁰⁰

A separate school in Morozovychi was established in 1886 and Tyt Revakovych in the already cited report was praising the community for supporting it. However, the first teacher appointed to a new school was also a Pole, who did not know a single word in Ruthenian. The community sent a deputation to the district school inspector Rev. Kulisz asking for a Ruthenian teacher, "but Rev. inspector behaved impolitely with one of the deputies." Nonetheless, the villagers continued to lobby the authorities, and the new teacher was assigned. This was a Polish woman, who appeared to be much better than the first teacher, and children attended the school gladly.¹⁰¹

Besides all these enlightening efforts, the village of Morozovychi was lucky to have a good mayor and good community scribe in Morozovychi, a rare case anywhere else. The community treasure had 1,050 Gulden in cash, and the community granary contained 90 *korets*'s (one *korets*' is equal to around 120 liters) of grain. Continuing to speak in the third person, Ivan Mykhas tells about his own role as a Ruthenian agitator in the last elections. The peasants from Morozovychi were attending performances of the Ruthenian theater in the town of Sambir; once even three girls from Morozovychi came to watch a Ruthenian play in Sambir. The community and community's council still held their meetings in the village tavern, but the only income of the local Jewish tavern-keeper from these meetings was from tobacco, because the peasants did not drink while having their sessions. Mykhas remarked with satisfaction that during these meetings the Jew, perhaps, was spending for light more than he received from the peasants.¹⁰²

The community was not only advancing in education, politics and cultured behavior, it was also changing its landscape and external appearance. Only eight

¹⁰⁰ Ivan z nad Dnistra [Ivan Mykhas], "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.48, 303.

¹⁰¹ [Ivan Mykhas], "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.45.

¹⁰² [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny I", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.50, 312.

farmers in the village still had old houses (those described in the protocols of the servitudes' trial in the 1860s). Mykhas does not mention it, but we can imagine the devastating effect that the simultaneous construction of almost a hundred new houses had on seven Joch of the community's forest. He himself had built such a nice stable that it was an example for the rest of the villagers. Now many houses had two to three rooms; although still built from timber, now they were planed and whitened. There were chairs, large icons, "English stoves," iron kitchen utensils and a clock in almost every house. All the houses were insured and fenced with cut (*vyrizanyi*, as opposed to the railings from raw timber) railings. Richer farmers were purchasing for their farms straw-cutting machines with three knives, curved harrows and ploughs for raking up potatoes.

In this technological revolution a certain I. M., in whom we without difficulty recognize Ivan Mykhas himself, was playing an important part. He actually invented the curved harrow and constructed with the help of two hired workers a new house, which was "better than houses of the petty gentry or of German colonists." Mykhas knew how to calculate expanse statement; when he showed his charts to the technician Felner, the latter was very much surprised. Ivan Mykhas says about this harrow: "this was invented by a certain I. M. who by that time had yet nowhere in the world been and had not seen anything":

Imagine what could have become of him if he had finished higher schools. He is our greatest entrepreneur (*promyslovet's*) and the first one to [partake in the] Enlightenment, and also in the love for his neighbor he gives an example for all.¹⁰³

This industriousness Mykhas ascribes to the whole village. And it goes together with other examples of the village's smart behavior. Morozovychi did not give up the struggle for servitudes and as a result got some forest. Mykhas describes a boom among the forest trade peasants, saying that the peasants could earn money in it. Working as a sawyer a villager could earn 1-1.5 Gulden and as a carpenter – 35-50 Kreuzer a day. Mykhas was aware that this forest boom was a golden opportunity not to last forever, and soon the peasants would be replaced with steam machines. He advised the peasants to earn some money on the forest trade and then to invest them in agriculture through, for example, improving their main asset, the land, by spreading slime from the Dnister River onto their fields.

In this context Mykhas praises his co-villagers as laborious people, thus anticipating the 1890s debate about lower productivity of Ruthenian peasants as a labor force in comparison with Polish peasants. According to Mykhas, when the Morozovychi peasants hire Polish peasants from the "third" village the

¹⁰³ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny II", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.51, 194.

latter cannot catch up with the speed of the former.¹⁰⁴ In another article Mykhas suggests that Ruthenian villages also have a better layout and positioning of the buildings within, while one in the Polish villages allows fires to spread too fast so that often whole Polish villages are burnt down.¹⁰⁵

Finally, Ivan Mykhas mentions that Morozovychi is not an exceptional village in the area. Other places doing as well as Morozovychi include Bachyna, Torchynovychi and the district center Staryi Sambir.¹⁰⁶ The settlements Ivan Mykhas mentions form a continuous band on the Sambir-Stare Misto road. Among the villagers in this agglomeration Mykhas' list omits are Vaneyvychi, the community with which Morozovychi's relationship was not that easy, the village of Strilkovychi, which had a Polish major and was located next to Sambir, and Sambir itself. When a certain "villager" from the Drohobych district complains about the villages in the Sambir district having Polish road signs, he does not mention either Cherkhava or Morozovychi.¹⁰⁷

Dividing communities into good and bad and more and less advanced was used by the national movement, but this discursive practice resonated well with the practice widespread among the village communities themselves, with their inter-community rivalry. Not accidentally quite often these community practices were transferred to the national level – Russophile Hrushiv versus Ukrainian Dobrivliany, Russophile Mistkovychi versus Ukrainian Berehy. Similarly, Mykhas contrasts his native Morozovychi, compact, homogenous and well-ordered, to the spread out and disorganized, socially and ethnically divided Vaniovychi, which would later transform into an opposition between the radical village and the settlement of the oinkers.

The movement used local histories and praised "its" communities against others. Nevertheless these divisions had never been stable. "Good communities" had their own dark past, and the window was left for the "dark" ones to join the right side and "recover their minds." Perhaps this explains the constant switching between the praising and rebuking of the same communities. Dark and ignorant Dobrivliany of Rymar's narrative contrasts with the enlightened Dobrivliany of the younger Chapel's'kyi, with the village having a tradition of native radical struggle, as well as "tallest in the district, there are lads two meters' tall among them. They are famous for their reason, clear and joyous eyes and good nature."¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny II", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.51, 194.

¹⁰⁵ [Ivan Mykhas] "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.41.

¹⁰⁶ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny II", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.51.

¹⁰⁷ Seliuk, "Pys'mo vid Drohobycha", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1883, No.48, 288.

¹⁰⁸ Volodymyr Chapel's'kyi, *Ia liubyy ikh usikh*, 137.

When Mykhas describes the situation in the Sambir region he also differentiates between the few “enlightened” and the rest of the “dark” villages. We know that Vaniovychi figures among the latter prominently, while the neighbor from the south is said to be good, perhaps under the influence of Rev. Brytan with whom Mykhas sympathizes. Mykhas says that only the peasants from Morozovychi and Torhanovychi were attending Ruthenian theatrical performances in Sambir.¹⁰⁹ At the same time Mykhas takes care to warn that the backwardness of most of the communities was the fault not so much of the peasants as of the local intelligentsia, which neglected to work with them. There was nothing inherently wrong with the peasant communities; it was just that they needed help and guidance: “We need enlightenment, enlightenment, the help and care of our intelligentsia!”¹¹⁰

Mykhas describes village communities in the region as plagued by natural disasters and pillaged by the state administration. He speaks of the regular floods of the Dnister that eat peasants’ landholdings (and his own plot of land stretched all the way down to the river).¹¹¹ The regular flood in 1885 was accompanied by hail. But the excesses of the local state administration were even more ruinous. Newly appointed tax inspector Krupchak was collecting taxes with great zeal and confiscated just harvested grain from those who did not have any cash. Peasants followed him, kissing his hands and begging to give them time to sell the grain themselves, but the inspector did not listen to this and sold the grain incredibly cheap. And what is more – to conduct confiscations and sales he brought in gendarmes. In Morozovychi Krupchak confiscated from one peasant 20 sheaves of wheat and sold them for six Gulden, from which one Gulden and five Kreuzer went for taxes and the rest was taken to cover the costs of the confiscation procedure. In Vaniovychi the tax inspector confiscated a cow, in Torhanovychi and Torchynovychi – wheat and rye.

After squeezing out of the peasants around 2000 Gulden of tax money, the inspector fled to America with his lover, leaving in Galicia his wife and three children. Mykhas used this case to attack the practices of the state administration. According to him, the Viceroy’s Office had to investigate these things better, especially the unjustified use of the gendarmerie based on a corrupt official’s unjust accusations of peasants engaging in rioting: “because here no one ever remembers ‘peasants rioting’. And our most enlightened Monarch did not give the right to allow such things and to drive poor people to [taking up a beggar’s] stick and bag.”¹¹² Finally former inspector Krupchak was

¹⁰⁹ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bar'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.3.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ TsDIAuL, f.186, op.1, spr.5052, a.43.

¹¹² [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bar'kivshchyna*, 1885, No.38.

brought back to Austria-Hungary and prosecuted. The peasants from Morozovychi, Torhanovychi, Torchynovcyhi and Vaniovychi testified. According to the trial's sentence, Krupchak was supposed to return to the peasants 500 Gulden. However, not all the peasants cheated by him claimed the money at the trial.¹¹³ These executions of unpaid taxes were a real plague of the Galician villages.¹¹⁴ In this Galicia was very similar to rural Hungary.¹¹⁵

This conflict with the tax inspector is the only concrete antagonistic encounter between Mykhas and a representative of the state administration. It also seems to be very characteristic. Tax and financial commissars were those doing injustice in the eyes of the peasants. There was a story circulating about another peasant activist, Antin Hrytsuniak, meeting a tax inspector in the tavern. When the latter started complaining about his income, Hrytsuniak offered him a job of stone-cutter in his village, which the inspector took as an insult and which was meant as a gibe by the peasant.¹¹⁶

These reports by Mykhas contrast with those by another reporter from the Sambir area, who was signing his correspondences with the pseudonym "a close one" (*blyz'kyi*). This correspondent could be Tyt Revakovich, a judge from Pidbuzh – the correspondences seems to betray the author's occupation. He reports on the arsons, and gangs of arsonists, quite often hired by the Jews. The problem for this author was not in Jewish misdeeds themselves but in Jews being an obstacle for the plans of the movement to reform the countryside: "in Biskovychi a decent man became a mayor, he immediately received a Jewish letter to be careful while governing if he does not want to be harmed."¹¹⁷ These images of Jewish mafia were common among those working in the legal system. Jews figured as those hiding and trading stolen horses and goods; just as some Jewish taverns were centers of village social life, while others were nests for various criminal and unsettled elements.

In 1887 yet another correspondent from the Sambir district to Bat'kivshchyna appears. While Ivan Mykhas was signing his articles as "Ivan from above the Dnister," this correspondent was signing his two correspondences as "Ivan the Second." This pseudonym suggests knowledge of Mykhas' contributions and, perhaps, personal acquaintance with him. My observations of the local scene suggest that the author hiding beyond the pseudonym of "Ivan the Second"

¹¹³ [Ivan Mykhas], M. in "Novynky i vsiachyna," Bat'kivshchyna, 1886, No.11.

¹¹⁴ Ivan Franko, „L'EXTORSION DES NÈDOIMKAS," Zibrannia tvoriv, t.44 kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 286-288.

¹¹⁵ Andrew C. Janos, The Politics of Backwardness in Hungary (Princeton University Press, 1982).

¹¹⁶ Antin Hrytsuniak. Icho zhytie ta smert' i spadshchyna, iaka po nim lyshyla sia dlia nas (Peremysyl': druhe vydannia nakladom B. Kona, 1902), pershe vydannia – 1900), 20.

¹¹⁷ Blyz'kii, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," Bat'kivshchyna, 1886, No.28.

was a certain Ivan Detsyk from the village of Berehy. This article describes some developments in the village of Zاراisko, a small community – a northern neighbor of Berehy without a parish of its own.

The story goes as follows: there was a poor Jew, Berko Neumann, in Zاراisko, but somehow (the exploitation of the community is suggested here) he became incredibly rich. No one of Neumann's six sons was drafted into the army (Bribing draft officers is suggested.), and he drives himself everywhere in a coach and has a private teacher for his children. But the thing that irritates the correspondent most is Berko's attempts to manipulate the community's government:

And how polite these little Jews [Berko's sons] are with [village] lads! They would treat them with a cigarette, an advice, lend them a Kreuzer, and invite them to the tavern. There [in the tavern] the lads elect their own lads' 'community council.' Little Jews [there] write down, vote, and for the cigarettes they become the council's members, and to hearten lads further they treat them with a pint of vodka.

The older Jew, Berko, was the best friend of the mayor, Stefan Futala, and Berko himself was a member of the new community council. He used without charge community alder trees while the Ruthenian peasants did not have access to them on Pentecost. When one of Jew's sons wasted someone else's field and 800 *kortsy* of potatoes were lost, that son got easily a certificate of poverty to avoid paying a fine, despite the fact that his father was such a rich man. The teacher in the village did not have any support from the community government.¹¹⁸

From Zاراisko a refutation of this article was sent to Bat'kivshchyna and signed by the community council, among others by Berko Neumann himself. The refutation stated that Berko was a friend of the older mayor, Pavlo Strons'kyi, while newly elected Stefan Futala was a man of honor. Berko had full right to take alder trees for the Jewish holidays – this was the right that his father Jankel had as well. Ruthenians also took tree branches for Pentecost from the manorial forests; it was just that they do not like alder because of the bad odor it has. There was a comment on this refutation from the author of the original article. He agreed that Futala was a good man, but still questioned Futala's ability to establish order in the community,

If the community's government does not know about the lads' commune and the lads' council, then it is a pity; because if they knew the barns would not be robbed several times and it could be that a fire would not have started from a cigarette in the village this year. Usually it starts with small, but may have serious consequences. Thank God, the community

¹¹⁸ Ivan Druhii, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," Bat'kivshchyna, 1887, No.1.

council already ordered that lads were not allowed to sit in the tavern and smoke cigarettes... Finally, about discouraging teachers – it cannot be called encouragement when the tablecloth sewed by the children specifically for an altar is rejected and the altar is covered with a manufactured oilcloth.¹¹⁹

It is interesting that this article came in a year after Ivan Mykhas described some changes in the village of Berehy (spelled as *Byrby* in the printed article). The “enemies of the poor people” governed in the village for quite a while. These “rich” being afraid for their power had brought a commissar from L’viv for the elections, but despite this the majority of the villagers elected a new community government; a grave-digger became mayor, a blind beggar’s guide his substitute, and the poorest of the villagers – a council member. Rich people protested to Vienna against these elections.¹²⁰ Perhaps Ivan Detsyk was in the new community government in Berehy and now tried to influence the neighboring village of Zaráisko as well.

In Mykhas’ memoirs, or better to say, his notes ordered and published after his death, we see clearly a distancing from the peasants: “I devoted myself to work for the dark brother and no one could take or scare me away from this work.”¹²¹ Or in another passage: “My work, this is my holy idea, to enlighten the blind, to help the weak, to defend the poor dark brother.”¹²² His correspondence from the 1880s is written from a very different position. He assumes the role of the common poor villager exploited by the state administration, Jews and his own rich people. He speaks about communities as relatively homogenous and having certain collective interests, the expression and defense of which were hindered by the community’s enemies. The task of the movement is represented as waking up the communities and helping in defending their interests. This does not mean that the position of Mykhas had changed with time, rather that different discursive fields of that time required him to be in a different role.

The 1880s was also the time when the institution of village community became the focus of Diet debate. Diet majority concerned with the developments on the level of village communities started advancing ideas about the reform of community self-government. These ideas were – the introduction of larger “collective communities,” to which both villages and landlords’ estates would belong; and which would unite several villages in one administrative community. For the Ruthenians it was obvious that the goal of this project was strengthening of the district administration’s control over villages. But official

¹¹⁹ “Pys’mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1887, No.25-26.

¹²⁰ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan, “Pys’mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1886, No.20.

¹²¹ Iarema Hirnychenko, *Mizh molotom i kovalom*, 5.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 6.

substantiation of the proposed reform was based on the inefficiency of the community government.

It was shown that, for example, in Turka, Stare Misto, and Sambir districts only towns had regular community police. Only some village communities in Stare Misto had organized regular night guard. In the Sambir district all the communities had police force but its efficiency was low. Only some village communities had proper places of detainment, investigations were conducted by community councils improperly as well as decisions in criminal cases. Community did not control their members' cattle, did not control measures used, neglected maintaining of the cemeteries and wells. The main problem was said to be the existence of a great number of communities, with tiny populations, and little tax paid.

Table 6-2 "Distribution of the Communities of Sambir and Stare Misto districts According to the Population's Size."¹²³

	up to 100	101-200	201-300	301-400	401-500	501-1000	1000-2000	2001-3000	3001-4000	4001-5000	More than 5000
Stare Misto	0	1	7	11	4	22	9	2	1	0	0
Sambir	1	4	3	6	13	39	12	5	0	0	1

This was the background against which Ruthenian movement's intervention into village communities' affairs started and first Ruthenian activists from these village communities appeared.

Politics

"The older [people] do not engage in politics, it does not concern them at all. People from the contemporary generation, those who have a better idea about politics, are doing it."¹²⁴ Politics were a prerogative of the new generation, one to which Ivan Mykhas belonged. We know that there were peasant deputies in the Reichstag in 1848 and in the Diet since 1861, and by the 1880s there were regular elections to the parliament as well; despite all this politics remained a

¹²³ This data, as well as the information above is taken from Witold Lewicki, *Materiały do reformy gminnej w Galicyi zestawione z polecenia Wys. Wydziału krajowego z dnia 16 Sierpnia 1887 do LW. 41.981* (Lwów, 1888).

¹²⁴ Jan Świętek, *Brzozowa i okolica Zakliczyna nad Dunajcem. Obraz etnograficzny – zbiór z lat 1897-1906*, cz.VI, (Archiwum etnograficzne, t.36-IV, d. by Edward Pietraszko) (Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, 2000), 135.

preoccupation of gentlemen, and the peasants did not perceive themselves as political agents.

Mykhas from the very beginning thought in terms of politics; politics for him was the means to defend peasants. Mykhas started his political activism with the Ruthenian movement, even despite the fact that he was critical of the local Ruthenian intelligentsia. We know that starting with at least 1884 Mykhas actively participated in electoral agitation. That was the year of the elections to the district council. Mykhas criticized the way elections were organized. Ruthenians were divided, and one Ruthenian activist, complaining that he was not proposed as a candidate, took voting ballots from peasants, deleted a peasant and wrote down himself instead. Poles had also divided into two parties, but both were held by the gentry.¹²⁵

In 1885 there were elections to the Diet, and the Ruthenian candidate, Dr. Nykolai (Mykola) Antonevych, lost. We have already seen the reports on these elections by angered Ruthenian intelligentsia.¹²⁶ Ivan Mykhas describes these elections in his article as well. First of all, he blames Ruthenian priests, who were loosing peasants' trust. This time peasants elected only eighteen priests as electors, less than it was the case on the last elections. The dean, Rev. Nestorovych, being a chair of the Ruthenian committee, did not even show up for the meeting with a Ruthenian candidate (which does not surprise us because of what we know about his political sympathies). On the day of elections only Rev. Bryttan from Torchynovychi was trying to organize and lead Ruthenian electors. Mykhas contrasts the Ruthenian clergy with the Polish one:

The Polish clergy was supporting a Polish candidate with all the power it had, they held nice and ardent sermons in his favor; [while] our priests did not teach the electors and some of them even voted for the Polish candidate...

Mykhas draws parallels between these parliamentary elections and elections to the community councils. He shows that community elections at the moment were manipulated as successfully as the Diet and parliamentary elections. The enemies of the majority of the villagers dominated community councils:

Everywhere Poles and Jews get in there; even if there is only one in the community he will get into the council. And if the elections are conducted against the will of the old mayor or of the Jew, protests against these elections are sent immediately to the captaincy and the elections are repeated several times. And what kind of mayor is usually elected we learn from the fact that in two years the Sambir captaincy removed more than

¹²⁵ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.48, 303.

¹²⁶ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1885, No.54.

20 of them from their office. Many decent people in the communities do not want to run for mayor, they say: "As for me, whoever wants can become mayor! What will the mayor do for me if I pay my taxes? And even if he is the best mayor he cannot decrease my tax! Should I become mayor, so that the captaincy, dishonoring and ridiculing, removes me?"¹²⁷

The kind of "xenophobia" we see in Mykhas' text has nothing to do with "traditional peasant stereotypes" and ethnic jokes (most of which were quite good-natured anyhow). There is no indication whatsoever that the coming of the Jews to Morozovychi following the peasant exodus of the 1860s, or the return of the peasant migrants, were accompanied by some kind of animosity or conflict. Mykhas' anti-Semitic, anti-gentry and anti-Polish escapades are obviously informed by Ruthenian printed materials. Even when discussing village fires Mykhas suggests that there could be a Jewish hand in it because Jews were those selling the material needed for the renovation of houses.¹²⁸ Now the anti-Semitic discourse around Galician fires gets one more component. Previously it was the crowdedness of the Jewish settlement causing fires in the small towns, and Jewish criminal connections resulting in the arsons in the villages; now it is ascribed to the entrepreneurs who stop at nothing to make a profit.

The movement, and Ivan Mykhas in particular, constantly complained about the influence of Jewish tavern-keepers on peasants and good relationships existing between these two. The village of Zaisko provides an example of these relationships, and because of this it became a target of a correspondent to *Bat'kivshchyna*. The same can be said about relationships with ethnic Poles and Germans, which seemed to be quite tolerant. Actually, Ivan Mykhas himself complains that "in some villages a [Polish] custom crawls in among the Ruthenians [and they] celebrate Polish [religious] holidays saying: 'There is one God, so it does not matter'."¹²⁹

Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi's accounts were full of complains about peasants living on too well terms with local Jews, who advised them and conducted their economic and other transactions. If we apply the models of "peasant society" to Galicia the Jews here fulfilled the functions of classical peasant "brokers."¹³⁰ In the 1880s the task of the Ruthenian movement was to take over these Jewish functions, to eliminate Jews who act as "parasites" on the peasants mediating the access of the latter to the world, and exploit the division between urban and

¹²⁷ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan iz-nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.3.

¹²⁸ "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.41.

¹²⁹ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan iz-nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.3.

¹³⁰ Eric R. Wolf, *Pathways of Power. Building and Anthropology of the Modern World*, (University of California Press, 2001), 240.

rural worlds. The Ruthenian movement was pointing towards Jews as towards the largest, scariest enemy “our people have on their neck.” There seems to be some change in the anti-Jewish enunciations from the 1870s and those appearing in the 1880s. Earlier, the direct exploitation, usury, and Jewish swindles were emphasized, now it was the social position of the Jews in villages in general. Despite all this, people were not too eager to follow the movement: “Many are still great friends with Jews.”¹³¹

Mykhas himself assaults these “foreign” groups largely for taking over administrative powers over the Ruthenian peasants. And in this action “foreigners” were assisted by the numerous Ruthenian peasants themselves. There is an incredibly great number of bad mayors showing up in the publications. Mykhas as one of the correspondents to *Bat'kivshchyna* is very exceptional for stating that the mayor of the village of Morozovychi was a good one. But as we shall see, even in Morozovychi this would not last. Besides the mayors, community scribes were playing an important role in the administration. Voloshcha's scribe, Antin Kochii (or Kochyi) was a perfect case of the “bad scribe.” A citizen of Dorozhiv holding several offices in his own and in neighboring villages, Kochii had good relationships with the Jewish holder of the right of propination for Dorozhiv, a certain Rohrberg. This Kochii lived in a “wild marriage” (not sanctified by the Church) and had constant struggles with the local populist Russophile priest Rev. Maliarkevych.

An interesting thing is that this figure was negative not only for the Ruthenian movement but for the liberal and anti-clerical circles as well. A liberal bilingual newspaper described the situation in Voloshcha. The village had a separate public building for the community's council, the so-called “communal house” (Perhaps this was the achievement of Rev. Ivan Drymalyk.), but it did not make much difference. The communal house was situated near the tavern and the sessions of the community council were held in that tavern, not in the communal house. The council's decisions always were in accord with the advice of the propinator, and wishes of the latter in the communal house were turning into official resolutions.¹³²

The task of those like Mykhas, who felt to be more enlightened and in possession of the knowledge of what should be changed, was to right the wrongs, to police havoc, and get rid of corruption. They not only relied on the powers of the national movement in this task but also derived their knowledge and agenda from the intellectual production of the movement. Mykhas for his political and social action from the very beginning did not use the old space of community space-government but the new space opened up by the national movement. After the first political organization of Ukrainian national-populists,

¹³¹ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], “Pys'mo z Staromiskoho povita,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.9, 51.

¹³² N. N., “Z Voloshchy,” *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1884, No.14.

the “People’s Council,” was created in L’viv in 1885, in the summer of 1886 Mykhas discussed with the local Ruthenian intelligentsia the idea of founding a “People’s Council” in Sambir, “but when started consulting other people I realized that there was no will to [do] this, and then had to bury this idea.”¹³³

In 1889 there were Diet elections and Teofil' Berezhnyts'kyi, whose origin was from the local petty gentry in the village of Berezhnytsia, was the candidate of both the Russophile “Ruthenian Council” and the Ukrainophile “People’s Council.” By 1889 the niche Mykhas had in the Ukrainian popular newspaper Bat’kivshchyna had closed. Franko and Pavlyk were “ostracized” by the mainstream “national-populists,” and a group of Ukrainian radicals would institutionalize itself only next year. As far as I scanned Ukrainian popular papers through the late 1880s, I have not found his correspondences. It seems that in 1888-1889 local radical peasants lost ties with Franko’s group. This was evident in the case of the peasants from Dobrivliany; the group was reestablishing its connections with the radicals in the early 1890s; the same is evident in the case of Ivan Mykhas. At that time and around 1890 Mykhas maintained contacts with the local Ruthenian intelligentsia, among whom there were no radicals.

Ruthenian reports on the 1889 elections state the fact of Mykhas’ participation in agitation on the Ruthenian side. Besides Mykhas, peasants from Cherkhava were also actively supporting a Ruthenian candidate. The administration threatened to remove the community scribe in Cherkhava from his office and not to give the peasant activist Pikhota, a member of the local Ruthenian electoral committee, a loan from the district council, if the elector from Cherkhava would vote for Berezhnyts’kyi.¹³⁴

In the 1889 elections all the mayors, who were elected as electors, with the exception of mayors from Volytsia and Hlynne, voted for the Polish candidate. Besides mayors, ten priests were chosen as electors from the Sambir court district and three from the Luka court district (Both districts belonged to the Sambir political district.). Of these priests Rev. Dmytro Bilyns’kyi voted for himself, and he was the only who did it, “because even electors from his parish, with whom he day and night democratizes,” voted for Berezhnyts’kyi.¹³⁵ Under this “democratization” the correspondent meant heavy drinking, for which Rev. Dmytro Bilyns’kyi was well known among his parishioners and local clergy.¹³⁶ It is interesting that despite the fact that there was no “positive” influence from the priest-alcoholic, the petty gentry of Bilyns’kyi’s parish, Bilyna Velyka, voted

¹³³ Ivan iz-nad Dnistra [Ivan Mykhas], “Pys’mo z Sambirshchyny,” Bat’kivshchyna, 1886, No.3.

¹³⁴ “Z Sambirskoho pyshut’ nam,” Dilo, 1889, No.130.

¹³⁵ “Iz Sambora,” Chervonaia Rus', 1889, No.160.

¹³⁶ APP, ABGK, sygn. 5764.

for a Ruthenian candidate. The fact that the candidate was petty gentry himself must have contributed to this.

Mykhas' activities and stance during the elections moved deeply one of the "older priest-patriots," so much that he kissed Mykhas, "a young farmer and zealous patriot," in his face. This gesture angered Rev. Severyn Polians'kyi from the village of Mokriany, who, perhaps, saw this as improper for the priest's status. The same Rev. Polians'kyi was reported to have spent 10 Gulden to become an elector from his own community (as we see, bribing peasantry was not limited to Polish side.) and in the elections demanded reimbursement from the Ruthenian electoral committee.¹³⁷

The elections of 1889 were a high moment of the 1880s; the Ruthenians still figured as a unified force: this was the last election before the founding of the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party and the compromise of 1890 between Ukrainian national-populists and the Polish majority, which in turn led to an intensification of the conflict with the Russophiles. Some documents on the way Ruthenians were preparing these elections show that they were different from the elections of the 1880s in terms of the attention paid and role assigned to the peasants. The Supreme Ruthenian Electoral Committee was created in accordance with the resolution of an all-national Ruthenian meeting (*viche*) in L'viv. This committee, chaired by Teofil' Berezhnyts'kyi, ordered Tyt Revakovich in Pidbuzh to get together with Rev. Torons'kyi and Mr. Okhrymovych in Drohobych, Revs. Skobel's'kyi in Lishnia, Nimtsevych in Letna, Hoshovs'kyi in Rolliv, and Kushnir in Storona. These patriots had to found a district committee for the Drohobych district, in which 1) all the locations of the district would be represented; 2) people of different estates would be represented, "namely peasants and townsmen;" and 3) no one influential among the people were to be avoided:

Especially I direct your attention at those peasants, mayors, scribes and others, who because of their influence on electors can be very useful activists for our cause if they go with us, and very dangerous agitators if the opposite side gets them.¹³⁸

Perhaps similar orders were given to the Ruthenian activists in other districts, and the incorporation of peasant activists became a policy of the movement. This would help to understand Mykhas' involvement in electoral agitation. The attention paid by the Ruthenian candidates to the electors seems to be a particular feature of the 1880s. These candidates were no longer relying exclusively on the priests, and they tried to speak to the electors directly:

¹³⁷ K. K., "Iz Sambora," *Chervonaia Rus'*, 1889, No.160.

¹³⁸ VR LNB, f. Tyt Revakovich, 11/p.I.

We also should mention as progress the fact that many candidates were calling pre-electoral meetings and in them were presenting to electors their political-social views on Ruthenian-national affairs and were explaining how they were going to defend them in the Diet.¹³⁹

Ivan Mykhas seems to turn his attention to local self-government under the influence of his experiences within the larger national movement. In 1887 Mykhas reports that “to find more about these matters [He means corruption of the community’s self-government and abuses with tax collecting.] I undertook scribing for the community for several months, and during that time whenever I had a chance I spied on [other] people and scribes.”¹⁴⁰ His observations brought him to the conclusion that the tax burden itself was quite bearable. What made things difficult was corruption and irregularities. His conclusion was very much in line with what was reported to be common knowledge of Polish peasants in Galicia: “A dishonest scribe quite often would push even an honorable mayor into disrespectful exploitation, and there are many like this among us.” An example of this could be found in Morozovychi’s closest neighbor, the village of Vaniovychi. The local scribe, a petty gentry and “traitor in all the elections,” together with the mayor would ruin the community if not for one villager (Z.). The scribe and mayor were collecting taxes but not handing them to the financial authorities; that is why a deficit of 850 Gulden was discovered recently.¹⁴¹

Mykhas says that the problem of the local government is in corruption and in the “real power” of state administration. Those who want to become mayors become them because of their own drive for power, but then they become integrated into the state hierarchy of power, and this hierarchy of authority does not care what its lowest and most important chain does:

Do not be surprised that many try to become the commanders of their communities because then they have power to pull their subordinates by the hair and squeeze people for profit. And our people live like oxen under the whip of a drover, till their patience lasts; a farmer relies on his administrator, that one on the steward, and that steward on the servants who take care of the working oxen, feed them, clean them and provide them comfort, not burdening them with excessive labor. But for some reason Ruthenian oxen are not mew, and they do not provide hair for our mattresses.¹⁴²

¹³⁹ “Orhanizatsiia suspil’noi pratsi Rusyniv,” *Dilo*, 1883, No.60.

¹⁴⁰ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, “Pys’mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1887, No.25.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴² [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, “Pys’mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1886, No.26.

Mykhas says that many mayors pretend to be good and promise co-villagers to defend their interests. However, once elected they become “oppressors of people and flatteners of people’s enemies.”

There is certain ambivalence in Mykhas’ account about mayors. On the one hand they are bad, and the Sambir captaincy had to remove more than 20 in two years. If there were better control over their work, they would not abuse their powers so much. But on the other hand, the captaincy is not the best example of administration as well. In Zvir the mayor who was resisting the captaincy’s order for the community to maintain a district road, which was built for the lord’s sawmill, was removed and got four days under arrest.¹⁴³ Actually it appears that the captaincy removes those mayors who care about their communities. Communities also believed that “strong” mayors, even if abusing their own villagers sometimes, were able to defend their communities in front of the captaincy.¹⁴⁴

This was a larger problem of the Ruthenian movement as well. The movement wanted responsible civil government for the community and at the same time resisted too close control of the communities’ self-government by the gentry-controlled district administration. Thus on the one hand, old style semi-independent communities could be used to hinder the influence of the administration; on the other hand the growth of the numbers of conscious citizens and their better organization would help to establish control over communities’ government from within the community itself. The solution was to place the district administration among the enemies of people and the communities. Those mingling with and pleasing district officials were said not to care about community matters. Cooperation with district authorities was represented as corruption. Mykhas reported that in the village of S. the mayor spent 3,000 Gulden of communal and tax money for banquets with all kinds of lords and lordlings; in the village of “V.” the mayor appropriated 700 Gulden and in the village of “Vo.” the mayor charged 10-12 Gulden of tax instead of eight from a peasant.

When Mykhas speaks about managers, stewards and their servants, he means the district administration, a corrupt bureaucracy:

And although there is extreme poverty, people with every year are even heavier pressed with great oppression and managers and stewards and servants do madly at their will. Maybe someone could be found to take care sincerely of the hurt and neglected people? We have all kinds of

¹⁴³ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.26.

¹⁴⁴ Świętek, *Brzozowa i okolica*, cz.IV, 130.

powers, and the Church, and the school, do we not? And the Holy Scripture says: whatever we do for someone, we do for ourselves!¹⁴⁵

Mykhas searches for an alternative authority, which would represent “us” and defend “people” better than current “powers” do. In Mykhas’ text the source of the evil in society, something with which Rymar was concerned, appears to be power, power without proper control that corrupts those who hold it. Many important changes were happening in the 1880s. Mykhas’ discourse appears at the time when provincial administration became seriously concerned with local self-government. And although one can see in this an attempt to spread the administration’s and the landlords’ influence, there is no doubt that some serious work was done on reforming and controlling community administration.¹⁴⁶ Corruption in communities at least partly was undercut by the decision of the state tribunal from 1883, which decided that the community could not be forced into the extraction of taxes; this was the duty of the captaincy.¹⁴⁷

If there were a single concrete example of direct exploitation of peasants in Mykhas’ texts, this would be taxes. In an impoverished countryside under a corrupt administration, paying taxes was seen as just another way to squeeze peasants, the extraction of the products of peasant labor. Taxes became an obligation internalized just the way *robot* was earlier. For the peasants it was just an obligation, and while in the feudal system there was some knowledge about the mutuality of obligations, peasants did not see any benefit from their constitutional duties:

People are paying and paying, finding the last they can sell, because they fear an executor and console themselves with a hope to earn money in the future if only they could pay right now; even if they have to suffer hunger and walk half-naked, they render what they owe and their heads can be at peace because the scribe told them that he wrote it down correctly.¹⁴⁸

Taxes as a rule meant also “sequestrations,” expeditions of tax inspectors backed up with gendarmes, confiscations of the peasant property when more went for covering the costs of expeditions than for the taxes proper. The peasants called these expeditions “robberies,” and local traders paid interest to the tax inspectors so that the latter sold confiscated property incredibly cheap.

¹⁴⁵ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.26.

¹⁴⁶ Witold Lewicki, Op. cit.

¹⁴⁷ Ivan Franko, “Borba o pobyrannia podatkov v hromadakh,” *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.44, kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 281.

¹⁴⁸ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, “Pys'mo z Staromiskoho povita,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.9.

Injustice was not limited to taxes; it was everywhere. Even those leaving villages to earn some money working in the oil industry or on railroad construction complained about being cheated by speculators,

People suffer injustices, and have nowhere to find a solution (*spravu*). Quite often they are forced to complain at first to those from whom they were wronged, – and if you submit your case higher, it gets stuck there. Others complain that in many cities the police is in the service of the Jews, and innocent Christians are quite often terrorized in detentions. The poor has nowhere to go, the rich people have become masters of the world (*zavolodily svitom*), and people talk among themselves: ‘slavery and slavery! all the liberties are taken away and laws (*prava*) imposed!’¹⁴⁹

As I have already mentioned the figure from whom Mykhas got his radical ideas was most probably Ivan Maksym’iak. We can guess that from him through Ivan Franko (whom he at first knew only through correspondence) he got in touch with the radicals from Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova. When the investigation and trial of the peasants from Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova took place, Mykhas was taken under gendarmes’ supervision. He defended himself in the newspaper, pointing to his membership in Kachkovskii Society and saying that “Whomever but a member of this society our authorities should not suspect of socialism.”¹⁵⁰ And we know that Mykhas’ membership in this society was becoming problematic; he was not satisfied with the activities of the local branch. This statement also implies another connection. At that time Ukrainian national-populism in general quite often was accused of involvement in socialism. Mykhas was well aware that the Kachkovskii Society was conservative and free from suspicions of being in socialist activities. Speaking about himself in the third person, Mykhas says: “Perhaps only Jews represent him as a socialist because he had always spoken against vodka, and maybe also the petty gentry, which in some places oppresses peasants and considers them to be something as base as cattle.”¹⁵¹

One of the Ukrainian patriots had also expressed concerns with placing Mykhas under gendarmes’ supervision and with making accusations of socialism:

too much zeal only harms the cause one would like to serve; suspecting someone without any reason, especially of something indeed illegal but at the same not dishonorable, would only incite him and lead to the staff, of which he is suspected.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan, “Pys’mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1886, No.20.

¹⁵⁰ Naddnistriany, “Pys’mo z Samborshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1886, No.38.

¹⁵¹ [Ivan Mykhas], “Pys’mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1886, No.45.

¹⁵² Naddnistriany, “Pys’mo z Samborshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1886, No.38.

In 1886 Ivan Mykhas returned to the issue of socialist agitation among the peasants and persecutions of these alleged socialists by the state administration:

Among our so-called socialists hardly one graduated from elementary school, and many cannot recognize [even] numbers; and about rioting – it is well known that our Ruthenians are [for this] a too quiet and subdued people, and the Ruthenian peasant suffers patiently even in cases when, for example, a Polish or German peasant would not stay calm.

This article of Mykhas is interesting because it betrays that he did not have a negative attitude towards socialists. Mykhas says, “Some sincere friend of the people is needed, even if he were called a ‘socialist’ a hundred times.”¹⁵³

It is interesting that while the Ukrainian movement tried to mobilize peasants against landlords’ domination of Galician politics, actual cases of conflict between the peasants and the landlords in the Sambir area became rare. After the end of servitudes’ cases, landlords’ and peasants’ properties were effectively separated. Administratively, landlords’ estates formed units independent of communities. For the 1880s and 1890s for the Sambir area there is only one case of landlord’s abuse mentioned in the Ukrainian press. In 1895 in the village of Vil’shanka near Sambir it was noticed that some old beggar was milking a landlord’s cow. The landlord, 25 year old army captain Adam Olszański, offered to an offender a choice between 25 sticks of flogging and 3 months of prison. The latter chose sticks and died in the aftermath of flogging.¹⁵⁴ And this was the case reported to Franko by Mykhas. All other complaints are not against landlords’ maltreatment of peasants but about landlords’ ability to influence the state administration, to dominate district and Diet self-government.

The year 1886 was the peak of Mykhas’ cooperation with Bat’kivshchyna: that year his contributions were published not only among the full-fledged correspondences but also among the news and the miscellaneous. He reported, for example, that in Torchynovychi a peasant hanged himself in his house, and a week before that the same peasant agreed to cut a rope on another suicide in Luzhok, Saryi Sambir district.¹⁵⁵ In 1886 Mykhas also responded to a note by Mr. Bandrovych who praised Prague straw cutters. But Mykhas knew that five machines were brought to his area from Prague, but only one of them was working and four others were in need of repair. He himself bought a local straw cutter which had cost for him five Gulden in two years, if not to count his own

¹⁵³ [Ivan Mykhas], “Pys’mo z Sambirshchyny,” Bat’kivshchyna, 1886, No.45.

¹⁵⁴ Dilo, 1895, No.49.

¹⁵⁵ [Ivan Mykhas], M. in “Novynky i vsiachyna,” Bat’kivshchyna, 1886, No.11.

work. His friends praised straw cutters from Biała, which had thicker iron, more hammered iron and four cutting edges.¹⁵⁶

Mykhas' articles from the 1880s show how a "third space" for him opened. This space was located beyond the limits of the local community and was relatively independent of institutions of state authority. This was the space of the Ukrainian national movement, and in this space Mykhas saw the opportunity for self-realization. Bat'kivshchyna with its golden days in the mid-1880s was one of these opportunities. In that sense it was not simply a newspaper, even a popular one: when it would become one, in the 1890s, it would lose much of its charm. For the most part of the 1880s it was something larger than a newspaper; luring in peasants, it acquainted them with a new authority and provided direct participation in the movement and articulation of their voices.

With time this changed. The signs of this change could be found already in 1889, when the editorial board decided to reorganize the "correspondences" section: everything from the reading clubs was supposed to go under a separate rubric and consist of articles republished from other periodicals as well. From the villages and individual peasants the newspaper shifted its attention to the most important institutions of the national movement in these villages. These institutions were also the core of the local "civil society," by and large the only voluntary associations these villages had. At the same time the main emphasis of the newspaper moved from negotiation of various issues between the villagers and the movement to providing a repertoire for the peasants:

We shall publish in the first place texts about urgent matters, or what should we do to advance faster and more certainly ahead; then scientific studies from our life and that of foreigners or science, and stories and theatrical performances from our peasant life and that of foreigners.¹⁵⁷

This shift was justified as follows:

Having seen that for our literate people even now brochures published by our enlightening societies are not enough, we shall take more important works from Bat'kivshchyna and publish them as separate books, and because of this we have to reduce the size of Bat'kivshchyna twice, so as not to change much while reprinting from it.¹⁵⁸

But at the moment, in the 1880s, Bat'kivshchyna was the place where peasant correspondents from all over Galicia could meet. Since no archive of

¹⁵⁶ "Visty hospodarski, promyslovi i torhovel'ni," Bat'kivshchyna, 1886, No.5.

¹⁵⁷ "Vid redaktsii," Bat'kivshchyna, 1889, No.1.

¹⁵⁸ "Vid redaktsii," Bat'kivshchyna, 1889, No.1.

Bat'kivshchyna has been preserved, there is always a question of how “original” were peasant correspondences published there. There is almost no doubt that correspondences to Bat'kivshchyna were censured and corrected by the editors. And we can only guess how far editors’ intervention went. The only manuscript of Mykhas’ texts comes from the 1890s. It seems that some correspondences were edited and corrected and some – not. It also seems that in Mykhas’ texts to Bat'kivshchyna corrections dealt with rather minor things like orthography, the order of paragraphs etc. while the core text remained unchanged.

The important thing is that “peasant correspondents” themselves were not against many corrections introduced in their texts. In 1899 Ivan Sanduliak sent his text to Pavlyk:

I request that you kindly accept the text I am submitting to you, although I laid it down, I give it to you to look over and entrust you to check better yourself that I have not mistaken [anything], because I am not sure about everything, I have written only what I see in some places, but I have no publishing skills, and it seems to me that this text should not expect confiscation, but this is your business, I laid it down but when I had to rewrite it from the draft I got sick, that is why there are different writings and so many corrections. I am also asking you kindly if there are some awkward parts to correct them but I only ask you not to shorten it, on the contrary you can expand this according to your thought. I am also asking the kind Editorial Board that if this is too much to put in Hromads'kyi Holos, let's put together and publish a small book for peasants and there is hope that everyone for his own interest would buy it, and to you my precious friend and comrade Mykhailo Pavlyk, sincere and sweetest Brother, do not disdain my simple writing because you yourself know the best what kind of man I am, tired with work and therefore cannot master everything in details.¹⁵⁹

Similarly, in 1900 Ivan Sanduliak wrote to Pavlyk asking not to shorten his auto-biography, “because everything there is true.”¹⁶⁰ Ivan Sanduliak, however, had a worse command of the pen than Ivan Mykhas. In the 1890s Ivan Mykhas never complained about significant changes in his articles, although he read the published versions carefully. He complained only about the non-publication of his contributions (during the 1899 crisis in the Radical party) and about editorial comments in the text, when he did not agree with them or thought that they treated him unfairly.

Later, peasant correspondents on the behalf of the peasants were defending their own importance in radical publications. Ivan Sanduliak, for example, wrote the following:

¹⁵⁹ TsDIAuL, f.663,op.1, spr.228, a.14.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., a.15.

And now about peasant correspondences, please publish more of the correspondences we send into your hands, because everything else does not attract the peasant to the newspaper, everyone is interested only in reading about his hard life. With this I would like to ask the Honest Editors for what reason my article on the elections in Sniatyn from the Fifth curia has not appeared till now, people ask for it and are very eager to read.¹⁶¹

Capitalism

By and large in Mykhas' description from the 1880s the peasants appear positively. However there is one feature of peasants' character he does not like. This seems to be the only feature testifying to the specificity of peasant attitudes and behavior, the only thing which could be seen as a feature of peasants' "social character." Except for this instance, peasants from Mykhas' texts are villagers, inhabitants of the villages. The particular feature Mykhas mentions is a certain "conservatism" in thinking, in the way to approach current conditions with judgment grounded in a non-existent framework. Mykhas discerns this attitude, or to be precise this divergence between cognitive model and the reality, to which the model is applied, already during the servitudes' struggle. The contemporary time, the 1880s, for Mykhas is the period in which a new, more adequate attitude in the villages is struggling with the old.

Ivan Mykhas' description of the servitudes' issue in the region looks like the following. After the abolition of *robot*, "those who had power in the community got a few Gulden, promise for the community and, being distinguished from the others, said in the name of the community: 'we do not need the forest, the forest is not handy for us.'" The rumor was spread among peasants that whichever community accepts a forest, its citizens would belong to the guard. Peasants reached the consensus that "it would be impossible that forests not grown by anyone were given as a gift." Mykhas says that the position peasants had taken was motivated by the same attitude as their position in the case of mills and propination which they did not take over, or in the case with indemnification obligations which they sold immediately after receiving.

The outcome of this unintelligent stance the peasant had taken was well known in the Sambir villages. Of 25 cameral villages "following the advice of Rev. Liskovats'kyi from V. and one mayor N. M. [this must be Mykhas' father Mykola (Nykolai)] (who came into agreement with other mayors) and with great obstacles, only five villages from 2,360 Joch of thick forest received 109 Joch." The rest of the forests belonging to the Sambir "economy" were bought for 5

¹⁶¹ TsDIAuL, f.663,op.1, spr.228, a.17-18.

Gulden per Joch, while already then third-party gentlemen were buying forests for 22 Gulden for a Joch.

Unlike the peasants the “petty gentry not only repelled [the onslaught on its] belongings, but also took over whatever [it] could from the communal, and many peasants even by now remain beggars.” The peasants missed the opportunity opened during the regulation of property. However, in recent years a new one arose. “Just like for other gentlemen for these three [who bought the forest] there never was enough money for their excesses, and they started selling timber by carts because there were no buyers to purchase it wholesale.” The sale looked as follows: the forest was opened, and peasants on carts could go in there and cut trees whenever and whichever they liked, paying 10-15 Kreuzer for the cart of fuel and 25 to 50 Kreuzer for the construction timber. Those who were cutting timber could earn 13-15 Kreuzer in two days, while those cutting, transporting and then reselling timber were earning three to five, sometimes eight Gulden a day. This was going on in the whole Staryi Sambir district. But there were not peasants eager to use this opportunity for additional earnings. Only poorer ones went for this, when an extreme hunger pressed them during the period of spring undernourishment (the so-called *perednivok*), or a heavy tax. There were some good reasons beyond this behavior: hard labor in the forest meant possible handicap and even death. These reasons even for Mykhas were seen as justifiable,

Nevertheless, many abstained from this work because of the various pretty things like a neighbor's festive commemoration of a dead relative, or petty work at home, or a Church, even if Latin, holiday; this way the day passed by day till it started raining and rains worsened the road. Weeks and months were wasted like that. And in general there was no great eagerness for this kind of earning, [people] were saying: ‘I cannot change the world, the horse is worth more than a Kreuzer and health is worth more than two, children can do whatever they want, we should let them care about themselves.

But the trade was running gloriously as perhaps nowhere in the whole Galicia.

There were buyers for this timber coming from major towns, Mostys'ka, Sudova Vyshnia, Horodok, Komarno, Rudky, and Sambir itself.

Better farmers and entrepreneurs tried not to waste a single day, and finishing farming chores as soon as possible, brought logs en masse home, cutting, planing them and building houses either for themselves or for sale, or simply selling the material even for dozens of Gulden. And then, on the same market, so not to waste a trade, they bought planks from the sawmill and earned from five to seven Gulden a cart.

The moment did not last. No peasant made an estate on these earnings. As a rule peasants went to the forest twice a week, and 13-25 times a year. The Jews had a totally different approach to the whole business; they came in and started wholesale trade, while peasants

Preferred a hard and small earning (one Gulden, or one and half) to starting a free enterprise (*puskatsia na svobodnyi zysk*). But even these industrious farmers soon became discouraged, especially when someone got a lot of material and it was piled together, the worry was eating [the farmer and he thought]: why did I bring it? But when there was no material a buyer would show up looking for it. One younger man in the village M. got an idea of establishing a sawmill where the logs would be cut by horses, and timber for it would be bought by a group of peasants, and those, who usually were bringing logs to the Jews, would bring them to that union, or if one could not go [to the forest] or get sawyers would cut one's own logs with horses. But others were laughing at this idea, in the meanwhile that young man was drafted into the army, and when he came back there was nothing to be brought to the sawmill because Jews bought and put two steam machines in these forests.

We do not know who was this young man from M. with a brilliant idea to mechanize sawing but this well could be Ivan Mykhas himself, and then army service was part of his biography. If Ivan Mykhas indeed served in the army, then his biography would fit very well among the biographies of peasant activists and community reformers, real as well as imagined by the Ruthenian movement.¹⁶² Ivan Sanduliak Lukyniv, born in 1845, was an example among real peasant activists of one with army experience. His father had 14 Joch (almost exactly as Mykhas' parents); in 1867 he was taken into the army and became a corporal and, later on, a *Zugsführer*. In 1874 he came back to the village and bought a house and garden, joining the temperance movement in 1875.¹⁶³

According to Mykhas, although there were many bankruptcies among Jews as well, in general their approach was different from the peasants. Instead of cutting and selling timber occasionally, besides farming, the Jews were investing their profits into an enterprise and expanded it, at the end purchasing the forest itself for unlimited exploitation. The peasants did not believe that buying forest could be profitable. Several Jews became very wealthy in this forest trade.

However negligible peasants' trade was, they still were a competitor for the Jews.

¹⁶² For an example of peasant activist coming from the army see Andrii Chaikovskii, *Obraz honoru*, (Vydannia Prosvity ch.180) (L'viv, 1895).

¹⁶³ Just like peasant sons entering gymnasia peasant activists seem to be usually sons of wealthier peasants. Ivan Sanduliak's parents (he was born in 1845) had 14 Joch, which very close to what Mykhas' parents had. Ivan Sanduliak Lukyniv, "Zhyttiepys'," *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1900, No.29 and 30.

So the Jews agreed with each other to get into their hands all the forests of the western Sambir district and eastern Stare Misto district and even before they piled enough cash the Jews warned gentlemen not to destroy forests because they would buy them for cutting down and would pay several dozens of thousands at once for everything. And indeed [during] one year the gentlemen closed all the forests and only allowed to take a “gathering” (e. g. dry fir trees, broken and uprooted trees). Thus peasants’ trade stopped because they did the “gathering” only after a great storm and only for a few days.

In this, in 1881, “the Jews” made big money. And the peasants could only work as cart-drivers earning one and half Gulden while ruining their health and equipment. The forest trade, however, was bringing not just profits:

Forests become thinner and every year the number of empty mountains increases. Unheard of clouds wash them every year and ruin farmers’ wealth. For example, last year in Volia Kobylans’ka and in Koblo cattle was drowned in the stables and people had to run up into the mountains.¹⁶⁴

This forest trade in the 1870s – 1880s became the main source of profit for many sub-Carpathian communities. And in most communities, as for example, Nahuievychi, it was the main source of cash for the majority of the villagers.¹⁶⁵ This trade, spurred by the newly built railroads, finalized the transformation that started at the beginning of the servitudes’ struggles. Most of the forests were finally closed and, what could be more important, most peasants saw this enclosure as quite normal, understandable and justified by the urge to maximize profits. Peasants themselves were using forest as a commodity, and even when they avoided too intense labor, they calculated possible profit and correlated it with their own health and strength. Mykhas’ account shows that he himself saw the new condition as a new opportunity and tried to benefit from it. This desire to become capitalist conflates with the nationalist project.

Mykhas goes as far as foreseeing some key discussions connected with the racial concerns of the nationalist project. These discussions always appear in connection with the capitalist concern about the productivity of the labor force. Mykhas’ “Request to our bishop about Lents” is an interesting example of such a discussion, one of the earliest of this kind. The “letter,” although never actually sent to the bishops, appeared in *Bat’kivshchyna* and was concerned with the body and health of Ruthenian villagers. While the clergy as a rule complained about peasants’ unneeded celebrations resulting in spending half of

¹⁶⁴ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1886, No.12, 13.

¹⁶⁵ Franko, “[Stanovyshche selian sela Nahuievychiv],” 80.

the year in idleness, Mykhas attacks peasants' habits of strict observation of Lents, which last "for half of the year":

Why should one wonder that our people are often skinny and weak, slow to work, happy to lie behind the oven, greedy for liquor? Just look at our life. For half the year a man doesn't *have* anything to eat, because the floods come and the hail, too, and nothing grows; it is a long, hard time before the next harvest, and the chance of earning something is up to God's will. For the other half of the year there's Lenten *fasting*.

And the lent is very strict; even children do not get milk.

The result of this was a lack of will and strength to work. People walk the whole day as if stunned and look for vodka to forget about hunger. According to Mykhas, one can have a lent if there is a choice of good food. People could keep Lent earlier when there was plenty of fish, mushrooms and honey. Now these times were over. Galicia exported oxen, calves, pigs, eggs, butter, cheese and milk:

Far away people think: "What a rich land! It feeds itself and can still feed others." And surely no one there can guess that this land is weak from fasting and hunger, that those eggs and that milk are the savings possible because of the fasting even of infants who cannot yet talk! What sort of savings is this! It is a grave waste because from a child so fed no worker can grow, no soldier, no wife, no mother – at most a cripple. And how many people have died because after several weeks of difficult fasting, finally being allowed to eat, they have so greedily snatched at their food that they knew no moderation!¹⁶⁶

Mykhas had heard that pig's fat is allowed during Lent in Hungary, and Poles are allowed to eat meat once a week and dairy products three times. He also calls on Ruthenian bishops to ease regulations on Lent: "Perhaps it is a less sin to have milk on Friday and meat on Sunday than getting drunk on Friday as well as on Sunday. I think that with better and healthier food vodka loses much of its taste."¹⁶⁷

Interregnum

Besides the Sambir trial of peasant "socialists," another important event in Mykhas' life took place in 1886. Rev. Pliaton Denyshchak died in the village of Vaniovychi. We know that he was a somewhat ambivalent figure, supporting

¹⁶⁶ Translation of the citations from this article is taken from Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 138.

¹⁶⁷ [Ivan Mykhas], "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1885, No.49.

the Ruthenian movement but not being excessively active in it. After Rev. Denyshchak's death Mykhas said that about this priest "community [members] among themselves from time to time complained but bore everything quietly and calmly."¹⁶⁸ We know that when Rev. Denyshchak died, Ivan Mykhas was a cantor in Morozovychi.¹⁶⁹ With the death of the old priest the filial community of Morozovychi became more independent in spiritual matters. It is easy to imagine that Ivan Mykhas as a cantor in Morozovychi in the meantime became the greatest authority on everything religious. We know that the members of the Dobrivliany "conspiracy" considered themselves to be religious people, whose religiosity as based on textual knowledge was of a different quality than that of the majority of the villagers. Mykhas' free-thinking and authoritative tone is evident in his article on Lents.

The death of the priest also coincided with a tide of money extortions. At first there was illegal sequestration and fraud by tax inspector Krupchak. Then after the death of the priest the buying out of *meshne* (customary payment in grain to the priest) came, and the community was charged with several thousands of Gulden; even the poorest farmer from Morozovychi had to pay 11 Gulden and 22 Kreuzer.¹⁷⁰ We must say the 1880s were a period of mass buying-out of *meshne* and other customary obligations villagers had before the priest. It seems that this process, placing an especially heavy burden on village communities in the period of dwindling agricultural prices, contributed heavily to the growth of anti-clerical sentiment in the countryside. The years 1886-1887 were also the time of a great corruption scandal in Vaniovychi. A mayor and a scribe committed fraud, and a deficit of 850 Gulden was discovered. There was little hope to get the money back, because both of them had their estates registered as their wives' property.¹⁷¹

There was also another problem; to be a filial of the Vaniovychi parish at that time was a particularly heavy burden. While Morozovychi had a small but decent wooden church, Vaniovychi had been engaged in a long-term church construction project. A stone church there had been built for more than 50 years. It was against this village of Vaniovychi, a large and mixed settlement with 52 taverns, numerous Jewish population and petty gentry, that Ivan Mykhas constructed his nice peasant Ruthenian community of Morozovychi:

for a long time there was not even the slightest order; there were constant arsons and destruction of grain fields with horses, and quarrels and fights,

¹⁶⁸ [Ivan Mykhas], "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.45.

¹⁶⁹ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1886, No.69-70.

¹⁷⁰ [Ivan Mykhas], "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.45.

¹⁷¹ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.25.

only a few people have been showing up in court several times a year. No one cared about order and morality.¹⁷²

Perhaps the death of the priest increased enormously Mykhas' own authority in the village. Around 1887 Mykhas, being up to now a local cantor, also became a community scribe. The mayor of this community was his good friend Baida.¹⁷³ Perhaps Mykhas wanted the new priest to take his presence into account, to share his ideas about proper work and to respect him as the most talented, most active and most conscious of local peasants.

However, the choices Ivan Mykhas was making among the local priests did not coincide with the choices of the Consistory. The first priest assigned to administer the parish of Vaniovychi was Rev. Iatsiv, whom Mykhas liked, but Rev. Iatsiv was transferred. Mykhas commented that it looked as if the Consistory "considered the priest supported by the people to be dangerous and wanted to have pastors whom the people did not like, as it showed up in the Drohobych district? And what was the outcome of it?" Here he was obviously pointing to the Dobrivliany affair and used it as a threat.¹⁷⁴ Mykhas says that some neighboring priests complained to the Consistory about Rev. Iatsiv, that he "stirred up the community to riot, and implanted [there] religious demoralization." The Consistory, without any detailed inquiries, took the administration from Rev. Iatsiv and gave it to the Rev. B.. This Rev. B. could have been Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi.

Mykhas reports that people were very dissatisfied with this change. Around 70 of them gathered together, "complained and talked loudly: 'we would rather join the neighboring Polish priest... we are giving fuel to warm our soul and body, but must suffer from the cold,' and expressed their sorrow for Rev. Iatsiv." After the words "Polish priest" the editorial board of Bat'kivshchyna comments: "It is not good even simply to entertain such a thing." This meeting was represented by the parish administrator as a riot. The communities sent deputations to the Przemyśl Consistory and to the dean and district captain. But Rev. Iatsiv was transferred even farther away, to the mountains (We'll find him that year in the Turka district.). Mykhas complained that such behavior of the Consistory was discouraging younger priests from working with people.¹⁷⁵

Even without Ivan Mykhas' strong personality the situation of Morozovychi as a filial village was potentially fraught with serious problems. Similar conflict was reported in the filial village of Ploske (Mshanets' area), which wanted to have its

¹⁷² [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," Bat'kivshchyna, 1887, No.25.

¹⁷³ Baida is mentioned as a mayor in [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan, "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," Bat'kivshchyna, 1886, No.20. Baida would become a secretary of Morozovychi reading club in the 1890s.

¹⁷⁴ Naddnistriany, "Pys'mo z Samborshchyny," Bat'kivshchyna, 1886, No.38.

¹⁷⁵ [Ivan Mykhas], "Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny," Bat'kivshchyna, 1886, No.45.

own priest. When the independent assistant left and another one was not appointed, peasants from Ploske did not want to go to their parson in the neighboring village and waited for a priest of their own to be appointed. On the basis of this the proverb “they wait for a father without no end (*zhdut vittsia ta nema kintsia*)” appeared.¹⁷⁶ And this problem of the filial village at the beginning of the twentieth century appeared in the ill-famous conversion of the village of Nedil’na from Greek-Catholicism to Roman Catholicism.

Afterwards, in 1887 Rev. Frantz Rabii administered the parish of Vaniovychi for some time. He is an interesting figure, quite prominent for the Sambir region. Born as a Roman Catholic in one of the Sambir suburbs, he became a Greek Catholic priest (Evil tongues said that he did so to be able to marry.). Later on, he was to become a parish priest in Sambir and activist of the Ukrainian clerical party (Ruthenian-Catholic Popular Union, and later Ukrainian Social-Christian Party). In the meantime, in 1887 his clericalism and conservatism were not preventing Ivan Mykhas from admiring him and wishing him to become a full-fledged parson of Vaniovychi. Mykhas said that Rev. Rabii in Vaniovychi “for the several months he spent there showed real miracles, and memory about him, about his heartily teaching and truly fatherly patronage will pass from generation to generation.” Rev. Rabii was one to work hard on the church construction in Vaniovychi and in several weeks with cheap costs made an altar and the rest of the most needed things. The priest was good because

he lived with everyone as with his native brother, inquired about family life, and if there were problems at home and in the family, he would visit that home and resolve disputes. There was never any disagreement about payments of the ritual fees, poor people were helped and the low-spirited were cheered up. He especially loved curious peasants, who flocked to science and enlightenment, and did not tolerate lickers (*lyzuniv*).¹⁷⁷

However, Mykhas mentions that “only people from another village were keeping distance from him.” This shows that it seems that in speaking about Rev. Rabii loving his parish flock, he was describing his village of Morozovychi, while “people from another village” were in fact the peasants from Vaniovychi, where a church had been constructed. Anyhow, shortly Rev. Rabii was transferred to some mountainous village, just as Rev. Iatsiv earlier, as Mykhas says “because it was said that he did not deserve such a parish (800 Gulden of [yearly] income and 100 Joch of wheat land).”¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁶ VR IL, f.3, spr.4157, a.3.

¹⁷⁷ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.25.

¹⁷⁸ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z-nad Dnistra, “Pys'mo z Sambirshchyny,” *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.25.

Stories of Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi

The career of Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi as a parish priest started quite typically. He married a priest's daughter, just as many other priests of peasant origin did to enter a somewhat closed clerical estate and acquire useful connections.¹⁷⁹ For the majority of the priests of peasant origin it was difficult; however, a petty gentry origin and presence of priests among his mother's relatives could mitigate Zubryts'kyi's case.¹⁸⁰ On 8 March 1883, just before Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi graduated from the seminary, his father died. On 27 September of the same year he married Ol'ha, a daughter of Rev. Ivan Borysevych, the vicar of the Porokhnyk deanery and the parish priest of Kryvna.¹⁸¹ As we see, only a short mourning period of half a year was observed.

Through marriage Rev. Zubryts'kyi got a connection which allowed him to get the position of cooperator at the parish of his grandfather-in-law, Rev. Antonii Nazarevych, parish priest of the village of Mshanets'. Although situated in the Staryi Sambir district, Mshanets' was very close to the Turka district, in which the village of Zubryts'kyi's birth was located. Just as his native village, Mshanets' was a mountainous village with a dialect, people and customs not very different from those one could find in Kindrativ. His wife's grandfather by that time was quite old, and his trembling handwriting, which one can see in the Consistory files, proves that Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi fulfilled most of the priest's duties.¹⁸² When the letters of support from a parish priest were needed for Zubryts'kyi's applications for various one-time payments and hardship compensations, the latter had to write them himself, and Rev. Nazarevych only signed them. In 1889 Rev. Nazarevych died, and Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi became a full-fledged parish priest of Mshanets'.

Just as many other priests of his generation, his activities in the parish were multi-component and multidimensional: pastoral duties were combined with political activities, work with the villagers, and historical and ethnographical research. All this shaped his attitude to and his relationships with the parishioners. Eager to work for and with the people even back in the Drohobych gymnasium, he got a perfect opportunity in the position of parish priest to realize this desire. Caring about the parishioners for Rev. Zubryts'kyi

¹⁷⁹ Oleksa Prystai, *Z Truskavtsia u svit khmaroderiv. Spomyny z mynuloho i suchasnoho*, v.2 (L'viv-Niutork, 1935).

¹⁸⁰ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Lisy i pasovys'ka," 503.

¹⁸¹ VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.21.

¹⁸² APP, ABGK, sygn.5388.

included caring not only about their conscience but also about their consciousness. And the latter in fact required combining an active social position in local affairs with participation in the province-wide activities of the national movement.

In this respect he was not unique. Many activist priests of the turn of the century were studying theology together with Rev. Zubryts'kyi. In his autobiography he mentions other "populists" (*narodovtsi* despite the fact that not all of them were of Ukrainian orientation and therefore were not "national-populists" in the sense this term is used in historiography): Omelian Hlibovytskyi, Lev Horalevych, Iurii Zhuk, Ihnat Vakhnianyn, Ivan Kypriian, Iosyf and Ivan Iavors'ki (Those two were the founders of the reading club in Stupnytsia, the Sambir district; the first one was involved in the Dobrivliany affair and the second one would later become a famous politician from the Staryi Sambir district.), Danylo Lepkyi, Bohdan Eliiashevskyyi, Nykolai Bachynskyyi, Sylvestr and Petro Bohachevski, Bohdan Kyrchiv, Ivan Mashchak, Ivan Litynskyi, Ksenofont Sosenko and some others as well. All of them went to work in the villages (There were not many positions available for Ruthenian priests in the cities anyway).¹⁸³

If we look for the priest of Zubryts'kyi's type with closer connections to the area we are interested in, besides Ivan Iavors'kyi, we can also take into account Ivan Volosians'kyi. Just like Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, he came not from a priest's family but from the townsmen of Staryi Sambir. Born in 1861, Volosians'kyi studied in Sambir during 1873-1881, and after that entered theology in L'viv. While studying in the gymnasium he subscribed to *Druh*, and because of this he got interested in the social question. Spending several years as administrator of Mkhava, Lukova, Velykyi potik and Smol'nyk, in 1889 he got the position of parish priest at Terlo.¹⁸⁴

At the beginning of the 1880s, Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, then still a seminary student, maintained close contacts with the peasantry. While in the 1870s his contacts (back then those of a gymnasium student and peasant son) with the educated peasants (the Svyshch brothers) occur as contacts between equals, who exchange books and share problems; in the 1880s he assumes the role of the educated intelligentsia coming down to the people. His work among the peasants acquires a character of knowledge-production, not only knowledge-transmission. During vacations, as for example in 1880 in Iasinka, where he stayed at a priest's house (that of Rev. Volodyslav Il'nyts'kyi), Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi combined writing down peasant songs and carols with reading to the peasants at the cemetery the popular newspaper *Bat'kivshchyna* and popular books from the *Prosvita* series. Similar meetings with the peasants he had in the

¹⁸³ VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.18.

¹⁸⁴ VR LNB, f. Ivan Levyts'kyi, op.2, spr.581, p.23, 2.

village of Rozbir, the residence of the local priest, the well-known Russophile Rev. Neronovych.¹⁸⁵

When Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was ordained and became a priest, he obtained a perfect position for this kind of work with the peasants. He obtained a position from which he would look at, work with and write about peasants till the end of his life. He realized that the link with his own peasant past was cut off in 1887, when his mother died. He came for her burial and felt deeply estranged from the farm and his own brother, who inherited it. The household did not fit into the images of Zubryts'kyi's memory. After this he did not go back to his village often, and instead of it Mshanets' became the main site of his activities.¹⁸⁶

Many of the priests from Zubryts'kyi's generation in one way or another were impressed by Ivan Franko's circle, and despite the fact that they did not share his radical views, there is no doubt that they shared a certain mode of reflection and action. Those intellectuals, who in the 1870s as gymnasium and university students were searching for a solution to the questions and problems they saw, and were finding it in social sciences, in the 1880s acquired positions and opportunities for at least partial application of these solutions in Galician villages. The foundation of all these solutions was knowledge. Characterizing the mistakes of the conspirators of 1846, Ivan Franko pointed out that

Enthusiasm, pure and sincere feelings alone, are not able to turn the wheel of history into a different, new direction; for this one needs hard, systematic work on the ground, one needs first of all detailed knowledge of this ground and its properties...¹⁸⁷

Just as with Ivan Mykhas, Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi started reporting to newspapers in 1884, and the newspaper was the same as well – Bat'kivshchyna. But besides Bat'kivshchyna, in 1884 he wrote an article for Dilo (the newspaper for the intelligentsia). While Ivan Mykhas' correspondences are written “from within,” and represent the standpoint of the person enlightened, conscious nationally and socially, but nevertheless belonging to the community of the readers of a popular newspaper, to the peasants and not gentlemen, Zubryts'kyi accepts the role of the outside observer, of the village patron, of the investigator, scientist and advisor. His first reports come in a style very traditional for the priest's reports on the villages and villagers.

In his article to Bat'kivshchyna he complains about the market-day in Liutovys'ka, which that year coincided with the Ruthenian Church holiday, *Striten'*. He complains about Ruthenian villagers, who went on that day to

¹⁸⁵ VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.21.

¹⁸⁶ VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.1

¹⁸⁷ Franko, “Zhyttia Ivana Fedorovycha,” 115.

market despite the Church holiday, but at the same time praises his own exemplary village. The peasants from Mshanets' were the only ones from the area not to go; moreover, they would not let peasants from other villages pass through Mshanets' on their way to the marketplace, so these had to circle the village by way of the fields. Although this behavior of the peasants could be explained by Zubryts'kyi's ability to remind the peasants of the ideas about the holiness of sacral time (See his own work about peasant explanations of the 1846 famine.), in this article he explains that Mshanets' in general was a more conscious village. The peasants here had hired a man several years ago to teach several boys and several older men (We know that this was Vasyl' Segyn from Hroziova.). "By now all of them [these boys] read eagerly themselves and other illiterates listen to them."¹⁸⁸ However, there still was a serious problem with Mshanets'. The villagers did not want to give up the tavern and in general did not care about improving their lives – they continued to live in houses without chimneys.¹⁸⁹ As we see, despite the fact that Mshanets' could be seen as one of the more advanced villages (just like Morozovychi), it was not behaving in exactly the same way as national-populist intellectuals wanted.

Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was a keen observer. He noticed that the problem of so-called traditional education and society was not in the absence of social life, political thinking and education, but in the presence of the wrong version of all these factors. There were villages and individuals that chose an education and pursued it. The villagers knew that education was a sure way of making a career, and many communities tried to increase their level of literacy as well. Zubryts'kyi's point was that these communal and individual efforts were not enough; education was a national concern: it had to become total and to encompass all the population, to become a condition and not a matter of choice. This fitted very well into the larger discourse of the national movement, which recognizing that "truly, there are villages where even children while pasturing cattle learn to read from each other and sometimes even to write," wanted this to be a rule and not an exception.¹⁹⁰

The thing that annoyed Rev. Zubryts'kyi in Mshanets' the most was the drinking of vodka. As an ethnographer he noted that vodka served multiple functions: it was a medicine, it was food, and it was a delicacy. Customs required drinking vodka for all celebrations as well. As a patriot concerned with the survival of the nation, he noted that children were drinking as well as old people. As a national activist he noted that there were as many as seven Jews living on the income from the consumption of vodka by peasants. They were

¹⁸⁸ O. I. [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Pys'mo z Staromiskoho povitu", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.9, 52.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ "Od Staroho Mista," *Dilo*, 1887, No.129.

almost the exclusive source of credit; they were those buying land and households. One of these Jews bought from a certain widow her household and land for as little as 25 Gulden.¹⁹¹

Vodka consumption had a harmful influence on social life and politics in the community. The tavern was the center of village life in Mshanets'. Everything was decided there; even community courts took place in the tavern. When the community punished someone with a fine the punished one customarily had to treat others in the tavern (and costs of these treats could be larger than the cost of the fine itself). There were many petty conflicts and quarrels. The Ruthenian population was decreasing. In 1870 there allegedly were 1,214 Ruthenians in the village, and by 1884 there were only 1,000 left (which testifies to how hard the 1870s were in the mountains). Rev. Zubryts'kyi saw the situation in Mshanets' as one that required urgent intervention. But his intervention was motivated by a profound belief in the people/nation (*narod*): "Despite some mistakes our *narod* is capable of everything good, everything human."¹⁹²

But what was considered to be human and good? In line with the tradition of national-populism from the 1860s and 1870s the examples were taken from other "more enlightened nations," and the task of the populists was to "bring our nation up and to equal it with other nations, which became superior from us in everything good that people for centuries have invented for themselves."¹⁹³ According to Zubryts'kyi the lack of visible success in work with the people up to now was the fault partly of the populists and partly of the people, although in the case of the latter "it does not originate from them directly."

People were not guilty; it was the condition in which they lived for centuries. There were many bad things transferred from generation to generation, and they dated back to the times of serfdom.¹⁹⁴ This heritage of serfdom had a dire impact even on the physical features of the population. In these concerns Rev. Zubryts'kyi was not alone. A Russophile popular newspaper said that the population of the Boiko Mountains was the smallest in the whole of Austria because of poor food and heavy drinking.¹⁹⁵

Another important concern which Rev. Zubryts'kyi shares with other educated readers is peasants' wariness of outsiders. It also originates in the long years of serfdom, when the peasants learned to distrust all the gentlemen:

¹⁹¹ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Pys'mo vid Staroho-mista I", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.22, 136.

¹⁹² [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Pys'mo vid Staroho-mista II", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1884, No.24, 148.

¹⁹³ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Pys'mo z Staromiskoho povita", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.9, 51.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ "Iak narody pidupavshii ratuiutsia," *Russkaia Rada*, 1882, No.11.

Now our people do not trust anyone. When a peasant has to do something important he goes to the city and wanders there from one authority to another, asking advice from all his acquaintances [there] and having gathered all the advice, still not trusting anyone, he finally makes a decision harmful to him. He does not trust anyone because no one has been telling him the truth.¹⁹⁶

In the end, just like Ivan Mykhas, Rev. Zubryts'kyi does not blame peasants but calls upon the intelligentsia, which has failed to work with people in a correct way:

Every sincere and wise man must tell himself once and forever: from the whole of my heart, with all my powers I wish to work to raise up our people, to liberate them from the slavery of darkness and economic decline, and to put them on the same level with other nations, who have already advanced far ahead [of us].¹⁹⁷

Despite all these concerns Mshanets' villagers in Zubryts'kyi's reports appear as making steady progress. In 1886, there were additional elections to the District Council, and the Council's secretary, Rudnicki, came to Mshanets' to secure the election of Slokhynia's landlord. But Mshanets' villagers stated: "We shall not elect the gentleman-landlord, let's elect Ivan Pukach, a farmer from Stril'bychi." When during the election the electoral commission on purpose misspelled Pukach's name on the ballots, some among the peasant electors quickly corrected the mistake, and Pukach won. Because of this Mshanets' mayor got into disfavor, and the district administration took revenge on the community for these elections.¹⁹⁸ We see that Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was very successful in his politics. There were no complains about him to the Consistory or state authorities from the peasants. He was happy with his villagers and did not intend to change the parish.

Newspaper articles by Rev. Zubryts'kyi on the electoral struggle emphasize the manipulations of the administration and the peasants' brave stance. It is interesting that in a more confidential account of the 1885 elections Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi acknowledges that the success of these parliamentary elections, when the Ruthenian candidate, Dr. Nykolai Antonevych, got the majority in the Staryi Sambir district (although failing in others), was not so much an achievement of local Ruthenians as of the district captain, a certain Draka, who secretly favored Antonevych. Because of these elections Draka had to leave his position and was angry at the Ruthenian priests-electors, who, perhaps,

¹⁹⁶ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Pys'mo z Staromiskoho povita," *Bar'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.9, 51.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ "Z Staromiskoho povitu," *Dilo*, 1889, No.159.

somehow betrayed his political sympathies.¹⁹⁹ By and large, in the 1880s the poor and mountainous Staryi Sambir district was lucky with its captains. When Draka left in 1887, Antonij Lewicki took this position. This one tried to improve the self-government of the village communities and stopped the practice of hiring Jews as community scribes. In 1887 he made a tour of the district villages persuading villagers to found schools. Although some villagers expressed their doubts in the usefulness of official schooling, pointing to the villages that had had schools for 60 years but did not have a single literate peasant (This repeats word to word the argument Rev. Pavlo Iasenyts'kyi heard from an "enlightened" peasant.), in general they gave in to the captain's arguments. But in 1889 Antoni Lewicki was transferred from Stare Misto.²⁰⁰

When in 1889 the Viceroy wanted to have Count Ludwik Wodzicki elected to the Diet, Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was one of the latter's greatest enemies.²⁰¹ Wodzicki was director of *Landerbank* and spent most of his time in Vienna. Elections in 1889 in the Stare Misto district were characterized by Ruthenian disorganization. Ruthenian priests, scared by the visit of the Viceroy Kazimierz Badeni, were concerned with receiving additions to their salaries or organizing competitions for the renovation of parish buildings, and therefore they were not active. Peasants and townsmen were asking around who was a Ruthenian candidate, but no one could answer them. Rev. Zubryts'kyi in the same matter about Ruthenian electors says: "Because of the lack of time, the Central Committee itself should appoint for us a Ruthenian candidate, some better known patriot, because otherwise in the once not that bad [in elections] Stare Misto district there will be not even one Ruthenian candidate."²⁰²

From Zubryts'kyi's correspondence it becomes obvious that Ruthenians were surprised by the excessive effort of the Polish side to push forward the election of Count Wodzicki. This was explained as an order of Count Badeni. To secure Wodzicki's elections, numerous agitators were sent to the villages. One of them was a postman from Lopushanka, Zadurowicz. He walked through all the villages, entering taverns and conversing with mayors. Zadurowicz said that he visited Wodzicki in Vienna and even brought some gifts from him. Mayors, who would become electors, were supposed to come to Zadurowicz's place in Lopushanka on 1 July to get some money and participate in the banquet. Sometimes he was countered by the peasants. In the village of Bystre, when Zadurowicz was talking about his love for *khodak* (peasant footwear as opposed to gentlemen's boots) the peasant Hryts' Dubei asked: "Mister, do you always

¹⁹⁹ VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.28.

²⁰⁰ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], *Dilo*, 1889, No.116.

²⁰¹ VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.28.

²⁰² [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Z Staromiskoho povitu pyshut' nam," *Dilo*, 1889, No.118.

love this *kbodak* or only before the election?” Jews, foresters and other agents of administration and landlords developed unheard of agitation – in Holovets’ko they even dared to approach a Ruthenian priest asking him to vote for the Count:

All this work caused great indignation among people, and every community orders its mayor to vote only for the Ruthenian candidate, and if not – he’d better not return to the village. There never was such a pressure on people in pre-elections in our district, [earlier] the whole action of our enemies was limited to the elections proper. Now, when our people have seen such a strong pressure from all the sides, they are thinking: “What does it matter so much to these gentlemen that they are ready to break their necks [agitating for] the count,” and are worried. If only Ruthenians could run in Stare Misto a candidate well known here, and he confessed to the electors his political creed, he would lead the people and easily defeat the opponent.²⁰³

Nonetheless, not everything went as good as Rev. Zubryts’kyi expected at the beginning of the electoral agitation. Mayors of Halivka, Hroziova, Vytsiova, Holovets’ko, Mshanets, Ploske and other villages, concerned with alleviating their communities from the new burden former captain Antonij Lewicki imposed on them in the form of public schools, were looking for ways to stop that project. The manager of the Spas state estate, a certain Ziglar, a person of Czech origin serving as agitator for Count Wodzicki, promised to help them with this, if only they did not elect the priests as electors. Another of Wodzicki’s proxies for these elections was a certain Jędrzejowicz, whose son in law Gennert was fulfilling duties of the district captain in Stare Misto.²⁰⁴

Finally, the Central Ruthenian Committee did not appoint anyone for the Stare Misto district, and the Ruthenian candidate became Lev Fedorovych, a townsman (shoemaker) from Staryi Sambir. He lost elections to Count Wodzicki with 14 votes against 82. The elections took place in the building of the district captaincy. “There were only a few electors in the church [in the morning], and from this everyone understood that the elections were lost.” Jewish and non-Jewish agitators terrorized peasants. Elector Husak from Tykha had his ID snatched off his hands, and when he complained about it, he was hit by a gendarme with a rifle. Elector Vasyly Gulych from Vytsiova was arrested. When elector Muzychak from Holovets’ko had cast his ballot for Fedorovych he was severely beaten with feet and sticks. Even Rev. Vitoshyns’kyi from Bolozva was abused.

²⁰³ [Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi], “Z Staromiskoho pyshut’ nam,” *Dilo*, 1889, No.128 and 129.

²⁰⁴ [Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi], “Z Staromiskoho povitu pyshut’ nam,” *Dilo*, 1889, No.116.

These elections can help us to reconstruct the geography of strong Ruthenian sympathies in the Stare Misto. There were communities, from which the electors came, who “proved that at least 20 votes in Stare Misto could not be bought for any price and it was impossible to abase everyone and turn them into cattle.”²⁰⁵ Besides the above-mentioned, the electors voting for a Ruthenian were: Revs. Skorodyns’kyi from Sushytsia Velyka, Hamers’kyi from Holovets’ko, Iatsiv (a former friend of Ivan Mykhas) from Linyinka, Iavors’kyi from Sushytsia rykova, Stukach from Halivka, and peasants mayor Hryts’ Hrytsak and Hryts’ Hrytsuna from Mshanets’, Andrii Lopushans’kyi from Ploske, peasants from Lavriv, Holovets’ko, Sozan’ and one more unknown. Just as in the 1870s the block of villages around Lavriv was still visible, now these villages got also a person connecting them with the national movement – Rev. Zubryts’kyi. Among others we see villages with Ruthenian patriot-priests and Sozan’, a village close to Staryi Sambir and part of the agglomeration of villages between Staryi Sambir and Sambir. Zadurewicz offered Hrytsuna and Hrytsak 80 Gulden each for a vote, and someone else offered Hrytsuna 105 Gulden. The whole election was reported to have cost Wodzicki about 12,000 Gulden. After the election, a celebration with music was organized in Spas in spite of Lent. There were many peasants from Hroziowa at this celebration, including mayor Andrii Stetskevych and cantor-scribe Iatsko Matsishak. Rev. Zubryts’kyi, just like Ivan Mykhas, blames the Ruthenian intelligentsia, disorganized and indifferent, for the failure of these elections.²⁰⁶

It seems that on the one hand the movement was trying to use general peasant resentment towards the Parliament and Diet as institutions producing only burdening legislations.²⁰⁷ On the other hand, electoral passivity accompanying this attitude had to be overcome. It had to be shown that the problem was not with the parliamentary system as such, but with the forces that came to dominate it using peasants’ ignorance. The parliament and Diet provided a valuable opportunity for the Ruthenian movement to speak out, and there was a strong chance that with further democratization of the electoral system they would get more power. Of all the institutions of self-government the Ruthenian movement was most critical of district Councils. While the community level still could be taken over to the Ukrainian movement, on the district level there were almost no chances. District self-government was dependent on the local landlords, too intertwined with the administrative hierarchy, and it cooperated closely with the district captaincy. Moreover, unlike the Diet and parliament, the district council had better means to influence politics on the community level.

²⁰⁵ [Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi], “Vybir posla v Starim misti,” *Dilo*, 1889, No.143.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁷ Świętek, *Brzozowa i okolica*, cz.VI, 135.

In line with the position of the national movement in these matters, Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi also called for abolition of district councils.²⁰⁸

In 1886 Rev. Zubryts'kyi reestablished personal contact with Ivan Franko, which seems to have been broken after their gymnasium years, and describes the case of Zakharko Koval'chak, son of a farmer from Iasenytsia who finished the third grade of the Drohobych gymnasium but had to leave because of the poverty of his father. Rev. Zubryts'kyi asks Franko to place the youngster in the "People's Trade" in L'viv.²⁰⁹ Thus Rev. Zubryts'kyi joins the ranks of those Ruthenian patriots, who tried to help peasant sons in obtaining an education and making a career. His patronage of the Mshanets' community also fits in with the tradition of paternalist patriotic priests. But besides these concrete instances of mediation between specific peasants and specific intellectuals, Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi started contributing to newspapers with what would become known as one of the finest ethnographic discourses of Ukrainian anthropology. In this his acquaintance with Ivan Franko was very helpful. Later, Zubryts'kyi contributed to both Etnohrafichnyi zbirnyk and Materialy do Ukraïns'ko-Rus'koi etnolohii, two of the most serious Ukrainian anthropologic serials at the beginning of the twentieth century. However, it is important not to forget that these contributions were a continuation and development of the discourse he started on the pages of Ukrainian newspapers back in the 1880s.

His first ethnographic article starts with a description of the peasants' winter pastime. He depicts long winter evenings when people usually sit at home, girls spin and to entertain themselves tell various tales and sing a mixture of religious and folk songs. Evenings pass merrily, the accomplished work grows and everyone is happy. But in this idyllic pastime he notices some "false notes" that cause his indignation. These false notes are Polish couplets sung by peasants. Rev. Zubryts'kyi reassures his readers, saying that these false songs will not become part of the folk culture and that they will leave.²¹⁰ This article of Zubryts'kyi's is a good example of normative statements one can find in the ethnographic research of that time about what is natural and good, what is part of the "true" folk culture and what is false, foreign, and strange. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi assumed the authority to decide about false and true notes in folk culture. These truth claims are based on his knowledge not of peasant life but of the canon of Ukrainian ethnography and of the national project itself. This construction of the repertoire of folk culture was supposed to shape not only scholars' and outsiders' ideas about the Ukrainian nation but also lived peasant culture.

²⁰⁸ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Z Staromiskoho povitu," Dilo, 1890, No.150.

²⁰⁹ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1608, s.53.

²¹⁰ "Z Staromiskoho povita," Dilo, 1887, No.17, 18.

Besides engaging in codification of Ukrainian folk culture (the work actually started by the Romantic ethnographers of the 1830s), Rev. Zubryts'kyi tries to describe and explain more mundane peasant behavior and attitudes, something one can rarely find in the previous studies of Ukrainian ethnography. Rev. Zubryts'kyi notices the difference in peasant attitude towards Jews between cameral (state) and private village. In the former state village peasants were not taking off their headgear in the tavern and were using abusive words when approaching Jews, while peasants from former manorial villages were kissing Jew's hands and took a humble pose when buying something from a Jew. Manorial peasants continued to rely on Jews or, in Rev. Zubryts'kyi's word, were "great friends with the Jew."²¹¹ People from cameral villages were said to be more interested in news and innovations than people from manorial estates.²¹² Just like in all the explanations of things the national movement did not like about the peasants, these characteristics of the manorial villages were explained by the centuries of serfdom, which was a synonym for the worst oppression and slavery.

Just like Ivan Mykhas, Rev. Zubryts'kyi pays attention to the economic conditions and economic strategies of peasants. He expresses an understanding of peasant wariness of change and resistance to innovations, and he explains to educated people peasants' "conservatism" and "traditionalism" as quite rational. On the other hand, he explains to the peasants that "without getting together, without the establishment of enlightenment societies in all the corners of our land we shall not accomplish anything."²¹³

Besides that, from the very beginning Rev. Zubryts'kyi's detailed descriptions of peasants' life shows that peasants in the mountains were not stagnant, immobile and narrow. The so-called traditional economic life had a dynamic of its own:

There are quite well-doing people in the mountainous parts of the district, a certain portion of farmers has saved money. There are people in several villages who go with sheep along the *Beskyd* (a mountainous range) as far as Bukovyna, the same with oxen. Some farmers keep sheep in summer and in autumn they sell sheep in Liutovyska, Dobromyl', Horodok, Peremyshl', Iavoriv, Velyki Ochi and others. Oxen usually are almost at once resold at the closest market or marketplace [(*torb* or *iarmarok*)]. Many trade pigs, following the example of Staryi Sambir townsmen, the most advanced in this trade are villagers from the village of Bystre.²¹⁴

²¹¹ "Pys'mo z Staromiskoho," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1887, No.9.

²¹² *Ibid.*

²¹³ *Ibid.*

²¹⁴ "Od Staroho Mista," *Dilo*, 1887, No.129.

Similarly in his autobiography, he was also stressing the ambivalence of all the attempts to define peasants' economic condition. In Mshanets', he says, "people are not too poor but at the same time, not wealthy. Poverty is relative, people are satisfied with little, and somehow carry on heavy burdens, they even have some prospects about the future." Despite the fact that the soil was rarely producing good harvests, people managed to find other sources of income.²¹⁵

Zubryts'kyi was the founder of the tradition in Ukrainian ethnography emphasizing peasant trade, mobility, sheep routes and trade connections with the cities; a tradition that has been quite often connected with the *Boiko* region, to which Stryi Sambir and Turka districts belonged.²¹⁶ Rev. Zubryts'kyi himself even later in his career continued to investigate themes uncommon for the traditional national ethnography, such as tobacco smuggling, which was bringing relatively high profits (100% on the invested money) to the peasants of this region and which played an important role for relationships inside the peasant communities and between peasants and state officials.²¹⁷

On one hand, Rev. Zubryts'kyi contrasted with many other young radical ethnographers entering scholarship in the 1880s. The latter, like Ivan Franko himself, tried to see their ethnographic observations as a way to critique rural conditions and contemporary politics. According to that they paid attention to the effects of the agricultural crisis and lamented downward economic developments and peasant inability to survive in these conditions.²¹⁸ On the other hand, Zubryts'kyi's contributions resonate well with Mykhas' articles on the villages not only adapting to the new conditions but bringing into these new conditions a tradition of enterprise and mobility, using new conditions as an opportunity. Rev. Zubryts'kyi was an exception in his ability to combine academic scholarship with residing in the village and taking care of the local community. On the other hand, most Ukrainian intellectuals had close connections with the villages, while many priests, although not succeeding as much as Rev. Zubryts'kyi, tried to contribute to scholarship and facilitated ethnographic and historical research in their localities.

²¹⁵ VR LNB, f. Vasyl' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.22.

²¹⁶ See, for example, Iaroslav Bilyns'kyi, "Vivchars'ki shliakhy Pivnichno-zakhidnoi Boikivshchyny," *Litopys Boikivshchyny*, No.10, 1938, 45-49. In general boiko patriots of the interwar period left some very "unorthodox" for the mainstream Ukrainian ethnography works. Observation on the „customary law” published in the interwar period show complete integration into market economy, incredibly developed structures of money circulation and property alienation. See Dr. Ivan Maksymuk, "Deiaki instytutsii zvychaievoho prava v Starosambirshchyni," *Litopys Boikivshchyny*, No.11, 1939, 5-69.

²¹⁷ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Pachkarstvo bakunu (tiutiunu) v horakh u Halychyni v XIX st.," *Naukovyi Zbirnyk prysviachenyi profesorovy Hrushevs'komu uchenykamy i prykhyl'nykamy z nahody Ioho desiatylitnoi naukovoï pratsi v Halychyni (1894-1904)* (L'viv, 1906), 409-431.

²¹⁸ As an example see Franko, "[Stanovyshe selian sela Nahuievychiv]," 80.

Another characteristic feature of Zubryts'kyi's reports and descriptions is an emphasis on the connections between peasant everyday life and the distribution of power and local politics and administrative practices. Publications about this in Ukrainian newspapers served the purposes of mobilization against the injustices committed by national and class foes. For example, in 1889 he reports on the lack of salt in such distant mountainous villages as Bystre, Ralivka, Hroziova, Mshanets' and Ploske. Earlier, the peasants were getting salt in the market towns of Liutoyska and Ustriky, but now they had to go to a Jew from the village of Topil'nytsia. Earlier that Jew was traveling around the villages and selling salt, but now local Jews did not want him to decrease their profits. And this was in the region where salt was the only way to diversify food, besides being vitally important for health: when the father was absent looking for salt children would say with bitter amusement: "went to look for the fat to grease (*pišbly bliadaty masnosty do tlystosty*)."²¹⁹ It was easy to exchange salt for eggs, because local Jews resold them in Przemyśl. Besides these competitive tricks to raise profits on salt, local Jews were also using illegal methods, such as, for example, scraping standard pieces of salt with state stamps so they became, in fact, much smaller.²¹⁹

While entrepreneurship among peasants was encouraged and praised by Rev. Zubryts'kyi and other Ukrainian activists, the same thing among Jews was shown as exploitation and indecency. The Jews were buying cloth in the towns and reselling them in the villages, so-called *maliovanky* and *dymky* worn by women. Buying for around 40 Kreuzer they resold this cloth for two Gulden and had around 216 Gulden from one village yearly. Moreover, the Jews bought cattle in the villages, cows at a price of three Gulden and colts at 30-50 Kreuzer, a maximum one Gulden price only to bring them to a slaughterhouse near Liutovyska, where Gypsies killed the cattle and Jews made a profit on their skin and bones. Before they slaughtered the cattle it suffered a lot, staying for days without any food and waiting for its turn to be killed.²²⁰

Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was obviously playing with the sentiments of peasants to their horses and cows, and he was trying to juxtapose the healthy peasant world with the immoral and indecent world of the Jews. But again, this was not an opposition between good old peasant world and bad modern and capitalist. Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi tried to mobilize the peasants, to make the bounded national culture he was constructing both dynamic and attractive.

Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi made from Mshanets' the site of research incredibly important for our contemporary ideas about Ukrainian traditional culture. And this was despite the fact that the *Boiky*, the ethnographic group residing in the region, was traditionally considered to be the most spoiled by civilization

²¹⁹ "Z Staromiskoho povitu," *Dilo*, 1889, No.268.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*

among the mountaineers of East Galicia.²²¹ Thanks to Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi Ukrainian museums and folklore collections got an incredible amount of proverbs, tales, icons, manuscripts and etc. Ethnographers' findings confirmed their assumptions. There was a Ukrainian nation, whose people's language, customs and traditions were defining its boundaries. Indeed, even in the mountainous Mshanets', people were singing Christmas carols mentioning Kyiv and the church of St. Sophia.²²²

As late as 1934 the Polish researcher Falkowski, conducting his field research among the Boiky and Lemky, observed that "the population is marked by great suspicions and distrust and without the help of someone living there permanently it is impossible to get anything."²²³ Even in the interwar period the priest in the mountains remained the only person able to affect people who did not trust any outsiders, and that is why Falkowski thanked 12 Greek Catholic priests who made his research possible. At the end of the nineteenth century the role of the priest was even greater. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was the person who made investigation by other ethnographers in this region possible as early as the 1890s.²²⁴

In The Tenets of Racial Discourse

As I have mentioned at the beginning of this part, the generation whose voice we hear in the popular newspapers brought with itself a new discourse, a discourse characterized by a particular emphasis on the social. This discourse appeared in the context created by the Ukrainian national orientation, and the difference between the discourses of Russophiles and Ukrainians, discussed in the previous part of this thesis, in the 1880s was not only maintained but growing. The discussion of land problem provides a good test case for the comparison between Russophiles and Ukrainians.

If we had to select one single obsession most characteristic of the Russophile popular discourse in the 1880s, it would be land. There were several reasons behind such an obsession. On one hand, there were certain economic developments, most notably the agrarian crisis of the 1870s, on the other hand – there was the appearance of the notion of *nationalbesitzung*, or *stan posidannia*.

²²¹ Franciszek Antoni Oscendowski, *Karpaty i Podkarpacie* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Polskie), 145-46.

²²² Franko to Drahomanov, in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.48 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 574-5.

²²³ Jan Falkowski and B. Pasznyi, *Na pograniczu Lemkowsko-Bojkowskiem* (Lwów, 1935), 7.

²²⁴ See, for example, Zubryts'kyi's correspondence with Volodymyr Hnatiuk – TsDIAuL, f.309, op.1, spr.2271, a.16-36.

Russophiles lamented the fact that Ruthenian peasants were selling land to the “foreigners.”

On one hand we see an awareness of the fact that the nationality of the owners defines the national attribution of space:

Wise nations and their diligent governments strengthen all their forces, sacrifice their wealth and blood, their own people, only to get a piece of land for their nation ... In our land people also buy land, but mostly foreigners [Jews and Polish peasants].²²⁵

This Russophile newspaper calls upon peasants to value land and to care that their co-nationals buy land. However, the real situation was different from the ideal imagined by the Russophiles; the nation was losing its land. In line with the discourse of the paternalist patriots of the 1860s-1870s, the newspaper blames peasants for such a situation. Peasants did not have enough resources at their disposition, but even more important was their attitude:

Our peasant, inheriting even only several strips of land, considers himself a proprietor, a farmer, and thinks that even without hard labor, endeavor and diligence the land will provide for him and his family. Through this strange reasoning we got many farmers and farms, who properly speaking cannot be called farmers: they lack conditions which define a farmer and a farm. They do not have adequate landholding or necessary equipment, they are neither entrepreneurs nor artisans, in fact, they are nothing, and it turns out that because of these several strips of land, they cannot dedicate themselves to some special earning or craft, nor become a hired worker, nor even go tramping.²²⁶

We see in this text the classical image of a pauperizing peasantry, a peasantry stuck in the outlived world of the traditional community, a society immobile and destining itself for disappearance. There is not even a hint at the positive things mentioned by both Mykhas and Zubryts'kyi in their correspondences.

Developing this argument to its logical consequence would mean rejecting any reason for this kind of peasantry to survive further on. The author of the article does not go that far but instead calculates how much land a peasant family needs to remain real farmers. These calculations produce the result of eight Joch. Having calculated this, the author looks for the means to secure that much land. He looks once more for the cause of the decline in the size of the average household and finds it in the law from 1869 about the divisibility of peasant land. The article ends with the call: “Beloved farmers, honor your own

²²⁵ “Zemlia maty nasha,” *Russkaia Rada*, 1885, No.5.

²²⁶ V., “Podil'nost' selians'kykh hruntov,” *Russkaia Rada*, 1881, No.22-23.

land and guard it as your own eye.”²²⁷ Thus the discourse makes a complete circle. It seems that Russophiles forgot that the law of 1869 was a realization of their wishes to establish proper property relationships in the countryside and to remove the remains of the feudal restrictions on peasant landholding. We remember that peasant deputies in the Diet protested against the restrictions on the divisibility of peasant land as well.

There were some attempts on behalf of the Russophiles to find a savior in the peasant community which would be more effective and wise in managing the only national wealth Ruthenians had, land in the possession of their peasants. But these attempts never went as far as arguing for some kind of community farm. The newspaper encouraged peasant communities to buy manorial estates and parcel them among themselves.²²⁸ There were communities buying landlords’ estates, and the Russophile popular newspaper, Ruskaia Rada, tried to take up the role of their patron and mediator informing other communities on their successes, albeit unsuccessful. Rumors started that the communities were unable to use the bought land effectively.²²⁹ The Russophile newspaper itself had to acknowledge that in many cases, communities simply sold the forests they got as communal property and suffered the consequences.²³⁰

The troubled nation’s future was pushing Russophiles towards a more conservative solution. And this reflected their more general political and ideological make-up. They were crying: “the landless people die out” and pointed to the example of Ireland.²³¹ Ireland was used as an image of a scary future not only for the peasants but also for the government. If the policies of the latter did not change, it would have to deal with peasant movements like those in Ireland. And that future was very close: “landlessness is already prepared among us.”²³²

But the Russophiles continued to blame peasants themselves as those contributing to this situation:

Of all people the worst do our rich of whom in every village and every deanery we can find several, or at least one. They sit on their [valuable] papers and *karbovantsi* [silver coins] instead of buying land and becoming people of some importance.²³³

²²⁷ V., “Podil'nost' selians'kykh hruntov,” Ruskaia Rada, 1881, No.22-23.

²²⁸ Mishchany, “Iz Nyzhankovych,” Ruskaia Rada, 1887, No.16.

²²⁹ “Iz Sambora,” Ruskaia Rada, 1880, No.14.

²³⁰ “O nyscheniu lisiv,” Ruskaia Rada, 1883, No.20.

²³¹ Ruskaia Rada, 1882, No.8.

²³² Ruskaia Rada, 1888, No.13.

²³³ “O gazdovaniu ruskykh liudei,” Ruskaia Rada, 1883, No.20.

The Russophiles realized dangers present in the “Enlightenment package” originally presented for the peasants by the Kachkovskii Society. They noticed the disappearance of commons as the result of peasants’ turning forests, pastures, bushes and swamps into arable land and meadows: “Earlier no one cared about the holy land, and now we have a boundary [of the field] near the boundary, people press together, and cannot live well with each other.”²³⁴ The specter of agrarian overpopulation was immanent, and the movement did not know what to do about it. The spirit of enterprise invoked by the movement among peasants led to the abuse of land and further divisions of landholdings.

But it was not so easy to get rid of the ideas from the heritage of the 1860s: it was not the discourse of the movement, but peasants themselves, or their ignorance, to be blamed: “when people found out that they were free to sell land, they went themselves to whomever had some money and asked to buy their land, and the price was so low that now it looks like a joke.”²³⁵ Salvation was to come in the form of proper property once more. But this time the proper property was one of a guaranteed size; it had to remain sufficient for prosperous farming, and thus the freedom to alienate it had to be restricted. Russophiles came dangerously close to the attitudes of the conservative landlords, such as the ill famed Diet deputy Hupka, with their idea of peasant *majorats* and of creation of an estate of strong farmers.²³⁶

And at this moment for the first time the economic teaching of the movement was openly opposed by the peasants who had been co-opted into it. This is especially visible in the discussions taking place within the Kachkovskii Society’s branches. At the meeting of the Ustryky (the Zalishchyky district) branch of the Kachkovskii Society, a memorial to the Diet was proposed which argued for the introduction of the indivisibility of peasant landholdings. Then

A farmer and the mayor of the community of Balyntsi, Lavrentii Hrabovets'kyi, had spoken against it, proving that the division of landholdings does not harm peasants and if this divisibility was to be abolished, then great hatred and court suits would appear within families and communities, causing murders, robberies, arsons and other crimes.

In this Hrabovets'kyi received support from one more farmer from the village of Trofanivka, and perhaps just like in the Sambir branch there were not more

²³⁴ “Pys'mo z dorohy,” *Russkaia Rada*, 1887, No.16.

²³⁵ “Tak nam umnozhyty zemliu?,” *Russkaia Rada*, 1880, No.2.

²³⁶ Hupka was the first one to propose restrictions on the size of peasant farms and their inheritance, which had to be connected with the larger reform of communities’, estates’ and districts’ self-government.

than two to three peasants present at the Ustryky branch's sessions. Because of this peasant opposition the memorial was rejected. The editors of Ruskaia Rada were obviously disappointed with such an attitude: "We shall ask here only one question: is this better when the community consists of 100 rich farmers or when the community consists of 300 exclusively beggar-cottagers."²³⁷

The emancipation of peasant landholdings went hand in hand with the emancipation of Jews, who got the right to acquire land. This led to the appearance of the first Jewish landlords in the 1870s. In the Sambir circle the first Jews to buy estates were well-known usurers Judah Bachmann, Leo Zelcer, and David Kreinzberg. These estates were bought in Kaiserdorf, Mistkovychi, Pyniany, Silets', Vaniovychi and Zarsko.²³⁸ The appearance and consolidation of Jewish real estates could be represented as correlated with the scattering and decreasing of peasant farmsteads and used to fuel anti-Semitism. However, it seems that in the case of the Russophiles the transition to a new kind of anti-Semitism was never fully accomplished. The Jewish tavern-keeper and usurer as exploiter and corrupter of the peasants had appeared in the context of the late 1860s and 1870s, and this image in Russophile publications did not undergo serious changes in the 1880s.

The Russophiles never explicitly elaborated or discursively shaped the transition from the "personal motherland" to the "ideological motherland," the peasants were supposed to make.²³⁹ The precariousness of their political position made it impossible to state that the Russian Empire was their "greater motherland." But this precariousness was part of their larger problematic relationships with modernity. Just as the Russian Empire had problems with becoming a modern nation-state, Galician Russophiles had problems with becoming a national, potentially hegemonic project. Contrary to this the discourse of national-populists, instead of blaming peasants for not being good keepers of the nation's main asset, used the problems of land for ideological purposes, for peasant mobilization and the creation of an appealing imagery.

The very title of the most successful popular newspaper, Bat'kivshchyna, was emphasizing a transition from ancestral landholding to the larger ideological motherland, having a double meaning of "patrimony" and "motherland."²⁴⁰ The opening article of Bat'kivshchyna was "To work!" (*Do dila*). It started with mentioning how many years had elapsed since the abolition of serfdom and the

²³⁷ "O zahal'nom Sobranniiu chleniv Obshestva Mykhaila Kachkovskoho v Kolomyi," Ruskaia Rada, 1887, No.17.

²³⁸ VR IL, f.3, spr.675, a.3.

²³⁹ The importance of the notion of the motherland and the idea about transition from local to ideological motherland was elaborated by Stanisław Ossowski, see Volodymyr Mendzets'kyi (Włodzimierz Mędrzecki), "Seliany u natsiotvorchykh protsesakh," Ukraina Moderna, ch.6 (L'viv, 2001), 62-65.

²⁴⁰ Himka, Galician Villagers, 69.

introduction of the constitution (respectively thirty and nineteen). Despite this the Ruthenian people continued to live on their own land as slaves, in poverty. As one of the reasons for this the newspaper provides the nation's inability "to walk independently." Poor people were made use of in the negotiations around the servitudes' struggle and deprived of forests and pastures. The land had been partitioned and sold out.

As we see, the description of the cataclysm is not different from that of the Russophiles. At this point, however, the problems become explained in terms of a total national war, in which one's survival is dependent on the survival of the whole nation:

The whole Ruthenian nation, simple as well as educated, is waging right now a great war, a war more fierce than one time with the Tartars, heavier and scarier than any war in the past. Because if in the war we are conducting right now, our enemies will win, it will not end just with taking from us some our wealth, and not even with occupying us and becoming our masters while we would become their subjects; they will break away from us everything we have, our whole motherland, our land, our cattle, our cloth, our faith and our language – and then we shall die out totally! [underlined in the original]

This signals the arrival of a different discourse. While Russophiles believed in the possibility of cultural autonomy in the liberal multinational state and did not have problems with living in a world in which political boundaries did not coincide with national ones, Ukrainians stated that nations were mechanisms of survival claiming power over its members for the sake of members' survival.²⁴¹ This kind of image, depicting an apocalyptic war between nations, did not disappear from *Bat'kivshchyna* during the 1880s. The summary of the year 1880 that appeared in this newspaper stated that nothing improved in the Ruthenian situation, "but only our enemies had grown up in power and wealth."²⁴²

The difference between the discourse of the Russophiles and Ukrainians cannot be diminished to simple oppositions like rational versus irrational, scientific against religious, modern against traditional. Better handling the culture of "modernity," Ukrainians were not simply rationalizing peasants' problems; the Ukrainian discourse had powerful ghosts of its own, its own

²⁴¹ "Ruskii nariid tsilyi – i prostyi i pys'mennyi – vede teper velyku viinu, lutiishu iak kohys' z Tataramy, tizhcbu i strashniishu, nizh koly nebud' iaka viina bula. Bo v tii viini, shcho my iei teper vedemo, iak vorohy nashi voz'mut verkeh, to ne skonchytisia na tim, shcho nam vidberut trokha nashoho dobra, ani navit' na tim, shcho nas zavoimint' i stanut' nashymy panamy a my ikh piddanymy; ale ony nam vyderut' vsio, shcho maiemo, tsilu nashu bat'kivshchynnu, nashu zemliu, nashu khudobu, nashu odezhu, nashu viru i nashu movu – i my musymo todi tsilkom zabybaty!" Vid redaktsii Bat'kivshchyny, "Do dila!", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1879, No.1.

²⁴² "Rik 1880", *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1881, No.1.

enchantment, but this enchantment had nothing to do with the supernatural, traditional or peasant. Conservative, religious and at the same time very liberal Russophiles, despite all their rhetoric about land, developed a very pragmatic discourse trying to solve the problem with the help of legislation and persuasions. Meanwhile Ukrainians were purposefully confusing different meanings of land and motherland, making allusions and invoking powerful symbols of war, survival and fear.

This magic of words and symbols was not limited to the privileged place of editorials; it penetrated representations of everyday matters. An article on the everyday life of French peasants gave an example of the peasant, who, while his wife goes to the vespers, “goes to see his milady... You would ask which?... His land...” It is said that land in France belongs to 20,000,000 peasants who work on it (Galicia serves as an unnamed antipode of this situation.),

For a French she [the land] is first of all *la patrie* (motherland), and stands together with the name: *la France*. Among them a man holds to the land and does not leave it, as if a Frenchman married this land for the whole of his life till the very end.

Then, there is a defense of peasants against accusations of materialism: it is in fact gentlemen, who think about peasants this way, who are materialists while for a peasant

land has boundless value, because he, with his spiritual and poetic look, discerns that beneath this ugly and debased land liberty shines to him like gold.

And this poetic approach, this spiritual dimension, this magic of the land, which if named becomes thousands of times more powerful, is no contradiction to modernity; on the contrary – this is a part of it:

Through the advance of the whole peasant estate France came to such respect and power, that even now, despite its military misfortunes, it will rise soon, and both its friends and its enemies are looking for it with a mixture of hope and reserve.²⁴³

In 1887 the national-populists published the first geography of Rus'. The first volume of this book was dedicated to Galicia, Bukovyna and Hungarian Rus'. The book provided national statistics, for the first time indicating numbers of those whose native language was Ruthenian. The book included information on the Sambir and Stare Misto districts as well: the Sambir district, 923 sq. km.

²⁴³ L. M. Kovshevych, “Pro pobyt muzhykiv u Frantsii,” *Pravda*, 1878, pp.201-209.

large, with the population of 79,216, of them 48,275 Greek Catholics, and 45,601 native speakers of Ruthenian. Numbers for the Stare Misto district were: 727 sq. km., a population of 44,958, of whom 35,796 were Greek Catholics, and 38,874 – native speakers of Ruthenian.²⁴⁴ The book mentioned that “the first and the oldest population of Galicia, Bukovyna, and Hungarian Rus’ is Ruthenian.”²⁴⁵

It is interesting that this first national geography was published in the series of *Prosvita* popular books. There were also data on literacy in the book. According to the 1880 census 417,658 men and 257,920 women could read and write; 204,692 men and 243,354 women could only read while 2,312,245 men and 2,523,038 women were totally illiterate.²⁴⁶ The Ukrainian geography textbook paid a lot of attention to the development of the reading clubs. The first of them appeared around 1870 in Denysiv and Kupchyntsi, and by 1887 there were supposed to be more than 600 (the data obviously taken from Pavlyk’s book).²⁴⁷ Thus reading clubs, as well as tiny villages that had them, were mentioned as important landmarks in the imagined national space, the space in which to see which one had to become literate.

When Rev. Kachala died in 1888, he left 8,000 Gulden for *Prosvita*, on conditions that interest from this fund would go for publishing popular books, honorariums for their authors and especially for the publication of the Map of Ukraine-Rus’.²⁴⁸ In fact, such a map was published in 1889.²⁴⁹ This became the basis for an 1896 publication, when the first ethnographic map of Ukraine was sold and distributed, showing Ukrainian territory combining lands in both Austria and Russia, with additions showing Ukrainian settlements in Siberia, the Far East, and Southern Hungary.²⁵⁰ The map was printed in 2,000 copies and was the first “scientific” map of Ukraine.

“Scientific” in this case meant a proper naming of the territory with about 18 colors showing various nationalities inhabiting the land of Ukraine-Rus’. The main task of this map was to publicize the imagined Ukraine-Rus’. As some would argue that from anonymous space, through naming, Ukraine’s place was

²⁴⁴ Roman Zaklyns’kyi, *Heohrafiia Rusy. ch.1. Rus’ halytska, bukovynska i uhorska. Z kartoiu Halychyny, Bukovyny i uhorskoi Rusy*, (Vydannia “Prosvity,” kn.98) (L’viv, 1887), 103.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 109.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 113.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 116.

²⁴⁸ Ivan Belei, *Dvadtsiat’ i piat’ lit istorii tovarystva “Prosvity.”* 60.

²⁴⁹ *Vydannia „Prosvity” Halychyny: knyhy ta arkusheva produktsiia (1868-1938). Bibliografichnyi pokazhchyk* (Kyiv: Abrys, 1996), 54.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 75.

constructed.²⁵¹ Ukrainian territory was separated by color from the territories of other nations, territories, demarcated not by political boundaries, but by the nationality of the majority of inhabitants.

In the 1880s Ukrainian social statistics were still in the making. The first data published there was simply reproduced with translations from official publications; because of that, the order of the districts in the table was arranged according to the Latin alphabet and not according to the Cyrillic. According to these statistics the population of the town of Sambir was made up of 4.49% Ruthenians and that of Stryi Sambir 41.61%. Villages of the Sambir district had 68.4% Ukrainians and the Stryi Sambir had the highest percentage of ethnically Ukrainian population (95.6%) followed by the Turka district (94.06%). Only then the more southern mountainous districts of Kosiv, Nadvirna and Bohorodchany followed.²⁵² Having become armed with these statistics Ruthenian patriots from the region started to analyze and plan their actions accordingly.

As I have already argued, not only the nation's space but the nation's past in the 1880s acquired a different shape. It was shaped by the Ukrainian discourse and characterized by the increasing emphasis on the social. But the nation's history in the 1880s acquired not only its past but also its future trajectories. This future was a future shared with the rest of the world; it was about progress,

It is about domesticating and spreading around the globe this wonderful flower "progress," which up to now lived somewhat wildly, once here and once there, run from one land to another, leaving behind deserts; and even if not, perhaps, evenly, still to the extent that no one in the world will be excluded from its benevolences.²⁵³

But people had to work hard for progress. For those who will wait for its coming, progress will appear not as a benefactor but as a fire burning them and razing from the face of the Earth. "Dying out, disappearance of non-progressive people goes now 100 times faster than it went earlier."²⁵⁴ This was an alternative to the national project. The proper course of history required action; the nation had to become an agent and not an object of history.

²⁵¹ Erica Carter, James Donald, Judith Squires, "Introduction" in Erica Carter, James Donald, Judith Squires (eds.), *Space and Place. Theories of Identity and Location* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1993), xii-xiv.

²⁵² *Kalendar' Prosvity na rik perestupnyi 1890* (L'viv, 1889), 81.

²⁵³ Ivan Franko, "Shcho take postup?," in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.45 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 313.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

In 1883 Franko writes:

Power lies not in knowledge but in action, and the basis for action is not consciousness alone, but organization. This is the time for us to realize that our power lies now not in Vienna, not in the Diet, but in the villages and towns, in those thousands of our villages and towns, in those millions of our peasants and townsmen, in whom, as of now, only the printed word awakens national feeling, but in which adequate organization can awaken energy and give birth to n a t i o n a l a c t i o n .²⁵⁵

In the 1880s the political hegemony of the Polish nobility in the province became an indisputable fact, and this nobility's influence in the Empire in general was growing. The educational system worked to the disadvantage of Ruthenians, and there was no workable way to change it. Even in the primary schools, the majority of which was Ruthenian, Polish dominated. In 1885 there were 8270 pupils in the elementary schools of the Sambir school district with Polish language of instruction, while in those with Ruthenian – 5751.²⁵⁶ These numbers reflect the fact that the web of primary schools was growing much faster in the towns and cities, where these schools were also much bigger, better funded and better staffed than in the countryside.

And the educational system was actually the only one among powerful institutions provided by the state through which Ukrainians could try to nationalize their peasantry. The army and state administration were both unattainable for the Ruthenian national movement. That is why the Ukrainian project was actively seeking for alternative ways of securing its potential members. This alternative way was to build up a national organization that would animate the nation's imagined body. Ivan Franko, although disagreeing with Volodymyr Barvins'kyi, the leader of the national-populists, and arguing for a more radical political program, acknowledged the latter's organizational talent and said that "if only the forces gathered together and learned to march with each other, it would be easier to change the flag."²⁵⁷ This was not Franko's own deviation from the original radical program; Mykhailo Drahomanov, the intellectual father of Galician radicals, himself argued along similar lines: "For everything – for the uprising, and for the peaceful work, and even for the election – one needs to have a united and ordered people."²⁵⁸

²⁵⁵ Ivan Franko, "Nashe teperishnie polozhennia," in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.46 kn.1 (Kyiv: "Naukova dumka," 1985), 317.

²⁵⁶ "Ubodzy uczniowe w szkolach ludowych," *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1885, No.23.

²⁵⁷ Franko to Drahomanov," in *Zibrannia tvoriv*, t.48, 434.

²⁵⁸ Anatolii Kruhlov, *Drama intelektualna: politychni idei Mykhaila Drahomanova* (Chernivtsi: Prut, 2000), 179.

And again the difference between the Russophile and Ukrainian projects is visible. There had been many complaints about the anti-militarist mood of the Ukrainian peasantry in Galicia voiced between 1900 and 1914. This anti-militaristic mood of Ukrainian society was seen as a great obstacle for attempts to create a disciplined organization. See, for example, the attitude of the radical founder of the peasant gymnastic and fire-fighting society *Sich*.²⁵⁹ The book of advice for the peasants in military affairs published by the Kachkovskii Society in 1880 was basically giving advice on how to avoid the service, to become commissioned from the army or to get a leave once in army service.²⁶⁰ In 1882 Andrii Chaikovs'kyi, later the leading national-populist activist, was drafted into the army from the fourth year of law school and sent to Bosnia. Ten years later he wrote an interesting memoir about his service, in which he included his contemporary views about the army as a prototype of organization and how in the army he had learned about making organization more efficient. The discipline he argued in favor for was not a mechanic but organic one: "a soldier should not be a machine. Even the most accurate of machines can without any pricks of conscience cut off its owner's fingers."²⁶¹

On 30 November 1880, there was the first general Ruthenian meeting in L'viv (*viche*), at which for the first time the idea of planned organizational work among the peasantry was expressed.²⁶² Using the liberal constitution, the Ruthenian movement hoped to build through voluntary associations, its own press and meeting a public sphere, which would compete with the state in terms of loyalties and allegiances. The main instrument in this project was the web of reading clubs. I have already discussed the numbers of the reading clubs and their intra-village context earlier. Now few words should be said about the discourse accompanying reading clubs' founding in the 1880s. Reading clubs were not only the instrument of the movement but also the symbol of peasants' national maturity: "There is no need to mention our peasants, [everyone knows that] now among them [is] the strongest and the most important Ruthenian movement in Galicia." The new goal of the movement was also clearly stated in the article celebrating a great advance in the development of the reading clubs in 1884:

We should not rest until our Rus' is covered as dense as with poppy flowers with enlightening societies, farming and artisan co-operatives and

²⁵⁹ Tryliovs'kyi, *Propam'iatna kynha Sichei*, *passim*.

²⁶⁰ Dmytro Vintskovskii, *Poradnyk v spravakh voiskovykh*, (Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho ch. 50-51) (L'vov, 1880).

²⁶¹ Andrii Chaikovskii, *Spomyny z-pered desiaty lit*, 8.

²⁶² Vytanovych, *Ukrains'ke selianstvo*, 27,32.

their unions; until there will be an impressive community building, housing a reading club, a choir, a theatrical and musical performance, a community granary, a community shop, a farming or artisan co-operative, and encompassing all the citizens, in every one of our villages.²⁶³

In 1884 the *Prosvita* Executive entrusted Vasyl' Nahirnyi and Kost' Levyts'kyi to create a Committee for the reading clubs, through which all the work with reading clubs would be conducted, and advice and help would be provided to the reading clubs.²⁶⁴ Even large-scale meetings themselves appeared as a tool of mobilization used by the movement. The movement saw these meetings (*vicha*) as a kind of one-time association, joining those who could not yet be encompassed by the network of permanently working organizations.²⁶⁵

When in the 1880s national-populists decided to go to the people, they found the village movement of the 1870s very helpful. The reading clubs in decline were revived, and new reading clubs were founded. The Bat'kivshchyna newspaper became a mediator between the members of the reading clubs and the Viceroy's office helping with registration, while *Prosvita* endowed newly founded reading clubs with books and provided necessary statutes. Back in the 1870s the village reading club could be registered and endowed with books only if the local priest dedicated himself to this task.²⁶⁶ The new approach to reading clubs was characterized by a centralization of help, mediation through central institutions and authorities. The web of reading clubs was woven around the central institutions of the movement, while earlier reading clubs functioned separately, entering in only accidental contacts with each other and movements' organizations. This approach of the 1880s was even more remarkable if we consider the fact that the *Prosvita* society was not yet based on the reading club and was supporting reading clubs as external autonomous organizations.

In Franko's popular brochure calling for establishing reading clubs, the latter are envisioned as centers in the countryside through which various national initiatives could be conducted and on which these initiatives will be based. Not criticizing the sobriety movement, Franko stresses that sobriety will not be able to take root without reading clubs. Reading clubs are imagined as organizations creating space. Similarly, it is not enough just to learn how to read; there must be a place where you can read and where you can find what to read.²⁶⁷

²⁶³ "Shche ne vmeral Ukraina", Bat'kivshchyna, 1884, No.33, 201.

²⁶⁴ [Omelian Ohonovs'kyi] "Besida d-ra Omeliana Ohonovs'koho pry vidkryttiu zahal'nykh zboriv chleniv Prosvity dnai 20 sichnia (1 liutoho) 1888," in Kyrilo Kakhnykevych, Iak robyty hroshi? abo nauka iak mozna v korotkim chasi staty sia bohachem, (Vydannia Prosvity, kn.104) (L'viv, 1888), 29.

²⁶⁵ Iurii Shapoval, "Dilo" (1880-1939): postup ukrains'koi suspil'noi dumky (L'viv, 1999), 12, 34.

²⁶⁶ Pavlyk, Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni, 179.

²⁶⁷ [Franko] Myron, Rozmovy v Dobrovil'skii chytal'ni, 18-21.

Obviously, the reading clubs were represented as a space through which village communities were linked with the public space of the “larger world.” The reading club from Skalat asked for the popular books from L'viv because “they wanted to know something from the world.”²⁶⁸ But in more concrete terms it was explained as the union of the Ruthenian intelligentsia with the peasantry. The intelligentsia assumed the role of honest broker and claimed to substitute dishonest Jews, corner scribes, and state officials, all of whom had been tested in this role by the peasants earlier. Similarly, newspapers indicated that people saw in the reading club the union of the Ruthenian intelligentsia with the peasantry; the intelligentsia was uniting with simple people for the “common good.”²⁶⁹

To make reading clubs perpetual centers of activity, independent of personal and political junctures, as well as to warrant their honesty, various structural connections were devised. The inside of the community reading clubs was supposed to be interwoven with various community organizations, and on the national level they had to form an organizational network. The number of branches of the *Prosvita* society was growing slowly but steadily; moreover, these branches were taking over founding and controlling the reading clubs in their areas. The newly established newspaper *Bat'kivshchyna* embodied this new community of intelligentsia and peasants working in the national project.

In 1885 *Prosvita* had more than 1,600 members; 1,360 of them were paying membership dues regularly. It published six books in a total of 13,000 copies. In 1885, 324 new members were accepted to the society. Of them 99 (30.5%) were peasants, 30 – townsmen, 14 teachers of elementary schools, 29 priests, 47 secular intelligentsia, five Church brotherhoods, six members of societies, and 94 (29%) – members of reading clubs. Branches of the society in Ternopil' and Stanislaviv founded separate committees on organizing reading clubs.²⁷⁰

Contrary to that, numerous branches of the Kachkovskii Society hardly constituted an organization. For example, the Drohobych branch, which was one of the better organized ones in the mid-1880s, was sending to the central executive 15 Gulden 30 Kreuzer of membership dues collected in the whole year.²⁷¹ The Kachkovskii Society branches' only activity was irregular general meetings. The distribution of publications and membership evidence went through separate agents, overwhelmingly priests, bypassing society branches.²⁷²

²⁶⁸ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 71, p/3, a.16.

²⁶⁹ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, 154, p.6, a.6.

²⁷⁰ VR IL, f.3, spr.2663, a.4.

²⁷¹ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.6, a.14.

²⁷² TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.5.

There were constant problems with knowing members and subscribers to popular books in the Kachkovskii Society. On 19 March Rev. Stefan Kushchyyk, from the village of Spas, asked the Executive of the Society not to send him as many books as it did, because he had to send them back; last year he clearly indicated the number of the Society's members. He asked to delete from the membership list all the members from the village of Opaka, and to send him only nine books which he "would distribute among school children because they are the kind of members that change every year."²⁷³ Schoolchildren, some peasants who saw membership in the society as a way to get cheap books, and only a few real activists, who would later switch to, or already sympathized more with national-populism and radicalism, constituted the "peasant membership" of the society. Many reading clubs did not see any problem in belonging to both Kachkovskii and *Prosvita* societies.²⁷⁴

For many peasants, membership in the Kachkovskii Society was connected with difficulties and pressure from the administration and landlords, especially in the 1880s. In the 1880s the Church hierarchy openly attacked Russophiles as well. In 1885 Vasyl' Bihus from the village of Vysotsko complained that the local manor hated him because of the new members, whom he had won for the Society, and because of his articles to Ruskaia Rada in 1882 and 1883. The manor was intercepting his correspondence, and he had to use someone else's address.²⁷⁵

Not only Russophiles but also Polish populists in their discourse and initiatives lagged behind the Ukrainians. The Polish Society of Farming Circles was formed in Przemysl in 1889, at the Congress of the Galician Economic Society, dominated by the landlords. Among the duties of the circles' members were the following: "motivate members to love order, cleanliness, and the agricultural profession... to punish everywhere idleness, wastefulness, drinking, atheism and voluntarism as well as the not less demoralizing lottery game."²⁷⁶ As we can see from this, the discourse of these circles was very similar to the one used by the Ruthenian movement in the 1860s and falling short of Ukrainian initiatives in the 1880s. An alternative attempt to create a more left-wing Polish peasant organization had also started in the 1880s and to this project Ivan Franko was contributing a lot.²⁷⁷

²⁷³ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.5, a.41.

²⁷⁴ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.5, a.97-98.

²⁷⁵ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.6, a.25-26.

²⁷⁶ Emil Mucha, Zarys dziejów kółek rolniczych w regionie Przemyskim, 1882-1982 (Przemysł: Polskie towarzystwo historyczne. Oddział i stacja naukowa w Przemyslu, 1983), 5-6.

²⁷⁷ Krzysztof Dunin-Wąsowicz, Dzieje stronnictwa ludowego w Galicji, (Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1956), 69-103.

During the 1880s the *Prosvita* society expanded its publishing, refining and redefining its publishing policy. Kachala's endowment for the publication of popular books was not the only one. Another important one, especially for the Sambir region, was endowed by Stefan Dubrovs'kyi, a member of petty gentry born in 1829 in the village of Topil'nytsia, the Stare Sambir district. Dubrovs'kyi's biography, included in the popular books sponsored by his endowment, stressed that both petty gentry and peasants respected his parents. In parish school he had learned Ruthenian, Polish and German ABCs, and in 1844 had graduated from the "main school" in Lavriv. Then he finished the Basilian gymnasium in Buchach and taught in the town of Stryi from 1868 to 1888.

In 1885 he wrote a will which started as follows:

I come from the Ruthenian gentry, poor, mountainous, living in the Sambir region, which had been living in that area for several centuries, multiplied a lot, and got pettier and poorer through the division of landholdings and lack of enlightenment. From the history of past centuries we know that some men from the families of the Ruthenian gentry of that region had become famous for their enlightenment and knighthood not only in this land and former Polish Commonwealth, but in Europe as well. Because of the character and historical traditions of the past of this Ruthenian gentry neglected in popular enlightenment I have decided...²⁷⁸

He decided to divide all his wealth into funds for eight scholarships for the poor members of his and of his wife's families. And if there were no eligible offspring, then the scholarship would be awarded to youth from other petty gentry families and to orphans of teachers in the Sambir and Stryi school districts. Besides these scholarships, a separate fund was established for the best publications for the people. The first book funded from the endowment was actually written by the author from the Sambir region and the offspring of a petty gentry family, Andrii Chaikovs'kyi.²⁷⁹

Money from the endowments was spent for publications whose purposefulness and quality were carefully weighed and often passionately discussed. The flood of images in the form of texts now was channeled into the space of the reading clubs where they were not just interpreted and spread but also performed. The 1880s were a time when amateurish performances in the reading clubs started on a larger scale. While the urban theaters were largely staging vaudevilles and farces for the urban intelligentsia, peasants were staging metaphorical performances with declamations, animating scenes from the

²⁷⁸ Andrii Chaikovskii, *Obraz honoru*, (Vydannia Prosvity ch.180) (L'viv, 1895).

²⁷⁹ Ibid.

Ukrainian past. But for some peasant activists even this was not serious enough. One of the correspondents to Bat'kivshchyna had actually asked for more political amateurish performances:

So, for example, it would be very useful to present in the village theatre these Mykyta Khrun's, to stage Diet elections in a comedy, even those that took place in Turka, or drama about the bear slaying three guys while gentlemen Counts sit, smoke cigars and hunt rabbits, or about Count Konarski buying 219 Joch for 60 Kreuzers.²⁸⁰

Unlike bodies of professional actors, bodies of peasant amateurs were used not for the aesthetic pleasure and fun of the audience but for the inscription of truth. During performances they were transfigured into abstract concepts, like motherland, or assumed the role of historical heroes.

Activities of the Ukrainian movement were not unchallenged. And among their competitors were not only Russophiles. In the 1880s official series of popular books had been also established. These books were published in both Polish and Ukrainian. As an example we can take the book written by Volodymyr Stebel's'kyi, who at one time was connected with national-populists, then switched to the Russophiles and ended with the Poles. The book is called To the Ruthenian People and consists of a single poem. The author addresses the "gentlemen-community (*panove-bromado*)" and represents himself as grown up in the village, but educated in the city, which did not decrease his love for the "native Ruthenian people." This love makes him explain what the Ruthenian "bread makers" really need. In fact, they need "sincere and hard work." (*Treba tobi shchyyroi pratsi // I tiazhkoho truda*).

When the author turns to discuss his opponents, all the nice epithets of "bread makers" disappear and the author refers to the "stupid peasant," who should avoid vodka, usury, and court suits. Then he places among enemies "ignorant people", like those who say, "for example, that the Ruthenian faith // Is one with Russians." He gives an example of the Russians killing Ruthenians in the Chełm diocese and says that "As long as this world and life are around // it cannot be // that with Russians // Our Ruthenian people become brothers!"²⁸¹ The difference between these and *Prosvita* publications was not less than the difference between *Prosvita* reading clubs and agricultural circles.

The spirit of the 1880s called for the revision of traditional-style publishing for people. Franko argued for telling people in popular publications "the whole truth" and called upon the authors to change their tone from high, teaching and

²⁸⁰ Seliuk, "Pys'mo vid Drohobycha", Bat'kivshchyna, 1883, No.48, 288.

²⁸¹ [Volodymyr Stebel's'kyi] Bohdan z Podolia, Do ruskoho liudu, (Knyzhochky dlia sil'skoho i miskoho naroda, kn.8) (L'viv: Komitet dlia vydavannia knyzhochok dlia naroda, vidpovidaie za komitet Kazymyr Okaz, 1882), 14.

prophetic to more respectful, remembering “that we also are an inseparable part of the people.”²⁸² Franko also envisioned a division of labour between *Prosvita* and Kachkovskii societies: the first one would control work with reading clubs and publish enlightening (i. e. scientific) books, while the former would be concerned with books of practical advice and organization of exhibitions and economic societies.²⁸³ While the “superstitions” of the simple people and their ways of ignorance were a common concern of the Ruthenian publications in the 1860s and 1870s, in the 1880s Franko could write that this was a specifically Polish approach to the problem, while a new generation of Ruthenians approached peasants in rational terms of economic and social problems, which could be solved by political change and social engineering.²⁸⁴

However, the attention paid to the reading clubs, and the establishment of new organizations that would create an independent public space, did not mean that the community’s self-government will be left to itself. Reading clubs were not an alternative to the community’s self-government; they had to be a beachhead from which the community council could be taken over. The community government had wide competence over village life, and national-populists took care to remind the communities of this government’s power and wide jurisdiction over the behavior of its members. So the community could control streets, fields and other space in the community. Public music could not be organized without the approval of the community council, and on holidays it could be organized only after vespers. Taverns had to be closed at 10 PM, according to the anti-alcohol law of 1877. The community council had to prevent the appearance of vagabonds and prostitutes in the community.²⁸⁵ The communities’ need to discipline its members was stressed together with the campaign for the establishment of the reading clubs.

Young radicals obviously owed the attention they were paying to communities to the Russian populists, whose works they (at least Ivan Franko) read, and to their intellectual father Mykhailo Drahomanov, whose ideas about free unions as an ideal of human organization they shared. The whole campaign of the 1880s for the establishment of the reading clubs in the 1880s was said to have started under the influence of Russian populism.²⁸⁶ It could be said that the version of Marxism Galician radicals knew was one developed by Russian

²⁸² Ivan Franko “Kil’ka sliv o tim, iak uporiadkuvaty i provadyty nashi liudovi vydavnytstva,” in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.45 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 188-190.

²⁸³ Ibid.

²⁸⁴ Ivan Franko, “Ustava proty bezsovisnosti,” 376.

²⁸⁵ Kost’ Levyts’kyi, *Nash zakon hromadskii abo iaki my maiem prava i povynnosti v hromadi*, (Vydannia “Prosvity,” kn. 112) (L’viv, 1889), 86.

²⁸⁶ [Mykhailo Pavlyk] Rusin, “Czytelnie ludowe ruskie w Austro-Węgrzech,” *Głos*, 1887, No.33.

narodniki. Chernyshevskii's influence is particularly visible in Franko's writing. Franko himself stated later that the Ukrainian orientation won over the Russophile, partly because of the fact that Ukrainophiles knew Russian ideas earlier and better than Russophiles.²⁸⁷ At the same time, knowing German, Franko had direct access to German socialist authors. And, more importantly, the Austrian political and legal system made Ukrainian populism in Galicia different from the populism of Russian *narodniki*.

The most sincere *narodnik* among Galician radicals was, perhaps, Mykhailo Pavlyk. In the 1880s he was preoccupied with the idea of the *viche* (the general assembly in ancient Rus'). In his investigations and presentations of the topic he traced the tradition of democracy starting with ancient Rus', through the Cossack period and up to the village communities contemporary to him. According to his project from 1883 about the "peasant society" (*muzhyts'ke tovarystvo*), this organization was supposed to consist of societies "that would gather for the larger or smaller assemblies on which the councils would be held on the conditions and needs of all working Ruthenians." If these societies needed consultation on some matter they could send a messenger to other communities.²⁸⁸

The idea about free communes and consideration of local circumstances (illiterate and impoverished peasant masses) led Pavlyk to envisioning the "revival" of the some kind of "direct democracy." The fixation with communities as potential free unions and centers of real democracy led Pavlyk to various totally ungrounded etymological speculations. For example, he stated that the word "*zavichaty*" (meaning to make a will or to predict) had originated from the fact that in antiquity the *vicha* of Rus' were deciding what to do and that this was coming true. The agency of the verb was ascribed to the body of a collective. Nevertheless, Pavlyk saw his ideas as compatible with the reading clubs and organizations of the national movement.

There was an important difference between the Russian populists and Galician radicals. For the latter at this stage the value of the communal organization was in the rudiments of direct democracy and had nothing to do with the collective ownership of the land. Even with direct democracy Pavlyk had to take as an example the *viche* communal order of Russian Ukraine, "where the *skhod* decides everything, while in Galician Ukraine even already long ago there were only a few *viche* remnants." According to Pavlyk, the early establishment of serfdom in Galicia was to be blamed for this early decline of primitive democracy.²⁸⁹ Only among the *Boiky* in the mountains the old *viche* order survived: "here for the

²⁸⁷ Ivan Franko, "Idei i 'idealy' halyts'koï moskvofil's'koï molodezhi," in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.45 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 418.

²⁸⁸ TsDIAuL, f.663,op.1, spr.71, a.5.

²⁸⁹ TsDIAuL, f.663,op.1, spr.71, a.52.

community council all the farmers gather. At these councils the mayor greets those gathered with ‘Gentlemen-community!’ (*Panove bromada*).” A community court ruling, according to customary law, was also said to belong to the remnants of the old communal self-government.²⁹⁰ Pavlyk says that “People seldom look for help in the Emperor’s or district courts and go there only with big complaints or when they think that the community’s decision was unjust.”²⁹¹ And this was a gross exaggeration as well. When Franko under the influence of Drahomanov wanted to write something about customary law, he had to acknowledge that there was almost no customary law preserved in Galicia in the second half of the nineteenth century. Austrian legal systems had made too deep inroads into the countryside.²⁹²

But the absence of pre-feudal village communes and communal organizations did not prevent from working with village communities as important tools of the national movement. From the very beginning national-populists tried to make the community as an administrative unit their own base. The explanation of the law on the communities included advice such as founding the fire-fighting societies called *Sokoly* whose statues could be received from the editorial board of *Bat’kivshchyna*.²⁹³ This had been said already in 1889, despite the fact that the Ukrainian *Sokil* society appeared only in 1899, and this can be explained by the fact that precisely in the 1880s the Ukrainian movement started to imagine itself as a network of organizations whose power field would keep the nation together.

The community’s citizens were encouraged to work with the community council, to control the mayor’s behavior and to take an active part in the community elections. The brochure called upon peasants:

Gentlemen community (*panove bromado*), use this self-government honorably and with profit for yourself, be good farmers (*gazdy*) for yourself and for the community, that big man on which the whole world is based! If you will be bad citizens, that giant [a community] will beat you, if you will be good citizens – he will save and help you.²⁹⁴

Most misfortunes with community self-government were said to come from the lack of knowledge of one’s rights and duties. Knowledge, eventually, must be grounded in schools, reading clubs, and science: “Any law and science are

²⁹⁰ TsDIAuL, f.663,op.1, spr.71, a.53.

²⁹¹ Ibid., a.54.

²⁹² Franko to Drahomanov in Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv*, t.48, 441.

²⁹³ Kost’ Levyts’kyi, *Nash zakon*, 91.

²⁹⁴ Ibid., 110-112.

written for the nation, which lives and wants to live. The law is written for those who will support it and take care of themselves.”²⁹⁵

The movement was defending communities’ autonomy, but at the same time intra-community politics had to be transformed into a representative, democratic and responsible one, which would be easily integrated with the larger body of national politics. The book said: “Let’s read and learn our duties in the community and guard ourselves from injustice, because our national honor requires it!” The enemies of the nation would like to see communal rights severally curtailed, and that was because of the special role communities played in society:

Communities are immortal persons that all the time grow and rejuvenate. Community life eases man’s life because the community can save the poor and teach the unwise, and help everyone for the sake of goodness and peace.

When other nations enjoy peaceful public life and grow in their economic, enlightening and national potential, the Ruthenian nation even more so has to save its forces, to live and rejuvenate on the basis of the freedoms of public life.²⁹⁶

It is interesting that in the 1880s future radicals and semi-socialists had views about community which were compatible with those of future clericals and conservatives. Community was imagined as a “great man;” only through him individuals could express themselves, and only communities were to guarantee rights for their members.²⁹⁷

This convergence of practices among activists belonging to different ends of the political spectrum but to the same national project was not limited to the community self-government but occurred in the reevaluation of the foundation on which the national movement based its activities. There is a rough reorientation from the sphere of attitudes and consciousness to economic conditions. In 1878 in his letter to Ol’ha Roshkevych, Franko said that, according to his conviction, “the economic situation of the nation is the basis of all its life, development and progress.” He was also sure that economic conditions of all the cultural nations was bad and in many respects was worsening because of the economic differentiation taking place inside of them. He also believed in permanent social revolution, which started with the French

²⁹⁵ Ibid., 121.

²⁹⁶ Ibid., IV.

²⁹⁷ [Oleksandr Barvins’kyi] Pomich vlasna abo “roby nebozhe, to j boh pomozhel!” Knyha o poradnosty Samuila Smail’sa. ch.1 Dlia potreby ruskoho narodu obrobyv Oleksandr Barvins’kyi, (Vydannia Prosvity, kn.68) (L’viv, 1882), 9.

Revolution and had been spreading since then.²⁹⁸ In 1885, Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, later a conservative and clerical politician, the advocate of a compromise with Polish fractions dominating provincial politics, argued for the improving of the peasants' economic situation, in favor of a peasant credit union and insurance, and for the state's intervention in agriculture.²⁹⁹

We have already mentioned Pavlyk's arguments about some general turn to the social characterizing Ruthenian life in the 1880s and the remarkable consensus on how to approach the peasantry among the Ruthenian intelligentsia. Mykhailo Pavlyk was not the only one to notice this turn to the social in the Ruthenian discourse and solidarity of the Ruthenian intelligentsia in this approach:

The most remarkable manifestation of Ruthenian national life is constant work on the material and moral advance of the "younger brother" and solidarity of the intelligentsia in this direction as well as full manifestation of its feelings and principles.³⁰⁰

In 1881 Drahomanov predicted the bloody peasant uprising in Galicia which never happened.³⁰¹ I believe that in making this prediction Drahomanov overlooked two things – first of all the political and legal system of the Austrian state in general, and Galician autonomy in particular, and, secondly, the powers of the discourse of the Ukrainian national movement in Galicia, its ability to deal with the problems of the modern world. Already his pupil, Mykhailo Pavlyk, was saying that differing in political orientation the activists of the 1880s had much in common: "Fighting against the progressive youth, even older Ruthenians had not noticed that they accepted its ideas about the nation. The evolution in this direction in their camps has started since the second half of 1875."³⁰²

This moment is celebrated by Pavlyk as a smoothening of differences on the basis of acceptance of the radicals' idea about who are the people and what kind of work they needed. Even the Poles and the government did not resist this movement because they also realized the importance of the social cause and the need for improvement.

²⁹⁸ Franko to Ol'ha Roshkevych, in *Zibrannia tvoriv*, t.48, 111.

²⁹⁹ "Pro upadok nashoho khliborobstva i sposib ieho podvyhnenia. (Vidchyt Oleksandra Barvins'koho dlia chleniv Ternopil's'koi filii „Prosvity” 13(25) marta 1885)," *Dilo*, 1885, No.41.

³⁰⁰ "Z Hlynians'koho," *Dilo*, 1887, No.42.

³⁰¹ Himka, *Polish and Ukrainian Socialism: Austria, 1867-1890*, v.1, 379.

³⁰² Pavlyk, *Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni*, 176.

The Ruthenian movement in Galicia becomes clearly secular and progressive, and with this for the first time reaches a wider field. Only now, thoughts of Shevchenko and other Ukrainians sympathetic with the people spread far, in depth and in scale, to the lowest strata of our people. The spirit of Ruthenian-Ukrainian history, the spirit of freedom and equality dominates for some time among even the hardest Russophiles: Ukrainianness for the first time springs roots deeply and bases itself on an unmovable rock, on the working people...³⁰³

The tone of Pavlyk's text was common in the 1880s. Tyt Revakovykh, being a national-populist who distanced himself from the radicals and later from the radical wing of national-democracy, in his letters to the liberal activist from Russian Ukraine, Oleskandr Konys'kyi, described his impressions from a two days' visit to L'viv for *Prosvita* and National Council meetings: "These two days inspired me for a longer time, they cemented my faith and hope in the better future of our unlucky, dense, fuzzy and dark nation." He emphasizes the difference between the 1860s and 1880s: "Then there was no peasant and no townsman with a feeling of his Ruthenian nationality, his human dignity, and the Ruthenian intelligentsia was represented by the by and large Polonized Ruthenian priest." Now he saw many peasants and townsmen, "even from the far away *Beskyd* area. And how they talked: if one did not see their peasant dress one could think that some very talented attorneys were talking."³⁰⁴

As we know, people-loving was not invented in Galicia in the 1880s. People claimed to do it in 1848, in the 1860s and 1870s. What was the difference? My answer is that the difference, as Pavlyk says, lies in the way the "people" were imagined, and they were imagined and new practices were induced by that vision. In 1882 Ivan Franko made notes on "the essence of the radical movement." According to these notes this essence was in: "1) love to a peasant (*muzhyk*); 2) critique of the work of the intelligentsia on the raising of the people's well-being; 3) education (enlightenment) on the basis of European positive science."³⁰⁵ This positivism of a new generation was part of the intellectual climate in Galicia at the end of the nineteenth century. People were imagined not as a group of individuals sharing some common attributes but as a collective sharing some common traits, whose common destiny was shaped by centuries'-long experiences.

These changes in the discourse had powerful implications for all kinds of relationships and practices. Anti-Semitism was changing its meaning as well. The battles of school pupils and gymnasium students with town Jews, so popular and frequent in the 1860s, and still in fashion in the 1870s, disappeared

³⁰³ Ibid., 180-81.

³⁰⁴ VR IL, f.3, spr.1607, a.301.

³⁰⁵ VR IL, f.3, spr.2252.

in the 1880s.³⁰⁶ This traditional centuries-long and religiously motivated anti-Semitism was losing in importance and undergoing mutation into a new kind of racial anti-Semitism. There were lists of sins for which the parish priest could not confess and which could not be forgiven by him but reserved for archpriests. In 1852 in a letter from Metropolitan Iakhymovych there is nothing about Jews in this list. In 1861, with the advancing emancipation of Jews, a letter of Bishop Polians'kyi includes among these sins "service to the Jews." Finally, in the 1870s among these sins we find "bodily mixing with Jews (*commutio carnalis cum Judaeis*) and serving as a milk mother in a Jewish family.³⁰⁷

Now Jews figure not as bearers of a different religion, and not only as tavern-keepers and exploiters of the peasantry, but as foreign national element siding with the strong and helping to secure the domination of oppressors over the oppressed nation. Jews become part of the larger picture of struggling nations and classes acting as one organism, as one collective will:

Now when the "social hierarchy" together with Jews made a plot against the economic life of the foundation of our society, our peasant, the first one through colonization of our land with Polish peasants and the second, with Jews, to kill that healthy root that preserved amid misery our nationality, our intelligentsia has a holy duty in the current hard moment to defend these people and to raise them at least so high so that they would be able to bear the competition with the intruders.³⁰⁸

Despite all the anti-Semitism evident in the discourse and in the practice of the Ukrainian national movement, Jews were not its most important concern. Jews were a subordinated element, which even if in prominence was not able to sustain a national action of its own. Polish landlords were identified as the main enemy of the peasantry, and the national struggle thus became a struggle for social justice as well:

If Polish landlords lose their estates the rule of Poland in Galician Rus' will end. Some Poles count on new nobility in Galicia, i. e. Jews, that these would stay with the Poles, because Jews not in politics always follow them hand in hand, and even more and more leave the German language in favor of Polish. But Jews do not care about Poland or any patriotism: *gescheft* is their primary concern, and because of that they always hold together with those in power. Now they stay here with the Poles, but if tomorrow the Germans have an upper hand, they will keep in politics

³⁰⁶ Andrii Chaikivskii, *Spomyny z-pered desiaty lit*, 5.

³⁰⁷ LODA, f.1245, op.2, spr.12, a.4-6.

³⁰⁸ "Holos z sela o nashykh ekonomichnykh problemakh," *Dilo*, 1886, No.67.

with the Germans, and the day after tomorrow with the Ruthenians, if their interest would require so.³⁰⁹

It is also evident that the Ukrainian nation is identified with the peasants. As Himka noticed, already Mykhailo Drahomanov wrote: “the power of each of man's nation lies in its peasantry.”³¹⁰ But Drahomanov was against the idealization of the peasantry. The peasantry was the bulk of the people, and therefore it had to be dealt with, dealt with in the spirit of progressive social science, no matter if it was destined to disappear with the industrial revolution or was destined to persist. Franko in the early 1880s abandoned the classic Marxist vision as well; he no longer believed that the industrial working class would be the leading class in the Galician revolution, and he turned to the agrarian question.³¹¹ In this he came very close to Ukrainian national-populists who increasingly identified the people with a single social class. This led to the development of a network of strategies that aimed at social class and were modified by this class' specificity.

Much of work done with the peasantry in the 1880s, however, exhibited continuity with the “civilizing mission” of earlier clerical populists. This was not limited to the Ukrainians alone but to everyone trying to work with the peasants. For example, the editorial of Edmund Solecki's newspaper with whom Atanasii Mel'nyk had close contacts emphasized: “The intellectual advance of the Ruthenian and Polish village people through education, cultivation and well-being we consider to be the only means of civilizing [making citizens of] them [The Ukrainian version talks about only means of “civic self-consciousness – *samopiznannia hrazhdanskoho*”]; and for this goal we shall stand strenuously and persistently against all the contrary elements of various kinds.”³¹² And these civilizing notes should not surprise us; turning to the peasantry as a class meant not so much listening to it as constructing it.

This construction and privileging of the peasants did not mean the reversal of social development. The majority of Ukrainian agrarian populists in the 1880s did not subscribe to the conservative utopia of a paradise for small landholders, free land for independent yeomen. Ukrainian intellectuals saw nationalism as a modern phenomenon replacing traditional forms of social organization:

For the weakened social feeling of the people (since corporate and communal [institutions] fell apart and ties, functioning as various

³⁰⁹ *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1886, No.26.

³¹⁰ Himka, *Polish and Ukrainian Socialism*, v.1, 138, 164.

³¹¹ *Ibid.*, v.1, 375.

³¹² Edmund Leon Solecki, “Program ‘Gazety Naddniestrzanskiej’,” *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, 1884, No.1.

autonomous spheres that wrapped up an individual, were uprooted by the state one after another) the one and only one shelter left was nationalism.³¹³

Most of the intellectuals understood very well that the peasantry with which they were dealing was quite a recent capitalist creation as well. Franko stated that after the abolition of *robot*, under the influence of Roman law, when land became the unlimited property of individuals, Galicia joined Western European capitalist development.³¹⁴ The interests of this peasantry were the interests of laboring people. The editorial of Bat'kivshchyna in 1882 said there was a struggle going on; "that is the poorer people, those who work and live from work, struggle against big riches, against those who live without work only from speculation."³¹⁵ To enter this struggle, peasants had to be organized. This would be a pioneering undertaking, because until now only German farmers made some attempts in this direction.³¹⁶ It seems to be obvious that the new national discourse was successively integrating the class discourse.

Now popular publications taught not about civil dignity but about class dignity as well. It was not that peasants were also humans, and therefore should be paid all the respect human beings were paid. Peasants were to be respected because they were peasants. In a popular novel, when a peasant wants to marry priest's daughter, the priest answers

I have great respect for peasants. Our grandfathers and ancestors were peasants as well. ... I respect and value the peasant estate because peasants are the most needed for the land, as far as they feed all the people in towns.³¹⁷

This class discourse had to lay new foundations for the influence of the Ukrainian discourse among the villagers, and that is how we should interpret Pavlyk's statement that "the main foundation of the current movement in the reading clubs [is] the unanimity of the intelligentsia and the people's interests."³¹⁸

³¹³ L. Slonyms'kyi, "Natsionalizm," Pravda, 1890, t.3, p.61.

³¹⁴ Ivan Franko, "Zemel'na vlasnist' v Halychyni," Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh, t.44, kn.1 (Kyiv: "Naukova Dumka," 1984), 575-580.

³¹⁵ "Vazhna doba," Bat'kivshchyna, 1882, No.24, 187.

³¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 188.

³¹⁷ Viktor Tyrovych, Rodyna Morozovykhiv, (Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.85) (L'viv, 1885).

³¹⁸ Pavlyk, Pro rus'ko-ukraïns'ki narodni chytal'ni, 2.

But I want to stress again that this discourse was not just brought in by Drahomanov and developed by his Galician disciples. This discourse was a permutation of the discourse we saw in the Ukrainian popular publications of the 1870s. Volodymyr Barvins'kyi, the leader of the Ukrainian national-populists, at the end of the 1870s stated that all the observations prove that poverty is undermining “the most lively [of the nation’s] roots – the people itself. Thus ‘people’, ‘peasantry,’ enter today’s agenda.” The concern with real problems should compensate for the deficiency of those seeing only drunkenness and laziness and the too superficial approaches of the government.³¹⁹ It is true, however, that national-populists were not that sure about solutions to these problems: “However, this question, of saving the peasantry, remains unsolved and, perhaps, will remain as such for a longer time, especially if we take into account the superficiality of the approaches to this question.”³²⁰ And here the radical discourse and transplantation by radicals of socialist ideas came in very handy.

Nonetheless, the very posing of this kind of question entailed a new approach to the nation, a new image of society and its functioning:

that this mass, great and strong in its wholeness, could come alive as an organism – there is a need for the communication, uniting and concentration of forces, detailed cognition of our own needs and deficiencies, of a clear program, in one word – ORGANIZATION. Up to now we usually used this program: we Ruthenians appear to be nothing positive or understandable for the people, unfulfilled.³²¹

This boom of the Ukrainian orientation in the 1880s was so unexpected and striking that the Russophiles did not know what to do about it. They had to justify their own opposition to the movement and failure of the attempted compromise with Ukrainians. The Ruthenian Council, the central (Russophile) Ruthenian political organization prior to the creation of the (Ukrainian) National Council in 1885, issued a brochure in which it explained that it tried to unite with the Ukrainians but could not possibly satisfy the Ukrainians’ request, which would mean “to reject our nature.”³²²

They also had to excuse their own unsuccessful politics:

³¹⁹ [Volodymyr Barvins'kyi] Rymidalov, “Suchasna litopys”, *Pravda*, 1879/vyp.1., 58.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, 60.

³²¹ *Ibid.*

³²² Venedykt M. Ploshchanskii, *Otchet o diatel'nosty Komiteta politicheskoho Obshchestva “Russkaia Rada” za vremia ot 17(29) noiabria 1879 do 30 oktiabria (11 noiabria) 1885* (L'vov, 1885), 6.

Any electoral action of ours lastly was seldom successful, however it brought a lot of moral use for our nation, the nation had been hardening in the struggle for its natural rights and increased its distrust of those people who with flattering words tried to attract it to their idea, totally unhealthy for the nation.³²³

The Ukrainians, making their own inroad into Galician politics and building their own infrastructure, were quite tolerable to the achievements of the 1870s. The more conservative wing of Ukrainians would readily subscribe to the paternalist rhetoric of early populism, mixing it up with more nationalist attitudes. They would say that “With one’s own work, patience and science one can rise from the lowest step to the highest importance and position in the world.”³²⁴ They did not hesitate to appropriate peasant activists won by the previous generation of Ruthenian patriots. In the cited brochure Oleksandr Barvins’kyi brings as an example Semen Kovtsuniak, who died in 1879, who since 1863 had been a member of the community council and since 1866 a mayor of Kovalivka community in the Kolomyia district. Despite the absence of both priest and landlord in the village, Kovtsuniak defended common pasture, and he persuaded the community to buy 130 Joch of state forest, organized communal granary and garden.³²⁵ Similarly, despite the fact that in 1882 Rev. Naumovych was accused of inciting his parish to apostasy, Barvins’kyi says that Naumovych and the Kachkovskii Society created by him contributed a lot to the spread of sobriety, prudence and enlightenment.³²⁶

However, they were tolerating Russophilism only as a passed stage in the development of the nation. Besides appreciation for the work of clerical populists from the 1870s, there was also strong resentment of them. We have already seen this in the example of Ivan Franko. Similarly, Rev. Ivan Chapel’s’kyi in his letter to Franko describes his dislike of Naumovych’s love of huge audiences, his reliance on “high spheres” and the supernatural.³²⁷ Not hesitating to rip the fruits of Russophile populism from the 1870s, Ukrainians slowly reshuffled accents and built a new hierarchy of tasks. Sobriety in the *Prosvita* publications entered the villages not alone but together with reading clubs, new material culture and new, civilized habits, such as getting used to

³²³ Ibid., 10.

³²⁴ [Oleksandr Barvins’kyi] *Pomich vlasna*, 12.

³²⁵ Ibid., 25.

³²⁶ Ibid., 32.

³²⁷ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1618, a.445.

tea.³²⁸ It was no longer a panacea for all the social diseases but a part and condition of civilized life.

While in the 1860s and 1870s rebuking peasants for their “superstitions” and numerous ways of ignorance were common for the Ruthenian publications, in the 1880s Ivan Franko could write that this was the specificity of Polish publications for people, while a new generation of Ruthenians approached peasants in rational terms and talked about economic and social problems that could be solved through a change in the political system and social engineering.³²⁹

What kind of civilization and civil self-consciousness national-populists had in mind is clearly seen from the brochure “Our Freedom or Which Rights We Have” written by young Kost’ Levyts’kyi, one of the future leaders of the Galician Ukrainians, and dedicated to Rev. Stefan Kachala. The book stresses that un-freedom was a general condition, not only in Ukraine but everywhere in the world. Only in the nineteenth century the star of liberty had risen, and now “every man, from when he comes into this world, has his natural right: to live freely in the world and to take care of his being.”³³⁰ Levyts’kyi follows Taniachkevych stressing that in the times of Joseph II, “the peasant was recognized as a human.” Final liberation of the peasantry occurred in 1848:

Indeed, serfdom was abolished, relations of subjugation between the peasant and the landlord were broken and the peasant was told: ‘from now on you are a gentleman as well,’ but people from the very beginning did not know which freedoms had to be given to all the nations living in the Austrian state. Some wanted this and others wanted something different, and the third, as for example, our people, did not want anything more, if serfdom had been already abolished.³³¹

Despite this passive attitude and unwillingness to accept responsibility for managing their own life, Ruthenians got a constitution in 1867: “the Constitution respects our nationality as well, allowing us to be what we were born, meaning, Ruthenians, true sons of our ancestral land.” Now Ruthenians must not repeat their mistakes from 1848; people’s enlightenment must itself insist on people’s rights and use the provided freedom to build its own organization. The state had provided an opportunity, but the movement should

³²⁸ [Vasyl’ Il’nyts’kyi] Denys, *Sviatyi spokoiu. harazd s toboiu*, (Vydannia “Prosvity,” kn.97) (L’viv, 1887), 11.

³²⁹ Franko, “Ustava proty bezsovisnosti,” 376.

³³⁰ Kost’ Levyts’kyi, *Nasha svoboda abo iaki my maiemo prava*, 6.

³³¹ *Ibid.*, 8.

finish the rest itself.³³² Ukrainian national-populists developed the ideas of their predecessors from the 1870s, but now the emphasis shifted from individual consciousness to the practices and organizations that would create and maintain that self-consciousness. Activists, who started working in Ukrainian periodicals in the 1870s, were changing accents in their work as well. Vasyl' Il'nyts'kyi, one of the older national-populists in the 1880s, put in the mouth of his character the following words: "We realized and saw our poverty by our own clear eyes, it was scary and we got an ardent wish to shake it off."³³³

These new accents appeared in the framework, which was becoming increasingly "positivistic." I cannot abstain but to draw a parallel with Latin America, when in about the same time "positivistic" governments appeared (The best known are those in Mexico and Brazil.) and tried to modernize their countries by the means of liberalism and science. In the case of the Ukrainian national movement, there was no possibility to take over the government immediately, but the projected national hegemony was adopting discourses very similar to its Latin American counterparts in power.

We have already seen in Rev. Zubryts'kyi's case how powerful in this new context ethnography became. After the beginning of the national awakening, ethnographic work was done only sporadically, and it almost totally disappeared in the 1870s, to be revived again in the 1880s. It entailed two things. First of all, in the 1880s ethnography was recognized as a respectable science and respectable occupation for an intellectual. While in 1848 peasants were seen as equal partners in perspective and an ignorant impenetrable mass in the present, in the 1880s they became the Other in the process of joining the Self, someone who had to be investigated, understood, tamed and elevated.

National-populists saw scientific investigation of the people as necessary for any successful work with them. As early as 1879 they were saying:

There is frequent talk about the 'bitter fate' of our nation but almost nothing is done that would lead at least to finding out the causes of this bitter fate and true situation of our people. It has been often written in Pravda about the need for such a work and there were calls to gather adequate ethnographic-statistic material and send news about the situation of the people, its current life and all the events in touch with these questions.³³⁴

Rev. Ivan Chapel's'kyi, discussing publications for people, said that these publications "should take into account first of all popular world-view, customs

³³² Ibid., 18.

³³³ [Vasyl' Il'nyts'kyi] Denys, Sviatyi spokoiu, 6.

³³⁴ [Volodymyr Barvins'kyi] "Suchasna litopys'," Pravda, 1879, 523.

and feelings – that is why – an obvious thing – the people must become known well first of all.”³³⁵

From the very beginning the need to organize Ruthenian peasant masses along class lines was stated. Such an organization, examples of which could be found elsewhere, would be of great help for the national movement itself. The introduction to the year 1889 by the editorial board of Bat'kivshchyna said that “With this we shall pay particular attention to how peasants and workers, ours and foreign ones, are doing and progress, and what is done elsewhere for them, as far as it can be interesting for our readers.”³³⁶ But at the moment it was difficult to realize. At the moment priority was given to accumulation of the knowledge about people and creation of platforms on which the public sphere of the countryside would be built (i. e. reading clubs.). But already then, in the 1880s, others started to perceive the Ukrainian movement as synonymous with everything radical and revolutionary. Russophiles in 1888 were accusing the Ukrainian movement of hoping “to abolish taxes, divide the land, slaughter all the landlords and Jews; that someone is inciting us to rioting etc.”³³⁷ Later on this kind of representation only accumulated and overwhelmed Polish views of the Ukrainians.

³³⁵ VR IL, f.3, spr.1618, a.182.

³³⁶ “Vid redaktsii,” Bat'kivshchyna, 1889, No.1.

³³⁷ “Ne biüte sia,” Bat'kivshchyna, 1888, No.13.

Chapter 7

STORIES OF IVAN MYKHAS

They read and educated themselves with passionate enthusiasm. (Even today, when one asks the inhabitants of Casas Viejas about their impressions of the former militants, now often dead or dispersed, one is most likely to hear some such phrases as 'He was always reading something; always arguing'.) They lived in argument. Their greatest pleasure was to write letters to and articles for the anarchist press, often full of high flown phrases and long words, glorying in the wonders of modern scientific understanding which they had acquired and were passing on.¹

Eric Hobsbawm on Andalusian peasant anarchists.

Morozovychi, Prosvita, and Mykhas' Revolt

As we have seen from the early texts by Ivan Mykhas, his political activity did not start in his own village. In his own words even the office of community scribe he took only for the sake of understanding better the problems experienced by the communities' self-government. We do not know much about him being a community scribe. The next time we meet Ivan Mykhas in the community's office, he is in the position of the chair of the committee supervising the village school. The school was established in 1886, and it seems that since that time Mykhas, as the most literate, was in charge of this community's establishment.

Although in the 1880s Mykhas was happy with his village, at the end of the 1880s the community council changed, and Baida, the old mayor with whom Mykhas was on good terms, was replaced by a new one – a certain Iurko Zawadz'kyi. The community council led by this mayor:

¹ Eric Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels*, 85.

decided to elect another member instead of the school chair Ivan Mykhas because Ivan Mykhas tries with all his powers to teach children only the Ruthenian language, behavior which the school council does not like at all.

But this ruling of the community council dated by 1889 did not last. Perhaps this attack of the community council on Mykhas personally motivated him to organize his own electoral campaign. Soon, in 1891 new elections to the community council were held, and Mykhas was elected mayor. A new school council was appointed because the previous one, chaired by Petro Sarakhman (one of the old council's members) was overpricing material bought for the school and used the difference to enrich its members' own pockets.²

The new mayor was 27 years old. Under the rule of Ivan Mykhas the landscape of the community started to change in accordance with the prescriptions of the national discourse. In 1892 the community bought a tavern from a local Jew, Ephraim Sales. This tavern was turned into a community building, which housed the reading club, established the same year, and the community store. The profit from the community school was assigned for school-related purposes. When the new community building was blessed, Revs. Bobers'kyi, Nesterovych, and Rabii from Sambir, three Polish students and "other people of good will" were present.³ All the three priests named here were quite conservative, and proponents of the agreement with the Polish political majority.

After a certain silence at the end of the 1880s, perhaps, connected with the outcome of the Dobrivliany conspiracy and a certain interlude in the larger political developments of the Ruthenian movement, Mykhas' political activities were resumed at the beginning of the 1890s. It is interesting that in 1892 Ivan Mykhas wrote an article to the official Narodna Chasopys' (People's Newspaper). The article was about the court case on some Jews from the Turka district who cheated local peasants.⁴ The article was apparently anti-Semitic and must have been written (or at least sent to such an unlikely periodical because of the latter's radicalism) under the influence of Rev. Frants Rabii, of whom Mykhas had very high opinion in 1886. In 1886 Rev. Rabii administered the parish of Vaniovychi and in 1892 he was present at the opening of the Morozovychi reading club. A year earlier, in 1891, the editorship of Narodna Chasopys' was transferred from Luka Bobrovych to Kyrylo Kakhnykevych, Oleksandr Barvins'kyi's friend. According to historian Ihor Chornovol, the newspaper became an "exemplary European newspaper of the conservative

² "Z Sambora," Dilo, 1891, No.277.

³ Kornylo Chaikovskiy, "Z Sambora," Dilo, 1892, No.242.

⁴ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, "Iz Sambirshchyny," Narodna Chasopys', 1892, No.52.

trend.”⁵ Rev. Rabii, perhaps, also took under his patronage Vasyl’ Plaskach, because another correspondence from Sambir, signed as V. P., also appeared in Narodna Chasopys.⁶

In 1891, in an addition to the issues 43 and 44, the Russophile newspaper Chervonaia Rus’ published an article in which grouped Rev. Rabii, Rev. Bobers’kyi and Ivan Mykhas together as “arrangers of the elections” and described these Ukrainian activists negatively. There was a phrase about Rev. Rabii saying that he “is a Pole and became a Ruthenian priest only because he wished to marry.” This article also accused Rev. Rabii in denouncing a “certain very respected person of clerical rank” to the Consistory. Rev. Rabii sued Osyp Markov, the editor of the newspaper; however, in November 1892 he renounced his suit for reasons unknown.⁷

In 1890, in the elections to the district council the party of the district council’s presidium was defeated. Seven Ruthenians and five Poles were elected from the peasant curia. All the Ruthenians were peasants, except for Rev. Tatomyr from the village of Cherkhava.⁸ Ivan Berezhnyts’kyi, petty gentry from Berezhnytsia, was among these peasant members of the district council. This success of the Ruthenian movement was achieved while Ivan Mykhas was in seemingly good relationships with the priest leaders of the local Ukrainian party. This also seems to be the year when these priests tried to use the atmosphere of the compromise between Ukrainian national populists and the Polish Diet majority together, reached with the help of Viceroy’s office (the so-called “new era”). Perhaps, these priests of conservative Ukrainian orientation managed to achieve agreement with the local administration and seemingly secured their domination among local Ruthenians.

But such a success was a momentary one. The compromise led to further divisions among the national-populists, who would eventually split into a pro-compromise minority and an opposition majority (1894). The latter established the Ruthenian-Catholic National Union in 1896 led by Oleksandr Barvins’kyi. Radicals and Russophiles were in an open opposition to the compromise from the very beginning, and the first opposition among national-populists appeared as early as 1891. The trajectory of Ivan Mykhas’ own position seems to be connected with these political developments albeit formed by the local context. While around 1890 Mykhas was finding common language with the local cleric-dominated Ukrainian party and his own parish priest Rev. Bobers’kyi, after

⁵ Ihor Chornovol, Ukrains’ko-pol’s’ka uhoda 1890-1894 rr. (L’viv: L’vivs’ka akademiia mystetstv, 2000), 145.

⁶ V. P., “Dopys’,” Narodna chasopys’, 1891, No.153.

⁷ VR LNB, f. Osyp Markov, spr.216/p.9.

⁸ Chytal’nyk, Bar’kivshchyna, 1890, No.25.

Mykhas became mayor the period of his harmonious coexistence with the parish priest was about to end. This conflict with the parish priest coincided with his joining the Radical Party.

The tension between a priest and a mayor was a rule, rather than an exception. We saw how powerfully this tension appeared with the introduction of community self-government and district administrations in the 1860s. This was reflected in the stories circulating among villagers, when mayors started to figure as powerful enough to compete with the priest. In 1868 a new church in Mykhnivets' was consecrated and the dean Rev. Nazarevych from Mshanets' came in. The mayor of Mykhnivets', Petro Udychiv, was not in the church during the service and came drunk to the priest's house only afterwards. The dean was "very sharp" and reproached the mayor for his behavior. The mayor stepped back to the kitchen and said: "you are not going to leave." When the cleric's guests were leaving, the dean's coach was the first one in the queue, but his horses did not want to move. Other carts had to go first, and only then the dean was able to leave.⁹

Sometime in 1892-1893 Mykhas openly joined the Radical Party. In 1893, Khliborob, a Radical newspaper for the peasants, published an account of Mykhas' "conversion":

I was an adamant enemy of the radical socialists. Priests with their sermons and teachings induced me to this. Besides that I was reading Naumovych's writings and other similar publications where radical socialists were attacked in an indecent way, being represented as rioters, robbers etc. At first I believed this and truly hated that party, and quite often spoke against it in a hostile mode.

Along with this I was very afraid to meet a radical so not to get infected with his spirit, and inuring myself, I delved into the teachings of Jesus Christ, researched his life and compared it with ours. Because of that I defended the poor and wronged man.

Quite often without taking much into account one's position I told people the straightforward truth, especially reproaching priests, that they, although being human, pastors wrong their flock. And because of this people often look for advice in the tavern and take a Jew as their pastor.

People have been telling me that for these words all the priests consider me to be a socialist atheist, and warn others about me. Even in the last elections to the district council, when I was trying to overturn a once mighty district ruler, landlords and priests proclaimed my list to be a socialist one. But that list won in the elections.

What the hell! Why did they start hanging on me all the dogs? For the word of truth?! I was wondering: 'why do they blacken me as a radical and socialist?' This fueled my interest to get to know closer the principles of these radicals, because I knew one very honest man and priests were calling him a radical. Last year from one friend I got several issues of your

⁹ VR IL, f.3, spr.4059, a.9.

Khliborob. I am reading it and see that it writes in my spirit – the pure truth; I have started thinking and concluded that I am myself a radical socialist.¹⁰

In 1892 Mykhas had problems with persuading his community to sign a radical petition to the Diet. Only he and the members of his community council signed it. However, he used this occasion to report to the radical newspaper on the revolution he managed to organize in the Sambir district:

A lot of water will flow down our Dnister before people will get to know at least a little bit about politics, gatherings, meetings and so on. Because we have this petty gentry – ignorant people, and priests lead everything, only I alone have started a struggle with them, and they call me here an atheist, and warn people against getting together with me, but people see whose is the truth and who is a cunning fox, but this is of very little importance, because I am alone, and what could I do? See, in winter we wanted to have a district meeting and of 20 invited for the council only 5 came, and when priests found out [about this meeting they] started such an agitation as if it was something very evil! These are pastors! But at least one thing I managed to do, namely: I had taken care that despite the stubborn delay of the old community council I fastened and Morozovychi became the first village in the district to conduct elections as progress and radicalism prescribe, and rulers mighty since long ago fell down. This happened in our [village], and neighboring villages also went this way, and their neighbors learnt from them, and such a revolution started in our district as never before, and which village started the first in the district that won the victory. And now the old government has to report on the account of its sins, and the district executive supports its old stewards. And there are some places where the old mayor even before the establishment of the new council sells his land and cures community wounds so to remain at least with honor.¹¹

Making order with one's own community was typically necessary for a peasant activist. Antin Hrytsuniak, for example, "cleared from the village various dire and evil" things, thus transforming a community famous for its thefts, drinking and other "vain things" into an ideal community.¹² It was not about some general improvement in literacy, farming, or knowledge; it was about introducing a new kind of discipline and transformation of social life. The new village was supposed to look as follows:

¹⁰ [Ivan Mykhas] Ivan z nad Dnistra, nachal'nyk hromady, "Tak vit prystav do radykaliv," Khliborob, 1893, No.10.

¹¹ Ivan Mikhas, "Dopys' z Morozovych kolo Sambora," Khliborob, 1892, No.9, 75.

¹² Antin Hrytsuniak. Icho zhytje ta smert' i spadshchyna, jaka po nim lyshyla sia dlja nas (Peremysyl': druhe vydannia nakladom B. Kona, 1902), pershe vydannia – 1900), 19.

Feasts according to old customs ceased. Weddings last only one day and one night. On the wedding only married men and women dance, while youngsters can only watch this and only till dusk. Youth's games with dances can take place only during the daylight on the common or in a farmer's house under the supervision of the community's government or relatives. After dusk youth are not allowed to walk the streets or gather in groups, unless accompanied by [older] relatives etc.¹³

With Mykhas the story was the same, and he describes his actions of this type in his autobiography. However, back in the 1890s his articles to Bat'kivshchyna about the good community of Morozovychi were too fresh to boast about the reforms there.

And the truth was that it did not matter much how "good" the village was; to be a new community, it had to become reorganized around new centers and along new ideas. But quite often the old stereotypes about the neighboring communities were mobilized in the descriptions of "bad" villages. The village of Dorozhiv, famous for its arsonists (*paliu*) was a perfect example of a disordered village. There was no reading club, and it was said that therefore even those who could read and write did not benefit from the skill they had. However, we know that some peasants were subscribing to Kachkovskii and *Prosvita* popular books, some – to Ruskoie Slovo and Ruska Rada, and "only two" were subscribing to Khliborob.¹⁴ It seems that the numbers were not that bad. The radical correspondent describing the village saw as a problem this community's disorganized condition. There were constant conflicts between lower and upper villages, the community's government was corrupt and villagers were not about to unite around the single reading club. Nevertheless, it was from the village of Dorozhiv that Ivan Makukh, the famous radical of the beginning of the twentieth century, came.

After Mykhas became a mayor, from this position of power he established a reading club in the village as well. The founders of the reading club in Morozovychi were: Ivan Mykhas, Il'ko Sarakhman, Pylyp Sabalo, Semko Sarakhman, Ferdynand Gobliar (vice-mayor, perhaps from the assimilated Germans mentioned by Mykhas), Iomyr Kruchko, Mykola Duniuk (perhaps, son of Iakym Duniuk, the only literate plenipotentiary during the servitudes' struggle), Pylyp Kuziv, Hryhorii Baida, Nykola El'chuk, Pavlo Sarakhman, and Nykola Baida (Mykhas' friend, secretary of the reading club and one-time mayor).¹⁵ To this reading club Prosvita sent for free its usual load of books,

¹³ Sanduliak, Selo Karliv kolys' a teper', 72.

¹⁴ Dorozhivskiyi hromadianyn, "Dopys' z Dorozhova kolo Sambora," Khliborob, 1892, No.13-14, 102.

¹⁵ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, a.35.

which otherwise would have cost eight Gulden and 83 Kreuzer.¹⁶ The list of publications included 32 titles; then books published for *Prosvita* members in 1892 were also sent, and issues of Hospodar' and Promyshlennik for one year also.

Registering a village reading club this time was much simpler than in the case of Cherkhava. Rev. Nestorovych, chair of the Sambir branch of the *Prosvita* society at the moment, sent the statutes to *Prosvita's* executive and the latter sent it to the Viceroy's office.¹⁷ It was made possible by changes in the society's structure. The year 1892, the year of the establishment of the reading club in Morozovychi, was also the year when *Prosvita* statutes changed, transforming the society into a network of reading clubs. It was also that time when the Sambir branch of *Prosvita* was opened. It seems that after joining *Prosvita* Ivan Mykhas gave up his membership in the Kachkovskii Society, and he angered local Russophiles in 1891 by allying with Rev. Rabii. Nevertheless, some other people found it quite acceptable to remain in both societies. This was the case with Vasyl' Plaskach, a peasant from Berezhnytsia, who was a member of the executive of the Sambir branch of the Kachkovskii Society, with Kornilo Chaikovs'kyi and Vinkentii Khlopets'kyi.¹⁸ The Kachkovskii Society in the area was based on the families of wealthier priests with pedigrees, such as Kozanevych, Vitoshyns'kyi, Shemerdiak, Hrushkevych, Nosalevych, Gelytovych, Davydovych, Krynyts'kyi and Skobel's'kyi.¹⁹ The *Prosvita* society in Sambir included a number of members of the secular Ruthenian intelligentsia and a few priests (Revs. Rabii, Bobers'kyi, Nesterovych), who were suspected of Polonophilism.

Powerful Ruthenian political lobbies in the province's districts appeared at that time on the ground of growing cooperation between Russophiles and oppositional Ukrainian national-populists against the politics of the "new era" and the Ukrainian-Polish compromise. Such cooperation and mutual toleration is described by Olesnyts'kyi in the Stryi District. For Ukrainians this was a tactical alliance which allowed them to use influences and structures of the Russophile camp. In many districts these oppositional alliances started to dominate local Ruthenian politics, but it did not happen in Sambir, although the founding of the Sambir branch of *Prosvita* could have led to the establishment of such an alliance.

¹⁶ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, a.31-33.

¹⁷ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, a.32.

¹⁸ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.70, a.1

¹⁹ Ivan Fylypchak, Pamiati Danyla Stakhury. Z hromadians'koi diial'nosti d-ra Danyla Stakhury v Sambirshchyni (L'viv, 1939), 4.

The moving spirit behind founding of the Sambir branch was an attorney-candidate and peasant son, Danylo Stakhura. Danylo Stakhura (19.12.1860 - 20.12.1938) in 1891 became a younger *Konzipist* of the attorney in Sambir.²⁰ Besides the small group of supporters among the Sambir Ruthenian intelligentsia, Stakhura had no supporters in the villages and no knowledge of these. His reports to the *Prosvita* executive show that at the beginning of his work he had only the Stupnytsia reading club to rely on. We know that this was one of the first reading clubs. In the late 1880s under the influence of the parish priest Rev. Ivan Dashkevych, it became the reading club of *Prosvita*. It became clearly national-populist in orientation, subscribing only to Bar'kivshchyna and Chytal'nia.²¹ Although in the early 1890s Rev. Dashkevych was transferred to another village, his reading club continued to flourish. Almost every literate villager there had the History of Rus' published by *Prosvita*, and not a single elector from Stupnytsia voted for the Polish candidate.²²

Besides Stupnytsia, Stakhura could count on some activists in Vaniovychi (Rev. Bobers'kyi) and several petty gentry in Luka and Dorozhiv, who were members of *Prosvita* even before Stakhura came to Sambir. To start with, Stakhura asked the executive of the *Prosvita* society to send him a map of the Sambir district.²³ This is an interesting fact, showing how little local assistance he had, and how much he relied on the center to chart the local context. It is important not to overestimate the power of the Ruthenian movement prior to the 1890s. Even around Stryi, one of the large provincial cities according to Olesnyts'kyi who came there in 1891, the peasantry was "dark;" there were no peasant organizations as those that had to be created later. Olesnyts'kyi says: "Whatever priests said was seen as holy in the communities." And this was despite the fact that Ruthenians in the Stryi district had always had a Ruthenian deputy from there.²⁴

The founding of the Sambir *Prosvita* branch occurred during a singing trip of Ukrainian student youth. This youth took part in the first general meeting of *Prosvita*, and Evhen Olesnyts'kyi came from Stryi to give a speech on the economic program and economic activity of the *Prosvita* branches. Olesnyts'kyi says that Roman Sosnovs'kyi had also played an important role in the founding of this branch.²⁵ On 25 June 1892 the committee organizing the *Prosvita* branch

²⁰ Ibid., 3.

²¹ Vol. P., "Z Sambirskoho," *Dilo*, 1893, No.63.

²² Stupnytskii, K., "Z-pid Sambora," *Dilo*, 1893, No.63.

²³ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.1-6.

²⁴ Evhen Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky z mohoho zhyttia*, ch.II (1890-1897) (L'viv: nakladom vydavnychoi spilky 'Dilo,' 1935), 20-1.

²⁵ Ibid., 37-38.

in Sambir sent letters about the upcoming creation of the new branch. The committee consisted of the following people: Revs. Bobers'kyi and Rabii, Danylo Stakhura, Iosyf Karanovych (court adjunct), dr. Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi, and Ivan Mykhas.²⁶ On this letter Revakovych wrote:

In the villages of the Sambir area people with head and heart should be found, who would be happy to enlighten themselves and encourage others to Enlightenment. Mostly we need peasants so-called *khlopy* and petty townsmen, that is self-evident because of our national situation.²⁷

The petition for the founding of the *Prosvita* branch was signed by 38 people. Besides Stakhura, the group active in its founding included Dr. Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi from the Sambir court, Boleslav Lityns'kyi, Rev. Frants Rabii, a catechist, Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi, Rev. Nykola Hurkevych (Viatskovychi), Rev. Ivan Mel'nyk (Berehy), Iakiv Hordyns'kyi, a teacher in Hordynia, Rev. Ivan Tatomir (Cherkhava), Vasyl' Silets'kyi, a retired k. k. controller and mayor of Silets', Ivan Mykhas, Vsevolod Sliuzar, a gymnasium professor, Rev. Iosyf Sabarai, (Torchynovychi) and several petty gentry.²⁸

When the branch was founded in 1891, 28 members paid their membership dues. Among them were Tyt Revakovych, court councilor from Pidbuzh, Volodysalv Khlopets'kyi (owner of the tabular estate in Berezhnytsia), Vinkentii Khlopets'kyi, an attorney in Sambir, Mykhailo Skoryk, a teacher in Luka. On 3 September 1891 in the hall of the Sambir magistrate the first executive of the Sambir branch was elected. Rev. Nykolai Bobers'kyi became the chair of the branch, vice-chair – Danylo Stakhura, secretary – Iosyf Karanovych and controller – Ivan Berezhnyts'kyi. Roman Sosnovs'kyi and Ivan Mykhas were elected as substitutes of the executive's members.²⁹

In 1891 the Sambir branch had 131 members. Popular publications of *Prosvita*, which went to every member, were sent to the following postal offices in the following numbers:

Sambir – 62 members
Staryi Sambir – 4
Kranzberg – 9
Luka – 39
Pidbuzh – 5
Limna – 2

²⁶ VR LNB, f. Tyt Revakovych, spr. 64, p.II, a.5.

²⁷ VR LNB, f. Tyt Revakovych, 64, p.II, a.5.

²⁸ Ivan Fylypchak, Ivan, *Pamiati Danyla Stakhury*, 5.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

Rudky – 1
Khyriv – 1
Nadyby – 1
Krukenychi – 1
Felshtyn – 1
Dobrivliany – 1
Cherkhava – 4³⁰

After a year of his activity Danylo Stakhura left Sambir and came back only in 1901 to open here his office as an independent attorney. After he left, someone more conservative of the clerical wing of the local national-populists won in the branch, thanks to the activities of Teodor Bilen'kyi, Oleksandr Barvins'kyi's friend and professor of the local teacher's seminary. Bilen'kyi's activity concentrated on the reading club in Babyna which he patronized and which won the right to sell vodka.³¹ The report of this branch for the years 1892-1893 shows that the chair of this branch was Rev. Bobers'kyi, while Ivan Mykhas was a member of the branch's executive. Mykhas founded the reading club in Morozovychi and the branch's executive founded reading clubs in Berezhnytsia and Kul'chytsi, both being to a large extent petty gentry villages.³² In the case of Berezhnytsia and Kul'chytsi several from Khlopets'kyi and Berezhnyts'kyi were among the founders of the branch.

When Stakhura left, tensions between Mykhas and Bobers'kyi grew and finally erupted at the branch's meeting in 1893. The meeting took place on 2 November 1893. Of 140 branch members those present included seven priests, four members of the secular intelligentsia, and thirteen peasants, largely brought by Mykhas: "some of them I caught at the market and some at the session of mayors, for a bigger number of the meeting [I] also [brought] nine Polish peasants." Rev. Nesterovych spoke about the progress of the branch, pointed to the founding of three reading clubs and claimed to address Basilian Fathers in Lavriv with the request of not selling timber to speculators, only to the peasants. Mykhas refuted the last statement, because he checked with the Basilian Fathers, and there was no such a letter. The new executive was elected, but Rev. Nesterovych, Dr. Khlopets'kyi and Mykhas did not accept positions there: Rev. Nesterovych, because he had a local agency of the *Dnister* insurance company, Dr. Khlopets'kyi, because of Rev. Rabiï (Perhaps, there was a personal antagonism between these two.) and Mykhas, "because insincere people were elected to the executive and there was no one to work with."

³⁰ Ibid., 7.

³¹ Ibid., 7-8.

³² VR LNB, f. Ivan Levyts'kyi, op.2, spr.291, a.15.

Mykhas said that the new executive took three peasants as substitutes only to mask its real face.

After the election Ivan Mykhas spoke. In this speech he said the following:

When our branch of *Prosvita* was founded, then it looked very much like if parents married their children, gave them land and said: 'sow and plough and you will harvest the beautiful fruits of the land and feed with them Gods' world.' And even the goal of this society defines the task of its branches as cultural work so that waste fallow-ground would bring beautiful fruits for the use of the people and the satisfaction of the state.

For the better understanding of my speech by the Delighted Gathering I am representing in this my account the Executive of our branch as the parents, the newly married as our branch, and the ground – these are members of our branch. I cannot develop this idea about our branch too extensively but I shall just present an outline of its activity for a year and half.

Our executive took upon itself as a task first of all the opening of reading clubs in the villages ... but how did the parents work on this ground? Let those, who opened the reading club, talk about this. I shall rather say here what [does it mean] for someone to enter this executive? This is done more for the sake of honor and triumph, to present one in the newspapers, but not for sincere work and sincere management, and the proof of this is in the fact that the executive has not persuaded a single community to found a reading club. And where they were founded several times [it was] for triumph, and maybe the second time there was something from sincerity, but I shall ask the gentlemen from Bilyna, Berezhnytsia and Kul'chytsi, did this executive come to the opening of your reading clubs, which was advertised? In this way [they] could celebrate you, modest peasants, and to bring themselves, sons of Rus', in order to enjoy together such a bright celebration, that at long last they saw their brothers Ruthenians willing to enlighten and to become equal with world civilization? I shall even better say, and this will be the truth, it looks as if they are ashamed of us (here shouts of priests: 'deprive him of speaking!' but the majority was for the continuation of the speech)... and as if they are afraid that the peasant wants to wake up from the impregnable darkness. And I am saying this from my own experience, for example my own community has done such great progress that we kicked a Jew out of the village and bought his tavern and founded there a reading club and community store but no one came to honor us. This is very similar to what the Holy Gospel says, that a man organized a feast and invited guests but one of these rejected the invitation justifying that he just married, and could not leave a young wife, and another one answered that there would be no oxen for sale.

So, in such circumstances, can our reading club get any spirit to life? Will they be interested in making connections with other [reading clubs]? Or does the executive ever supervise reading clubs?

Now, I am turning to the other side and represent you, the Delighted Gathering the hindrances with which our peasant progress meets and with how much difficulty our culture, our enlightenment develops against our Ruthenian civilizers and how they try to stifle this development

sometimes in the embryo, let this fact show how instead of standing together to work we have to struggle with them.

Several of us, national-populists, seeing that the executive of our branch is not doing anything useful for the people, and there is stagnation among people, while in the world progress advances as days pass by, we decided to call a people's meeting and discuss there hot issues: such as the case of the general franchise, because now everyone, even a wage laborer, is taxed, but has no vote, and now the Most Enlightened Lord and ministry is not against it. Then, the case of area mayors because landlords want with this method to have power over all the villages in their own hands, then the case of credit banks, if now they have such big capital, could not they take a lesser percent from the poor people in such hard times as these, [since] even The Most Enlightened Lord helps people in difficult times? Then the case of district roads ... which also harms poor peasants, then relief from the housing tax for 12 years, about which Dr. Chaikovs'kyi spoke here, and also the question of Ruthenian language in the administration.

You see gentlemen, is there something illegal in this program? Or, perhaps, something unimportant? Then, know, gentlemen, what was the outcome. All the priests, our pastors, made a noise that the secret radical society was founded, which keeps contacts with revolutionaries from abroad and wants to incite a rebellion here, and spread in a moment rumor among people that the captaincy would arrest those who come for the meeting, because those who call this meeting are suspicious people. And true, then [when] the committee had to gather and establish the list of speeches, we were forbidden to meet.

I am asking you, Reverend Fathers and our pastors: if something concerns you, do you not organize deanery meetings? And even cantors get together and have councils about their fate, and all the officials organize their own meetings and accept their own resolutions, and industrialists, and artisans, and workers organize meetings and improve their own fate. And would you like it that we, poor peasants, were forever used as oxen? Forgive me the word of truth, but All-knowing God be my witness that with such a behavior you yourself evoke radicalism against you among the people.³³

Then Rev. Rabii spoke (and Mykhas comments that Rev. Rabii was actually the first one to scare priests with the proposed meeting and alarmed the captaincy, while later on tried to refute it and blamed Mrs. Knihinets'ka, an accountant of "People's Trade"). Rev. Rabii called Mykhas "an impostor," but Dr. Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi countered Rev. Rabii so well that there was no discussion after that; only Rev. Polians'kyi "gave a sermon":

³³ Ivan Mikhas, "Prosvita narodu i pevni ruski otsi dukhovni v Sambirshchyni," *Khliborob*, 1893, No.21-23, 153-155.

The only enlightenment given by God is on the road by which we direct people, and only this can bring you salvation. And all the other adherents like Radicals lead to destruction because they live only for their own interest.

After this intervention Rev. Polians'kyi received the reply that he himself gave a nice example, by asking in the last elections 10 Gulden from Berezhnyts'kyi for the vote, and all the Polish peasants were witnesses of this.

It is worth comparing Mykhas' complaint about the intelligentsia not coming to the villages with one of the members of the intelligentsia who tried to do this kind of work. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi complains about hardships he had to endure participating in the openings of various village reading clubs around Ternopil': several hours of traveling bad roads, coming back home at night with having to work the next day, frost and wind, uncomfortable buildings housing reading clubs. Barvins'kyi concludes: "Anyone trying to do this at least once or two times will understand dangers to which health and life of those participating in these lectures and travels was exposed."³⁴

Mykhas' speech signaled the final break between him and Rev. Bobers'kyi, and the beginning of an open war between the mayor of Morozovychi and his pastor. Then, on 5 November Rev. Bobers'kyi in the church had a sermon, in which he called Mykhas "A Satan, one possessed, envious of humankind, [he behaved] towards [his] priest as Judas [while] I was for the people." Mykhas, in turn, accused Rev. Bobers'kyi in overcharging ritual fees and purchasing with this money apartment buildings in Sambir.³⁵

Conflict was developing in Morozovychi. Nikolai Baida, one of Mykhas' supporters, wrote an article to Khliborob. Mykhas himself was acknowledging in his private letters that everything Baida did was in fact organized by him; that is why we can guess that this article was also written largely by Mykhas. In this article Baida claims that the conflict with Rev. Bobers'kyi started because of the payments for ritual rites. The year 1893 was supposed to be especially difficult for peasants, because Bobers'kyi's charges crossed the limits of the reasonable, "maybe because he wanted to compensate for the harvest he lost this year, or maybe because he started to build a stone apartment building in Sambir." When Vasyl' Sarakhman was dying, he was afraid of the priest's charges more than of death itself. He asked Rev. Bobers'kyi not to overcharge and the latter promised it, but nevertheless dared to charge 20 Gulden. According to Baida, youth did not have enough funds to pay for weddings, which caused promiscuity and demoralization, and older peasants spoke openly against the faith and the

³⁴ Barvins'kyi, Spomyny, 184.

³⁵ Ivan Mikhas, "Prosvita narodu i pevni ruski otsi dukhovni v Sambirshchyni," Khliborob, 1893, No.21-23, 153-155.

eastern rite. Allegedly, it was because of all this that Ivan Mykhas called a meeting to establish fixed fees for the ritual rites. This was done “to stop the decline of holy faith” caused by the priest’s behavior. Mykhas opened this community meeting:

The leader of the community spoke to the gathered: about old Rus’ meetings when people came together for council and defense from injustice; and now the community of Morozovychi suffers from the Rev. Bobers’kyi’s injustice, and this is a glorious community because here [people] since old times have been standing hard for the community good and even suffered, not only men but also women, ‘for which let them be glory for times eternal.’

After this Mykhas said:

Rev. Bobers’kyi did not do to me personally anything evil but we had a quarrel because of the several words of truth I told them [priests] on 2 November 1893 on the meeting with a dozen peasants and seven priests, on how they behave with people.

After this, during a sermon, Rev. Bobers’kyi called Ivan Mykhas a Judah and a Satan, while Mykhas in his turn sent a complaint about Rev. Bobers’kyi to the newspaper, “not for revenge but to bring Rev. Bobers’kyi back to his senses.” Mykhas called upon his community:

Do not let ourselves to be used: now is the best moment for this and if we got together here, let’s establish one constant tax: how much and for what we should pay the priest, and what we decide today will be valid and holy. Let’s not worsen each other, because today to one, tomorrow to another one and then to all of us the same will happen. Once more I am asking and praying to you, gentlemen community: let’s not allow ruining ourselves because through that our faith is declining and our love to our pastor. Do not think that I am asking this from you because I am afraid that the priest wants to sue me. If he only sued me he would have himself to answer for this, I am asking this from you for your own good. As your mayor I am calling you to guard this our resolution, and for our generation, and I am saying once more: do not worsen each other.

So the community established the following fees – for the baptism – three Kreuzer from the godfather, if the ritual was done without a Service, and the priest had no right to force people to accept the Service. The wedding itself was priced for two Gulden, and three wedding announcements for one Gulden. For those going to marry the priest had to teach religion and not to substitute these lessons with the work on his field. A sung Service was priced for one Gulden, and together with blessing by holy water – for one Gulden and 50 Kreuzer, with blessing of the house – two Gulden (Earlier the priest charged five.); a

burial was established at one Gulden for those under 15, two Gulden for those from 15 to 24 years old, and one Gulden from *zabin* (a stripe of land, around 1.25 Joch) for those older than 24.

Finally, the article stressed that the struggle with the priest was just part of a whole complex of actions:

This event seems not to require too much effort, but in fact it appeared “that the farther in the forest, the more timber,” and we can say that we were lucky to succeed, having at the same time to deal with uprooting Jews from the community, introduction of the store in our lives and the enmity to it from inexperienced friends and enemies, and most stubborn rowdies, and with making order with them, when in the most useful for the community’s good intents they (together with the Jews) were trying to make obstacles, and those innocent [had] constant delays in courts, where they were sentenced because of their own suits and got 8 months of prison and this historical struggle with the Rev. pastor, and especially now, when the community on all Church rites insists in its resolution, and Rev. Bobers’kyi does not want to allow for that, and makes all possible obstacles, and says ‘even if Morozovychites burst it is not going to be as they wish.’ He reproaches everyone and sends to the ‘*pip* Mikhas,’ and that resulted in the district captain’s investigation, which will decide and have a great importance in the district.³⁶

In the meantime clerical presence in the district *Prosvita* was growing. Olesnyts’kyi’s and Stakhura’s friend Roman Sosonovs’kyi moved to Bibrka and Rev. Nykola Nesterovych became a central figure in the branch.³⁷ He actually became the branch’s chair.³⁸ In 1892 Rev. Nykolai Polians’kyi from Mokriany joined the society. Some peasants joined the branch as well – several peasants from Sushytsia Rykova and in 1893 Ivan Savchyn, a mayor of Tatary.³⁹ Among petty gentry most active were those from Luka and Berezhnytsia. These were approached by attorney Khlopets’kyi, who being himself a petty gentry had relatives in Berezhnytsia. A dozen of Berezhnytsia peasants and petty gentry paid their membership dues in 1893 to him.⁴⁰ In 1896 Rev. Ioann Mel’nyk from Berehy became a member of *Prosvita* as well.⁴¹ However, this growth of *Prosvita* was not as substantial as *Prosvita*’s central executive wanted; the branch failed to

³⁶ Nykolai Baida, „Straik hromady Morozovychi protiv platni za treby tserkovni,” *Khliborob*, 1894, No.4, 21-23

³⁷ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.16.

³⁸ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.13-14.

³⁹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.18.

⁴⁰ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.21.

⁴¹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.65.

organize a network of reading clubs, and some of them, like the one in Morozovychi, were in open opposition to the branch's politics. But this growing conflict in the area was overlooked at its incipient stage by the society's central executive.

On 11 September 1894, Kost' Levyts'kyi, a chair of the central executive of *Prosvita*, wrote a letter to Ivan Mykhas. The Prosvita Calendar, published yearly, included biographies of more prominent Ruthenian activists, peasants as well as intelligentsia. In the Calendar for the year 1895 they wanted to include Mykhas' biography and Mykhas' picture, both of which Levyts'kyi requested from the mayor of Morozovychi himself.⁴² The news reached Rev. Bobers'kyi, who reacted immediately and on 26 October wrote a letter to Kost' Levyts'kyi:

I have received news that Ivan Mykhas' photo should be published in this year's calendar. It would be very sad if it was true, because Ivan Mykhas is an enemy of the clergy, well known in the area, a socialist, a radical and acknowledges this himself and states this openly in the radical newspapers. Besides this, he is a restless man, in his community as a mayor [he] is unjust towards defenseless citizens... in one word he cannot be given as an example to other citizens. If it happens I shall leave *Prosvita*, Mykhas permits himself blasphemy and incites people. He broke the branch of *Prosvita* in Sambir with his behavior, he does not build but ruins.⁴³

Now *Prosvita's* central executive realized the importance and scale of the conflict for the whole Sambir area. On 29 November there was a meeting of the Sambir branch with Kornlyo Pan'kovskii as a representative of the central executive. That meeting did not reach any decision about Mykhas. Then, at the beginning of 1895 the Sambir branch approached Kost' Levyts'kyi with the request to expel Mykhas on the ground that the latter's activity was harmful for the society. Levyts'kyi approached Volodymyr Khlopets'kyi. Khlopets'kyi, writing from Berezhnysia, although being ready to move to Lanovychi as a manager of the local estate, answered that Ivan Mykhas at the local *Prosvita's* meeting spoke against the clergy, and it was not the first time he did so. If Ivan Mykhas remains in *Prosvita*, local priests will leave the society. "Against Mykhas I have no personal grievance and do not feel any, he behaves towards me very politely and my stance against him is explained only from the interest of our society as a whole."⁴⁴

We have the report of Mykhas to Franko about this meeting of the Sambir branch.

⁴² TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.27.

⁴³ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.29-30.

⁴⁴ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.28-35.

After having read the report from this meeting in Dilo I was amazed that interesting arguments of the meeting unflatteringly characterizing peasant civilization were avoided there.

Mykhas said that he spoke out against certain trends in the development of the society. He was pointing to the reading club in Morozovychi as a model of how *Prosvita* should work in the villages. This was the only village reading club to report on its activities while the rest of the clubs did not even respond to *Prosvita's* branch request. Mykhas praised his own village: the “reading club in Morozovychi awakened people to find out their injustice, their oppression and their slavery, and decided odorously not to allow to exploit itself further on.” According to Mykhas, Rev. Bobers'kyi said:

Those who go to the reading club are stupid, the reading club will bring misfortune on you, it is better to spend time in the tavern than in the reading club, do not give a razor to a kid and the written word to a peasant.

Mykhas had found out that a certain member of the branch's executive sent a letter to L'viv to deprive Mykhas and his reading club of *Prosvita's* membership.

In these conditions we decided to enlighten ourselves and develop without the help of our intelligentsia, and have nothing to do with them.

Mykhas also protested against not granting *Prosvita* membership to two “most prominent activists,” namely, Ivan Franko and V'iacheslav Budzynovs'kyi, obviously comparing his own fate with theirs. At the meeting of the Sambir *Prosvita* branch he said:

These are the talents valued by Europe; we need precisely their teachings, only on the basis of their teaching we can get out from political slavery, and there are proofs that whenever they teach their teachings bring fruit, and where it is taught not according to their themes, progress is slow; people read books published by them with great ardor, and that is why in the name of our peasants I support them, the Executive of our branch ought to request the Main Executive to accept them as society members.

Rev. Kozanevych countered Mykhas saying that not only Franko's and Budzynovs'kyi's books should be read. For example, there is no good in criticizing and throwing away Kost' Levyts'kyi's books after one just started reading them; something useful can be always found there as well. The judge Tanchakovs'kyi and Professor Bilen'kyi stated that they could not agree with Franko's tendencies. Mykhas answered that “even your Dilo and governmental Bukovyna were saddened by the refusal to accept Franko and Budzynovs'kyi’.”

Finally, Mykhas complains to Franko about injustices of the land cadastre, when the good land of landlords was estimated to be less productive than the pitiable land peasants owned. Only one landlords' parcel of land was listed in the first class, and the rest were peasant plots. This proves how overtaxed peasant land was although the landlords justified it arguing that smaller land plots of peasants allow for the better care of them.⁴⁵

In November 1894, Mykhas sent a long letter to the Consistory signed by him and Mykola Baida, reading club's secretary. The letter starts as follows:

We are tired by now from this endless situation which we have to bear with our Rev. Bobers'kyi, pastor of Vaniovychi, instead of getting to some peace he with his actions brings us every time in a whiter rage. This most recent fact will serve to show to which goal and by which means Rev. Bobers'kyi uses his spiritual power...

Rev. Bobers'kyi proclaimed in the church the founding of the Church Brotherhood. Mykhas' party at first hesitated, but after having read that the Brotherhood had the goal of a moral and sober Christian life and that everyone could join it while exclusion of the members would be based only on the statute, it decided to enter, and all the community, upon the call of those who signed the letter, entered the Brotherhood. But soon it appeared that the Brotherhood "under its cover had to serve personal and not spiritual goals." After the list of members was read aloud, Mykhas and his friends found that Rev. Bobers'kyi excluded them from the Brotherhood explaining that because of the right secured to him in the statute he could do that; "and under the threat of a court suit we were publicly forbidden to carry candles in the church." Then Mykhas continued:

If Rev. Bobers'kyi has thrown us out of the Brotherhood, [but there was no] immorality or irreligiosity in our life, for which he together with our most ferocious enemies could reproach us [and to remain in peace] with their conscience. We do not really care about membership in such a [Rev. Bobers'kyi's] brotherhood, but we think it must be a great miracle that some [other] brothers were not excluded from the list [as well], those [who] in the church raise their hands to God, and pretend to be righteous, while outside of church are used to acquiring wealth at the cost of others' estate and injustice, and propagate to the dark people such a teaching: 'only I was doing good in this world, because no one knows how does it go in that other world,' and others laugh at those who have not been to prison yet, and say that these are not [real] farmers. (We do not need to name these brothers here, but everyone here knows them because they do not hide with that. The real condition is hard to be described (in Vaniovychi) k. k. gendarmerie can give here a more detailed account.) And

⁴⁵ VR II, f.3, spr. 1613, s.309.

yet other brothers instead of inclining neighbors to sobriety only make them drink even more. And how to abstain from drinking, if Rev. Bobers'kyi himself is very angry with those who approach him with some business without bringing with them several liters of vodka.

Rev. Bobers'kyi, a priest, superior to Christ's truth, because they support his actions, his oppression of poor and helpless people, organizes such a brotherhood to have himself help or silence them. And in what light [this brotherhood] appears if a significant number of the brotherhood's members (in Vaniovychi) are charged in the k. k. court with theft of church articles during the construction of the church by Ivan Bilyns'kyi, a member of the Church committee. Or, perhaps, it is appropriate for the priest to be in so close a friendship with M. Semash, well-known among us and tried several times for various swindles, (we do not want to talk about this man more), and this is only because Semash has witty influence among the dark people and is a community scribe (there is no other man for a scribe). And where is the shame? Where is respect? Where is ambition? On which foundations is this brotherhood organized and constructed?!

That is how it goes inside, where people are dark and unable to speak out their injustice, and to evaluate their defense, or to be more precise do not know where to go with it, and where the authorities do not control strictly, and even when they look inside, at that very moment people from the brotherhood try not to allow people to the event, as for example we in Stare Misto were not allowed for the audience with Their Eminence [Metropolitan] on the day of 7 October this year [to prevent us] to present our fate, and others were afraid to open their mouth, so not to bring upon themselves even worse shame from their pastors, as for example in Vaniovychi on the dean's visit on 21 September this year, and when two on the commission said to the Most Respected Rev. dean only these words 'our pastor takes too large payments from the burials and weddings, they got so much infamy and Rev. Bobers'kyi ordered even poor servants to pay him from 25 to 30 Gulden for weddings.

The faith of those, who signed this letter, is that developed from the reading of Biblical history and Holy Writ [what is in the] spirit of Christ's truth and with it we come out openly and freshly, and try to bring our dark and poor neighbors back to reason, to develop enlightenment and progress on the foundations of Christ's teaching because we see that our pastor uses God's word to dark people only with this understanding that there was good for him, that he could live an upscale life (*panoshyvsia*), and considers us to be the last junk, and with his actions he gives us evil examples to exploit each other without pity, and because of that even greater enmity and demoralization would develop among our neglected people. That is why we were not accepted to the Church Brotherhood, because we do not deserve, because we are the breachers of the peace. In the sermons on 11 and 20 November of this year Rev. Bobers'kyi cast a dirty light on us saying that we were Godless, atheists, roaming like the Devil, like a roaring lion in the desert looking for whom to swallow, and that we were dangerous because infectious mould woke up in us that we were damned and complained about our rights, that I (Mykhas) was not prosecuted by the k. k. court in Sambir investigating his complaint about irreligiosity and the perturbing of public peace.

And the lost part was not excluded from the brotherhood, because they are in the service of those, who try to finish us from hindering those used to exploit poorer and darker people. And attention was strongly paid to us, and it was emphasized that we became dangerous mutineers of peace, and allegedly of the holy faith but attention was not paid even once to the fact that the Ruthenian parish in Vaniovychi became Jewish (there are already around 400 souls by now, and they have almost half of the Ruthenian landplots in their possession, and the other half is burdened with debts) and dark people turn into a proletariat without business – without work, and to what hunger can [this] bring them? And this is not scary that the flock demoralizes! But it is scary that we are mutineers? God! God! Which kind of truth is that?

So the outcomes from the organization of this brotherhood became such that announced citizens from Morozovychi on the defined day had to confess, take holy sacraments and enter the brotherhood's life, but when they found out about the goal of organizing such a brotherhood only five came. And other people, most exemplary in the community, like Pylyp Sagalo, Mykhailo Patsai and Vasyly Patsai, said that as long as this brotherhood remains under the protectorate of Rev. Bobers'kyi they will not join it.

Therefore we the undersigned ask kindly the Lucid Consistory to consider in detail this case and to correct the fate of such a Church Brotherhood according to your justice. We ourselves by now are not hurt so much that we have been thrown out of the holy church, because of this the spirit in the heart towards the Lord God, holy faith and love towards a neighbor will not die among us and our honor will not be taken away from us by the fact that we shall not hold a candle in our hand. But [we are afraid] that with time instead of the exemplary brotherhood the other, exemplary priest will have tormented and both priest and people would indeed become martyrs innocently.⁴⁶

The consistory sent this letter to the local dean for an investigation. Rev. Lev Kozanevych had to interrogate witnesses according to the accusation for and against Mykhas. He did it together with a priest from P'ianovychi and from Mykhas' friends and foes found

That Ivan Mykhas having learned a bit (*prychyvsia*) to read, to write, and of contemporary politics in elections, did his best to and indeed became mayor in Morozovychi, taking as his help Nykolai Baida and other people dark and blindly believing in him, propagates among them radicalism, reads to them newspapers Narod and Khliborob, and even in all his correspondences with the Rev. Pastor from Vaniovychi he signs himself as "radical." I do not know how and through which lens (*jakym chudom i dyvom*) authorities look at the fact that this man in the whole Sambir district distributes these newspapers among people... Now enmity and struggle rose between the pastor and Ivan Mykhas, who boasts

⁴⁶ APP, ABGK, sygn.4272, ch.192.

everywhere that he must destroy the local pastor, evict him from Vaniovychi and even bring him to death. Ivan Mykhas uses the lowest possible means and having nothing to point to against the pastor he resorts to the last thing, that miserable *jura stolae*, to bite and dishonor his pastor at least with this.⁴⁷

Rev. Kozanevych characterized Rev. Bobers'kyi as a good pastor, who finally finished the church that had been in disorder for 40 years. To bring vodka to the priest has been an old custom, which he neither brought in nor tried to abolish, but Rev. Bobers'kyi himself does not drink and is a sober man. Now Mykhas proclaimed his own patent, according to which the payments had to be made. The village reading club and store were founded by Mykhas and the priest before they split, buying the tavern from a Jew. But Mykhas turned it into the place for partying and dissoluteness, and this is why the priest had to dissolve that reading club. Mykhas himself described it as "our casino" in a conversation with Rev. Kozanevych. All the women and children were attending the store, and it even started selling vodka, although in the newspaper they boasted about Morozovychi's youth giving up drinking.

Rev. Kozanevych also mentioned the incident at the *Prosvita* meeting in Sambir in November 1894 and continued his characterization of Mykhas:

Ivan Mykhas comes sometimes to the church, grabs the candle, but he has not been confessing for several years, he himself states that he confesses in Peremyshl' or some other place but no one knows about that, and the local pastor has not been notified where and when Ivan Mykhas had his Easter confession... I think that this case will not lend itself to an easy solution, the hatred of Ivan Mykhas toward the local pastor crosses all the boundaries (*perekhodyt vsiaki poniattia*), when the undersigned explained to Mykhas that living in discord with his local pastor is not in the Christian way, that it is necessary to reconcile, Ivan Mykhas promised that 'I shall apologize to the pastor, if he will behave in a different way, but he (the pastor) will lay as a burden in my heart forever,' which means that this man is irreconcilable (*neprimirnyi*).⁴⁸

Prosvita Without Mykhas and Mykhas' Opposition Politics

The list of *Prosvita* members from 1892 shows one "farmer" from Berezhnytisa and three from Luka, Mykhailo Luts'kyi (owner of the tabular estate from Luka), Boleslav Lypyns'kyi (a tabular estate's owner from Bukova), five priests, and peasants from Ozymyna, Volia Iakubova, Silets', Morozovychi (Ivan Baida and Mykhas), Chapeli, Dorozhiv, Hordynia, Cherkhava, Vasyl' Plaskach from

⁴⁷ APP, ABGK, sygn.4272, ch.192.

⁴⁸ APP, ABGK, sygn.4272, ch.192.

Berezhnytsia (who was also a member of Kachkovskii Society). There also were settlements in the area that had *Prosvita* agents (for the distribution of publications and members' recruitment): Boskiv, Berezhnytsia, Morozovychi, Horodyshe, Luka, Vaniovychi, Lopushanka, Stare Misto, Bilyna Velyka, Dorozhiv, Torhanovychi, Stupnytsia, Chapeli, Blazhiv, Sambir, Volia Iakubova, Bilyna mala, Novotychi, Kornalovychi, Ortynychy, Cherkhava, Berehy, Mistkovychi, Urozhe, Bykiv, Zaraisko, Mokriany, Kupnovychi, Silets', Ozymyna.⁴⁹

But after Stakhura and Sosnovs'kyi left the numbers of peasant members decreased significantly. In 1897 there were only two reading clubs that paid membership dues: Pidbuzh and Cherkhava.⁵⁰ Already in June 1895, when the Sambir *Prosvita* branch organized a "farming and industrial" (*hospodarsko-promyslove*) meeting and asked "Spiritual fathers and literate people to spread the word about it in their parishes," Ivan Mykhas was not in the program. The meeting took place in the "Sokół Hall" in the k. k. gymnasium, and it could be a proof of the fact that the local *Prosvita* was on good terms with the local administration and Polish politicians.⁵¹ At the general meeting of the branch that took place in 1895, the new executive was elected. The new chair of the branch became gymnasium professor Volodyslav Sliuzar, the vice-chair – judge Stefan Tanchakovs'kyi, the accountant – Rev. Rabii, his controller Zakharasevych, and secretary – Teodor Bilens'kyi. Isydor Stakhura, a townsman, and Maksym Fedak, a farmer, were elected as members of the branch's executive. Their substitutes were Volodymyr Khlopets'kyi, Ivan Berezhnyts'kyi and Illia Kul'chyts'kyi.

The main object of the discussion again was the development of reading clubs. At first the executive asked in writing for the list of members but never got it. Then it asked *Prosvita* reading clubs in Berehy, Morozovychi [in the newspaper by mistake *Mordovychi*], Kul'chytsi, Berezhnytsia, Cherkhava, Bilyna Velyka and Stupnytsia to send a list of members and detailed reports. No answer came back. After that the executive asked more prominent members of the reading clubs to come to Sambir in person, but to no avail – only Mr. Berezhnyts'kyi from Berezhnytsia came and reported on his reading club. Having so little success with the reading clubs the executive decided to increase membership by personally writing to the Ruthenians in the town of Sambir. A total of forty people were approached but only nine entered the society. It became obvious that the town itself could not provide a sufficient base for the branch's activities.

⁴⁹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4893, a.3-5.

⁵⁰ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4893, a.42.

⁵¹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.58.

The Executive returned to the question of reading clubs and to ten priests and four secular people from the countryside to discuss their development. Only two priests and two secular people showed up. Having held the meeting, the executive decided to found reading clubs only in places that had an appropriate building for them and a man willing to conduct their activity; otherwise it was deemed to be a waste of effort.⁵² The Executive also decided to call for a general branch meeting in December 1895. For this meeting 44 members showed up. The chair of the meeting was Rev. Tatomyr from Cherkhava, and the secretary Rev. Pohorets'kyi from Bilyna Velyka. After Bilen'kyi reported on the Executive's activities a discussion developed, in which Rev. Kozanevych, Mykhas, Tanchakovs'kyi, Rev. Mel'nyk, Rev. Pohorets'kyi and Bilen'kyi took part. It was decided that the executive should start organizing talks in the villages, and these talks should be given not only in reading clubs but in all the communities that had their own communal building. Rev. Nesterovych and Mykhas checked the finances of the branch and found them to be in good order.

The new executive consisted of Tanchakovs'kyi, Sliuzar, Zakhariasevych, Bilen'kyi, Ivan Silets'kyi, Hrynevets'kyi, Vasyl' Plaskach, Hryhorii Sen'kus, Rev. Mel'nyk and Ivan Novosil's'kyi from Bilyna. We see that Mykhas is not there, but his radical friend Hryhorii Sen'kus got included among the executive's members. Neither Rev. Bobers'kyi nor Rev. Rabii entered the executive this time, and the number of peasants had grown up. In 1895 a meeting took place after the majority of national-populists broke up with the "new era" (The 1890 compromise between national-populists, Viceroy and the Polish Diet majority.) and the attempted "consolidation" with the Russophiles and radicals. The minority of national-populists staying with the compromise was ostracized and moved rapidly in the conservative and clerical direction. Perhaps this explains the shift in the local *Prosvita* politics. The discussion on community stores stated that in Berehy and Morozovychi it was felt that there was a lack of people for an adequate running of these stores.⁵³ The community store in Stupntysia founded in 1893 on the advice of a local priest and conducted by the former mayor was not mentioned.⁵⁴

In 1896 Sambir's *Prosvita* branch approached Revakovych with an appeal "to organize discipline in the field of enlightening and economic [activity]" in his area. They sent to Revakovych a list of the *Prosvita* members from Revakovych's area with a request to check on them. They asked about farmer Pylyp Morych in Pidbuzh, a priest and teacher among two farmers from Opoka, a mayor and

⁵² *Chytal'nia*, 1895, No.23, 161-2.

⁵³ *Chytal'nia*, 1895, No.24, 190.

⁵⁴ Vol. P., "Z Sambirskoho," *Dilo*, 1893, No.63.

reading club from Storonna, and a teacher and parish priest from Urozh. All these places belonged to the postal office in Pidbuzh and Sambir *Prosvita* had no idea about the status of its alleged members there.⁵⁵

In 1898 Bilen'kyi reported to Revakovich about *Prosvita* activities in Sambir and presented going to the villages with talks as an unusual achievement:

The enlightening movement is expanding slowly and the new Executive is getting to work, and most important is the fact that it already got brave enough to go to the people in villages with talks.⁵⁶

In 1898 reading clubs from Berezhnytsia, Cherkhava, Bilyna, Lavriv and Berehy reported on their activities, while the reading club in Morozovychi did not send any report.⁵⁷ When on 8 December 1898, the general meeting of *Prosvita* took place, there were only 50 members present. Revs. Petro Pohorets'kyi and Mykhail Ortyns'kyi had a celebratory service. Teodor Bilen'kyi opened the meeting, while Kornlyo Ustyianovych was elected to chair it. Rev. Mel'nyk from Berehy was the secretary, Petro Budzins'kyi –the accountant, while Revs. Rabii and Nesterovych served as controllers. Hladylovych, Bilen'kyi, Sliuzar, Revs. Ortyns'kyi and Lityns'kyi, Senkus from Neudorf, Budzins'kyi from Sambir, Kishakevych from Silets', Makar from Berehy and Novosil's'kyi from Bilyna were elected to the executive.⁵⁸ At that time there was “an alliance” (*soiuz*) between Ivan Makar (a mayor) and a pastor. In 1899 10 *Prosvita* members came from that village alone for the branch meeting in Sambir.⁵⁹

The pet reading club of Teodor Bilen'kyi, one in Babyna, was not doing well. This reading club because of its store with the license to sell vodka became a site of fraud and speculation and had to be audited in 1899. Its right to making and selling vodka also became a source of debate in *Prosvita's* executive about the moral implications of the situation. Finally, it was decided that the store could do it “if [it] had the right and conditions for it. An important thing is not to spread drinking and not to compromise already existing reading clubs.”⁶⁰

In 1899 a letter from the *Prosvita* branch in Sambir to *Prosvita's* central executive was sent with a critique of the society's publication. The authors liked things about the times of *robot* presented as popular tales (published in connection with the 50th anniversary of the abolition of *robot*) but did not like

⁵⁵ VR LNB, f. Tyt Revakovich, spr. 64, p.II, a.1-2.

⁵⁶ VR LNB, f. Tyt Revakovich, spr. 25, p.I.

⁵⁷ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.77.

⁵⁸ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.78.

⁵⁹ “Viche filii 'Prosvity' v Sambori,” *Svoboda*, 1899, No.17.

⁶⁰ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.81, 93.

fiction like “Oksana, a thief;” especially the word “thief” was considered to be not a good idea in a publication for peasants. The letter asked for more historical books concentrating on the narrower historical periods and not on whole epochs, and it wanted more books on the Church Union and ritual matters. The authors also asked for biographies from ancient Ukrainian history to be published in *Prosvita's Calendar*. Moreover, they wanted the society to publish books on the “social behavior and [proper way of] addressing people in higher positions.” This letter forced its reader in the Prosvita executive to put a big question mark on the margins.⁶¹ It indicates that the conservative-clerical leadership of the Sambir branch was unusual in *Prosvita* of the 1890s. Perhaps Mykhas remained in the society because of the politics of the central executive and in spite of the local *Prosvita* leaders.

Although Mykhas distanced himself from the *Prosvita* society, his fight against Rev. Bobers'kyi and clergy in general did not stop; in fact, it escalated. The struggle was connected with the already mentioned general shift in Ruthenian politics. In 1894 the majority of national-populists officially broke up with the politics of compromise and went into opposition. They formed an alliance with Russophiles and Radicals, while the conservative wing of national-populists led by Oleksandr Barvins'kyi and Natal' Vakhnianyn continued the politics of compromise with the Poles, called the “new course,” and together with their supporters in 1895 founded the so-called “Ruthenian-Catholic Union.” However, in the Sambir area the differences were not that sharp, and there was no clear boundary between national-populists and clerical-conservatives: quite often the difference between Russophiles and Ukrainians mattered more. The Sambir area was not typical in this respect. We know that in the Turka District, the politics of “consolidation” were more successful and united Ruthenians, while the pro-Barvins'kyi group was considered to betray the Ruthenian cause to the Poles.

The confidant of Oleksandr Barvins'kyi in Sambir was Teodor Bilen'kyi, a professor in the teachers' seminary. Several sympathizers of Barvins'kyi could be found among parish clergy. Moreover, most of them were able to pose as allies of the national-populist mainstream. Most of them belonged to the new generation of clergy, which came to the region in the 1880s. Among them the more prominent ones were Rev. Tatomyr, whom Bilen'key characterized as too passive a person, and the very lively and enterprising Rev. Pohorets'kyi.⁶² Ivan Mel'nyk from Berehy also belonged to this group. All of them appeared in villages with a long tradition of Ruthenian politics. Barvins'kyi's influence among Ruthenians rested on his important position in the province's

⁶¹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.86.

⁶² VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.626, p.59, a.23.

administration. It is hard to distinguish clearly between his personal clients and his political supporters. Even Rev. Ivan Iavors'kyi, a renowned Ruthenian politician from the national-democratic camp, had to address Barvins'kyi asking for "protection."⁶³

While this group of Sambir conservatives could not emphasize this conflict with national-democracy for purely tactical reasons, they did emphasize conflict with the radicals. Bilen'kyi wrote to Barvins'kyi:

The Radical party has here several representatives, and the strongest is the farmer Mykhas from the parish of Rev. Bobers'kyi, whom [Mykhas] together with Russophiles undermined Bobers'kyi's respect in the local area. For some time this Mykhas has been in the service of the Russophile party and figures as Humets'kyi's adjutant. Through this peasant local Russophiles influence people, but, perhaps, will not do much, because, as I can judge from local meetings, peasants and [petty] gentry blame him as a traitor.⁶⁴

While from the point of view of the peasant fraction the petty gentry were an enemy, conservative groups thought that the petty gentry were not lost to the Ruthenian cause at all. While thinking about putting Tyt Revakovych as a candidate in the 1897 elections, Bilen'kyi reported that "many from the gentry, even mayors, are zealous adherents of national-populists and we can count on them."⁶⁵

The following story explains this enmity of Sambir national-populists to Humets'kyi. Not only in the private correspondence but also in the press the supporters of the "new course" accused Mykhas of Russophile sympathies. The conservative newspaper for the people, Narodna Chasopys' (to which Mykhas contributed in 1892), also complained that for the Ruthenian meeting in Sambir on 29 August 1895 Ivan Mykhas invited an attorney, Humets'kyi, with whom he lived in great friendship, while the latter invited Rev. Markov, a cooperator from Raitarovychi and brother of Osyp Markov. Rev. Markov's participation brought the meeting to a dead end.⁶⁶

In 1897 Rev. Lysykevych died and left money for Ruthenian children; Humets'kyi wanted to get them for Kachkovskii's residency. However, Bilen'kyi and Lashkevych managed to leave them for next year when Ukrainians would open their own residency. Bilen'kyi complained that Russophiles were not doing anything themselves and were making obstacles to every honest

⁶³ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.2864, p.171.

⁶⁴ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.626, p.59, a.24.

⁶⁵ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.626, p.59, a.32.

⁶⁶ "Rukh vyborchyi," Narodna Chasopys', 1895, No.189.

Ruthenian cause. It looked like all their activity was concentrated around the lucrative enterprise “*Ryznytsia*.” In 1898 a conflict between Russophiles and Ukrainians erupted in “*Ruska Besida*,” and Russophiles were constantly blaming Rev. Rabii, Teodor Bilen’kyi, and Sliuzar. When the Ruthenian school of exercise (preparations for gymnasium) was opened, they barely managed to get 15 pupils to the first grade. Children who were enrolling into this school, and among them were many Ruthenians, did not speak Ruthenian. The slow progress Bilen’kyi explained through the absence in this area of “more active priests,” saying at the same time that “people are willing, a little more encouragement and sacrifice and the Sambir district could become better than many others.”⁶⁷

Mykhas’ friendship with the local Russophile attorney Humets’kyi was logical against the background of Mykhas’ conflict with the local Ukrainian establishment in 1893-1895. However, we can also see that Mykhas was just participating in the wider alliance with the Russophiles, the so-called “consolidation,” when radicals, opposition national-populists and Russophiles were trying to unite against the ruling elite. The politics of consolidation started in the province, in the nearby Turka District in the summer of 1891. I do not know if the opposition was indeed “the strongest in the most backward mountainous districts of Eastern Galicia.”⁶⁸ It seems that the problem was that there was no provincial representation in the “National Council,” the policy-making body of national-populists. From the very beginning, people like Rev. Zubryts’kyi opposed these politics. Another problem was that politics in the capital and in the province were not yet synchronized.

Another interesting thing was that when Mykhas in 1892 joined the Radical Party he, just like Hryhorii Rymar, did not mention his 1880s’ background; he presents himself as being converted to the radical cause only in 1892. It seems that in the 1890s, now with the Radical Party and not the Ukrainian movement, the story of peasant activists from the 1880s was repeated. There were peasants who fought against the social establishment (this time in many cases Russophile or Ukrainian), and there was a party ready to provide them public space and moral support, while at the same time expecting to use them for its own goals. At first, there was one radical newspaper, *Narod* (people or nation). However, soon it appeared that Radical Party members and sympathizers were divided into two large groups, learned activists and not that learned followers. The founding of the Radical Party, which had, according to Franko, to “carry into popular masses consciousness of their economic, political, and national interests, explain these interests giving them publicity and defend them,”

⁶⁷ VR LNB, f. Tyt Revakovich, spr. 5, p.I.

⁶⁸ Ihor Chornovol, *Ukrains’ko-pol’s’ka uhoda*, 189.

occurred without peasants. Franko acknowledged this, and it seems that the public resonance and support from peasants that the Radical Party received amazed him himself.⁶⁹

Already in 1890, after the discourse of one of the radical peasants, Pavlo Dumka, the editorial board stated: “we have found that it is impossible to publish a newspaper equally understandable and equally interesting for the more learned and for the little learned or the totally dark.” Therefore from now there would be two newspapers, one for the more learned and another one for the less learned.⁷⁰ The first article from Ivan Mykhas appeared in Khliborob in 1892, in the peasants’ radical newspaper, although we know that Mykhas was subscribing to Narod, as well, at least in 1895.⁷¹

In the 1890s, besides Ivan Mykhas, there were eleven people subscribing to Narod in the Sambir, Saryi Sambir and Turka districts. Most of them belonged to the younger secular Ukrainian intelligentsia. They were working in the courts or in the private attorneys’ offices, and some of them were teachers. But almost none of them had a strong local connection, and most of them did not stay in the area, being transferred or moving elsewhere. Among these subscribers was also Mykhas’ friend Dr. Lukiian Humets’kyi.⁷²

An attorney friend of Ivan Mykhas was Luka Teodorovych Humets’kyi, the son of the Russophile priest, who was a friend of Rev. Ivan Naumovych back in the 1870s. Proof that the former shared populist ideas of the latter could be found in the letter of Rev. Naumovych to Humets’kyi. In this letter the idea of the founding of the Kachkovskii Society is revealed, and of publishing in Kolomyia of “a kind of manifesto” – obviously the brochure that started Kachkovskii society’s publications.⁷³ Luka had eight brothers and three sisters. His brother was Rev. Kornylii Iavors’kyi, another well-known Russophile in the Turka Mountains. He did not change this national orientation even during the Ukrainian-Polish War of 1918-1919 and left a valuable unpublished memoir. Luka, or Lukiian, a friend of Ivan Mykhas, was a member of the Russophile student society *Akademicheskii kruz’bok* at the university, and an acquaintance of Ivan Franko. Being born in 1857, he belonged to the same generation as the latter. Lukiian Humets’kyi graduated from Przemyśl gymnasium, where allegedly was the most talented, but “did not care about it.” He was a bearded brunette and very phlegmatic. As a one-year army volunteer, he seriously

⁶⁹ Antin Krushel’nyts’kyi, Ivan Frako (poeziia) (Kolomyia: Halyts’ka nakladnia Iakova Orenshtaina), 120-21.

⁷⁰ Post-scriptum to the article Pavlo Dumka, „Nashi seliane i radykalizm,” Narod, 1890, No.23, 366.

⁷¹ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.165a, a.126.

⁷² TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.161, aa.13, 64, 82, 154, 807, 336, 395, 514, 559, 639, 727, 752.

⁷³ VR LNB, f.Osyp Markov, spr. 286, p.11, a.1.

undermined his health. At first he started his career as a judge, but he did not see there any perspective for himself as a Ruthenian in that field, and therefore switched to being an attorney. Peasants allegedly loved him for his “lenience” (*sniskhoditel’nost’*) to them, and his office was doing very well, but he died soon from stomach sickness in 1901.⁷⁴

When Humets’kyi opened his office of independent attorney in Sambir in 1894, the Russophile newspaper said that he “without doubts belongs to very talented people with a rarely met [strong] character.”⁷⁵ Humets’kyi opened his office after the suicide of the local Ruthenian attorney Khlopets’kyi. The story was as follows: Judge Tanchakovs’kyi, who was also a *Prosvita* activist, in a trial slapped the face of an accused Jewish woman, and she filed a complaint. This could have been very serious accusation, and attorney Khlopets’kyi, another *Prosvita* activist, paid her 10 Gulden to drop the complaint and explain that Tanchakovs’kyi hit her unwillingly. However, Khlopets’kyi took this bribing so much to heart that could not bear it longer and committed suicide, shooting a rifle straight into his mouth. Revakovych in 1911 recalled that Khlopets’kyi was inclined to melancholy, and usually and he was “back then in Sambir the only support for some kind of Ukrainian life.” Tanchakovs’kyi “was a very honest and very talented man and good a Ukrainian, but to a high extent antsy (*narvanyi*). Having 20 years of service and being on the way to another advance he resigned altogether from his position and pension because he did not want to pay alimonies to his wife whom he was divorcing.”⁷⁶

The death of Khlopets’kyi opened this place for Humets’kyi, and he moved in. In the conditions of escalating conflict between Ivan Mykhas and local national-populists, Humets’kyi became a valued ally for the former. Humets’kyi cooperated with Franko and Ukrainians in the 1897 elections, actually informing them about the arrest of Ivan Mykhas, and asking Tyt Revakovych to become a candidate from the cities in Sambir-Stryi electoral district.⁷⁷

Instead of Revakovych, Humets’kyi himself became a candidate in that district. Allegedly, Polish peasants from the Sambir suburbs decided to vote for Humets’kyi and the Ruthenian townsmen from Drohobych and Stryi also supported him. Finally, when the elections were over, in Sambir his Polish opponent Roszkowski got 526 while Humets’kyi 247 votes. In Stryi and Drohobych Ukrainians instead of Humets’kyi advanced as their candidate Evhen Ozarkevych, and the result was: in Stryi 579 against 118, in Drohobych

⁷⁴ VR LNB, f.o/n, spr.3966, s.125.

⁷⁵ *Russkoie slovo*, 1894, No.45.

⁷⁶ VR LNB, f.Rev. 114/p.IV.

⁷⁷ VR IL, f.3, spr.1610, a.175.

665 against 6.⁷⁸ These results show the popularity of Humets'kyi in Sambir. If not for Ozarkevych, who was perhaps put in the list by the Stryi Ukrainians, Humets'kyi would have had good chances.

In 1898, Humets'kyi defended Franko's brothers, Onufrii and Mykhailo, in a criminal trial. While the former was released, the latter was sentenced to four months. As Humets'kyi explained: "There was no way to save Mykhailo because there was a witness, and besides that he had already been three times punished for theft."⁷⁹ And Ivan Franko could be another connection between him and Ivan Mykhas.

Many peasant radical activists came to the party through personal acquaintance with Ivan Franko. The Radical party for the peasants served also as a means to get unusually honest brokers, who could lead them. We have already seen Ivan Mykhas' placing his hopes in the intelligentsia for the bettering of the peasants' fate. These hopes were also placed on particular persons, especially Ivan Franko. Ivan Mykhas was not alone in this. Pavlo Dumka's similar attitudes are seen in the following passage from 1890:

And now as well we are looking for this Moses, who could get a lively stream; to have become a ferment of our stagnating life; to have awakened among us a mighty cult of the divinity of enlightenment and equal us with other people.⁸⁰

Ivan Mykhas was able to participate in many Radical Party congresses, he conducted correspondence with its radical leaders, and he managed to combine it with successful farming and local activities. It seems that Hryhorii Sen'kus from Neudorf in the 1890s was the closest cooperator of Ivan Mykhas in the district. Both of them participated in the 1896 Party Congress as delegates from the Sambir area.⁸¹ In 1897 Ivan Mykhas also took part in the Congress of the Radical Party, and the national-populists ridiculed his speech:

Ivan Mykhas could not boast with the great radical movement [in his area], so, instead, he attacked the clergy providing examples of his own relations with the local pastor. 'Our enlighteners proclaim: 'Suffer and you will be saved! and distract people from the reading club and enlightenment. In the electoral action there were enough meetings and the support of Polish peasants was won. But the enemies of radicals (meaning

⁷⁸ *Galichanin*, 1897, Nos.52, 55.

⁷⁹ VR IL, f.3, spr.1626, a.276.

⁸⁰ Pavlo Dumka, "Nashi seliane i radykalizm," *Narod*, 1890, No.23, p.368.

⁸¹ "Z'izd partii radykal'noi," *Dilo*, 1896, No.208.

of the speaker) are going to burn and kill them.' That is why so many people voted for Franko.⁸²

Also it was reported that "The peasant Mykhas has an opinion that despite the fact that corporal punishment ceased the *robot* still exists. 'Nevertheless, we have among us an apostle who wants to liberate us from slavery.'"⁸³ How does Mykhas fit the Radical Party in the 1890s? The Congress of 1897 was quite representative of the Party's development. It showed that the Kolomyia District (Kyrylo Tryliovs'kyi), Przemyśl District (The Novakovs'kyi brothers), and Zbarazh District (Shmygel's'kyi) were those where the Radical Party had the strongest roots. Radicals' political society in Kolomyia, "*Narodna volia*," had 723 members. The majority of the peasant activists reported that their areas were won for the Radical Party, that peasants did not trust priests. While reports from Zhovkva, Mostyska and Sokal' districts (Dr. Oliinyk) were indicating difficulties, reports from Horodenka (Lev Bachyns'kyi), Ternopil' (Pavlo Dumka), Sniatyn (Liudchak and Sanduliak), Drohobych (Mel'nyk), Tovmach, Skalat, Pidhaitsi (Sobkiv), Sambir (Mykhas), Stryi (Derhalo) and Kosiv (Danylovych) were providing more optimistic statements.⁸⁴ The Congress of 1897 also showed that in many districts Radical action was organized by the peasant activists of Mykhas' kind. Besides Sambir, these activists represented six other districts.

The first preserved letter by Mykhas to Ivan Franko is dated by 1884 and was already cited. There are no letters left from the second half of the 1880s and beginning of the 1890s. In 1895 Mykhas with his reading club, Mykola Baida, Pylyp Sabalo and Vasyly' Shupalo joined the society "Progress." He felt he was reaching quite a prominence in the area and reported to Franko with pride:

Yesterday on the market I found that priests everywhere (in the Sambir, Stare Misto and Turka districts) get together 15 to 25 people and have councils about me (that is what several cantors told me); because I developed a strong agitation here 'that soon the communities will have to pay the priests their income, and to deposit so much capital that interest from it would be equal to their current income.' Where the community is smart and will pay according to the Josephinian patent it will pay a small amount...⁸⁵

The year 1895 was also the year in which Rev. Bobers'kyi organized a complaint from some Morozovychites, especially church controllers, against Ivan Mykhas.

⁸² "Z'izd ruskoï partii radykal'noi," *Dilo*, 1897, No.204.

⁸³ "Z'izd ruskoï partii radykal'noi," *Dilo*, 1897, No.207.

⁸⁴ "Z'izd rusko-ukrains'koi radykal'noi partii," *Ruslan*, 1897, #205.

⁸⁵ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr. 222, a.35.

The complaint was sent to the dean, the dean sent it to the Consistory and the Consistory turned it to the district captaincy. The complaint said that Mykhas took 41 eggs donated by the parishioners for the pastor to serve the Liturgy and go with a procession. Taking these eggs and making a gibe about the priest and an ancient custom, Mykhas “jarred their religious feelings.”⁸⁶

Rev. Bobers’kyi himself already complained to the Consistory in the previous year, 1894. He sent to the Consistory Mykhas’ article from Khliborob, in which he acknowledged his belonging to the Radical Party and sent his own letter saying that Mykhas

gathers in the reading club in Morozovychi, villagers not caring about their gender and age, even children obliged to school attendance, reads to the Khliborob, the newspaper forbidden by the Bishops, explains this newspaper to them and spreads among people hate towards the clergy, disdain for the sacrament of holy confession and for the Emperor’s law, and sows discontent with the current social order.⁸⁷

In 1894 Pavlyk donated several books to the reading club in Morozovychi, among them Rai i postup (Eden and progress), Dzvin (Bell), Shevchenko’s poetry and several volumes of Narod. The executive of the reading club thanked him; at the time it consisted of Ivan Mykhas (chair), Mykhailo Patsai (vice-chair), Mykola Baida (scribe), Pylyp Sabalo (librarian) and Petro Sarakhman.⁸⁸

In 1895 Ivan Mykhas cooperated with Ivan Franko closely. There was an open meeting organized in Sambir, but it was not allowed. As was the usual practice in such a case, the organizers transformed the meeting into “a gathering of trusted persons” (*dovirochni zborny*). But even this gathering was closed by the governmental commissar. Then Mykhas visited Stare Misto and on the market there invited around 50 people, both townsmen and villagers from the surrounding area, for a meeting in Stare Misto on 24 March. Hoping that it would not be forbidden, Mykhas looked for speakers and approached Ivan Franko. To this letter a description of Stare Misto townsmen was added. Stare Misto, unlike most other district centers in Galicia, had a Ruthenian majority. According to Ivan Mykhas, there were several reasons to organize meeting in Stare Misto:

one thing is that these townsmen are Ruthenians but the radical spirit is underdeveloped because there is no one like that among them, the second thing is that these townsmen travel a lot in their commerce, and especially

⁸⁶ APP, ABGK, sygn.4274.

⁸⁷ APP, ABGK, sygn.5670, s.198, 316.

⁸⁸ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr. 222, a.35.

in furrier's trade, with all this they are unusually smart, so that if [only] we could stir them up and show them the way, they could do more than all of us, the more active peasants in Galicia.⁸⁹

Mykhas asked Franko to come with two talks: 1) “about enlightenment (radical)”, and 2) “about the standing of peasant deputies (as Novakovs’kyi and others) against gentlemen deputies [*pan’skykib*] (as Barvins’kyi) and others.”⁹⁰ This passage indicates that for Mykhas of foremost importance was the difference between radical and clerical-conservative wings of the Ukrainian movement. The difference between “plebeian” and “aristocratic” camps is represented as the difference between gentlemen and peasants. Oleksandr Barvins’kyi became a “gentlemen’s deputy” not because he was a landlord, or was elected by the landlords, but because of his cooperation with the aristocracy dominating Galician politics. The local politics of the Ukrainian movement explain why this opposition was so important to Ivan Mykhas.

In 1895 there was a meeting called the [Ruthenian] Sambir Area Council; the president of this council was Dr. Humets’kyi and vice-president – Ivan Mykhas. Ivan Mykhas stated that new taxes were far worse than the former *robot*.⁹¹ This speech against taxes had a wider resonance and was reported in the Russophile press as well. Ivan Mykhas brought as an example his father, who had to work 9 days of *robot* from the land he owned. When counting 30 Kreuzer for one day, it was 2 Gulden and 70 Kreuzer, while Ivan Mykhas from his land now was paying a tax four times higher than that.⁹² Press reports, however, and Ivan Mykhas himself, failed to mention that his father’s village was state-owned, and that Mykhas’ own land plot was larger than that of his father.

When Mykhas spoke about *robot* times as better than contemporary ones, he was picking up the discourse quite popular among the peasants at that time:

Whatever you say son, then it was better than now! There was no such a take over, taxes were not high, it was not so crowded. Despite the fact that one had to suffer some things and was tortured by *robot* it was freer and more secure back then. There was no such a sorrow in the houses, no one heard about executions and sales for debts; Jews did not have such

⁸⁹ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1611, s.91. It is interesting that the description of the Sambir circle from the 1840s noted that “there are less Jews than anywhere else, while more townsmen with better education.” - BJ, sygn.5368 II, t.3, s.183.

⁹⁰ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1611, s.91.

⁹¹ “iz Sambora,” *Galichanin*, 1896, No.48.

⁹² “Iz Sambora,” *Russkoie Slovo*, 1896, No.9.

freedom over us, and who was laborious, worked well for the landlord and cared about his own, lived just like in God's pocket.⁹³

The situation and social structure in the Sambir district made it difficult for Ukrainians in the 1890s to win even in the curia of small landholders. In the 1895 elections of 149 votes in the curia of smaller landholders, 37 were in petty gentry's hands, 46 belonged to the Polish and German communities, 52 to the Ruthenian peasants and 14 to the Ruthenian priests.⁹⁴ Ivan Mykhas said that the elections characterized very well the three strata of the district's people: Ruthenian-peasant, Polish-peasant and petty gentry. The Ruthenian candidate was Ivan Berezhnyts'kyi. On the eve of the elections, peasants founded their own committee. While in Polish villages mayors and their supporters were elected for electors, in petty gentry villages gentry were paying money to become electors, and in the Ruthenian villages peasants were resisting commissars. In Torhanovychi, although the commissar was pressuring the mayor to elect an obedient elector, the community elected the biggest enemy of the local landlord Sozański. Mykhas says that in some villages people wasted their votes not voting for either side, as for example, in Vaniovychi. There were hopes that because the Ruthenian candidate was a gentry, the petty gentry would vote for him. Mykhas expected Berezhnyts'kyi to receive 74 sure votes. However, when the day of elections came, it appeared that the petty gentry and Polish peasants went to the tavern and started praising Sozański, while saying that Berezhnyts'kyi had no respect for the petty gentry and called them "fools (*tumany*)."

Some among the petty gentry reported to the captaincy on what they heard from the peasant electors; others were saying that Sozański had paid them 500 Gulden, and if only Berezhnyts'kyi gave them at least 400, they all would vote for him,

But when we answered that we do not trade votes, [they] looked at each other, shook their heads and left. Another gentry told us that Kul'chyts'kyi already got 2,000 to distribute among the petty gentry and had been paying from 10 to 50 Gulden per person, and after he finished there still were 400 left for him. Polish peasants behaved differently from the petty gentry.

Mykhas also wrote that in the Polish villages there were mayors that had ruled their villages with cliques of supporters and tried to appeal to the Polish peasants with Polish patriotism. This would be the first instance when Polish

⁹³ Ivan Franko, "Shcho take postup?," in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.45, (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 303-4.

⁹⁴ *Dilo*, 1895, No.217.

patriotism was used among the Polish peasants in the area of the electoral struggle.

Of the 37 petty gentry votes Berezhnyts'kyi got only four: one from his father-in-law and three from his native village of Berezhnytsia; even his own uncle, a certain Rudnyts'kyi from Horodyshche, did not vote for him, shunning from the election altogether. Of the 46 votes of Polish and German peasants he got only one – from Czernychowski, the mayor of Vykoty. Of the 14 priestly votes Berezhnyts'kyi got 12, and of the 52 votes of the Ruthenian peasants he got 21. Mykhas reports that 10 electors, “on whom we counted” did not vote (Among these were Khlopets'kyi (perhaps Volodymyr, the owner of tabular property in Berezhnytsia, who would automatically have right to vote in the curia of smaller landholders) and Rev. Davydovych.), and 26 “on whom we counted voted for the enemy”: Potochniak from Stupnytsia (He was a subscriber of Hromads'kyi Holos.), Fedak from Ozymyna, Kustryts'kyi from Pyniany, Voronyk from Babyna, Myga from Cherkhava, Shynka from Dorozhiv, Vadyk Luts'kyi from Luka, three electors from P'ianovychi and Maksymovych, Ortyns'kyi from Ortynychy, and Fliak from Lukavytsia.

Those who voted for Berezhnyts'kyi were Ivan Detsyk, Kaniuk, Vizniak and Penyzhkevych, electors from Berestiany, Bukova, Dubrivka, Hlynna, Humenets', Liutovyska, Raitarovychi, Rakova, Rohizna, Sadkovychi, Sprynia, Spryn'ka, Vykoty, Zاراisko, and 6 men from the village of Morozovychi. After the elections the captain thanked the mayors for trusting him in the matter of elections.⁹⁵ The Ruthenian newspaper reported that six young farmers from Morozovychi “were acting so fearlessly that enemies had to give up in front of them.”⁹⁶

In 1895 Felix Sozański was elected with 111 votes, and although the Polish regional newspaper said that there were better landlord-citizens and philanthropists than Sozański, his victory was good because it meant the defeat of a “totally unpopular candidate of the Ruthenian, radical party.”⁹⁷ We also see that the local Polish establishment was afraid that the Viceroy's office would press for a Ruthenian pro-Polish candidate, such as Barvins'kyi or Vakhnianyn.⁹⁸ On the eve of the elections the conservative Narodna Chasopys' stated that the Russophile candidate did not have chances here, because the district had a population up to 45% Polish. The same newspaper said that the Russophile candidate was supported by Ivan Mykhas, while national-populists

⁹⁵ [Ivan Mykhas], *Tovarysh narodnyi*, “Z Sambirshchyny pyshut' nam,” *Dilo*, 1895, No.217.

⁹⁶ *Dilo*, 1895, No.217.

⁹⁷ “Po wyborach,” *Gazeta Samborska*, 1895, No.18.

⁹⁸ “W sprawie wyborów do Sojmu,” *Gazeta Samborska*, 1895, No.9.

were going to vote for Tyt Revakovych, but the latter refused the offer.⁹⁹ In 1895 Rev. Bobers'kyi wrote to Teofil' Hrushkevych and advised Tyt Revkovych to talk to the dean Rev. Kozanevych, who started distancing himself from the Russophiles.¹⁰⁰ It seems that just before the elections Ukrainian and Russophile parties managed to agree on a candidate acceptable for both – Ivan Berezhnyts'kyi.

In January 1895, Mykhas wrote to Pavlyk, assuring the latter that his own description of Bobers'kyi was true. However, he did not want the editorial board to publish the material as his own letter: “please make use of this but in such a smart way that it would not look as if originating from me: just say that is a well known case and we heard about it.”¹⁰¹

In 1895 Mykhas wrote to Pavlyk that there were gendarmerie's abuses, from which “one's hair stands up.” He promised to write about one case, but it seems that he never actually did. While Mykhas could forget the gendarmerie case, he never forgot to mention Rev. Bobers'kyi in his correspondence with Pavlyk and Franko. Most of Mykhas' letters center on this, his conflict with the pastor. Mykhas' letters describing it are repetitious; quite often he mentions the same episodes several times and uses the same epithets to characterize his enemy. Back in 189... he claimed to have written 12 pages of complaints against Bobers'kyi to the captaincy and Consistory.¹⁰²

The only case when he mentions landlords' abuses is the already mentioned story of the landlord punishing an old man for milking his cow.¹⁰³ The original letter to Franko with the report from Mykhas provides interesting details of this story dropped from the newspaper article. In it Mykhas compares lynch-law in the usage of which communities were accused with the lynch-law of the landlord. Moreover, it appears that the landlord in this case also consulted the mayor, telling him that he let the old man choose between detention and flogging. The mayor said: “today flogging is abolished and this case belongs to the court, however I am mayor of the community, which does not belong to the estate” and left, not trying to intervene. The problem was that the poor man belonged to the estate. The story was actually told to Mykhas by the mayor and commandant of the gendarmerie, and the latter actually asked to publish the case in the press, showing acts of the gendarme's investigation. Mykhas in his

⁹⁹ “Rukh vyborchyi,” *Narodna Chasopys'*, 1895, No.169.

¹⁰⁰ VR LNB, f. Tyt Revakovych, spr. 19, p.I and VR LNB, f.Tyt Revakovych, spr. 7, p.I

¹⁰¹ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.39.

¹⁰² TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.39.

¹⁰³ *Dilo*, 1895, No.49.

letter also stressed that the origin of this information had to remain strictly confidential.¹⁰⁴

Another similar thing occurred in Raitarovychi, on the estate of the district council's speaker. The latter did not pay money he owed to a wage earner, who worked a week for the landlord. When the wage earner protested, the landlords accused him of "rioting." Mykhas finishes his letter:

Please, make public use of this interesting news according to your knowledge, but in the second fact leave out everything that touches our district captain, because I am a mayor of our community and he respects me much (perhaps, more than any other mayor), and quite often in the most difficult communal and national affairs is not harmful but even to the contrary, helpful; despite the fact that he knows that I am a radical and propagate Christian Socialism. If you publish this in a newspaper, please send me a copy and I'll pay back [for the issue].

It is worth to note how Mykhas defined his ideology here – Christian Socialism, and some of his clerical enemies would join the Christian Social Party in 1913. It also appeared that Ivan Mykhas in 1895 was a member of the jury in the Sambir court. He was there together with Rev. Izydor Pasichyns'kyi, and because of that talked to him quite often: Rev. Pasichyns'kyi even visited him in Morozovychi several times.¹⁰⁵

On 7 February 1896, Mykhas reported to Franko on the political actions he had undertaken. The proclamation of Hromads'kyi Holos was signed by 20 mayors, who also donated to the newspaper 6 Gulden and 40 Kreuzer. It is interesting that he did it during the session of mayors organized by the district administration. The petty gentry were not happy about the meeting in Berezhnytsia, only one from the petty gentry "with higher civilization" signed this proclamation (perhaps this was Anatol' Kishakevych from Silets). Polish peasants joined the meeting eagerly; that is why "our meeting was purely peasant without any difference of nation or party." The attorney Humets'kyi was the only one among the intelligentsia to help peasants sincerely.

Ivan Franko was supposed to come for the meeting on March 5. At this meeting electoral reform, elections to the district council, legislation on communities, the Diet and parliament and peasant situation were to be discussed. Mykhas looked for speakers among Polish peasants and reported on the gymnasium students who were happy from the prospect to see Ivan Franko.¹⁰⁶ It seems that this year is the earliest point to which Mykhas'

¹⁰⁴ VR IL, f.3, spr.1621, a.94.

¹⁰⁵ VR IL, f.3, spr.1621, a.94.

¹⁰⁶ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1613, a.363.

connection with gymnasium students – his followers – can be traced. In the 1890s one of the most active among them was a certain Mykola Min'ko, subscriber of Hromads'kyi Holos and Zhyttia i Slovo; most probably he was a native of Morozovychi, where Hryn' Min'ko figures among Mykhas' supporters.¹⁰⁷ Later on, this connection with the gymnasium of Mykhas only strengthened and in the twentieth century, Sambir produced some prominent leaders of the Radical Party. This is how Mykhas' contacts with the students were described on the twentieth anniversary of his death:

Every Sunday or holiday he went on his cart to Sambir, it did not matter if it was good or nasty weather, he took with him students – young radicals and brought them to the villages: he taught, talked, united, made them aware, encouraged youth to work – and laid the foundation of a new life, a new force.¹⁰⁸

In 1896 there was a meeting of 250 participants in the hall of Rus'ka Besida in Sambir. The meeting was chaired by Dr. Humets'kyi. The vice-chair was Ivan Mykhas, and the secretary – Hryn' Senkus. Ivan Mykhas had a speech in which he said: “We are a peasant nation, if [our] meetings and councils are organized; they are not for obtaining a Ruthenian crown, as Czechs do, but for getting equal rights and relieves.” After such an introduction he went through the issue of school founding, which was imposed upon the communities, the schools were founded, which now stood empty, while those working “were not teaching but wasting children.” Mykhas says: “From this it is clear that administrators have a goal to show the world that we do not have that many illiterates, but in fact they serve not to educate people but to keep them in ignorance as long as possible.” This is one more case when peasant activists were siding with village communities in the latter's resentment of obligatory schools.

Mykhas was also against projects to organize larger administrative communities. “Our parents were doing *robot* but for that they paid less taxes, had free wood for fuel, free timber for houses and free pastures.” Now “the serfdom as *robot* is abolished for the landlords but for the peasants it is even worse.” Landlords' taxes were twice less than peasants' taxes. The revision of cadastral was conducted in secret, and now the peasants had to bear the same taxes for another 15 years. Rev. Skobel's'kyi spoke at this meeting about the elections and the reform of the franchise, saying that only a general and secret franchise could save Ruthenians.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ VR IL, f.3, spr.1610, a.104.

¹⁰⁸ M. Z., “Ivan Mykhas (U 20-tu richnytsiu smerty),” Hromads'kyi Holos, 1938, No.45.

¹⁰⁹ “Pro viche v Sambori 5-ho marta s. r.”, Hromads'kyi Holos, 1896, Nos.5, 35.

In 1896, 70 mayors came to Sambir to form a committee, which would organize elections to the district council. The chair of this meeting was mayor Mykhailo Shustr. Mr. Baranets'kyi from Horodyshche described the work of the Presidium of the district council, of which he was a member. According to Baranets'kyi the Presidium was working in the interests of landlords and not of the communities. All its members were bought, and this was the reason why two years ago he resigned from membership in it. Mykhas was the second one to talk. He reproached those councilmen who did not follow Baranets'kyi, and he described the session of the district council which he once saw himself:

Referents were as if bubbling, there was no discussion, and councilmen were sitting like wax figures, with a machine in the hands of the Chair controlling them: when he pulls a string all the councilmen raise their hands up and say "we agree," although [in] many cases were crying to resist.

Then Mykhas mentioned all the burdens the peasants suffered because of the district Council:

The reason for this is that on the elections we go blind, without any [preceding] electoral action, and do not elect people with strong character and of their own principles.

Mykhas proposed a separate meeting to elect a commission, to which independent peasant candidates had to be found. But there was a difficulty: the commission could not find twelve peasants able to fulfill the duties of the district council's members.¹¹⁰

Then another meeting took place. On 25 June 1896, the Chair of the district Council organized a council of mayors, several landlords, and Polish and Ruthenian priests. Ruthenian priests were represented by Rev. Rabii. Of 40 invited 30 people came for it:

The only peasant to reject the invitation to the council was Ivan Detsyk from Berehy who said: "My honor does not allow me, gentlemen, to be your servant, I have enough property not to count on your wealth, and I do not know any other committee besides the People's one."

One to arrange this meeting was the landlord-"democrat" Władysław Popiel from Cherkhava, a relative of Michał Popiel. Rev. Rabii proposed a list including four Poles and four Ruthenians, but the Poles did not agree to this. Popiel talked to the three candidates of the People's Committee, and three others volunteered themselves. And these three that volunteered won on

¹¹⁰ "Z Sambora," *Dilo*, 1896, No.142.

previous elections as representatives of the “people’s list.” Polish peasants did not want to support the “People’s committee.”

The petty gentry is against the committee, saying that peasants took it over, and [the petty gentry] would like to play the role of both Poles and Ruthenians, oppositionists and opportunists, to be on the people’s and district list. And, in general, the petty gentry keeps with gentlemen...¹¹¹

These events of 1896 seem to be connected with the politics of Count Badeni. In this the attempt to reach some rapprochement with peasant leaders and pull them away from the national movement can be discerned. Ivan Mykhas participated in the meeting of 15 March 1896, called by the governmental candidates, in which 10 officials, three Ruthenian priests, and 80 peasants participated. He talked there about taxes for military purposes and complained that reservists were drafted for maneuvers during harvests and that the obligation to provide carts was imposed on the communities. He also mentioned the last revision of the cadastre when landlords' lands were estimated as being of a lower value than peasants' ones.¹¹²

In 1896 there was also a meeting in Stare Misto. At that meeting the invited radical activist Petro Novakovs’kyi spoke, followed by local townsman Ivan Volosians’kyi, and then by Semen Vityk, Rev. Iavors’kyi and Dr. Humets’kyi. After Vityk’s speech the district captain present there was going to dissolve the meeting but the chair “caught his suit and with the force of his hand set him back in the chair, and Dr. Humets’kyi reminded him that the meeting could not be dissolved because the “Long live” to the Emperor had not yet been sung.” Then the old man became quiet and waited till the end of the meeting. The meeting sent telegrams of thanks to Lewakowski, Romanchuk, Pernestofer (who became an ally of the Ruthenians because of his opposition to Count Badeni’s politics) and of disdain to Vakhnianyn.¹¹³ This meeting in Stare Misto shows another thing as well. Oppositional national-populists, like Rev. Ivan Iavors’kyi, and his collaborator in the district, Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi, were quite comfortable in the alliance with the Russophiles of Humets’kyi’s type. The problem with Sambir proper and its neighborhood was that the conservative trend dominated among local national-populists, and this pushed Ivan Mykhas closer to the Russophiles.

There could also have been a problem of two different kinds of clergy, which was noted by some national-democrats. Evhen Olesnyts’kyi in his memoirs distinguishes between good (patriotic, altruistic) and bad (egotistic, indifferent)

¹¹¹ [Ivan Mykhas], “Z Sambora [Kandydaty do rady povitovoi],” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1896, No.13.

¹¹² “Ot Sambora,” *Russkoie Slovo*, 1896, No.37.

¹¹³ *Hromads’kyi Holos*, 1896, No.19, 133.

priests. It is worth to note that this classification by Olesnyts'kyi has a regional dimension: bad priests have positions in rich Podillia, and good – in poor Pidhir'ia.¹¹⁴ It seems that the mountainous and poorer Stare Misto and Turka districts had more open and younger clergy than the richer parishes of the Dnister plain near Sambir.

On October 20 there was supposed to be a Ruthenian peasant meeting, but it was forbidden for formal reasons. The meeting was called by Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi, and Ivan Mykhas cooperated with him in this.¹¹⁵ When on November 25 Felix Sozański held a meeting reporting on his activities in the Diet, Ivan Mykhas, Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi and Anatol' Kishakevych, present there, posed him questions.¹¹⁶

In November 1896 Mykhas reported to Franko that his and his party's position in the district was not bad. Peasants were still dark, enemies accused radicals of being a revolutionary and riotous party, while they represented themselves as the true people's party, but

Around me it is better than it used to be. I do not want anything else, if only we succeeded at least once in the calling a meeting, people would move, and after hearing you at a meeting and Novakovs'kyi in a peasant coat, I'll be a winner! While *starczyki* and their lickens will break their necks at once.¹¹⁷

This time Ivan Mykhas did not juxtapose active and eager to enlighten themselves peasants with sleeping intelligentsia; he actually said that there is not enough intelligentsia, “but with the villages it is perhaps even worse.”¹¹⁸

We have a list of subscribers for Hromads'kyi Holos from 1896-1897, which can help to reconstruct sites of the radical activity in the area. First of all, there were groups of secular intelligentsia subscribing to the newspaper although not sharing in its political ideas. Among these people we find Tyt Revakovych in Pidbuzh, dr. Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi in Sambir, Dr. Drozdovs'kyi, and Toma Pechers'kyi, who worked for a while in Humets'kyi's office. Radical peasants are found in Hlynne (Luka postal office) and in Luka Mala, where the community council was subscribing to the newspaper; there were also two peasants in Luka Mala and Kokoshyntsi. Then there was Hryhorii Sen'kus from Neudorf, Mykola Man'ko from the gymnasium in Sambir, Ivan Mykhas, Petro Detsyk Tymkiv in Berehy, Dmytro Hena in Torhanovychi, Anatol' Kishakevych from

¹¹⁴ Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, t.1.

¹¹⁵ *Gazeta Samborska*, 1896, No.11.

¹¹⁶ *Gazeta Samborska*, 1896, No.16.

¹¹⁷ VR IL, f.3, spr.1632, a.505.

¹¹⁸ VR IL, f.3, spr.1632, a.517.

Berezhnytsia, Hryhorii Potochnyk from Stupnytsia, Mykhailo Stasyshyn from Baranovychi, Mykhailo Senezha from Stare Misto and Ivan Hoshovs'kyi from Iavora Horishnia. Some other names in the list were not connected with a particular location.¹¹⁹

Mykhas' report about the school board in Morozovychi once made it to the leading Ruthenian newspaper *Dilo*. On the elections of the president of that board Rev. Bobers'kyi voted for Sozański, a landlord in Torhanovychi. According to Mykhas, in this way the priest participated in the Polonization of the community. Rev. Bobers'kyi sent a refutation: "It is true that I voted for Sozański but this is because the candidate for the chair, community member Ivan Mykhas, is unfit for this office of which he had already given proof." Bobers'kyi justified himself saying that the community could not be polonized because it was purely Ruthenian, and the chair of the local school board had no influence on the teaching process itself.¹²⁰

Besides problems caused by administration and priests, Mykhas' participation in radical politics was complicated by his uneasy relationships with the peasants, something that never showed up in the newspaper articles. There are some signs that his wealth and marriage with a Czech woman, daughter of the manager of the tabular estate, were used in the counter-agitation of his enemies. Then posing as a leader of the district's radical movement, Mykhas had all kinds of problems with organizing radical politics. His problem was the problem of the Radical Party at that time – it was based more on personal connections and local hearths of radicalism, such as the reading club in Morozovychi, than on some real organization or party structures.

It is quite clear that Ivan Mykhas was a figure on the district scale; he knew peasants from many villages, and the position of his own village – in-between Staryi Sambir and Sambir, on the main road – was very convenient for political engagement. Markets in Sambir and in Staryi Sambir figured prominently in Mykhas' reports. These were places where he met his acquaintances from other villages and found out about local politics and collected rumors, which could be reported to Pavlyk and Franko.¹²¹ But participation in radical politics was bringing not only benefits; Mykhas felt that he was discriminated against for his radical convictions: "if it were a traitor's case (*sprava khruniarska*) I would be judged justly, but because I am a radical there is no truth for me."¹²² His vocabulary betrays good knowledge of not only radical publications. We have seen that he likes to use words and phrases taken from elsewhere in the local

¹¹⁹ LODA, f.116, op.1, spr.1, a.51-59.

¹²⁰ *Dilo*, 1896, No.149.

¹²¹ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.39.

¹²² VR IL, f.3, spr. 1611, s.8-9.

context. For example, he called his enemies a “refined gang (*rafinovana shaika*).”¹²³

Mykhas’ enlightening habits were described as follows:

In his youth he was a friend of Franko and Pavlyk, and from them got for his whole life respect and love for books. A book and periodical were for him such peasant daily bread as a plough, cart, and rake. ‘Comrades, - he was always saying on meetings, - I cannot manage without our peasant newspaper, without reading a good book, without science – just as I cannot manage without food. If I have nothing to smear my food with, I smear my cabbage and potato with a wise book, which becomes then for me fat, butter and sour cream!

Then the authors of the articles recalled that when one was coming in the evening to Lanovychi, to “Mykhas’ farmstead,” one would always find Mykhas after hard labor reading a book: “in front of him on the table stood lean food and in his hands he had a periodical or book.”¹²⁴

But besides reading newspapers, and corresponding with their editors, Mykhas did not participate in some regular party activity. This, again, could be typical of peasant radical activists in general. Peasant societies in the province, like *Narodna volia* in Kolomyia, were short-lived; there was no one to keep them alive, and the leadership of the party in the 1890s was concentrated in L’viv. Even for the most active radical peasants, members of the inner circle of the Radical Party, coming to L’viv was difficult.¹²⁵ This was something the Radical Party had to deal with from the very beginning. In 1890, when the party was formed, many peasants had to refuse taking up positions in the Party’s executive. Andrii Martsiniuk explained this in his letter from the second half of August 1890:

Please excuse me benevolently, that I cannot help in such an important matter for the people’s cause. Circumstances do not allow me for this. With my poverty and simplicity I cannot become a leading political activist.¹²⁶

On the other hand, Ivan Mykhas obviously wanted to be seen as a leading political activist. That is why he represented all his local conflicts as affairs of the foremost national importance. Mykhas never speaks of his conflict with

¹²³ VR II, f.3, spr. 1611, s.8-9.

¹²⁴ M. Z., “Ivan Mykhas (U 20-tu richnytsiu smerty),” *Hromads’kyi Holos*, 1938, No.45.

¹²⁵ For example Pavlo Dumka complained to Pavlyk that he would not come to L’viv for a meeting of party’s executive because of the lack of funds TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.179, a.223.

¹²⁶ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.221, a.85.

Rev. Bobers'kyi as about a village, local or community matter. He always approaches this in terms of religion in general, corruption, truth, in the categories of not only the radical but also the national movement and the national discourse, which was usurping the discussion of the social as well. This case is always of “great importance;” it is “characteristic” so that it has to be defended in public by the party and brought to the parliament and sent to the Ruthenian, Polish and German newspapers.¹²⁷ In 1895 Ivan Mykhas sent a registered letter about Bobers'kyi's case to Narod “for the interpellation of some deputy. Did you get it and what happened to this case? The captaincy started investigating him seriously [*zachynate do neho vzbe bratys' na dobre*] but it would still not harm to refer this case to a deputy.”¹²⁸

In 1895 Rev. Bobers'kyi stopped serving liturgies in the Morozovychi church. Thus something like an anathema was pronounced against the rebellious community. Mykhas mentions that people “do not lose in faith because of this; they go to the ‘mother’ church [in Vaniovychi].” The two churches were indeed in close proximity to each other – in the distance of a 20-minute walk. We can guess that Rev. Bobers'kyi stopped serving in Morozovychi after local peasants refused to drive him to their church from his residence in Vaniovychi; something he had requested from them and something that, in Mykhas's words, “has never been done earlier.” The Morozovychi community finally had bought out *proskurne* or *meshne* (customary tribute in kind to the priest) estimated to be worth several thousand Gulden. The Morozovychi reading club was subscribing to Narod; although the newspaper did not go directly to the community, it was sent to the postal office in Sambir and picked up by the villagers there. Among the more active local radicals Mykhas mentions Mykola Baida and Tys'ko Sabalo.¹²⁹

Elections of 1897

The “bloody” or “Badeni” elections of 1897 in the Sambir area were especially important because Ivan Franko was a candidate for parliament from this district. Franko's friend Ivan Mykhas was one of his trusted men, on whom organization of pre-electoral agitation in the Sambir district lied. In the election of 1897 in the Sambir area the district captain detained “braver” peasants for 4 to 14 days on the basis of denunciations from the landlords' officials alone and kept them under arrest even without interrogation. This happened to Ivan

¹²⁷ VR IL, f.3, spr.1632, a.519.

¹²⁸ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.165a, a.126.

¹²⁹ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.39.

Mudryi, Andrii Pylypchak, Stefan Mel'nychyn, Voitikh Kunaia, Andrii Taras, Hryn' Andryshchak and others. Besides these there were two investigations conducted against Ivan Mykhas and Anatolii Kishakevych from Silets'. The Ruthenian tax inspector Varyvoda denounced Mykhas. Allegedly, Mykhas said that "landlords would like to return serfdom, they introduce mandators [obviously pointing to the project of the reorganization of community administration], peasants pay taxes for the landlords as well, and landlords' lands would be taken away from them."

For all this the captain suspended Mykhas in the office of the community mayor, although not a single mistake was found in his government. The captain sent messengers around the district to find someone willing to testify against Mykhas. Finally, two people were found: a certain Zadorozhnyi and a certain Schugard, who testified that they heard Mykhas' saying at a meeting in Luka: "Poles should be beaten with pales, let's slaughter them, because they want to return *robot*; we do not need an army and gendarmerie..." They also testified that Mykhas said something about the Emperor. However, other witnesses of Mykhas' talk rejected these testimonies, and the two denunciators themselves in the end retracted their own words. Finally Mykhas was fined 1 Gulden and 50 Kreuzer as guilty against §23 of the press law. Then Mykhas stood up and spoke against the way the protocol was written, with an omission of some important words. For this the judge composed another protocol, in which Mykhas was charged of accusing the judge with an abuse of power, and sent him back to the prosecutor's office. Kishakevych was accused by his own mayor, Bilyns'kyi, who was angered that the people trust Kishakevych more than him. Kishakevych allegedly had said "slaughter and hang the landlords." No one supported this accusation, and Kishakevych was released.¹³⁰

It was reported that Ivan Mykhas lay in bed ill when the gendarmes came to arrest him. He asked them to leave him in peace, but they insisted on going with them. He stood up, but not being able to walk, he fell into bed again. The gendarmes brought Mykhas to Sambir on a cart, and the captain assigned 10 days of arrest for resistance to the gendarmes. Mykhas asked the captain for a written decision because he was going to challenge this in court. The captain started shouting: "Do you want to sue me? I know what I am doing."¹³¹ Ivan Mudryi, one of the arrested peasants, was a *Prosvita* member, who wrote an article to the newspaper about pigs' disease and a ban on the import of Galician pork to Vienna, the Czech lands and Germany. He pointed out that this happened through the neglect of veterinarians, and the bureaucracy closed

¹³⁰ Svidok [Ivan Mykhas], "Povyborch spravy v Sambori (Dopys)", *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1897, No.15, 123-4.

¹³¹ *Dilo*, 1897, No.44.

down the trade in the whole Eastern Galicia without localizing the infection in certain districts.¹³² However, it seems that after these elections Kishakevych left radical politics; although having paid the subscription fees, he stopped accepting Hromads'kyi Holos.¹³³ In 1907 we meet him one more time, now in a union with local Russophiles.¹³⁴

In the post-electoral court trials Humets'kyi defended peasants in Sambir: a certain Ivan Havryshkevych from Berezhnytsia, townsmen from Komarno and two peasants from Khashchiv, all of whom were tried in Sambir.¹³⁵ In 1897 rumors about preparations for the slaughter of the landlords and coming ethnic violence appeared anew. But this time fears and ideas were invoked by administration and landlords trying to compromise peasants and justify their electoral terror. Slaughter was a common trope in denunciations all over the province. Ascribing these statements to peasant activism, the administration was merging old stereotypes and fears of a peasant Jacquerie with the image of the Ruthenian movement, representing latter as radical and socially dangerous.

When Mykhas was suspended in his office and arrested in 1897, Lukiian Humets'kyi was one to report to Franko on pre-elections and elections in the district. Already on the second day of pre-elections they were in a minority, although all the peasants, except for two, voted for their list of electors.¹³⁶ One more time the social structure of the district appeared as an unsurpassable obstacle. At the Sixth Congress of the Radical Party, Mykhas reported that the 1897 elections brought to the Sambir area eight meetings and resulted in twelve peasants arrested, who spent in total 63 days in detention. However, these numbers are not that impressive if we compare them with those from the district neighboring Sambir from the north, the Rudky one. There were 66 arrested in the 1897 election in the Rudky District, which belonged with the Sambir one to the same electoral district. That district was obviously more radicalized, and peasants there were more active – it had 40 subscribers to Hromads'kyi holos.¹³⁷ In 1896, national-populists were considering Sambir and Staryi Sambir to be districts where the peasantry “still sleeps very much.”¹³⁸

Mykhas sent to Franko a copy of the act, which suspended him as a community mayor on 22 February 1897. The act said: “Instead of fulfilling his

¹³² Ivan Mudryi, “Torhovlia bezrohamy (Dopys' iz Sambora)”, Hromads'kyi Holos, 1897, No.16, 131-2.

¹³³ LODA, f.116, op.1, spr.1, a.51.

¹³⁴ Gazeta samborksa, 1907, #12.

¹³⁵ VR LNB, f.167, op.2, spr.924, p.33.

¹³⁶ VR IL, f.3, spr.1613, a.391.

¹³⁷ “Shesti z'ezd delehativ rus'ko-ukrains'koï radykal'noï partii”, Hromads'kyi Holos, 1897, No.19, 150.

¹³⁸ “Do choho se ide,” Bar'kivshchyna, 1896, No.6.

duties on various public and private occasions he spoke with poison and hate against the administration with the aim of the creation of social tensions.” This was said to be a heavy abuse of a mayor’s duties and the main reason for suspension.¹³⁹ Franko collected from Mykhas material on the mayors in the Sambir area in general to present a context for Mykhas’ story. Bad mayors were in Strilkovychi, Luka, and especially in Vaniovychi, where the community complained several times against the mayor. The latter still remained in his office thanks only to his loyal support of the governmental candidate during elections. In Bukova the mayor was scared by the captain, who told him: “if you do not vote according to my order I shall punish you.” The captain told Mykhas: “My rank is higher than yours,” which must have hurt Mykhas’ ego. Describing his own suspension, Mykhas characterized himself in the following way: “[he] enjoyed good opinion in the whole district and brought his community to enlightenment and morality, did not do the slightest fraud or exploitation, won in his community general love and trust.” The suspension was provoked by Mykhas’ speech about an even distribution of burdens between communities and landlords at the meeting on 10 February. At the same time the mayor of Dorozhiv, the ill-famed Kochii, against whom 80 community citizens protested and who was suspended because his guilt had been proven, was reinstated for the elections, and the captain said that Kochii was an example for other mayors to follow.¹⁴⁰

The elections put Rev. Bobers’kyi in a difficult situation, which was immediately used by his adversary. Ivan Mykhas accused Rev. Boberskyi of not fulfilling his pastoral and communal duties. “Someone could think that these were just personal misunderstandings, but it is not true.” In the elections there, Rev. Bobers’kyi did something unheard of in the whole district. “Rev. Bobers’kyi already in the governmental elections gave signs of not anticipating anything good, because he said to the mayor in the presence of an official: ‘I will tear the skin off you,’ and Rev. Bobers’kyi started talking about the fourth commandment of respecting any power, because this is from God.” When his supporters became electors, he said that would vote for Dr. Ivan Franko. And after the elections, he boasted that he voted for Ivan Franko. However, on 19 March 1897, when there was a feast at Hryts’ Min’ko’s place, the conversation turned to the topic of “gypsies and oinkers who allowed themselves to be bought and sold the communities.” Rev. Bobers’kyi reacted badly and said that it was not true that an elector sold his vote, that no one saw it and etc. At the end he blamed “white gypsies,” meaning radicals, for everything.

¹³⁹ VR IL, f.3, spr.2322, a.183.

¹⁴⁰ VR IL, f.3, spr.2322, a.191-2.

Ivan Mykhas claimed to know the explanation for such a behavior of Rev. Bobers'kyi: "and I agree with this totally. Because who if not a white gypsy in the corridor of the captaincy was "gypseing" ballots, deleting Ivan Franko and writing down Lewicki, saying to the others that he was putting in Franko?" One of Bobers'kyi's most important allies, Mykhailo Dedyk, attacked those in the community that were raising funds for those arrested during the elections, saying: "Are you collecting for the rioters?" According to Mykhas people from two communities got into debts, sold their land for a sacrifice to God, because "he persuades the faithful that whoever gives more, will do the biggest sacrifice to God. Let two two-storey apartment buildings in Sambir prove this," and those two buildings of course belonged to Rev. Bobers'kyi. From an "iron fund," which the community had kept in the church, the priest took sums to cover his transportation expenses (perhaps, a continuation of the story about the refusal to drive the priest for a liturgy) and another 30 Kreuzer, while paying his coach-driver from the service donations.¹⁴¹

However, it seems that Bobers'kyi did not have much choice in this case. Ivan Mykhas was consciously provoking the priest and made it impossible for the priest to vote for Ivan Franko. In 1897 at the pre-electoral meeting in Sambir on 14 February, Mykhas made a speech. The national-populist newspaper reported on it as follows: "Without any need and any reason farmer Ivan Mykhas touched priests and through that a quarrel started, the Polish priest Biela from Sambir defended priests and Polish peasants applauded him and even proposed him as a candidate [for elections]."¹⁴² It could well be that the fact that radicalism in the area was represented by Ivan Mykhas contributed to Franko's defeat. But even these national-populists had to admit his unusual oratorical talent and praised Mykhas' other speech given at an 1898 meeting in Sambir in front of numerous Polish peasants, townsmen from the suburbs, and workers. Of course, this time the topic was not the priests but elections.¹⁴³ While Franko was running from the fifth curia, the fourth peasant curia was left to the clericals and conservatives: When in 1897 Tyt Revakovych was proposed as a candidate for the elections, Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi was one to promote him. He talked to Revs. Zubryts'kyi and Iavors'kyi and reported to Tyt Revakovych that these "accepted willingly" him as their candidate. However, Rev. Iavors'kyi had some doubts and mentioned that Tyt Revakovych was Barvins'kyi's candidate. Nonetheless, they agreed with Rev. Bobers'kyi that Revakovych was "harder" than most of Barvins'kyi's followers. Rev. Bobers'kyi

¹⁴¹ [Ivan Mykhas], "Z Sambora (Dopys). Po chim mozh piznaty cholovika?" *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1897, No.7, 53.

¹⁴² "Rukh politychnyi ruskoho selianstva," *Svoboda*, 1897, No.6.

¹⁴³ *Svoboda*, 1898, No.4.

could not promise much work on the elections, “Because I have already brought upon myself hatred and persecution for politics.”

Rev. Bobers’kyi thought it necessary for the candidate to appear among the people; “moreover one should have 3,000 Gulden ready and the sympathy of the local district captaincy.” According to him this was the way Telishevs’kyi won. From the Russophiles, Dr. Davydovych was going to run, and he said that he had guaranteed votes in the Rudka District. Franko was running from the fifth curia, and Bober’skyi perhaps felt his agitation close to home: “he *touches*’ in a radical way – not only in towns but also in the villages. Thus it is a struggle and that is it!”¹⁴⁴

However, Tyt Revakovych decided not to run and explained this decision in a letter to Izydor Pasichyns’kyi from February 1897, whom he considered to be a Russophile supporter, “but not totally Muscovized” (*v dushi sbche ne skatsapilyi*). He did not see many chances, and for that he blamed the Russophiles. Telishevs’kyi was good, but the Russophile Turka surroundings made him to go against his own party. This was one of the reasons why Barvins’kyi sacrificed the Turka area to the Poles. Ruthenians here were split and dispersed, and the government would support Karol Dzieduszycki.¹⁴⁵

Another well-known Sambir figure, Frants Rabii, was also working in 1897 in favor of Revakovych. He reported that after several talks, he found that Revakovych was sympathetic as a candidate for national-populist priests “and many peasants.” The best would be if Rev. Kozanevych, the dean, called a deanery’s council in Sambir and introduced Revakovych. On 10 February there would be a meeting in Luka, and it would be good if Revakovych could make it there. Rev. Pohorets’kyi would support him and mayor Koblians’kyi as well. In talks Revakovych had to be careful and not to mention Barvins’kyi’s committee, because it had a very bad reputation among peasants. Finally Revs. Tatomyr, Pohorets’kyi, Mrs. Silets’kyi and Berezhnyts’kyi were supporting Revakovych. In the south Revs. Iavors’kyi, Zubryts’kyi, Soltykevych, Moroz and Nesterovych were supporting him.¹⁴⁶ Frants Rabii had also reported on the counter-candidate, Modest Karatnyts’kyi. Rev. Rabii mentioned that they could not support Karatnyts’kyi; even respecting Barvins’kyi, they could not vote for him because they were afraid of losing their popularity among other priests. The best candidate would be Revakovych, and it would be good if they could persuade Karatnyts’kyi to resign on his behalf.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ TsDIAuL, f.664, op.1, spr.9, a.20-1.

¹⁴⁵ TsDIAuL, f.664, op.1, spr.7, a.29.

¹⁴⁶ TsDIAuL, f.664, op.1, spr.29, a.2-3.

¹⁴⁷ TsDIAuL, f.664, op.1, spr.29, a.5-6.

On 28 February Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi wrote to some priest (I guess either Rabii or Bobers'kyi.), saying that he met Revakovych and Oleskandr Barvins'kyi in Peremyshl' on 21. Badeni was not allowing Revakovych to run, and Barvins'kyi himself was not willing to support him, "because he sees [in Revakovych] a possible second Romanchuk." Rev. Zubryts'kyi characterized Barvins'kyi as follows:

Finally, who the hell knows where he goes with his politics. He wants to beat Russophiles [*tverdiaky*] and that is good, but to praise violence and cheating is too much yielding even for a Ruthenian.

Rev. Zubryts'kyi reported that there was some "[Ukrainian] movement" in the Staryi Sambir district, but many priests refused to support it and some were openly hostile to Revs. Zubryts'kyi and Iavors'kyi. He asked Revakovych to come to speak to people at the meeting, but Revakovych could not get a leave from his job. Rev. Zubryts'kyi was very critical of Revakovych:

It was different when Telishevs'kyi was a candidate – he traveled everywhere himself, always was talking to electors, while this [man does] nothing, only waits for the government to do everything for him. The government must be really pressing to make his election.

Rev. Zubryts'kyi also heard that a provincial independent committee, perhaps, would run here a Russophile candidate. He heard this from Rev. Onyshkevych from the Rudky District, and the latter got this information from Iulian Romanchuk. Perhaps this would have been Davydiak:

But it is for sure that he will not pass, so it would be better to have any Ruthenian at all. And in the district that wretched as us only the candidate supported by the government can win.

Revakovych in this respect would be the best because he is a much better oppositionist than Dr. Antonevych, for example. And there is nothing strange in the fact that he does not like Russophiles "because these wasters [*drian*] no one reasonable can possibly like."

There were rumors as well that Rev. Vasyl'kevych is preparing for a deputy. There was a rumor that our district is assigned for a Ruthenian, and the poor guy thinks he can slide in and earn some Kreuzer in Vienna. Perhaps his political comrades from Tur'ie and Topil'nytsia also encourage him to vote.

Vasyl'kevych's chances were zero. He had only two friends among priests: the Revs. Hrytsakevych and Shemerdiak.¹⁴⁸

Later on, in Mykhas' memoirs, the whole story of the Badenian elections would become the crucial episode of his radical struggle. There this story looks as the following. On the eve of the 1897 elections, district captain K. came to Mykhas and asked him to give up the whole work "because with such behavior he endangers his wealth and his life." Mykhas allegedly responded: "you yourself will be the first one to spit into my eyes, if I, as a Ukrainian peasant, will go against the same peasants as myself." Several days afterwards the gendarmes came and suspended him in the mayor's office according to the §102 "because of the overreaching of his duties and breaking of a given oath, promising loyalty and obedience to the governmental authorities." Then they came to arrest him while he being sick stayed in bed. Among these gendarmes was Mykhas' friend, who looked at Mykhas' wife, at Mykhas himself, and started crying. This was because there was an order to kill a dangerous radical.

Nevertheless, I did not expect anything bad. But when the commandant Builyk called me to go, while I was not yet ready, he gave a silent but sharp signal with his eyes to the gendarmes.

But the gendarmes stood motionless as if frozen. Then the commandant went mad and tried to get a bayonet from one of the gendarmes, but the latter did not give it in. Then the gendarme V. whispered to my ear: "your death." I had understood the words and immediately the picture of Stasiuk's death was in my eyes. I followed them. The captain ordered me 10 days of arrest. Through the prison grid I heard the music of the Polish electoral victory and cried.

Time passed. I was free once more. Oh my fate! How clearly saw I now those terrible fetters, those chains that bounded our dark people. How scary were the iron hands of the Galician administration and what a nil was in comparison with them an Austrian paragraph. Oh no! An Austrian paragraph is just a curtain that hides the licentiousness of the Galician administration from the world, from the contempt of Europe. Instead of the paragraph, beyond that curtain they torture, drag through prisons innocent peasants, while in public claim to punish them mildly for peasant riot, for stubbornness and disobedience towards the authority. But I believe that one day this curtain will be torn down and gory, scary images of corpses, blood and lawlessness will rise to the world's sight.

I am crying like a child recalling the minute I was released and met my two old friends gendarme V. and L., as they with tears on their eyes started embracing and kissing me from the simple joy 'that we see you alive!' Although I got a bitter 'medicine' for the unfulfilled order of the captain ... it is a detail.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁸ TsDIAuL, f.664, op.1, spr.59, a.3-4.

¹⁴⁹ Iarema Hirnychenko, *Mizh molotom i kovalom*, 6-8.

There are some other heroic moments in this “memoir” composed of Mykhas’ autobiographic pieces and the editor’s own text, never clearly separated from each other. Allegedly once at the meeting in Sambir gendarmes arrested Mykhas, but the crowd got him from their hands and brought him to hide in the neighboring village. When one night four gendarmes circled his house and wanted to arrest him a second time, the village rang the church bell in alarm and people flocked to save him, “and who knows what would then have happened if the deseased Mykhas had not calmed down the crowd.”¹⁵⁰

The story about the attempt to kill Mykhas does not fit into reports of the district captain on Mykhas and on Mykhas’ position from the preceding year. (And the office of the Sambir district captain throughout the 1890s and up to 1914 was held by the same person – Bogusław Kieszkowski.)¹⁵¹ When it was coming down to the villages, besides the manipulation of elections, Badeni’s “iron hand” could do very little. In 1896, all the district captains received the order to travel through all the villages in their districts and send to the Viceroy’s office detailed reports on the radical movement in the countryside. It is interesting that the captains from Eastern Galicia showed in their reports incredible ignorance about the political developments of the Ruthenian movement and about the situation in their villages. For example, the Berezhany captain reported almost no “popular movement” similar to that in western Galicia; “in general people are totally indifferent towards politics.” He says that priests do not have such an influence on people as they used to have in older times, and now, when there is a radical priest, it does not mean that peasants are also radical. He mentions “radical individuals” such as the attorney Chaikovs’kyi and the Revs. Mashchak, Bachyns’kyi and Lepkyi. It is interesting that he has no idea about the Radical Party and mentions national-populist and Russophile activists.¹⁵²

The Sambir captain claimed that he “established closer relations with the population.” Having visited all the villages, he represented these trips to the villagers as a usual check-up of the community’s administration. Checking government, schools and cemeteries, he tried to divert possible suspicions of the villagers. “Having been done with these government duties I was trying to discuss things with persons worthy of trust and through them carefully find out if radical agitation took place in this community. If yes, who was giving impulse and who supported this movement.” He studied the number of the supporters and spread of the forbidden press.¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 5.

¹⁵¹ See memoirs of Stefan Uhma - BJ 9847 III, s.30.

¹⁵² TsDIAuL, f.146, op.7, spr.4676, a.17.

¹⁵³ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.7, spr.4676, a.49.

However, “the most important goal of my travel was to increase the influence of the authorities and to persuade the population that it could with complete trust count on the support and help of authorities in any their real interest and actual need.” Only the trust between people and the authorities could make the authorities look attractive for people. The captain said that by and large his travel proved that the Sambir district belonged to the areas where radical agitation did not have a significant influence. People did not shatter their loyalist attitudes but in fact hardened them. Of course, there were exceptions, but they were few and insignificant.¹⁵⁴ Further on he said:

As I have already known for some time, there is a party in this district calling itself Little Russian, but [going] rather with the slogan of the Ukrainophile party and with the strong admixture of radical categories and tendencies.

He said that this party was led by Ivan Mykhas, Hryhir Sen’kys (a vice-mayor in Neudorf), and Vasyl’ Plaskach (owner of land in rustical Berezhnytsia).

The liveliest of them all is Ivan Mykhas, a person of intelligence higher than [would be expected from] the usual peasant, and of a passionate temper, who, working under the influence of a general tendency wants, perhaps, to mask his political convictions, and to attract the attention of the Ruthenian people. He believes, to a certain extent, in the righteousness of his own intentions and that in this way he will bring the village people of the local district to a commonly shared goal. This is the head overturned (*zavrocona*) and staffed with socialist foundations.¹⁵⁵

The captain also mentioned Mykhas’ defense of people against the priest who charged too much. Hryhorii Sen’kus, a former gendarme (just like Hryhorii Rymar and, perhaps, Mykhas’ brother), the district captain, described as a chameleon, who partook in Mykhas’ radical politics only to get a better position for himself. He was playing the role of the leader-beginner, not a skillful one; “in the end he is pushed by Mykhas.” Vasyl’ Plaskach is described as “an evil individual in the full meaning of this word, looking only for his own interest.” He participates in the movement expecting profit during the elections, and “for him it is enough to know that he acts against the ‘gentlemen’ and government.”

This party of Mykhas has support from some younger Ruthenian priests, and it “searches diligently to get root in the peasant strata but does not find among them the mutuality it expects.” This happens because the population does not think that this party’s representatives are totally trustworthy and unselfish. As

¹⁵⁴ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.7, spr.4676, a.51.

¹⁵⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.7, spr.4676, a.52.

proof of this the captain notes the last elections (1895), when this party got only 36 votes out of 147. Besides the three leaders already mentioned by the captain, there were two other skillful agitators, Ivan Berezhnyts'kyi (a member of the executive of the district council in Sambir) and Toma Svyshch (a community scribe in Vaniovychi). Ivan Berezhnyts'kyi even got those 36 votes he received only because of skillful agitation of the Ruthenian clergy. Six years of being in this office had persuaded the captain that the "Ruthenian clergy sees its occupation only as a means to better its own economic existence or as a means for the realization of its political aspirations, but not as a pastoral vocation."¹⁵⁶

Even if Mykhas had relatively good relationships with the district captain and local gendarmes prior to 1897, "bloody" elections changed it. For the first time in his life Mykhas was arrested. And after this in his letter he no longer cared about the relationships with district administration and did not refer to his contacts with local gendarmes.

Bobers'kyi's Victory in Morozovychi

According to Ivan Mykhas, after 1897 his situation changed for the better. Soon the whole district knew that Mykhas was looking for the "truth," and that is why he was tortured. "Hundreds of peasants were coming for advice."¹⁵⁷ In 1898 Mykhas opened the biggest radical meeting in the area, with 1,200 participants: "as long as Sambir has been Sambir it has not seen that many peasants gathered for a common council." Chaired by Mykhas, the meetings had a certain Seget from Sambir and a certain Sen'kus from Neudorf as its secretaries. After Semen Vityk and Rev. Skobel's'kyi spoke, Mykhas had a talk on community matters, speaking about the crimes of mayors and proposing a resolution in favor of general elections to the community councils. Mykhas also proposed to petition for the administration's offices in Sambir to work at least till 3 PM on weekdays, because it was hard for the peasants to reach officials there. After Mykhas, Dr. Humets'kyi spoke, and Mykhas ended the meeting with singing of the Ukrainian anthem "Ukraine Has Not Died."¹⁵⁸ An interesting thing is that there was no manifestation of the Russophiles against the Ukrainian national anthem this time, while we know that the very same year and in the very same city on another occasion they refused to stand up while this anthem was sung.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.7, spr.4676, a.54-5.

¹⁵⁷ Iarema Hirnychenko, *Mizh molotom i kovalom*, 8.

¹⁵⁸ "Radykal'ne viche v Sambori", *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1898, No.4.

¹⁵⁹ It was during the celebration of centennial anniversary of the revival of Ukrainian literature. When the anthem was sung few "hardened (*masysti*) patriots" refused to stand up and were holding hands of their wives to restrain them as well. Kh., "Iuvylei Kotliarevs'koho v Sambori," *Ruslan*, 1898, No.54.

On 17 January 1898, just after the cycle of Ruthenian winter holidays, there was an article sent by Mykhas to Franko and entitled “A Case-study about Emigration or (A Spiritual Mystery about Emigration).” When the article was published, this title was dropped as having little to do either with mystery or Ruthenian emigration, much discussed in the press. One can guess that the title was supposed to point towards clerical exploitation (“spiritual”) as one of the sources of peasant poverty causing peasant emigration. This article was actually a response to one published in *Dilo* and entitled “From the Mysteries of the Stare Misto Polish *Bezirk*.” The article was saying that Mykhas was used as a tool of the district administration in inciting peasants in Stril’bychi against their pastor, the Ukrainian activist Rev. Ivan Iavors’kyi. The article in *Dilo* also argued that that provincial additions to taxes were an incredibly heavy burden for the peasants, contributing to their impoverishment, and, eventually, to emigration.

Mykhas story says that in spring 1897 some respected villagers from Stril’bychi (Vasyl’ Lavryk and others) visited him “with 120 signatures” (As we shall see from the story, there were no actual “signatures,” and villagers simply claimed to speak on the behalf of 120 villagers.) and asked for advice on writing a complaint against Rev. Ivan Iavors’kyi.¹⁶⁰ Obviously, Mykhas by that time was well known for his anti-clerical agitation, and it was easy to get his help in any intrigue against the clergy.

Villagers from Stril’bychi did not want to pay money for the construction of parish buildings (the so-called concourse). Because of that gendarme Nadolski and mayor Vasyl’ Dushnyi organized a sequestration of 1,500 Gulden, which the community of Stril’bychi owed. Two plenipotentiaries (Vasyl’ Lavryk and Ivan Hashchysyn) went to complain to the captaincy but “[there] the doors were opened with them, and Lavryk was hit in the neck.” People decided that they would not pay, and if the commission arrived, they would “slaughter in front of them [cattle] and burn feather beds” so that the commission would have nothing to take. The mayor had to threaten villagers with an army station, and Rev. Iavors’kyi said during the service about those complaining: “Mother of God! Let their tongues become wooden, and their mouths become shut, and the hand, which will dare to threaten me, turn to iron.” People were badly surprised to hear swearings instead of a prayer. The last piece was typical of Mykhas’ tactics, a bit more sophisticated method taken from those the peasants usually used against their priests. He was showing the inadequacy of the priest as pastor of the community. To the accusations in the inappropriate usage of sermon and dirty language Mykhas added complains about Rev. Iavors’kyi hindering some marriages and not wanting to christen children.

¹⁶⁰ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1613, s.148.

Mykhas also points to the family connections of Rev. Iavors'kyi, helping him to get a good parish and securing his position – his wife was a relative of Rev. Shchavins'kyi, the dean of the Stare Misto deanery, and he himself was a relative of the minister Jaworski, while Rev. Shchavins'kyi was an uncle of Bishop Iulian Pelesh. Mykhas says that with such a powerful backup Rev. Iavors'kyi felt pretty safe and “exalted himself.”¹⁶¹ A new peasant deputation from Stril'bychi complained to the district administration, threatening officials to become confessionless (*bezvir'ia*) or emigrate from the village. It is interesting that Ivan Pukach, one of the peasant patriots from the 1880s, for whom Mshanets' peasants voted in 1886, was involved in this struggle against Rev. Iavors'kyi. Pukach died in the midst of this struggle, and Ivan Mykhas implied that the death could have been caused by Rev. Iavors'kyi. Rev. Iavors'kyi charged 150 Gulden (an incredibly high amount, half of the priest's yearly salary) for Pukach's burial and boasted in the sermon: “[you see] this man [was] as strong as an oak, he had to have a court case against me tomorrow (about the abuse of honor), but death cut him down ... This is God's Wrath!”¹⁶²

Mykhas' article was published under the title “Patriot in His Own Home.” It is interesting that more personal details were dropped while more general things were emphasized. According to Mykhas, the village did not have a school, the reading club was in cantor's house, and the only newspaper was *Dilo*, which the cantor borrowed from his priest. He says that mayor Vasio Dushnyi and members of the committee on church construction complained to the Viceroy's office, but Rev. Iavors'kyi removed them from the committee. The community was sequestered for that four times.

Rev. Iavors'kyi's neighbor, an orphaned daughter of the local teacher, Ms. Emyliia Bushchakovska, complained that the priest was suing her (And we know that her father was very popular in the village).¹⁶³ At the time Ivan Mykhas visited the village, commissar Ostrowski was confiscating feather bed covers and winter coats. His mission had to be paid by peasants as well, and it was more than the amount he had to squeeze from peasants. Mykhas defended peasants and angered the commissar who wanted “to write a protocol,” accusing Mykhas of being a corner scribe and causing people to riot,

To this I answered that I was not a son of a scared man [*strashkiv syn*], but a radical and my name is Ivan Mykhas, a mayor of the community of Moroozvychi.

¹⁶¹ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1613, s.149-150.

¹⁶² VR IL, f.3, spr. 1613, s.151.

¹⁶³ Fylypchak, *Shkola v Stril'bychakh*, passim.

I have pointed out that such a sequestration was an obvious robbery, and I cannot recognize you mister as a commissar because you do not have either a governmental cap or buttons.

After this Rev. Iavors'kyi inquired among his parishioners if Mykhas by chance was not saying something against God or the Emperor. And in the sermon on Sunday, 27 February, he said: "Do not listen to Mykhas, that Devilish radical, he is a rioter, follow me, I know that you are poor, I shall wait for the money from you till fall, and take back everything sequestered from you."¹⁶⁴

The story with Rev. Iavors'kyi for the first time seriously undermined Mykhas' reputation. Rev. Iavors'kyi sent a refutation of this article. He said that he became a pastor in Stril'bychi only in 1893 while the fund-raising for the parish buildings was assigned in 1888. He never sequestered anything and never called gendarmes in the village. The rest of Mykhas' accusations were not true as well.¹⁶⁵ Mykhas wrote another response to the priest's response, but neither Franko nor Pavlyk ever published it. The reason for this can be inferred from the publication of Rev. Iavors'kyi's article in Dilo in 1899.

The publication showed that the conflict in Stril'bychi was not only because of the competition for the construction and repair of parish buildings, but because of the construction of the school building as well. The school burnt here in 1894 (exactly the year before Mykhas dropped by for the first time). The school council took the teacher out of the village, and the "community" in 1897 decided to rebuild the school. The project met too many obstacles from the district administration. It also appeared that Emyliia Bushchakovs'ka and Stefan Bahni, whose households bordered the school, in 1895, while building a new fence, appropriated 138 square meters of the school land. Most of the obstacles in this project were coming from the government, and Mykhas' intervention was benefiting the authorities.¹⁶⁶ Finally, it turned out that in the Stril'bychi' concourse's case, not a pastor but the district clerk collecting money was guilty. This clerk was Stanisław Ostrowski, who did not want to give any report on his activity, and only through the parliamentary deputy and Viceroy's interventions the deficit of 250 Gulden was discovered. Despite this, Ostrowski remained in his office.¹⁶⁷

Rev. Iavors'kyi's account with the Ukrainian national movement included more deeds than that of Ivan Mykhas. Rev. Iavors'kyi was one to contribute most to the election of Kost' Telishevs'kyi in 1891. This was the year when

¹⁶⁴ Iv. Mykhas, "Patriot u sebe doma," Hromads'kyi Holos, 1898, No.4.

¹⁶⁵ Hromads'kyi Holos, 1898, No.15.

¹⁶⁶ [Ivan Iavors'kyi], "Borba o shkolu", Dilo, 1899, #118.

¹⁶⁷ Z. D. A., "Zi Starosambirskoho," Svoboda, 1901, No.43.

Turka Russophiles were defeated, and Rev. Iavors'kyi who "commanded" the area around Limna contributed most to it. Rev. Salamon, a veteran of the ritualistic movement and leader of Turka Russophiles characterized Rev. Iavors'kyi as "Ulysses-Machiavelli (or how he is called here, 'Mazepa')." ¹⁶⁸

The year 1898 also witnessed three meetings organized by Mykhas in his native village of Morozovychi. On 3 May 1898, there was a meeting celebrating the 50th anniversary of the abolition of *robot*. There were around 1,000 people. On 6 December there was an angel's day for Rev. Bobers'kyi, and around 400 parishioners gathered in the reading club to celebrate the fifth anniversary of liberation from his "inquisitional slavery." This "liberation" occurred in the form of a "strike" started by Ivan Mykhas against Bobers'kyi's excessive charges. The third meeting took place on 27 December with around 500 participants. It is interesting that at these meetings Ivan Mykhas was appointed as k. k. Commissar from the district Captaincy. Mykhas reported on that fact: "These meetings were politically significant because of the fact that political control was trusted to the community mayor, Ivan Mykhas, and he had to report on them." ¹⁶⁹

In turn, Rev. Bobers'kyi allegedly said in his sermon: "The Holy Church allows such enemies of God's servant [as Mykhas] to destroy and torture. Holy Father Leo XIII ordered and advised to destroy Pagans like this." Mykhas concluded that "from this fact it is clearly seen that if the clergy takes over the government in their hands, they would be ready to introduce the inquisition, and then the brotherly revolution [perhaps, Civil War] must have to occur." ¹⁷⁰

The meetings officially were called by Mykola Baida, who in the newspaper publication was misspelled as "Koida" and chaired by Hryn' Sen'kus. Baida opened the meeting, speaking about all the estates getting some improvement in their lives, but there was no one to care about peasant life:

Young life is destroyed by hunger and cold, while in old years one dies from starvation. We should not rely on someone else's defense [of us] because who [else can do something] if not a peasant on the land (*khlop na grunti*)? [Everyone] lives from him; we peasants have a power of millions, that is why for us getting rights could be the easiest thing.

Mykhas at first spoke about giving up land to the railroads' construction, saying that the peasants should take care of taking enterprises surrounding it in their own hands. After him Petro Novakovs'kyi spoke about the Jews and landlords wanting to keep peasants in darkness. He said that the Jews took over capital,

¹⁶⁸ TsDIAuL, f.196, op.1, spr.101, a.1-4.

¹⁶⁹ [Ivan Mykhas] Uchastnyk, "Vicha v seli Morozovychi," *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1899, No.3, 19-20.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

“and that is why they rule over us;” the landlords helped them to do this, but soon they would become the servants of the Jews as well. Sen’ko Vityk spoke about the poverty of peasants and against the “oinkers,” who unfortunately could be found in every Ruthenian undertaking starting with the community and ending at the state level.

Then Ivan Mykhas spoke once more, this time on parish affairs:

They proclaim that they are God’s servants? But does God order to do these sinful things? What kind of example do they give to us? God says to love one’s neighbor, while [Ruthenian] priests say that your neighbor is only a Ruthenian, and Polish that only a Pole, and incite each against other. Jesus Christ with two breads and two fishes fed 5,000 people, while now 5,000 people cannot feed one priest.

According to Mykhas, the priests exploited the peasants without bringing any good; they founded their own bank, which they themselves robbed, and 30,000 peasants were left without money (Here he refers to the story of *Obschchoe Rol’nycho-Kredytovoe Zavedenie*). The priests have exploited peasants to make estates for their children, while these children have spent “the bloody money coming from our work in coffee shops and casinos. The priests play into politics and shout out slogans against the Jews and the landlords but not against themselves. They try to win the trust of the peasants and when peasants start trusting them they use them in their own interest.” Mykhas says that there were two “Apostles” whom people trusted – the Revs. Stojalowski and Naumovych, but “it wound up that they were traitors.” “There are some true characters among the priests but these must live themselves and not show [their true feelings] in the world before the eyes of their neighbors.”

Priests try to get in on the elections to the community councils or [to become] electors [on Diet and parliamentary elections], but not for the peasants’ good, they want in this way to get everything into their hands. Sometimes, they pretend to be loyal, but in fact they always care about their own estate. They want to be our dictators. God, do not allow us to see this! In our own interest, and in the public interest we should not allow this, because then we instead of suffering from slavery will tear from an inquisition, like the one we have now to bear from Rev. Bobers’kyi.

This “inquisition” looked as follows:

he organized “the Church Brotherhood” from drunks, thieves and debauchers. Vegetable and fruit gardens of all those who did not give up to his influence were destroyed, their households robbed, grain fields destroyed with horses, and cows poisoned with arsenic. The local police was threatened with beating if only tried to prevent this, and the community government was left powerless. And against me, as against the chair, the enemies – members of this brotherhood, made a conspiracy to

murder me, and [even] as they did not manage this, still one of them on 28 November fulfilled an anarchist attempt on my life with an iron rail over my head.

Rev. Bobers'kyi in the sermon was encouraging these kinds of things, saying that the „Holy Church allows to torture and destroy such enemies of God's servant. Holy Father Leo XIII ordered and advised to destroy such Pagans.”

From this fact it is clearly seen that if the clergy took government in its own hands they would be ready to introduce inquisition, and then the brotherly revolution [i. e. civil war] should come.¹⁷¹

A remarkable thing was the participation in this meeting of well-known radicals such as Novakov'skyi and Vityk. Semen Vityk proposed several resolutions which were accepted with “loud applauds”:

- about buying out the landlords' and church lands;
- about the abolition of the land tax for the farmers with an income of 300 Gulden a year or less;
- about the abolition of road toll payments;
- a protest against the project about housing construction in the villages to be conducted only according to the plans of the engineers;
- against certified community scribes;
- to petition the minister to confirm the Josephinian patent and enforce gendarmes to watch that it is as obeyed as the law against usury and drinking;
- to cancel the right of patronage and to give the community the right to accept and to fire a pastor;

After this meeting a festive party took place which ended only at 5 AM. The meetings had a follow-up:

On 13 January after a meeting, five members of the brotherhood armed with pikes attacked the reading club; they found there two reading club members and these had to lock themselves in from the attackers, only after an hour [of siege] one woman accidentally came to pick up her husband and through the window noticed the bandits who were getting to the doors. [She] notified the village thus saving their lives. One member of the [church] brotherhood, Fedio Khorko, was showing his knife and boasted that on weekdays he peels with it potatoes, on weekends he shaves with it himself, and if needed he could use this knife on someone's throat or stomach.¹⁷²

¹⁷¹ Ibid..

¹⁷² Ibid..

In Mykhas' private letters to Franko some other details about the meetings can be found. Ivan Mykhas speaks of a "radical wonder," when he (although formally under Baida's name) called a meeting on 15 May, and the district captain, knowing perfectly well that Mykhas and not Baida was the organizer of that meeting, assigned Mykhas there as the captaincy's commissar. Two more gendarmes were sent to help Mykhas, as he himself says, "perhaps only to throw away and arrest oinkers." It interesting that he counts "up to 800" participants, while in the report published in the newspaper the number grows up to "around 1,000."¹⁷³

In the report called "Anarchy in Morozovychi" and dated on 26 November, Mykhas reported about an attempt on his life. At first three inebriated supporters of Rev. Bobers'kyi came to the reading club. They were thrown out, but one them, Prokip Khimiak, made an ambush in the hall with an iron rail in hand. He missed Mykhas' head and got only an ear. "In response to my yells the citizens flocked in, had caught him and beaten so hard that there is a chance he will die." One of the Mykhas' friends had his windows tarnished, another one – broken, yet another one, Ivan Turs'kyi, had his two cows poisoned with arsenic.

Mykhas himself started suing Rev. Bobers'kyi, and the latter was fined with 20 Gulden, although the priest did not agree with the court's verdict and appealed against it. Mykhas asked [Roman?] Sembratovych in Vienna to take care of this case, but he never got any answer: "perhaps he has become too proud of himself to belong to our party." There was also a larger disappointment with radical politicians on Mykhas's side. He pointed out the Poles who have patriots to whom anyone can submit whatever grievance he has, "and among us, Ruthenians?! That is our radical fate, which can raise up and liberate our Ruthenian people." Mykhas characterized his current position as "extreme" and realized that some words Franko told him "would come true."¹⁷⁴ Mykhas reported all this to Monitor as well, and conceived a plan of switching with his friends from the Greek Catholic Church to some Protestant confession.¹⁷⁵

The government was worried by the activities of the Radical Party in the village. When in 1898 the 50th anniversary of emancipation was celebrated, all the state services were ordered to double their attention to radical agitation, being afraid of possible excesses.¹⁷⁶ The administration obviously thought that radicals would use such an opportunity to advance their own agenda. Przemyśl's district captain reported that the brochure Strike or Boycott (written by

¹⁷³ VR IL, f.3, spr.1632, a.523.

¹⁷⁴ VR IL, f.3, spr.1632, a.513.

¹⁷⁵ "Anarchista w sutannie," Monitor, 1899, No.1.

¹⁷⁶ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.6, spr.106/1, a.90.

V'iacheslav Budzynovs'kyi) was very popular among the villagers, and numerous agitators were interpreting it.¹⁷⁷ We know that in the 1890s Mykhas found about strikes as well. He mentioned that some (!) peasants in the Sambir area work on the landlords' estates, and this could be used in a strike struggle.¹⁷⁸ But we know that it never materialized; when real agricultural strikes came, they barely touched the Sambir district. But, in the context of this heightened attention to the radicals on the side of the administration, Mykhas' appointment as the governmental commissar on the anti-clerical meeting in Morozovychi becomes even more enigmatic. One possible reason could be that while in West Galicia peasant parties and agitators were clearly an enemy of the regime, in East Galicia they still could be used in hopes to split the Ruthenian national movement.

However, in general the district administration knew very little about differences between radicals and did not differentiate between peasant activists and others. In March 1898 the Przemysl District captain reported that "already now a certain, although not significant, part of the peasants takes part in the meetings of socialists, and some of them, such as Petro Novakovs'kyi and Sen'ko Vityk speak there." Both mentioned in the report were important radical activists. Vityk was son of the railway worker, and not a peasant. He was not from Przemysl but from Drohobych District originally. Novakovs'kyi by that time was a Diet deputy.¹⁷⁹ Neither of them was just a peasant attending a socialist meeting.

The lists of subscribers to the Polish peasant newspapers show that at the end of the 1890s they were almost absent in the eastern Galicia. According to the report of the Ternopil' District captain, only a few Polish communities subscribed to them. Contrary to this, Ruthenian newspapers were very popular. In the village of Kupchyntsi alone (one of the centers of radical agitation) there were more than 40 subscribers of Hromads'kyi Holos.¹⁸⁰ In the Sambir district, Biskovychi, Chukva, Nadyby, Voiutychi and Susidovychi (All of these were Polish villages.) received Wieniec polski and Pszczółka free of charge. These papers also went to Ivan Mykhas, who, besides them, was also subscribing to Prawo ludu, Przyjaciół ludu, and Hromads'kyi Holos. This, perhaps, explains Mykhas' references to the more advanced Polish peasants and could indicate his earlier engagement with Stojałowski's movement.¹⁸¹ As we remember, he

¹⁷⁷ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.6, spr.106/1, a.62.

¹⁷⁸ "Z'ezd ruskoi partiy radykal'noi," Dilo, 1897, No.207.

¹⁷⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.6, spr.106/1, a.62.

¹⁸⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.6, spr.106/3, a.563.

¹⁸¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.6, spr.106/4. This is pure guesswork but in 1883 when certain „Iu. M.", a native of Morozovychi is in Kraków and tried to enter field gendarmerie Rev. Stojałowski organized there a

mentions the latter together with Rev. Naumovych; a certain Iu. M., which could be Mykhas' brother, was in Kraków when Stojałowski organized there one of his first peasant festive meetings.

In 1898 Radicals from the Sambir district sent Hryhorii Sen'kus to the Party Congress. After this Mykhas wrote a letter to Franko, in which he explained that they ordered Sen'kus to greet Franko with the 25th anniversary of his literary work. However, from the report of the Congress they found that he did not say even a word, and that is why they had to greet Franko now. At the end of the list we have a list of the Sambir area radicals greeting Franko: Mykhas himself, Mykola Baida, Franciszka Michas (Mykhas' wife, who signed her name in Latin characters), Pylyp Sabalo, Hryhorii Sen'kus (Who also signed in Latin characters; we should remember that he was of Polish origin, although he appeared and whole his life stayed in the context of Ukrainian politics.), and Anatol' Kishakevych.¹⁸²

In 1899 Mykhas wrote, "I have realized that I cannot break the wall with my head and turned my work towards the community, this area will become a radical 'nest' for the whole district."¹⁸³ But his days of glory in Morozovychi were coming to an end. Rev. Bobers'kyi organized a church brotherhood and made an alliance with the kin of the Dedyks, who held the office of Morozovychi mayor in their hands for 24 years.¹⁸⁴ "That brotherhood the whole summer to me and my friends was bringing the scariest material destruction, all the police measures could not help, they threatened [us] with a robbery and there was no way to deal with that." Rev. Bobers'kyi allegedly knew about it but did not stop it – in fact, he encouraged this. There was even an "anarchist assailant" on Mykhas' life.¹⁸⁵ Later, Mykhas recalled: "Eleven times *pip* B. complained about me to the prosecutor's office about atheism and breaking of the public peace, and urgently wanted to see me in the prison to pacify me and

celebration of 200th anniversary of the Battle of Vienna with, allegedly, 12,000 peasants participating in this celebration. We know that one of Stojałowski's co-workers was a Ruthenian and even corresponded with the latter in Ruthenian. See Helena Hempel, Wspomnienia z życia s. p. ks. Stanisława Stojałowskiego (Kraków: nakładem związku ludowo narodowego, 1921), 40-41, 98-99. It would be quite a reasonable guess to state that Mykhas could get acquainted with the Stojałowski's ideas back in the 1880s. Stojałowski's newspaper Wieniec in 1882 published positive article about Taras Shevchenko, representing him as an example of a peasant, who became a great man – Nos.22, 26. There was also a note about death of Rev. Pavlo Iasenyt'skyi published in No.14.

¹⁸² VR IL, f.3, spr.1632, a.509.

¹⁸³ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.36-37.

¹⁸⁴ "Anarchista w sutannie," Monitor, 1899, No.32.

¹⁸⁵ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.36-37.

scare others. He was suing me even for such stupid things as merely the word *pip*.¹⁸⁶

In his letter to Franko, Mykhas tried to explain his struggle with the priest. Of course, at first he has to mention that this was a larger case of injustice, very characteristic of the relationships between priests and peasants. But later on he says:

So I decided to struggle, I am not going to fight with him physically, but I strongly believe that if I write about his abuses to various newspapers, speak through the deputies, I'll tame him so that he either improves or leaves for a place with more stupid peasants.

For Mykhas there was no other choice: "Either I or he":

If I tame him I'll boast about it and encourage other people to work. If I do not tame him, then all his, even the smallest abuses I'll expose and bring him down anyhow... And I hope that Mr. Doctor will not refuse to help me as his pupil. Moreover, the Poles promised me 'to bring down and tame this tyrant of humanity... It has already been five years since I sat down on his spine, not he on mine.

Mykhas says that during all that time Rev. Bobers'kyi had not won even a single case against him.¹⁸⁷

We have a conspectus of Rev. Bobers'kyi's sermon preached in the Morozovychi church at the end of 1899 and sent to Ivan Franko by Ivan Mykhas. The story was as follows. Bobers'kyi started with the Biblical story about Jesus telling to Simon: "now we shall fish for people." But then he went to contemporary times when people could be found who want to withdraw people from Christ's teachings:

They wish to found a radical kingdom, as here among you, in Morozovychi. They want to have common property and your wife to be also mine.

Radical leaders see that only on a rope they can pull the dark mass of people for their own interests. They say: 'why should you peasants be in such poverty? Let's buy out and divide the landlords' land' – that is how radicals shout, calling priests dullards (*nezdaramy*).

Radicals are atheists, the Devil organized them and sent among people to unsettle peace cultivated here for ages, they abandoned faith, because of them God punishes people, they want to abolish priests.

¹⁸⁶ Iarema Hirnychenko, *Mizh molotom i kovalom*, 5.

¹⁸⁷ VR II, f.3, spr.1632, a.519.

Then Rev. Bobers'kyi asked his beloved parishioners not to get caught into the fishing nets of radicals. The radicals were said to be the greatest of Pharisees. Their leaders, Franko, Pavlyk, and Drahomanov, were said to be criminals. The moral of Rev. Bobers'kyi was simple: if you listened to the priest you will be rich and happy. All those who would sign for the radical kingdom would sin heavily, and there would be no absolution of such a sin. He allegedly said that "we should destroy and torture the members of this party, the holy Church allows us to do this, because they stand against the teachings of Jesus Christ, they are Pagans." There were references to Leo XIII, who allowed that, and the concluding remark was: "hold hands together and fight as hard as you can, and you will defeat the damned radicals."¹⁸⁸

Now Mykhas' personal enemies, the Dedyks, led this "anarchist band" of the local priest. There are good reasons to believe that at the end of Mykhas' rule in Morozovychi, Rev. Bobers'kyi managed to organize a wide coalition against him. This coalition was based on the clans against which Mykhas struggled in the early 1890s while becoming a mayor. Later Mykhas would say that while in power he did only one "wrong" thing: "I have only one thing, that I happened to dislike the family of the Dedyks, who ruled in the village over the weaker and poorer as executioners [*jak katy*]." He sued them for 2,000 Gulden, which the community did not believe it would recover, and won the case.¹⁸⁹ Dedyk, who was once a mayor and earned his wealth on the community's estate, became an ally of Rev. Bobers'kyi. According to Mykhas, around Dedyk a union that had to destroy the radicals was formed. They attacked the reading club after getting drunk and waited in the evening to attack Mykhas alone. "When I was late in the reading club, around 15 comrades were accompanying me back home so that the 'church brotherhood' (that whole gang belonged to the church brotherhood) could not kill me."¹⁹⁰

On 28 May 1899, Mykhas sent to Franko the testimony of a certain Mariia Petryna:

Petro Pobirad and Patro Nikolaiivs'kyi were saying to me: 'leave Mykhas, and keep with the Reverend and the Dedyks, then there would be no harm to you, but if you do not leave him then till you live they will do harm to your wealth.

Mariia Petryna also testified that when she was confessing to Rev. Bobers'kyi and complaining about the Dedyks who ruin her farm, the priest advised to join the Dedyks. A cart wheel was stolen from her yard, and sexton Ivan Biliak told:

¹⁸⁸ VR IL, f.3, spr.1625, a.81.

¹⁸⁹ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.49.

¹⁹⁰ Iarema Hirnychenko, *Mizh molotom i kovalom*, 6.

“Petrynykha! Join the reverend, and you’ll get your wheel back tonight.” These testimonies were signed by the witnesses Nykolai Dunyk and Nykolai Baida.¹⁹¹

When a certain Hryn’ko Min’ko said that he “will not keep with the thieves,” the brotherhood’s members broke his cart, moreover they four times were destroying his field of wheat and clover. Poor widow Maria Kharko had her windows broken several times by the God-fearing [brotherhood’s] members. Finally it reached the stage when no one among the independent farmers was sure of his life and sat at home with doors closed having a ready rifle or revolver. Under Mykhas’ windows the guard composed of his ten friends was watching day and night, because no one was sure that some kind of sent mercenary will not make an attempt on his life.¹⁹²

During the confession, Rev. Bobers’kyi himself inclined Nykolai Dunik to testify that he did not sign the complaint to the Viceroy’s office and that Mykhas falsified his signature.¹⁹³

This intra-village struggle was not something totally new or unusual. Often, it has been represented as a generation conflict, but if we look closer at the concrete cases we can always find some more complex alliances at work, alliances that quite often were also based on kinship networks. One of the radical activists, Andrii Martsiniuk from Dobromirka, explained this in 1893 as follows: “Older [farmers] will never allow the younger to transform them by any means, because they want to rule themselves till their death, and from a sincere heart wish the same to their children.”¹⁹⁴ Even from this sentence we can sense another meaning of “older”: in this context it meant “former.” It points not to generations but to clans as well. The opposition to Mykhas was led not by older people but by the previous community leadership, whom Mykhas withdrew from power and from sources of wealth. Ivan Mykhas, in his own words, conducted his revolution back in early 1890s not against the older people but against the local “mighty rulers.” In the case of Ivan Mykhas, enemies are clearly identified with the supporters of the Dedyk family, “to which almost half of the village belongs.”

These clan fights in the Galician villages quite often just tried to use existing political organizations and differences between them. The enemies of the radicals almost automatically became national-democrats, and to the contrary. For example, when in the village of Mytseva near Belz the old mayor Shurma

¹⁹¹ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1625, a.82.

¹⁹² “Anarchista w sutannie,” *Monitor*, 1899, No.31.

¹⁹³ “Anarchista w sutannie,” *Monitor*, 1899, No.31.

¹⁹⁴ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.221, a.87.

and his sons were struggling with the new village council, a member of the latter complained to Pavlyk about the former “sending him” to the newspapers Svoboda and Ruskoe Slovo. The peasant said that he was trying only to “make an order” with the new mayor who was about to continue the infamous dealings of his father, who was found guilty of 500 Gulden’ fraud in 1892.¹⁹⁵

Power in the community was not usurped either by state officials, or by the priests or by Jewish middlemen. All of these, despite exercising their authority over the community and using their power, remained outsiders, never becoming part of the village. There were others inside the village, able to use their wealth to acquire power, or vice versa, those who because of successfully established kinship networks stayed as familiar landmarks of the communities’ social landscape. However, these village strongmen did not form some closed and clearly seen class, however. The kinship networks were not too strict or too complicated either, but they were real even if short-lived and could be mobilized. If the Dedyks ruled the community for 24 years in the second half of the nineteenth century, Mykhas’ family, perhaps, ruled it for another 15. Mykhas’ disadvantage was a relatively small number of relatives.

Usually the behavior of these village rich was associated with authoritarian rule, violence and festivities. Wealth meant better food, more expensive drinks and greater physical strength first of all. These signifiers related not only to the male but also to the female members of this strata. In Volia Baranets’ka in 1893 Maria Shurdas, the mayor’s wife, because of her jealousy had a conflict with Hanka Vasyl’nychko. In the end Hanka hit Maria with a mattock, which caused the latter’s death. Maria was characterized by Hanka in her court testimony as “a proud drunk, a great rich one, debauched a lot and thought about others in an evil way while I had my poverty and needs in my head. [*To byla butnaia pyiachka; velykaia bohachka rozbulialas' i dumala o drubnykh zloe, a mni moia vida ta nedostatky na bolovi*].” Other women who testified about her good behavior and the unrestrained debauchery of Mariia supported Hanka’s words.¹⁹⁶ The court jury acquitted Hanka.

In the village of Dorozhiv in 1895 mayor Hryn’ Hrytsai and the scribe Antin Kochii were overturned, fraud was discovered, the mayor fined, and new elections arranged. On the eve of new elections a vice-mayor, Vasyl’ Blyznyk, was arrested for blasphemy on the basis of testimony by certain Hnatish, a renowned drunk. Kochii arranged new elections about the location of which no one knew. Of 350 villagers with the right to vote, only 55 voted. Kochii was holding 12 offices, including some offices in the administration of the Luka

¹⁹⁵ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.162, a.61.

¹⁹⁶ Galichanin, 1893, No.207.

court district. He rented fishing and hunting in the area, making from this concession “gifts” to high positioned officials.

Dorozhiv’s new vice-mayor, Fed’ Shyshka, was worth his mayor. Sent to cut willows for the community road, he took them for himself, and cantor Sen’ Stetsiv had beaten him for that. Although married, Shyshka was running after others’ wives and pleasing them with gifts. Being a *Dnister* agent, he was not sending properly peasants’ dues to the insurance society. That is why when Hryn’ Kryvoruka’s household burnt, the latter did not get any compensation, and Shyshko Artymovs’kyi got some money from Fed’ privately. Kochii and the Jew Schimschin built their houses on the community’s common. A mayor changed the rules of pasturing on the common and discriminated against some parts of this big village.¹⁹⁷

Peasant activists-reformers tried to uproot these practices and change the way village government worked, but most probably this switching from the old mode of rule could not be done at once and could not be complete. At least many “good” peasant mayors did not hesitate to use violence or get benefits from their position. Franko’s step-father was one not to allow other peasants to attend the tavern when he was sitting there and did not hesitate to use violence against those challenging his power. Similarly, the mayor in Horodyshche as late as 1908 could beat severely a peasant who dared to come to the tavern while “Mr. Mayor” was there.¹⁹⁸

Ivan Mykhas was accused of this as well. But nevertheless the distinction between older and newer elites was quite clear. This distinction stretched beyond community affairs and involved a different understanding of the state, the law, and politics. The family of his main enemies, the Dedyks, constituting in Mykhas’ words either half or one third of the whole community, earlier were making profit on straightforward robbery, attacking carts on the road. Only when Ivan Mykhas became a mayor he put end to this illegal and immoral enterprise.¹⁹⁹

It is interesting that trying to represent himself in the right light, Mykhas accuses Rev. Bobers’kyi of anarchism. Villager-opponents of Mykhas were making “anarchist attempts,” the activity of Bobers’kyi’s supporters in general is represented by Mykhas as “anarchy,” and Rev. Bobers’kyi himself is presented as an “anarchist in a cassock.” The last one was the title of Mykhas’ articles to Monitor. The source of this negative attitude to the anarchists by Mykhas, one of whom killed the Empress Elisabeth is obvious – the very first part of

¹⁹⁷ „Poriadky po hromadakh,” *Hromads’kyi Holos*, 1898, No.13.

¹⁹⁸ Ochevydets’, “Horodyshche p. Sambir,” *Svoboda*, 1908, No.37.

¹⁹⁹ One at once recalls Franko’s early work, “Petrii i Dovbushchuky,” when the good family of Petrii stands against the bad family of Dovbushchuk, whose main profits come from the robbery.

Franko's brochure Radical Tactics is entitled "Radicals and Anarchists." This part states that radicals and anarchists represent two opposite poles of political thought:

While socialists and radicals wish change, betterment, and improvement of the laws of social and political life, anarchists would be happy to completely demolish and abolish any laws and impose instead of them only the unlimited will of every individual.²⁰⁰

The main argument of Ivan Mykhas's articles against "anarchism" was that those whom Rev. Bobers'kyi in his sermons called "socialists and radicals" are the "most honest, most laborious, and behaving most morally farmers." The priest was presented as an exploiter of the people, making his own profit equal to donations for God. While leaving his own parishioners in poverty, Rev. Bobers'kyi was building new apartment buildings in Sambir.²⁰¹ Just as was the case with priests in Dobrivliany and Volia Iakubova, Rev. Bobers'kyi was said not to like the whole new order, when a new kind of power and legitimacy was believed to emanate from the community, when the community was being reorganized, and the position of more traditional authorities such as the priest and the Church was changing. The rioting of the Dedyk family as well as a rioting motivated not only by personal grievances but also by the opposition to the new discipline that Mykhas tried to establish.

We have seen plenty of examples how the activists of the national and radical movement alike were dissatisfied with the old habits of peasants, were fighting older people as well as youth groups behaving too independently, and were ordering community land and civilizing people's customs. When in 1892 a community meeting took place in the radical village of Karliv, its resolutions included the following: that the wedding should last a maximum for two days and one night, that not a bride with a groom but a messenger should invite people to the wedding, that witnesses should not pay for the wedding, and that all the guests should not follow the bride, only seven people and without music. There had to be no drinking and no paying money when taking the bride from her house.²⁰² We do not have data on similar resolutions from Morozovychi, but we can imagine that the struggle against the priest was accompanied by the establishment of new discipline in the community.

This time in the village of Morozovychi the anti-Mykhas party received powerful support from the local parish priest and conservative clerics in general. The party managed to print a whole brochure, Radical Mayor, directed

²⁰⁰ [Ivan Franko], Radykal'na taktyka, ch.1 (L'viv: nakladom "Hromads'koho Holosu," 1899), 7.

²⁰¹ "Anarchista w sutannie," Monitor, 1899, #30.

²⁰² Nykolai Ivaniichuk i Ivan Sanduliak Iuriia, "Hromatske viche v Karlovi," Khliborob, 1892, No.1.

against Mykhas; this was something unheard of in Galicia. The most interesting thing is that in this brochure the usual complaints of radicals against the old community government and village riches were turned against the radical mayor Ivan Mykhas, who was represented as not somehow better from those against whom he claimed to be fighting. Six farmers from Morozovychi signed the brochure Radical Mayor.²⁰³ The brochure disrupted the peace, which Mykhas believed was about to be established after the band of the “church brotherhood” had become a bit calmer, and only the priest continued to work against Mykhas. National-democracy helped Rev. Bobers’kyi to print the brochure as an addition to Dilo (although I have not found it in various yearly volumes of the newspaper); it was distributed “everywhere.” Every priest was reading it in the church. This brochure was written by the son of Rev. Bobers’kyi.²⁰⁴

On 28 April 1899, Mykhas complained to Pavlyk about this brochure, which, he believed, Pavlyk had already seen, because it was distributed to all the villages of the Sambir district, to all the editorial boards in L’viv and to more known figures. Mykhas says that the whole brochure was only proof of the extreme lies and indecency to which Rev. Bobers’kyi had turned: “Not only the biggest, but even the smallest thing against from that brochure is not true.” Mykhas states that those villagers, who allegedly signed the brochure, “did not know [how] to read and how to write (except for two a little bit) and rejected their signatures.” Mykhas’ enemies were the “creatures” of Rev. Bobers’kyi, and that is why they had to support the latter in everything. He asked Pavlyk to come down to the village and see everything himself.²⁰⁵

In the court trial following the brochure Radical Mayor, three witnesses testifying against Mykhas were arrested for false testimonies; it appeared that not Mykhas but Andrei N. was requesting a pint of beer from Sen’ko Spryns’kyi for issuing a certificate in the name of the community. Three other witnesses proved that Pylyp Kuzio had inclined Stefan Spryns’kyi to give false testimony.²⁰⁶ Just as in the case of Atanasii Mel’nyk, who was betrayed by his former ally, Mykhas was betrayed by one of his, “whom I have fed and to whom I have helped, now is testifying falsely against me, that is the way the world pays back now!”²⁰⁷

²⁰³ Svoboda, 1899, No.18.

²⁰⁴ Iarema Hirnychenko, Mizh molotom i kovalom, 8.

²⁰⁵ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.38-39.

²⁰⁶ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1611, s.8-9.

²⁰⁷ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1611, s.8-9.

We can be sure that the brochure Radical Mayor influenced opinions about Mykhas. Mykhas complained to Ivan Franko: “I have found that you also suspected me [*na mene maiete kryve oko*] but I am not guilty.”²⁰⁸ Nonetheless, even Mykhas’ letters prove that there were good reasons for the suspicions of Ivan Franko. First of all there was suspicious cooperation with the government. For example, the district attorney sided with Mykhas, emphasizing preceding assaults on him and his merits.²⁰⁹ We know that in the anti-clerical meetings in Vaniovychi and Morozovychi Mykhas fulfilled the role of the governmental commissar. The anti-clericalism of radicals all too often placed them on the side of administration, which was trying to counterbalance clerical influence on the peasantry. Similarly, Atanasii Mel’nyk, who died in 1905, just before his death was said to have received a mandate from the district council from the enemies of Rus’ and to testify against Ruthenians in the district captaincy. The people’s council in Drohobych called on him to put down his mandate, but he died before he could react to this.²¹⁰

This was also the case in the Sambir area. Rev. Iavors’kyi was accused of mishandling school finances, but a review revealed that it was not true, and all the finances of the Stril’bychi’s school were in an exemplary order.²¹¹ And Rev. Iavors’kyi was one of those against whom Mykhas fought so fervently. In 1896 a printed appeal was spread among the mayors of the Turka and Stare Misto districts, stating that the peasants and landlords had the same enemies – priests. The brochure referred to the Josephinian patent, compared payments to the priests with *robot* and was signed by the “friends of communities.” Against this appeal Rev. Zubryts’kyi and Dr. Kornyllo Chaikovs’kyi wrote a refutation, pointing towards those who try to separate the clergy from peasants.²¹² The truth was that the new populist priests were quite often honest men, and the government was playing peasants against the nationalist priests.

Urban activists of the national movement had always had trouble with peasant agitators who worked for them. This was the case with Teofil’ Kostraba, who in fact agitated for the other side during elections. This was the case with the famous Mykola Kovbasiuk after St. Georgians decided not to elect him to the Diet anymore.²¹³ How different was it with the new peasant activists at the end of the nineteenth century? The Polish peasant party, for example, complained

²⁰⁸ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1611, s.8-9.

²⁰⁹ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1611, s.8-9.

²¹⁰ “Politychni zbory v Drohobychi,” Dilo, 1905, No.126.

²¹¹ Dilo, 1899, No.25.

²¹² Kornyllo Chaikovs’kyi and Mykhailo Zubrsts’kyi, “Pryiateli hromad’,” Dilo, 1896, No.103.

²¹³ Chornovol, Ukrains’ka fraktsiia, 245.

about its peasant agitators, although though many of its leaders claimed to be peasant. These peasant agitators were said to be famous for taking money from both sides.²¹⁴ Was Franko thinking about Mykhas as about a conscious comrade or as about a “peasant,” perhaps helping the radical movement to spread but not really able to understand what was it about? Sometimes Ivan Franko was showing clear disdain of “half-learned” people, to which, by the way, many of his peasant friends belonged. We know, for example, that about a certain miller who tried to marry Pavlyk’s sister, he said that “people like this, wealthy, and only on top lacquered with education, are the worst for any progress and for life.”²¹⁵ His attitude to Ivan Maksymiak was similar.

This cooperation of Ivan Mykhas with the government had another dimension. In the 1890s the ruling landowning class started worrying about the growing peasant movement. At this point separation of the communities from the landlords’ estates became a problem. So convenient just after the emancipation of 1848, now it was an obstacle in securing landlords’ political domination. A program was advanced aimed to change the attitude of landlords and administration towards peasants. It was said that press discussion and occasional meetings were not enough to remedy the situation. The landlords had to realize: “what a peasant is – the future is, whose the peasants are – to those the future belongs.”²¹⁶ In 1890, when Władysław Loziński started fundraising for the development of popular education in Galicia, it was explained to be “an intent of counter-agitation against deadly corrupting influences, spreading more and more among village people and lower classes of our society.” For such a purpose the largest donations were given by Counts Kazimierz and Stanisław Badeni – 2,500 and 2,000 Gulden.²¹⁷ In 1894 the government organized a trip of peasants from the districts to the Provincial Exhibition. Ruthenian opposition parties protested against this trip as yet another show of paternal patronage staged by the landlords. In Sambir Rev. Frants Rabii cooperated in the organization of this trip.²¹⁸

Somehow, this was also the period of Mykhas’ close cooperation with the authorities. In his letter from 1895 Mykhas says to Pavlyk:

²¹⁴ Świątek, *Brzozowa*, Część IV, 136.

²¹⁵ Franko to Ol’ha Roshkevych, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.48, (Kyiv: “Naukova dumka,” 1986), 132.

²¹⁶ Jan Badeni, *Ruch ludowy w Galicyi* (Kraków: druk W. L. Anczyca i Spółki, 1895).

²¹⁷ See memoir of Marjan Ostrowski - BJ 9117 II, s.38.

²¹⁸ “Wycieczka włóscian powiatu Samborskiego na Wystawę Krajową we Lwowie,” *Gazeta Samborska*, 1894, No.19.

Please, make use of this case, but do it so smart, that it would not look as coming from me: as if it were just a loud case, and somewhere we found about it. Because not only I, as a mayor of the community could lose my position, but the cause would also suffer, because I would lose the trust through which I sometimes can get information we can use. They know that I am a radical, but officials are also radicals and that is why they do not hide from me.²¹⁹

Besides this cooperation there was also alleged exploitation of the co-villagers and neglect of the community property. In his letters to Ivan Franko Mykhas complained about being undermined by the publication of his enemies. The turning point in the conflict was not only the fact of the publication, but also the moment when Mykhas' enemies started using his own tactics and represented him as an exploiter of the community for personal gains, as person with an authoritarian style of rule, so that, in his own words, the "unfaithful would believe." Mykhas tried to reassure Franko that all this was a lie, that Franko was the only person whom Mykhas trusted and asked him to recall his own campaign, "when newspapers represented you as a robber or as a Jew." Mykhas stated that it was the captaincy's politics to make him appear as guilty of all these crimes against the community, local as well as national.²²⁰

The details of Mykhas' accusations can be found in the press. When in 1902 he spoke at a meeting in Sambir, he complained about the district administration and court officials and said that if this goes like this further on, people will have to request for officials to be sent from Vienna. The local newspaper commenting on these words said that at this point Mykhas went crazy, and something similar can be wished only by a candidate to *Kulparkow* (L'viv's bedlam).²²¹ Mykhas felt a need to defend himself and sent an explanation with a history of abuses of him by the administration and court officials.

That history started in 1897 when during the elections he was arrested on the order of the captaincy and kept in detention for 10 days without any reason. But an even worse case was the sentence of 14 days' arrest from 1900 for the crime against § 411 of the criminal code. Mykhas said: "I did not commit this offense at all and even if it took place, because of the remoteness of the event, it had to be dropped because my 'friends' were late with informing the court about the beating up of the victim, Prokip Khimiak." But even this Mykhas was ready to forgive: "I was too sure that I was not guilty, did not hire an attorney, was defending myself; while the victim and another witness testified against me

²¹⁹ TSDIAUL, f.663, op.1, spr. 222, a.34.

²²⁰ VR IL, f.3, spr.1632, a.535.

²²¹ *Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobycki*, 1902, No.37.

under oath, then that judge could be mistaken.” Mykhas’ grudge was against the Senate of Appellation with four experienced councilors, which he approached with an attorney. Only one of these four was a Ruthenian. The Senate did not notify about the end of the investigation and simply sent gendarmes on Easter to bring Mykhas to the prison. “It seems that I was walking God’s world for too long for free, and there was an urgent need ‘to teach’ me.”²²²

A response was sent from the editors to this angry letter by Mykhas. The real editor of the newspaper had his own reasons to dislike the court system and numerous cases of injustice towards him personally. These answers also disclosed the connection between this local newspaper and Ivan Mykhas. The actual editor of *Tygodnik* appeared to be Edmund Solecki, former editor of *Gazeta Naddniestrzańska*, whose political creed had evolved and evidently brought him closer to Polish national-democracy.²²³

It is obvious that Mykhas felt alienated and betrayed by his intellectual patrons/friends. Mykhas’ disappointment could also be approached in terms of a more general pattern of relationships between peasant activists and intellectuals or urban party functionaries. Mykhas’ disappointment was not a singular occurrence. Misunderstandings between the peasants and party activists could range from petty discords to serious breaches. When in 1905 at the Congress of the Radical Party Ivan Sanduliak brought a decorated axe and a tobacco-box he made himself and priced for 76 Kronen, Pavlo Volosianka, a member of the party’s executive, took them to sell on the *Sokil* bazaar, but Sanduliak did not hear anything after that. After a year he wrote to Pavlyk: “I must complain to you as to a native Father, what kind of people we have now, what kind of Ruthenians, and patriots, in whom can I now believe, on whom can I rely?”²²⁴

Another very telling example is the conflict between Kyrylo Tryliovs’kyi, who became a parliamentary deputy in 1907, having as his substitute a peasant Iurii Solomiichuk from Zhab’ie, the largest village in Europe. In 1907 Tryliovs’kyi won in two districts and instead of giving another parliamentary seat to Iurii Solomiichuk, his substitute in the electoral campaign, he gave it to his friend from the city. The case was immediately brought to public attention by the Polish press. Solomiichuk in 1907 wrote to Petro Shekeryk-Donkiv, “the first traitor is my Tryliovs’kyi.” In March 1907 Solomiichuk had to go the prison. When he got a five months’ sentence, he was about to go to the prison immediately so that he could get out of there by the elections of 1908. But his

²²² [Ivan Mykhas] “Corespondencye od Iwana Michasa,” *Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobycki*, 1902, No.39.

²²³ “Odpowiedź panowi Iwanowi Michasowi,” *Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobycki*, 1902., Nos.47, 49, 50, 51, 1903: Nos.3, 6, 10, 16, 17, 20, 22, 39.

²²⁴ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.228, a.19-22.

attorneys, together with Tryliovs'kyi, did not allow that, promising him to file a complaint and save him from prison altogether. Tryliovs'kyi said to Solomiichuk that he needed him as his representative, and this would ease Solomiichuk's road to the Diet seat. Solomiichuk says:

But it did not happen the way I hoped. Tryliovs'kyi was afraid that I would become a candidate for my own and would harm him, that is why they had a council with Zijcer, the attorney I hired and did not bring the complaint they had to make.

He continues: "I was working for the people and for Tryliovs'kyi and he dug a hole for me and pushed me there." He was advising Petro, who was much younger, not to care about the attorneys but to rely on his own reason.²²⁵

Shekeryk-Donkiv, having grown up, described Tryliovs'kyi's behavior in Solomiichuk's biography:

his spirit was not broken even by the terrible tragedy which was prepared for him by Dr. Tryliovs'kyi, when he, despite his promise, did not bring the complaint against Solomiichuk's sentence. This behavior of Tryliovs'kyi's Iura considered to be an unheard of, faithless betrayal, to be a purposeful sending him to prison, as he recalls it in his own autobiography.²²⁶

I found letters of Iurii Solomiichuk very much revealing of the nature of peasant radicals. Several of these letters to Shekeryk-Donkiv, partly destroyed by insects and water, are unique in the sense that they represent correspondence between two peasant radicals, two peasant politicians in the same area, and not radicals' reports to Party functionaries or letters to the editors. He was calling Shekeryk-Donkiv for councils usually taking place on Sunday. Just like Ivan Mykhas he took part in the Diet elections of 1908. He supported certain priests, for example Rev. Popel', whom he promised to help to get a position in district politics. A suspicion of treason and accusations of treason figured prominently in these letters. Especially those who would call Solomiichuk to resign in favor of some other candidate would be called traitors.

Solomiichuk knew Jews in the neighborhood and could without any problem discuss with them political matters and ask them for support. He had to mobilize his electorate by the means of frequent trips, quite often gathering people in Jewish taverns. Just like Ivan Mykhas, he was quite often getting ill during these trips. His peasant buddies whom he trusted with organizing agitation quite often appeared to be unfit for the task and would sit quietly at

²²⁵ VR LNB, f.NTSh, op.II, spr. 63/2.

²²⁶ Petro Shekeryk-Donykiv, "Kameniar Hutsul'shchyny," *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1928, No.3.

home while he was requesting from them some action. In 1908 Tryliovs'kyi betrayed Solomiichuk once more, asking him to give up his votes in favor of Okunevs'kyi, but Solomiichuk refused. He lost the 1908 elections just like Mykahs did; however, he was sure that "we have fought with our last ounce of strength, and I am sure that we would win." He was sympathetic to attempts to organize an amateurish theater in the village, but this was for younger people largely. However, in 1909 he had to become a chair of the reading club so as not to let it "mess up." He had a conflict with the Zhabie mayor who accused him of making threats, and for that in 1909 Solomiichuk was sentenced to 4 weeks and not allowed for 6 years to be elected to the Diet. He characterizes this deprivation of citizen's rights as "I became a serf." This is the first time that this word *kripak*, originally used in the context of Russian Ukraine, is met in Galicia among the peasants; obviously it was borrowed from Ukrainian literature.²²⁷

At the end of the 1890s, peasant members of the party had an increasing sense of crisis in everything they fought and hoped for. The intelligentsia left the party (Some became founders of the Ukrainian Social-Democracy and some – co-founders of Ukrainian National-Democracy.), and local fellow peasants cooled down, giving up politics and returning to their daily farming chores. The small group of peasant radical activists, who started participating in politics in the 1880s, felt increasingly isolated.²²⁸ They felt that their anti-clerical *kultukampf* was not producing many results: "peasants return back to religion."²²⁹

From about the same time we also have reports that the Polish peasantry got disappointed with the Polish peasant party, which only promised much but remembered peasants only during the elections.²³⁰ The elections of 1900 witnessed the defeat of the Polish Peasant Party – only three deputies elected from the fourth curia and not a single one from the fifth. Christian-Populist political groups appeared from these elections as much stronger than *ludowcy*.²³¹ The year 1899 and the years immediately preceding and following it were a period of general realignment of political parties and forces. The Radical Party broke up, with some members joining national-populists and forming the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party, some separating into the Ukrainian Social-Democratic Party, and only a tiny fraction of it remained under the

²²⁷ VR LNB, f.NTSh, op.2, 63/2.

²²⁸ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.179, a.225.

²²⁹ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.179, a.226-7.

²³⁰ Jan Świątek, *Brzozowa i okolica Zakliczyna nad Dunajcem. Obraz etnograficzny – zbiór z lat 1897-1906*. Część IV, Archiwum etnograficzne, t.36-IV, ed. by Edward Pietraszko, (Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, 2000), 135.

²³¹ Krzysztof Dunin-Wasowicz, "Zjednoczenie stronnictw ludowych (1900-1901)" in *Studia z dziejów ruchu ludowego ofiarowane Czesławowi Wycechowi w 70 rocznicę urodzin* (Warszawa: LSW, 1969), 60.

banner of the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party. Peasants were disturbed by these divisions and became formally separated from the majority of urban radical intellectuals: while the majority of intellectuals left for either social- or national-democracy, peasants usually stayed with the Radical Party.

It is interesting that at least some of the intellectuals that left the Radical Party did so because of disappointment in its organizational abilities. Instead of growing into a mass party, the Radical Party looked more like a bunch of intellectuals followed by their peasant clients. Ivan Franko himself motivated his departure from the Radical Party by the fact that the party was unable to *organize* the peasantry, that “precisely *organization* was always the weak side of the Radical Party...” The Radical Party was not a real political party; it was not a mass party but “more like the Church to which only its faithful come.”²³²

The nucleus of peasant activists regrouped around Pavlyk, who turned into a symbol of the Radical Party. Pavlo Dumka wrote to Pavlyk that it was even better that those who had been always splitting and quarrelling finally left the party. He believed that those who left were intelligentsia members, never really trusting peasants and considering them to be too dark to understand important things.²³³ In 1899, when the struggle in Morozovychi reached its peak, Mykhas partook in this general disappointment with the Radical Party among the peasants, but in his case it was complicated by personal problems. According to him, there was no chance to get help against Bobers’kyi’s band from courts and the captaincy because of membership in the Radical Party: “they said: ‘you were a radical’.” On the other hand there was no help coming from the Radical Party as well:

I am searching for advice but cannot find an adviser, so I go to Dr. Franko with a complete hope that he would listen to me, and will expose him [Rev. Bobers’kyi] publicly to shame (*upoblichyt*) and bring him into newspapers, and influence deputies so that they would mention us, martyrs. But Dr. Franko said: ‘and who would bother to engage with your private affair?’, after this kind of answer one can just simply die, or subdue, kiss the hand of one’s enemies, or leave without knowing where to go. I got an idea to drop by the editorial board of *Kurjer* [Lwowski], and on my way there I spotted the editorial board of *Monitor*, so I dropped in. There Mr. Breiter promised me the best defense and immediately made a sharp intervention in *Monitor*, issues 39 and 40, and 1 from this year. So look at this, foreigners took me to defend and my own kin did not want to. Even more, with this case I went to Iarosevych but did not find protection while the Pole Stapiński promised the greatest possible, and socialists asked me to gather all the facts, mine and of the

²³² Franko to Pavlyk, 1900, in Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.50, (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 147.

²³³ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.179, a.223, 224.

others wronged. I have become convinced that foreigners and socialists turned to be more sincere friends than my own [national and party comrades]. Albeit, as I have already mentioned, my convictions are radical and not socialist, and I only help them in some matters.

The last sentence is actually Mykhas' answer to Pavlyk's worries that he joined Social-Democracy – this apparently was claimed by Vityk. This letter proves that Mykhas had a grudge not only against Franko, but also against Pavlyk. There was no answer to Rev. Iavors'kyi's response to Mykhas' accusations. Despite the fact that Ivan Mykhas sent another letter with facts and witnesses, that letter had never appeared in the newspaper; he ended his angry letter: "I do not know how to play with lies and those who count on me are never disappointed!"²³⁴

Among the "foreigners" who volunteered to help Mykhas was the editor of Monitor Ernst Breiter. The following letter of Mykhas was published in Monitor:

I have neither words to express my gratitude nor a way to pay the Mr. Editor back for taking me, a Ruthenian, in such a sincere defense.

Moved to pity and got deep to my flesh I recall sometimes the holy words of my beloved dr. Franko: "I do not love Rus'!..." And I now repeat the same, I do not love Rus', I do not love peasants! (Ruthenian peasants, although I am myself such a peasant). With true ardor, enliven by the best wishes I came to raising the level of this burdened and exploited peasant, in my community as well as in the whole district. Besides the fact that I am a mayor, a figure ill-famed in the Galician autonomy, I called three times meetings in my community in which more than 1,000 people participated, and three times similar meetings in Sambir, besides that several meetings before the elections. For this activity I was suspended in my office of mayor, was arrested in 1897 in Sambir, and even an army company was stationed in my village. Later I was arrested once more and with four gendarmes brought to Sambir, from where after a 10-days inquisition I was released, because it was affirmed that I was no criminal, and the whole of my guilt was my attempt to make my brothers conscious, the will of teaching them of their rights and citizenship duties. I am proud of this as well as of the fact that local "rabbis" from politics had to take me into account and I became a horror for *stańczyki*. Now this policy brings Rev. Bobers'kyi to push Ruthenians against Ruthenian, who with the help of his band ruins me and in front of the world pretends to be innocent. Peasants go with him hand in hand, those for whom I did so many good things [betray me] for the vain glass shot of vodka. Dogs blindly fulfill their service and destroy me morally as well as materially! I believe that neither Pole nor German, nor gypsy would do that – to sell their own brother. I believed holy that the authority would not allow such a torment by a priest of his parishioners,

²³⁴ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.36-37.

but I was wrong, the anarchist in a cassock made a career, and the criminal deeds of his servicemen meet with the indifference of the authorities. On the other hand – who is with me? Our famous Ruthenian patriots, with whom I dreamed together, hide at the moment when the herd torments me and no one wants to know me or defend me. Even with advice or simply sympathy no one helped me, although I had to deal with the whole band of false witnesses, put there by the anarchist, in one word, no one helped me, although I had not committed any crime so that they had to avoid me. Perhaps, the only thing was withholding them, the fact that I was a peasant.

In the meantime, the anarchist dirties me with slander because his only method is to blacken me in the eyes of the Sambir intelligentsia and deprive me of trust which I still enjoy. He incites my friends against me during confession, as in the case with Mykola Donyk, [he] even [requests] my own family not to live with me...He necessarily wants to make me lonely and leave me as if naked in a thorn bush, to make me harmless through this and to force me to subdue to him. The same was the goal of the brochure spread by the Rev. anarchist: “Radical mayor!”

But God is benevolent. I have managed through the worse I shall bear this as well.

To finish – once again, [I would like] to thank Mr. Editor, as well as Dr. Olesnyts’kyi, and Court Councilors in Sambir, who decided to defend me from my persecutor. Gentlemen students Rozhankovs’kyi, Matsiushak, Koladzhyn and Mr. Sen’kus, God pay back for their heart and good word!²³⁵

It is interesting that in hard times Mykhas finds support among the opposition national-democrats (Olesnyts’kyi) as well as among the radical students, from which the new leadership of the Radical Party was about to appear in the 1900s. These tensions notwithstanding, Mykhas’ ties with Pavlyk were not broken, and just like many other peasants he continued to trust him. Similarly, in 1899 Ivan Sanduliak congratulated Pavlyk with remaining the editor of “our newspaper” Hromads’kyi Holos: “our only joy lasts as long as we have the full hope in the true medium for our peasants.”²³⁶

In his letter to Mykhailo Pavlyk from 11 January 1899, Mykhas says that it was not true if he had written to Przemysl saying that he was leaving the Radical Party. He explained that he wrote to Vityk only to invite him for meeting but did not talk to him about the newspaper.

It is true that while being in Przemysl I was complaining everywhere that if someone breaks up in the struggle no one is going to say even a word in his defense, neither Ruthenian patriots, nor the Radical Party... If such a

²³⁵ “Anarchista w sutannie,” *Monitor*, 1899, #32.

²³⁶ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.228, a.12.

man [his] enemies places on the bonfire no one will defend him, of this I have become sure not a once, and not even ten times.²³⁷

Mykhas argued that there should be a principle, “one for all and all for one,” in the party. Newspapers and MPs should defend their comrades. For him the most painful was not the “tortures” of his enemies but the joy many “patriots” had from this.²³⁸

Mykhas wished to reestablish his connections and the trust he used to enjoy: “It would be good if someone comes to defend our honor here, to the place, and found out about everything directly, about my behavior, about accounts etc.” Then that person would write an article because “to do it myself is inconvenient... you should verify this not only to defend the honor of our party but also to defend your comrade as a district leader.” He was also asking for advice, complaining that he “does not have a single person from the intelligentsia milieu to whom he could complain, and now more than ever.”²³⁹

Of course neither of these letters with complaints and disappointments appeared in Hromads'kyi Holos, only an excerpt talking about Mykhas' staying with the radicals appeared there. Pavlyk published an excerpt from the letter, stating that social-democracy's claim about his intent to leave the Radical Party was not true. He was only inviting Vityk for the meeting on 8 January (the third day of the Ruthenian Christmas). Mykhas said that he was also sympathizing with socialists in some matters but that “my politics are Radical and not socialist.”²⁴⁰ It is hard to say how Mykhas understood the difference between socialism and radicalism and what did radicalism mean to him. Usually he speaks about working “radically,” or as “radicalism” prescribes, and he does not connect it with some elaborated ideology. Ivan Franko himself once defined radicalism as nothing else but a mode of thinking that goes straight to the essence of every matter, to natural consequences of every thought.”²⁴¹

In the case of Galicia radicalism was associated with peasants, especially after the party split in 1899, but even before that. On 27 August 1899, Ivan Sanduliak started his letter to Pavlyk and Franko with greetings to them “and all the supporters of our party, long live those who feel [themselves to be] peasant radicals!”²⁴² The problem, however, was that peasant activists themselves were

²³⁷ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.36-37.

²³⁸ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.36-37.

²³⁹ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.38-39.

²⁴⁰ [Mykhailo Pavlyk], “Radykaly i sotsiial'ni demokraty”, Hromads'kyi Holos, 1899, No.2.

²⁴¹ Ivan Franko, “Halyts'ke ukraïnofil'stvo. Vidpovid' na ‘Uvahy rusyna’,” in Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh, t.46 kn.1, (Kyiv: “Naukova dumka,” 1985), 443.

²⁴² TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.228, a.14.

not as peasant as they tried to be on the pages of newspapers. There is one thing Mykhas tries to suppress in his public articles, but which springs out from time to time and figures prominently in his private letters. This is his alienation from the local community. That is why all these ties with Franko, Pavlyk, and the larger world in general are so important to him. That is why he is reporting so much and writing all these articles. The new public sphere actually compensates for this alienation from the local community. There were others similarly alienated from the community. Ivan Sanduliak in his other letter complained that not only some co-villagers but also his own wife was rebuking him for participation in radical politics.²⁴³

In scholarship there is a tendency to represent peasant activists more poor than they were. Most of them actually came from quite prominent village families. Most of them got some kind of education, which only richer peasants were able to provide to their sons. And most radical Galician districts were in fact located in the richer regions of Galicia. There is at least one moment in Mykhas' letters when his position among the peasants appears as not of one of them but as that of a gentleman:

I changed into a suit (because I married a Czech woman, daughter of the estate renter and from an important family) to have an opportunity mingling among civilization to enlighten oneself better and ask something for these poor people...²⁴⁴

Nevertheless, saying that Mykhas was richer than most of his co-villagers, I am not saying that his activity was not motivated by a strong sense of justice or that he was insincere in his claims to work for his peasant brothers. Actually, most peasant activists saw their work as a struggle for truth or justice. Truth or justice (*pravda*) figures prominently in the biography of Antin Hrytsuniak as well. It was said that he "loved truth most of all," "served the truth his whole life."²⁴⁵ There are complaints against the rich and a defense of the poor in Mykhas' texts. However, he sees excessive wealth as derivative of political power. Those in power are rich and those without it are poor. There is exploitation but, again, that exploitation is based not on the monopoly on means of production but on the monopoly on political power, against which Ivan Mykhas rises. Landlords are bad not because they retain their estates and force the poor to work for them, but because they control the government.

²⁴³ Ivan Sanduliak, *Selo Karliv kolys' a teper'*, 63.

²⁴⁴ VR IL, f.3, spr.3113, a.254-257.

²⁴⁵ *Antin Hrytsuniak. Ieho zhytie ta smert' i spadshchyna, iaka po nim lyshyla sia dlia nas* (Peremysyl': druhe vydannia nakladom B. Kona, 1902), pershe vydannia – 1900), 19.

Something similar can be seen in the case of many other peasant activists. Even those who were most sensitive to the social question, and tried to emphasize the conflict between rich and poor, did not perceive this conflict as class struggle. They emphasized the corruptness of the wealthy and powerful, the conjunction between wealth and authoritarian exercise of political power. This is seen very well in the poems sent to Mykhailo Pavlyk by one activist.²⁴⁶ The poems praise the movement for uncovering the truth, “which hurts eyes of the unjust,” and for showing the true origin of poverty. The taking away of forests and pastures is emphasized as a source of impoverishment, but is not connected with the landlords, or any other social group. These poems look like a great popular interpretation of radical teachings by someone who was less versed in publications and politics than Ivan Mykhas. It shows how village life and peasants’ usual search for justice intertwined with the new radical discourse. But even in the writings of this less educated radical activist we sense a strong feeling of alienation:

[you] ask people // but have your own reasoning // today the world //
will not advise // only betray // or will have eaten (*abo z'ist'*) // envy
everywhere // and hate // fierce rage // like the fox with you // behind
your back // bites like a snake // everyone for oneself // no one for you
// even your brother // will not help...²⁴⁷

The problems of poor villagers are presented as the following:

hardly having your own daily bread you have to feed // a small piglet //
which you have to sell in order to pay your tax // that is why there is such
a bitter misfortune // after a lent you can only watch // rich man
everyday // taking out and turning (*vynymaie, povertaie*) // a big piece of
pig's fat // he smokes pipe // blood raises in him // [drives him] to fight
with others // dance and jump // to feel higher with this // I myself do
not fight and do not drink // even water I need only little // I do not
debouch and jump // can barely live...²⁴⁸

As we see, just as Ivan Mykhas in his texts, the poem mentions taxes and rich co-villagers as the main source of peasants’ misfortune. This was the reality of village life, but there was hope as well:

The poor, learned and literate, // gave truth to the poor // [those]
enriched and blind // punished [them] with arrest, God's voice // comes
from people, and community // if stands together against and presses //

²⁴⁶ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.67, p.3.

²⁴⁷ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.67, p.3., a.8.

²⁴⁸ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.67, p.3., a.9-10.

there must be justice, // everyone should take care of justice for the community // and community always eagerly // must accept it // the whole community – one thought // a big man...²⁴⁹

In the concrete case of lost forests and pastures the following solution was proposed:

let's go to forest in crowd // and get fuel for ourselves // take sheaves from the grain field // and thresh it together // do not riot to fight // only feed us and our children // they have no right to beat us for this // and what else can they do to us // if there was a big collective of us // they would not be able arrest all of us // and even if they send soldiers to us // let's host them in our houses // do not riot against them // respect [them as] someone's children // and they will help us // to steal at night from the forest and grain field // we should be silent [if asked] about each other // and keep together peacefully // then for sure // there will be better time for us // we shall have enough drink and food // and we shall live longer // and if there is not enough in field // we shall go to the barn // and divide whatever we find // so that everyone has an equal share // let's love each other equally // and get to learning // when we go for our Kaiser // and fight another tsar // we should likewise stand for our own [cause] // and let's not fear anything // to take where everything is enough // and to give where there is nothing // to the Jews, Poles and everybody else // will not be a sin.²⁵⁰

In this account the “more original” and tested by time peasant tactics can be distinguished from the strategic recipes of the movement. These latter are as if taken from Severyn Danylovych's programmatic article in Narod. Danylovych, for example says:

However difficult times are now for simple people, however hard is their life, there is still a chance to correct it, if only all the peasant could realize that their power is in unity, and if only they stood all together beyond every cause of theirs.

And later on, about peasant agency:

There is nothing eternal in this world, everything changes, similarly sufferings and current peasant misfortune cannot last forever and at a certain point it would change.

Therefore your fate depends on you, black breadmakers, only do not lose hope and strongly, collectively step ahead to light, to truth, - and the

²⁴⁹ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.67, p.3., a.13.

²⁵⁰ VR LNB, f. Mykhailo Pavlyk, spr.67, p.3., a.19.

newspaper *Narod* will tell you how and what should our simple Ruthenian people do in every concrete case.²⁵¹

This mixture of peasant “moral economy” and socialist ideas, however, did not become a dominant trend in the Radical Party, and we can consider Ivan Mykhas to be more representative of the mainstream peasant radicalism than the anonymous poet writing to Pavlyk. Mykhas himself differentiated between the ordinary peasants sympathizing with radical movements and the organized movement; he speaks about the former as about those “of radical spirit but unlearned.”²⁵²

If we compare the stance of Ivan Mykhas with the official pronouncements made by the party, we’ll find out many similarities as well as some differences of opinion. The radicals in general, unlike Ivan Mykhas, were not somehow more tolerant of the Russophiles than national-populists. Russia in the party’s opinion had an even worse “order (*poriadky*)” than the Habsburg Empire.²⁵³ It was a more radical version of national-democracy’s ideology. For the radicals it was important to proclaim reliance on the nation’s own forces; agency comes from the people and not from foreign powers or governmental compromises: “The Radical Party ... states that the people [nation] should gain everything for itself with its own hands, own mind and even own blood, if it will be needed.”²⁵⁴ In the language question radicals defended vernacular Ukrainian, just like national-democracy did, although giving social reasons for such a stance: “this is our simple peasant language.”²⁵⁵ It is interesting that on the twentieth anniversary of his death Mykhas was represented as a fighter with Russophilism in “the motherland of Mykhail Kachkovskii.” Mykhas allegedly was known in all the villages around Sambir, in every village he had several friends, and therefore he could enter places, where “no other Ukrainian food would ever step.”²⁵⁶

Radicals claimed that national-democracy used peasants for political purposes only, and peasants appeared in its discourse only as a rhetorical device:

Both [Russophiles and National Populists] consider the peasant to be not their brother for whom they should devote all their work and even their lives, but only the ladder, through which they can climb up.²⁵⁷

²⁵¹ [Severyn Danylovych] D., “Tak zhyiesia selianam-khliborobam v Halychyni,” *Narod*, 1890, p.11-12.

²⁵² VR IL, f.3, spr. 1613, s.148.

²⁵³ [Mykhailo Novakovs'kyi] Mykhailo N., *Radykal'na taktyka*, ch. III i IV, *Moskvofily, narodovtsi i konsolidatsiia*, (Khlops'ka biblioteka XVI) (L'viv: nakladom “Hromads'koho Holosu,” 1898), 1-2.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 5.

²⁵⁶ M. Z., “Ivan Mykhas (U 20-tu richnytsiu smerty),” *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1938, No.45.

²⁵⁷ [Mykhailo Novakovs'kyi] Mykhailo N., *Radykal'na taktyka*, ch. III i IV, 8.

The radical brochure designated both Russophiles and national-populists as “Ruthenian gentry,” implying that they tried to become a national elite, as detached from the peasants and as unreliable as any other.²⁵⁸ It is interesting that in many radical publications the landlords appear as little as in Mykhas’ texts.

In 1895 Mykhailo Pavlyk transferred the editorship of Hromads’kyi Holos to the younger radicals.²⁵⁹ The new issue edited by them stated:

We think that our peasant suffers from such poverty because he does not have enough land. There is enough of this kind of wealth in Ruthenian land, only that this wealth is not for the peasants. Ruthenian land is so wide that it could feed the whole world!

The solution was said to be in state redemption of the land, especially of forests and pastures from the landlords, and in reselling them to the peasants for a fixed price.²⁶⁰ The new editorial also states explicitly that the enemies of peasants were gentlemen-landlords – they were holding together, and to fight them the peasants also had to organize.²⁶¹ However, this approach did not last, and after 1899, especially radicalism for the peasants meant largely anti-clericalism, a struggle against discrimination against the peasants, and peasant enlightenment based on the recognition of peasantry’s distinct interests.

Party leaders explained that the foreign political party most closely resembling a Ukrainian one was the Serbian radical party of Svetozar Markovic and Pera Todorovic.²⁶² Radicalism claimed to be the only solution to peasants’ problems:

Every Ruthenian peasant, who becomes conscious of his interests, understands his situation and wishes not only to defend himself from the beggar’s bag but to progress and develop so that his children will live in a world better than his, must become a radical.²⁶³

But the Radical Party also positioned itself and firmly placed itself in the context of the national movement, seeing itself as the culmination of its 100 year long development.²⁶⁴ Radicals stated that there was a whole complex of ideas tied with being Ruthenian: “everyone among us knows that he is a

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 11.

²⁵⁹ Hromads’kyi Holos, 1895, #1.

²⁶⁰ “Vid redaktsiy”, Hromads’kyi Holos, 1895, No1.

²⁶¹ “Pany-didychi, a muzhyky”, Hromads’kyi Holos, 1895, #1, 3-5.

²⁶² Radikaly i radikalizm, (Khlopska Biblioteka IV) (L’viv, 1896), 10-11.

²⁶³ Ibid., 16.

²⁶⁴ Ibid., 17.

Ruthenian but not everyone will be able to explain what it means and to what it bounds.”²⁶⁵ Radicalism required from every Ruthenian to become conscious of the social question as well and to realize that the fate of the Ukrainian nation depended on the fate of the Ukrainian peasantry.

Radicals stressed that the most important point of difference between them and socialists was in the attitude towards the peasants. Socialists, allegedly, were saying that the peasants were a dark and harmful mass, destined to disappear. Radicals, unlike socialists, were targeting not a hired agricultural labor but independent peasants, “farmers, richer and poorer, to create from them a political power well-disposed to progressive thoughts.”²⁶⁶ Some socialists would share this pro-peasant attitude of the radicals, but these were largely so-called “wild socialists” not belonging to the structures of Social-Democracy. Breiter, who had helped Mykhas, was one of them, saying that “because Galicia is a peasant land, every educated peasant would feel its needs best, he does not need landlords to defend his interests.”²⁶⁷

All the Ruthenian and Ukrainian parties claimed to care about peasant well-being. But as the radicals pointed out, the landlords also claimed the same: “the better the peasant lives the more he can be exploited.” The point was not just well-being in itself but a change in the complex of social and political relationships.²⁶⁸ Radicals saw the biggest problem of Ruthenian peasants in the fact that the Ruthenian leadership did not support them. Radicals also pointed towards servitudes’ struggles as to the example of the Ruthenian intelligentsia’s neglect. “We are sure that with even the meager help of the Ruthenian intelligentsia the case of forests and pastures would be solved in the peasants’ interest.”²⁶⁹ One of the party’s problems was the absence of what had to be done to remedy peasants’ problems.

On this question, before the party split in 1899, significant differences showed up not only between the more socialist and more nationalist wings; significant differences surfaced between the leaders and peasant activists. The discussion of the land question at the 1897 Congress is a case in point. Two projects were represented there. The first one was by Ivan Franko. According to this project the province had to buy out land from the landlords, the land had to be divided into 20 Joch’ parcels, and there would 110,000 of these or 20 per community. The income from renting these parcels would bring 35 million Kronen, which

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 29.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., 28-29.

²⁶⁷ Ernest T. Breiter, *Spoleczenstwo Galicyjskie. Szkice krytyczne i programowe*, cz.I (Lwów, 1890), 32.

²⁶⁸ Mykhailo N. [Mykhailo Novakovs'kyi], *Radykal'na taktyka*, 15.

²⁶⁹ *Radikaly i radikalizm*, (Khlopska Biblioteka IV) (L'viv, 1896), 31-2.

would be used as a payment to the landlords for this land. Every parcel should be divided for rent separately, with local and neighboring communities having a priority to rent them.²⁷⁰

Semen Vityk called this project and the way Franko represented it to be a simple “peasant-catching (*keblopolapstvo*)” and advanced his own project. Just as it happened with the railroads, landlords’ estates and all the banks, in which both peasants and landlords had debts on account of their land, had to be bought out by the state. From these banks one large bank would be created, which would become the sole owner of the land and pay the farmers settled on the land monthly pensions. The whole project should lead towards the abolition of not only landlords’, but any private property altogether, because the final goal was the creation of a new social order.²⁷¹ This was the project L’viv socialists favored, but the problem was that the peasants did not like either of these. Ivan Sanduliak spoke in their name and deemed both projects as impractical. According to him, the landlords had to be left in peace and the peasants had to wait till the landlords go bankrupt. Then the peasants would buy out landlords’ land.²⁷² Because of this opinion of the peasants both Franko and Vityk withdrew their projects, saying that first of all the peasantry should be prepared by some other means to understand these projects.

It is interesting that the plan of the agrarian reform Franko advances in his fiction starts with the state estates and is more radical:

...transfer of state estates under the province’s supervision, founding in these estates free farmers’ unions with participation of peasants and intelligentsia, gradual purchase and parceling by these unions of the landlords’ estates, a gradual break up of the current villages into groups of the farms kept by these unions.²⁷³

While radical intellectuals saw peasant members of the party as representative of the peasantry and reflecting the peasantry’s ideas, peasant activists had no idea what the peasantry was about and how its reactions could be explained. Pavlo Dumka, for example, wondered if one could go through the whole story of peasant development in Galicia, starting with Rev. Naumovych, to figure out “what is the spring that moves public nerves.” For him it was a mystery. To figure it out he was ready to resort to the strategy of the educated— studying and

²⁷⁰ “Z’jizd ruskoi partyi radykal’noi,” *Dilo*, 1897, No.206.

²⁷¹ “Z’jizd ruskoi partyi radykal’noi,” *Dilo*, 1897, No.206.

²⁷² “Z’jizd rus’ko-ukraïns’koi radykal’noi partii,” *Ruslan*, 1897, No.206.

²⁷³ Ivan Franko, “Soichyne krylo. Iz zapysok vidiud’ka,” in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.22 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1979), 73.

researching.²⁷⁴ It is interesting that peasant activists often complained about other peasants along the lines intellectuals did. Nykolai Huleichuk from Kutu, who was searching among local peasants for delegates to the Radical Party's congress and collecting donations to the "meetings' fund," reported in 1900: "About the first thing I talked to various more important peasants, encouraging them, but this thing does little progress because in our area peasants are incredibly little developed." It was actually easier with getting donations: 12 people contributed 14 Kronen.²⁷⁵ The changes proposed by the peasant activists to deal with the crisis inside of the party, if accepted, would transform the radical movement into a modern mass party, and end with an ambiguous alliance of intellectuals and peasant sympathizers. There was a need for a "school" – "to make each member accustomed to the feeling of duties."²⁷⁶

The Radical Party's position in local politics was fitting very well with the interests of peasant activists: to contest those in power. Political struggle was seen as the only means to bring in change. Hromads'kyi Holos proclaimed the following imperative for the elections in 1897: "Whoever is saying to you: 'a peasant, work and you'll have [wealth] but do not go into politics' – is lying." The idea was to show that participation in constitutional politics was necessary for the improvement of peasants' fate: "Today the constitution calls upon everyone to [participate in] politics. The constitution imposes on us great duties and burdens, but instead gives to us great rights."²⁷⁷ This was the point: having a constitution was worth paying taxes for it. Although, on the other hand, along with Mykhas' complains about unjust taxes, radicals were in favor of changing the taxation system (leaving only the income tax) and argued for a more even distribution of the tax burden according to the income received.

It is interesting that the landlords became a distant, almost invisible, abstract enemy, and radicals acknowledged it. Those who saw in the landlords the main object of struggle, like Social-Democracy, never got much support in the countryside. Just like Ivan Mykhas the radical newspaper would rather search for the enemy among the peasants themselves. It said that there were two things that had to be fought: 1) mayors, rich people and others subservient to the captaincy and 2) denounciators, as they were causing many people to end in prison. The power of the enemy rested on these two: "the landlords and Jews rule over us because they have their own spies."²⁷⁸

²⁷⁴ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.179, a.226-7.

²⁷⁵ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.179, a.239-40.

²⁷⁶ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.179, a.226-7.

²⁷⁷ "Desiat' zapovidei vyborchychk," Hromads'kyi Holos, 1896, No.3, 18.

²⁷⁸ "Iz zapysok khlops'koho likaria," Hromads'kyi Holos, 1897, No.9, 73-74.

It seems that after the party split in 1899 most radicals would agree with the following assessment of socialism by national-populists done back in 1891:

The program of socialism has a lot of truth, but even more untruth. Each is mixed with the other and that is why this mixture drives the inexperienced and that is why it is so dangerous.

It is true that liberalism, giving the full freedom to the rich and mighty, did not pose any limits for property, allowed for the monopoly of capitalism on labor and earning, but it is not true that we can manage without private property, that we should expropriate private property, even if this was done for the whole society. In this socialism missed justice, and further plans of socialism sin against the possible.²⁷⁹

And this would be the peasant assessment of the question as well. On the other hand, it seems that in the fact that Mykhas stayed with the radicals and did not join socialists, personal motifs could play a great role. Pavlyk actually was supporting him, at least morally, during the whole case surrounding the publication of the brochure Radical Mayor, although at one point Mykhas suspected that Pavlyk “did not believe that the brochure Radical Mayor was the biggest lie.” He reassured Pavlyk: “Be sure that I did not stain either myself or our party.” And in doing this Mykhas was not particularly humble about himself: “I did more during my mayoralty for the citizens and community than [had been done] in all the centuries since the community appeared.” This allegedly was acknowledged by not only his co-villagers but “foreign villages” as well. “I have only one thing, that I happened to dislike the family of the Dedyks, who ruled in the village over the weaker and poorer as executioners [*iak katy*].”²⁸⁰

Mykhas believed that the brochure Radical Mayor had two goals. The first one was personal – to compromise Mykhas “in the eyes of the administration” and to distract attention from his complaints against Rev. Bobers’kyi. The second one was political – to compromise Mykhas on the eve of Diet elections – for this purpose the brochure was read aloud in the villages, “and even my faithful (*moi virni*) were saying: ‘so that is what Mykhas is.’” The second one, Mykhas believed, was the main goal of the brochure because the official investigation against Mykhas almost immediately turned against those who wrote the brochure.²⁸¹

It seems that no representative of the Radical Party came to console Mykhas, and at the end of April – beginning of May he started his court suit against Rev. Bobers’kyi and Bobers’kyi’s son Metodii with the help of the attorney

²⁷⁹ “Shcho to ie radykalizm,” Bat’kivshchyna, 1891, No.19.

²⁸⁰ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.49.

²⁸¹ TSDIAUL, f.663, op.1, spr. 222, a.50.

Aleksandrovych, although it could be that this attorney was suggested to him by Pavlyk. Mykhas felt depressed and was not able to write a detailed report about this case, suggesting again that someone from the party would better come for the court sessions.²⁸² The court process did not go well. Already in August Mykhas complained that the attorney wanted several hundred Gulden for upholding this case. He says: "I am not able to do it unless I sell out my land." Mykhas was looking for "some good attorney" to file a complaint in his name for less money.²⁸³

The court case was quite prolonged, and the final session took place in March 1900.²⁸⁴ The court case filed by Mykhas against the authors of the brochure Radical Mayor ended with the sentence of 14 days of arrest and return of trial expenses for the brochure's authors. In the court it appeared that all those signed under the brochure Radical Mayor were signed by Rev. Bobers'kyi's son.²⁸⁵ The appellation in L'viv left this sentence intact. The court in Vienna, however, cancelled it on the ground that the case was too old, and Mykhas had to return court expenses of 180 Kronen himself.²⁸⁶ Moreover, the elections were coming, and the court trial did not cool down agitation against Mykhas, while the brochure succeeded in discrediting him.

Rev. Bobers'kyi, allegedly, continued his agitation from Ambon and in confessional. Mykhas said that there was no redemption of sins, unless one promised to vote against Mykhas in the approaching elections to the community council. Bobers'kyi's son, a teacher, started calling meetings in the house of his supporter. Once, when Mykhas was at home, a group of people came in, asking to show them governmental documents so that they could check if these were in good order. The group was led by Kuzio:

Without suspecting anything I am giving them all the acts, and Kuzio in that very moment catches my throat so that I could not even say a word, not mentioning calling for help. Luckily, just at that moment my wife entered with another man and they defended me, half-fainted... For this his intent Kuzio got two days of arrest and good people told me that I would not be able to avoid a bullet through the window at night or on the day of elections. The same [fate] was waiting for my friends. So there is no wonder that most of them afraid to lose wealth and life did not come for the elections."²⁸⁷

²⁸² TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.40.

²⁸³ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.41.

²⁸⁴ TSDIAUL, f.663, op.1, spr. 222, a.42.

²⁸⁵ Hromads'kyi Holos, 1899, No.14-15.

²⁸⁶ Iarema Hirnychenko, Mizh molotom i kovalom, 9.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

The long mayoralty of Ivan Mykhas (seven years) ended with the victory of Rev. Bobers'kyi. The elections took place on 17 April 1899. On 9 April, during the sermon, Rev. Bobers'kyi allegedly said:

Fight as much as you can! I'll go ahead as Jesus Christ, and you, Dedyks, follow me as apostles! All together! And we shall not let even one from these damned radicals [to the community council]! And who will support them those will have a heavy unforgivable sin.²⁸⁸

Pylyp Kuzio and the numerous kin of Dedyks and Sarakhmans led the opposition. Ivan Dedyk was one to threaten Mykhas' supporters openly, saying that "A false oath does not harm as one has a sharp knife under his coat on his heart."²⁸⁹ When the commissar from the captaincy arrived in the village on the day of the elections, Mykhas told him

that the party composed of thieves, drunkards and scoundrels, led by a person of higher social position – here Rev. Bobers'kyi interrupted the speaker adding: 'this is me' – had terrorized electors with banditry or threats only to get its own candidates elected to get the government of the community estate in its hands.

Hryts' Min'ko proved Mykhas' words, presenting the broken wheel to the commissar.²⁹⁰ Elections came to a second tour, and now Mykhas' and Bobers'kyi's candidates received an equal share of votes. Then, the governmental commissar said: "Now the Lord God will elect." The procedure foresaw the possibility of three repetitions of voting among the candidates for mayor. In the third round only those two with the largest number of votes could compete. If the votes were divided equally between the two, then the elections had to be decided by a draw.²⁹¹

Rev. Bobers'kyi reported to the clerical newspaper:

In that so important minute I asked Jesus Christ with ardor and with hope with the words: 'Sweetest Jesus, save us, guard us from the current mayor-half-believer [*viiť-nedovirok!*] Show your might and glory, oh, God, and I shall thank you publicly in Missionar.' And mercy of God-The Savior! The hard-core radical himself on the order of the commissar picks up the

²⁸⁸ "Anarchista w sutannie," Monitor, 1899, No.30.

²⁸⁹ Ibid..

²⁹⁰ "Anarchista w sutannie," Monitor, 1899, No.32.

²⁹¹ Kost' Levyts'kyi, Nash zakon hromadskii abo jaki my maiem prava i povynnosti v hromadi, (Vydannia "Prosivity," kn. 112) (L'viv, 1889), 36.

cards and does not draw himself, but three of our candidates and [only] one misguided by him.²⁹²

An illiterate Dedyk became mayor, and his words, allegedly, were “Priest, teacher and mayor should hold the community well for its hair” (*Pip, uchytel' i vit povynni dorbe za chuv trymaty bromadu*).²⁹³ In total the new community council got four Dedyks among its members.²⁹⁴ According to Mykhas, besides the Dedyks, there was Petro Babirad, Mykhas' former pupil and store-keeper, who committed a fraud in the community shop, Ivan Min'ko, a drunkard, punished for the theft of salt in the community store, Fed'ko Koval'chuk, whose son Myron was a well known thief, and finally Iosyf Kruchko, a former community policeman fired because of theft.²⁹⁵ It is interesting that Rev. Bobers'kyi mentions one council member misguided by Mykhas, while Mykhas does not mention anyone worthy in that council. When Mykhas failed in the 1899 community elections the national-populist newspaper expressed its satisfaction with the outcome of the elections: “That is what he deserved, he did not have to follow always the Sambir captain as his best friend” (*A dobre iemu tak, bo ne treba bulo vsehda ity za 'pani-bratsi' zi starostoiu sambirskym*).²⁹⁶

From Mykhas' letters we know that 15 supporters of Mykhas came to the captaincy to ask for the protection of their lives and property. The captain sent two gendarmes to the village for 10 days. Allegedly there was some cheating during the elections, and the commissar sent to control the elections was helping the priest. The peasants again reported to Mykhas that the priest was inciting them against Mykhas during confessions.²⁹⁷ On the other hand, even from Mykhas' texts it looks like the district administration was not taking anyone's side in these elections. The band of Dedyks calmed down in the presence of gendarmes.²⁹⁸ Although Mykhas said that the complaints against these elections were sent to the Viceroy's office, there are good reasons to believe that the governmental commissar was doing his job and nothing more.

There are Mykhas' words from the 1897 Party Congress, suggesting that already back then he was afraid that if re-elections would come, he was not going to win them. Mykhas objected to the proposition about shortening the

²⁹² [Mykola Bobers'kyi] o. Nikolai B., “Z Morozovych,” *Misionar'*, 1899, No.9.

²⁹³ Iarema Hirnychenko, *Mizh molotom i kovalom*, 10-11.

²⁹⁴ “Anarchista w sutannie,” *Monitor*, 1899, No.32.

²⁹⁵ “Anarchista w sutannie,” *Monitor*, 1899, No.32.

²⁹⁶ *Svoboda*, 1899, No.18.

²⁹⁷ TSDIAUL, f.663, op.1, spr. 222, a.49.

²⁹⁸ “Anarchista w sutannie,” *Monitor*, 1899, No.31.

term for which mayors were elected (six years), saying that a good mayor would not manage to establish good order in the community having only three years at his disposition, and frequent elections would only give the office of mayor to oinkers' hands.²⁹⁹ The elections of 1899 in Morozovychi actually had to take place in 1897 and were postponed by Mykhas for two years. But this was not something unusual – in Bobers'kyi's Vaniovychi, the community council elected in 1891 stayed with no reelections even in 1900.³⁰⁰

Moving to Berehy

Even after the elections there was no peace for Ivan Mykhas. In the end gossip started that he and his family had to be blasted with dynamite. A friend, gendarme P., told Mykhas that if this happened the gendarmes were ordered to let it go.

Having heard this trustworthy warning my life and the world became loathsome for me. I knew that all this could come true because the people, who were about to do this, would not be restrained even by [conscience] of sin (although [they were] from the church brotherhood), because the priest did not stop maintaining that 'finishing the devil-radical is a merit in God's eyes.' And I felt a pity for these dark brother-peasants. Work for them, spend your health for their well-being – and beware of them. I knew very well that they were not guilty of this, that their eyes were blinded by a priest's fog.³⁰¹

It is interesting that *Prosvita* did tolerate a radical reading club in Morozovychi among its members for quite a long time. Only in 1899 the order of the Main Executive of *Prosvita* to its Sambir branch came to dissolve the reading club in Morozovychi. The cause, as Mykhas explains, was "that [its] members develop in the radical spirit and fight bravely for the national causes against the oppression of Rev. Bobers'kyi. Mykhas inquired from Pavlyk if it was true that the Consistory forbade Monitor because of his articles – "If this is true then take in a radical way to defense and open these peasants' eyes how they want to torture us without the world knowing about it."³⁰²

Summing up all the good he made for the community, Mykhas mentioned the following things:

²⁹⁹ "Z'jzd ruskoi partyi radykal'noi," *Dilo*, 1897, No.205.

³⁰⁰ *Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobycki*, 1900, No.14.

³⁰¹ Iarema Hirnychenko, *Mizh molotom i kovalom*, 10-11.

³⁰² TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.48.

From the Dedyks' hands I got back the community's land, the so-called Konychivka, which they appropriated for themselves, started a trial against Rev. Bobers'kyi about the return of the community pasture, which he over-ploughed to the parish land; due to his [Mykhas'] efforts the new classification of land was conducted in the result of which the land tax community members had to pay was decreased for more than one third, then some landless peasants got the relief from the house tax for 12 years, the whole community got tax relief three times and the total amount of that relief was 3,000 Gulden, while the community got aid in food worth 400 Gulden. Furthermore, during the mayoralty of Ivan Mykhas the school was built, moreover thanks to Ivan Mykhas' efforts the Diet's Presidium assigned to the community 50 Gulden yearly for school expenses, the store was founded and new stone bridges built which did not cost even a cent for the community. In the direction of moral reform of the people, Mykhas made sure that members of his party stopped drinking vodka and instead of it became conscientious readers of newspapers.³⁰³

Mykhas' enemies at the same time published an article in Słowo Polskie on 6 March 1900, signed by Pylyp Kuzio and Sen'ko Spryns'kyi (the same two who signed the brochure Radical Mayor). In this article they wrote that Mykhas failed in the elections and the commission sent to investigate his misbehavior found

how the mayor was torturing people with confiscations, how he did injustice to the poorer distributing anti-famine aid, how "wisely" he conducted accounts, and, (what is the best), how totally he destroyed the community forest.

According to the authors of this correspondence, Mykhas had to pay 72 Gulden in fines. And two peasants who testified in the court that they were forced to sign the brochure Radical Mayor, did so because of fear of Ivan Mykhas.³⁰⁴ Mykhas rebutted these accusations, showing that in fact the commission proved that Ivan Mykhas won three Joch of community land unrightfully kept by Kuzio's family. Pylyp Kuzio himself was punished for stealing domestic fowls, and Ivan Dedyk was sued by Mykhas for the attack on a cart with an attempt to rob it.³⁰⁵ In fact, the judge Chaikovs'kyi stopped the investigation started on the basis of the brochure Radical Mayor because of a lack of evidence, but this happened after the elections to the community council took place.³⁰⁶

³⁰³ "Anarchista w sutannie," Monitor, 1899, No.30.

³⁰⁴ VR II, f.3, spr.1632, a.541.

³⁰⁵ VR II, f.3, spr.1632, a.547.

³⁰⁶ "Anarchista w sutannie," Monitor, 1899, No.31.

Mykhas had also approached Franko with a letter dated on 11 March 1900, making rapprochement with him and saying that all his misfortunes started with 1897 when Franko was a candidate in the elections. Mykhas had no power to fight enemies, and there was no Ruthenian “patriot” to help him with advice. When the brochure Radical Mayor appeared, all the newspapers were talking about it, but now, when the court ended and proved his innocence, no one wanted to mention it. Mykhas asked Franko to publish a refutation somewhere,

I ask for a kind reply what will you do with this? And what should I do, should I give up national work and surrender? Or should I fight? There are [only] separate individuals with me and the truth.³⁰⁷

Despite the beginning of the court trial for the brochure and the not that benign situation in Morozovychi, Mykhas asked Franko to run in the elections from the Fifth (general) curia. Vityk told Mykhas that Franko decisively refused to run, nevertheless Mykhas assured Franko that if only he changed his mind all the peasants would vote for him and not a single one for the social-democrat Hankevych.³⁰⁸

Then, there is the never published article by Mykhas among Franko’s papers called “The Court Investigation against Ivan Mykhas.” The article starts with the history of the conflict, when Rev. Bobers’kyi decided to revenge the strike of the Morozovychi community on the community mayor, and to scare with his example the whole Sambir district. “He took my enemies as heroes and sued me [in court] for anti-religious propaganda while in the district Presidium and criminal court for office abuses.” Already one mayor from Biskovychi fell as an innocent victim of such a plot.

And after the first shots were fired on the battlefield of paper (protocols in the prosecutor’s office) they shouted “Hurrah!!! Mikhas lost! Mikhas is no longer a mayor, the priest managed to finish him!!” – echoed in the area. But I laughed from this hoarse but also get numb, because I am a usual man, somewhat lean, without might but with clean conscience, and I think that before the sun rise the dew may have eaten the eyes. They all are heroes! Sextons and cantors! While I am alone and if I perish my poor army will scatter and will not want to gather together the second time. Hey! Whatever comes let it come! Am I not a Cossack son? And I recalled Ivan Franko’s words: ‘Judge me my judges...’

So Mykhas decided to appeal to the community:

³⁰⁷ VR IL, f.3, spr.1632, a.539.

³⁰⁸ VR IL, f.3, spr.1632, a.569.

Whoever believes in God and in me, come to me as a volunteer to stand in my camp! As the investigation started the whole community, except of these heroes, even cantors and sextons testified on my behalf and it became lighter in my heart. (For the editors, the community has not yet stood up, only to my call, if there is a need, everybody would volunteer). I go to the battle alone on the 22d of March and suddenly the awl came out of the bag, and I got every hero from my rifle...

At first he got Rev. Bobers'kyi – it appeared that he took from the starving laborer Les'ko Min'ko 150 Kronen of aid from the district administration as payment for the burial of his wife, who died from starvation. And Min'ko himself died soon, others did not have any money left to pay taxes, and they had to sell their land to the Jews:

They are becoming proletariat, and frequent arsons, thefts and fights occur, I think that this is an anarchism in embryo, and we should give education to this proletariat because what will happen if they will have grown up with this spirit?

As a mayor of the community he allegedly saw that such a situation leads to the decline of holy religion and loyalty to the pastor, and that is why he decided to end this. Rev. Bobers'kyi, "the general-mayor," was hit by that in his head. The second hero, Bobers'kyi's supporter, told that "there is no harm in a false oath," and proving that he was testifying falsely, Mykhas got him as well. The third one Mykhas claimed to "get in his liver because I proved that when he was a mayor he appropriated three Joch of school land." The fourth, "a valet," got in his stomach, "he was my pupil, and robbed the community store for several dozen Gulden. A Jew was promised 100 Gulden for false testimony (actually not a Jew but a renegade [perhaps assimilated one]) but got his own for the theft of tax money."³⁰⁹

Rev. Bobers'kyi "accused me in rioting people against lords, that I gave up a peasant coat and took on a suit and mixing with gentlemen could find how these gentlemen weave a whip for the peasants (and we should remember that Rev. Bobers'kyi was also a peasant son.)" So the investigating judge asked a cantor:

Did he hear as I on some dinner complained about people in suits degrading and despising poor peasants whereas they had to caress them, because they [peasants] are the foundation of everyone's life, and that I changed into the suit (because I married a Czech woman, daughter of the estate renter and from an important family) to have an opportunity mingling among civilization to enlighten himself better and ask something for these poor people... I was also accused in this battle that I was rioting

³⁰⁹ "Anarchista w sutannie," *Monitor*, 1899, No.32.

peasants not to keep lent, because this was a priest's freak... I did not reject that, but I rejected that I ever told it was a freak, and asked the gentleman judge if lent was only for peasants, or generally for gentlemen and priests? And told that as long as our peasants will keep lent they will be dark and poor because from *borsbch*, fatless cabbage, potato and sour soup our farmer for sure will have no energy to labor or will to work, and from him there will be neither a worker, nor a soldier, nor a woman, nor a mother, but will drink vodka, trick the stomach and hunger and will be happy that can spend a day and no one forces him to work, and he and his children live as cattle.

When Mykhas was accused in reading Khliborob to incite against the clergy, he answered "that there are no inciting articles, only true facts about singular individuals, which are arguments on the daily agenda." Moreover, Khliborob passed the state prosecutor's censorship and everyone was allowed to read it. The reading club was founded to keep books of *Prosvita*, the Kachkovskii Society, of Naumovych, Franko and some others, and there also were newspapers: Khliborob, Poslannyk, and Narodna Chasopys'.

It is interesting that in this reading club we do not see Bat'kivshchyna or Svoboda, only radical and clerical newspapers. Perhaps this says something about the problem of the Sambir area where national-populism was represented by its clerical and conservative wing, but also about Mykhas' "Christian Socialism." Being accused of radicalism Mykhas answered:

As far as I know about radicalism, everyone is called radical who preaches justice, who wants to uproot abuses, and an open truth and uprooting of worldly falseness should not be considered as troublemaking and should be persecuted. Finally, I added that I would bravely endure all the sufferings for the truth, because Jesus Christ had also died on the cross for people, and now the same is going on.

Judge yourself respected readers how boldly, how relentlessly, how shamelessly, what roads they pursue to hide the light of God's truth from the dark and leave lone people, I call upon you, our pastors and fathers, how will it end if you continue pursuing these roads and undermine yourself and your pastoral respect! And is there Heaven, Hell and Last Judgment?!

At the end of this letter Mykhas asked to publish it as soon as possible, and he would report on the developments of the court.³¹⁰

The local parish priest was quite often the foremost enemy of the radicals. We know the story of Hryhorii Rymar and Rev. Hrabovens'kyi. When another radical peasant, Antin Hrytsuniak, died in 1900, the priest requested 15 Gulden. Hrytsuniak's son claimed that his father ordered to pay only 6 Gulden for his

³¹⁰ VR IL, f.3, spr.3113, a.254-257.

own burial, and if the priest requested more, to bury without a priest. The priest agreed for six Gulden; however, he did not allow the body in the church and served from the church door. There were people from 17 communities, around 500 people. At the cemetery, when comrade Zahaikevych had a speech, some lads in headgear (what is totally inappropriate at a burial), several girls, old women and children were laughing, and the priest distributed among children bells so that they could ring and debase the ceremony.³¹¹

The point, however, was that greedy priests were bad not only because they exploited poor peasants but because they hindered the advance of the national movement and prevented peasants from trusting educated Ruthenians. Not all the priests, even in Mykhas' accounts, were bad. For example, the radical newspaper Hromads'kyi Holos reported about Rev. Petro Perchyns'kyi from Torhanovychi, quite possibly that on the basis of information provided by Ivan Mykhas (Back in the 1880s Mykhas was praising Rev. Brytan from the same village.). That priest sobered the community for 6 years, people were flocking to him, and he helped the community in self-government. The article ended with the words: "Honor to such a pastor."³¹²

Besides sheer conflict about power which was almost a common case, there was some original reevaluation of religious beliefs. It is hard to say how much this reevaluation was home-grown, and how much it owed to the persistent efforts of Ivan Franko and Mykhailo Pavlyk to sow the seed of doubts. There were numerous attempts at translating pieces of Biblical critique into Ukrainian. But the most popular book on anti-clericalism became Pavlyk's translation of Draper, published as The History of the Struggle between Religion and Science. Vasyly' Benchuk from the village of Bazaryntsi, Zbarazh District, an active radical subscribing to "Peasant Library" and Hromads'kyi Holos, asked Pavlyk to send him a copy of Draper "because I need it desperately for reading... ." Ironically, this Benchuk's letter ends with the phrase "God's luck to you (*shchast' vam Bozhe*). Other peasant activists were following the publication of Draper even in periodicals: Luka Harmatii, for example, asked Franko for the last installment in 1899.³¹³

In 1904 Pavlyk published Draper's work as a separate book with his own introduction. In the introduction Pavlyk says:

Publishing in Ukrainian a book about the struggle between faith and science... we, naturally, are interested to see its influence on the contemporary faith of our popular masses, the nature of which is the

³¹¹ Antin Hrytsuniak. *Icho zhytie ta smert'*, 20.

³¹² Hromads'kyi Holos, 1899, No.5.

³¹³ VR IL, f.3, spr.1621, a.127.

same on all the territory of Ukraine-Rus' with its colonies,³¹⁴ but to say the truth it is far removed from the proper Christianity. It should be mentioned that this book itself will not overturn this faith even if it will get to all the individuals of our nation; but it will for sure undermine in it at one stroke ignorance, superstition, spiritless forms, crude materialism, and, most importantly, the worst religious evil that was transferred from the field of faith into all other human relationships, and, sometimes, into the field of science as well – intolerance.³¹⁵

The Catholic camp answered the book with its own interpretation. Leaving religious dogmas aside, its characterization of popular faith had very much in common with Pavlyk's words in his introduction to Draper:

Draper's book is dangerous to us mainly from the following reason: our people, even our intelligentsia, do not know well the basics of the Christian faith, therefore it is not easy [sic! should be "hard"] to undermine such a faith.

This publication also observed the popularity of anti-clerical texts and critique of religion in general among the villagers: "we know from our experience that however bad such a book is written it nevertheless spreads very fast."³¹⁶

But let us take a look at the radicals' anti-clericalism. We may say that there was no atheism in the Galician village at the turn of the twentieth century. Even the hardest anti-clericals claimed to remain Christians. The majority of radical peasant leaders claimed to be better Christians than their pastors were.³¹⁷ Of course, already after the First World War, things would become different, but during Habsburg times free-thinking and rationalist critique of religion in the case of peasants never leads to atheism. Even being an unorthodox believer was inconceivable in that context; here was the proverb, "This must be a heretic, not a human."³¹⁸ The Galician countryside at the turn of the century was very

³¹⁴ the word "colonies" refers to the Ukrainian settlements overseas and in Siberia

³¹⁵ Mykhailo Pavlyk, introduction to Dzh. Dreper, *Istoriia borot'by viry z naukoju*, pereklav Mykhailo Pavlyk (New York: nakladom ukrains'koi knyharni im. T. Shevchenka i spilky, 1919), original publication – L'viv, 1904.

³¹⁶ Za O. F. Shchepkovychem, *Borot'ba Drepera z viroju* (v-vo tov. Sv. Ap. Pavla ch.9-10 ("Nyva," rr.1904, 1905, 1906) (L'viv: z "Zahal'noi drukarni", 1908), 9-10.

³¹⁷ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.162, a.25. Even the first Polish peasant electoral committee formed in 1889 put „being a good Catholic, not ashamed of its religion” as the first of its requirements to the peasant candidates. This resolution was propagated in the newspaper anthemized by the priests – *Przyjaciel Ludu*, 1889, No.3. Neither *Przyjaciel Ludu* nor *ludowcy* were against religion – Andrzej Kudłaszyk, *Katolicka myśl społeczno-polityczna w Galicji na przelomie XIX i XX wieku*, *Prace naukowe Instytutu Nauk Społecznych Politechniki Wrocławskiej*, v.24 (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Wrocławskiej, 1980), 87.

³¹⁸ Iv. Franko, "Halyts'ko-Rus'ki Narodni Prypovidky," *Etnohrafichnyi Zbirnyk*, 1907, t.23, 93.

much like the Rabelaisian world described by Lucien Febvre – atheism was simply impossible in that context.

This situation did not testify about some particular “Galician backwardness.” Writing on rural Radicalism in nineteenth century France, McPhee writes about:

the symbolic attraction of a peoples republic [*la Rouge* or *la Belle*] and the notion of quasi-religious conversion and solidarity ... The recurring reference to 'Christ the first republican' reminds us that it was the ecclesiastical establishment, priests, and church involvement in conservative politics that was anathema to the Left, and only rarely Christianity per se.³¹⁹

Mykhas, at the beginning of his anti-clerical struggle, used the strategy often met in peasants' complaints to the Consistory about their priests. He was arguing that the priest was not fulfilling his pastoral duties and the religiosity of peasants suffered because of that. In 1895 even in his letter to Pavlyk he complained that the priest had not had a service in their church for already a year.

Because of his abuses and his inhuman behavior towards people, and because we live without moral teachings like Pagans, we want to ask on behalf of our community to transfer to the Latin rite and, belonging to the neighboring village, we shall send into the world a demonstrational triumph over the priest and Consistory albeit we would remain Ruthenians in language (there are only Ruthenians in our community), and if our fate improves we can apply to the captaincy again about switching back to the Greek rite. Unconfessionality (*bezvir'ie*) is impossible here. That is how my friends advised me. Please advise me what should we do?³²⁰

We do not know Pavlyk's answer but from other cases know that switching to Roman Catholicism was not considered to be an option; Roman Catholicism in the Galician context automatically meant Polish culture.

On the other hand, Mykhas' anticlericalism was something larger than his personal enmity with Rev. Boebrs'kyi. It was described as follows:

To clergy, that worked among people on economic or cultural field, who in their lives were led not by the egoistic interest but by the good of their folk he had always maintained respectful attitude. 'Let him work, do not make obstacles to him (the *pip*) – this would be for us anyhow.' But he was pitiless to those whose religion and faith started and ended in the

³¹⁹ Peter McPhee, “Popular Culture, Symbolism and Rural Radicalism in Nineteenth-century France,” in *Journal of Peasant Studies*, v.5, No.2, 1978, 248.

³²⁰ TSDIAUL, f.663, op.1, spr. 222, a.34.

pocket. Especially, he was fighting conspicuously flourishing then pilgrimages. Impoverished people instead of getting to work went for miles, tens of miles to pilgrimages – in the hope to succeed somewhere there in his prayer for a better future. Against this, some kind of superstition, was battering the deceased with the whole ram of his word. To understand the soul of all these pilgrimages he went on purpose to Hoshiv and told people such a true story: 'There were dozens of us standing for the confession. It is hard to get in. I am standing at the back and cannot reach the confessor. Because I am a tall man I stand on the tips of my feet and show a Gulden (two Kronen) to the monk, who does the confession. He has noticed, tells people to give me way and calls upon me. I had confessed, hid money and stood up. But the confessor – 'Give me the money.' I have them only for the way back to Sambir – I answered and went to do penance.'³²¹

Mykhas belonged to the type of anti-clericals whose creed was expressed by Petro Novakovs'kyi, originally a peasant from the village of Torky, who said to his priest: "I believe in Christ's teaching, but I do not believe in you, Reverend."³²² There are too many references to the Bible and Christianity, and even his socialism in one letter Mykhas defines as "Christian." His early speeches are clearly styled in a Biblical way, and he refers to Jesus Christ as the example he follows. In the resolutions of early radical peasant meetings, especially in the cases where these resolutions were proposed not by party functionaries but by the peasants themselves, points aimed to tame priests' greediness go hand in hand with the points aimed at the purification of religious behavior. For example, the community meeting in Karliv, 1892, accepted among its resolutions one ordering the community's members to abstain from trade on Sundays and holidays, so "that the Jews will not laugh that we do not honor our holidays." Parents had to take care of youth, which was demoralizing and "had no shame before the older villagers." Then there was a resolution about abolishing unneeded conversations in the church "because the church was a place for prayer."³²³

Ivan Sanduliak was very unhappy when he saw signs of atheism in the radical press. There is a letter from him dated by 1901 to the editors of Hromads'kyi Holos, in which he says:

Please, take care of the Capital Letter in important words because Priests are again starting to shout at our Newspaper Hromads'kyi Holos and have a reason to attack Radicals from everywhere, although they have never

³²¹ M. Z., "Ivan Mykhas (U 20-tu richnytsiu smerty)," Hromads'kyi Holos, 1938, No.45.

³²² Hromads'kyi Holos, 1900, No.9.

³²³ Nykolai Ivaniichuk i Ivan Sanduliak Iuriia, "Hromatske viche v Karlovi," Khliborob, 1892, No.1.

been too quite. In the first issue of Hromads'kyi Holos in many instances you put small letters in the word God.³²⁴

Kyrylo Tryliovs'kyi, who at that time was organizing a new revival of the radical movement from Kolomyia, was also incredibly angered by this publication, which threatened to decrease significantly the popularity of the Radical Party among the peasants. He asked Pavlyk: "What idiot printed the word 'god,' and in such a propaganda issue with a small letter?"³²⁵

Finally, the Radical Party itself had been constantly underlining that it was not propagating atheism: "We must say once and forever that radicals as a political peasant party do not intrude into religious matters, it means that they do not stand up either against religion or in favor of it, leaving the matter of religious education for those who are responsible for it from the government." Nonetheless, they were defending "rationalism" in religious matters:

What is rationalism? This is the struggle to be ruled by reason, enlightenment. Is there something evil in it? And you, our enemies want that people in everything, religious matters included, were guided by unreason, darkness and superstitions? Or maybe you think that reason and education lead to the decline of faith and destruction of religion? Then you are the worst enemies of religion, because you consider it to be inseparable from darkness and unreason.³²⁶

When faced with the new religious publications paying attention to the social issue, connected with something that can be called a Greek Catholic revival, which started in the 1890s, radicals had hard time. In 1901 Sanduliak wrote:

Now the calendar of Missionar came out with interesting lies, and was bought in mass in our village on the very Christmas in the church. I have read it myself and my head is aching from such a tricking [*krutni*].³²⁷

While working with the priests of the old pattern, even with Rev. Bobers'kyi, who did not want to discourse about the basics of faith and considered any inquiry into matters of creed to be an attempt on religion and on their power, the radicals had good chances to win peasant support. However, starting with the 1890s a new generation of priests appeared, and it was more difficult to fight with. The church changed its tactics: numerous popular books, calendars,

³²⁴ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.228, a.17-18.

³²⁵ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.231, 44.

³²⁶ Ivan Franko, "Radykaly i relihiia," in Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh, t.45 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 270-271.

³²⁷ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.228, a.18.

newspapers and brochures were being published. In this context the influence of the Radical Party based on the critique of clerical authority and discussion of religious matters was diminishing. A new missionary movement was started by the Church, and numerous “missions” worked among peasants.

Already at the 1897 Congress Petro Novakovs’kyi complained that missions hinder the development of the radical movement and people “wander as if blunted (*kbodiat’ iak zatumaneni*).”³²⁸ In 1897 the first church mission was organized for several days in the Turka Mountains, and it was unexpected success: “How could one be sure that people, addled by various scum, would go after the voice and leadership of their pastors, blackened and slandered in their eyes, and if they would show in an adequate number for the advertised celebration.” Around a hundred people showed up despite rain; later, for the confessions, already more than 300 peasants came.³²⁹

These new religious periodicals made fun of the Radical Party and its alleged influence on the peasants. One of these newspapers, Poslannyk, told the “story” of the “radical peasant” who got an invitation for the radical congress in L’viv, where he was forced to speak about the “radical spirit” in his corner of the district. The whole Congress was a small (up to 100) group of people constantly quarrelling with each other.

And the peasants who came to the Congress, – every time one was about to speak, even before he opened his mouth, one could swear that he would either complain about his priest, or propose a “wise” resolution like one about publishing a Christian-Catholic catechism in the truly Christian spirit (read radical) because priests corrupted the faith! (And gentlemen accepted this wise resolution at the congress of last year)!...³³⁰

The point priests were making was hard to refute. The whole radical movement in the countryside was based on the mobilization of the conflicts of the type “priest vs. community;” instead of emphasizing class conflict and the search for the core of peasant problems, the radicals organized their work around a pretty marginal thing:

Is it not true that if there was no Josephinian patent there would be no congress of yours, tell me the truth? The whole work of the radicals by this time went only in that direction. It seems that only after you finish “radically” with this one you will move to other works, but by that time the Ruthenian nation will disappear having been eaten by Jews, misery, poverty and usury. Do no fear, priests have not ruined the Ruthenian

³²⁸ “Z’jizd ruskoi partyi radykal’noi,” Dilo, 1897, No.203.

³²⁹ Uchastnyk, “Ot Turky,” Poslannyk, 1897, No.13.

³³⁰ “Tak ia perestav buty radykalom. Povistka z nashykh chasiv,” Poslannyk, 1899, No.14.

nation and they will not ruin it, and it would be good if the only exploitation people experience was from the priests for the rituals, and people did not go because of that to Canada and Brazil! They would not be leaving their own land.³³¹

The radicals attacked priests partly because the latter were those least defended by the law and state authority, which had been secularizing itself since the 1860s. Clerical newspapers showed that the peasants were radicalized by the party functionaries from L'viv, who were publishing about peasant activists' work, exaggerating the scale and importance of their activities and enchanting them with prospects of becoming a Diet, or even parliamentary, deputy.³³² Clerical publications were showing nicely how the shortcomings of single individual radicals were automatically transferring onto the whole clerical estate, how important in all these conflicts personal motifs were.

But if we go back to the beginnings of anti-clerical propaganda in the 1880s, to the projects conceived by Franko and Pavlyk under the influence of Drahomanov, we shall see that the point of radical struggle was not in making peasants non-religious, but in separating faith from other aspects of social life, and from pastors' claims to power in particular. While ethnographers were stating that there is no distinction between the spiritual power of the priest and God's power in the villages and priest is considered to be God's or holy, the movement made this distinction.³³³ Paradoxically, in this the radicals' project was coinciding with the claims of the new leadership of the Greek Catholic Church. Faith was becoming more and more a matter of conscience only.

In 1901 Rev. Bobers'kyi founded a reading club in the village of Vaniovychi. The national-populist newspaper reported about the activities of this reading class:

Members of the executive and some members that can read better than others, read taking turns. From time to time they sing together folk songs and carols, or play domino, "sheep and wolf", "mill," "a fool" [card game], and some even started learning playing chess from the last year's calendar of *Prosvita*.

On Christmas this reading club organized a caroling, and on Epiphany a party took place in the reading club. There were two comedies presented: "She Tricked Us" (*Perekytryla*), and "Germanized Iurko". The daughter of one of the farmers recited a poem by Rudans'kyi. The reading club's store reported much

³³¹ Ibid.

³³² "Iak ia perestav buty radykalom. Povistka z nashykh chasiv," *Poslannyk*, 1899, No.18.

³³³ Świętek, *Brzozowa i okolica*, 141.

success and distracted half of the village from the Jews, who held six shops in Vaniovychi.³³⁴

The most remarkable event in its early twentieth century history was the visitation of the parish by the archbishop in 1902. The welcome of the prince of the church was organized by Rev. Bobers'kyi. Far in the field peasant cavalry met this important visitor and accompanied him to the village. To the signal of a horn, from the cavalry the community's powder guns answered with a salute. There were welcoming speeches and a march with songs to the local church for the service and sermon. In the evening there was a party in the local *Prosvita* reading club. A theatrical performance, singing and recitations were in the program of that party. The church brotherhood's members were present and carried emblems on their chests. The carriage of the archbishop was accompanied by parishioners for ½ an Austrian mile till it reached the boundary of the Sambir district.³³⁵ But by that time Mykhas belonged neither to the parish of Vaniovychi nor to the community of Morozovychi.

In 1905 Vaniovychi celebrated the day of the pastor's Angel. After the service there was a meeting near the church, and representatives of the Church brotherhood, school and reading club greeted the priest,

Then the command was given to everyone: 'Attention! Look to the left!' Everyone looked to that side, there were 'Sokols'! ... All with blue and yellow bands, strong lads and young farmers stood like a wall, and their leader, Ivan Herhanivs'kyi thanked the pastor for the moral support of the development of the society. With the song "Long Live (*Mnobaia lita*)" the community accompanied its pastor home.

In the evening there was a party in the reading club, a performance of St. Nicholas giving gifts to children with the small "Devil Antypko" playing a clown. This is the first village St. Nicholas party, the description of which I found in the press and a typical case of the embourgeoisment of village life. But there was also a dissonant note in this celebration:

One of the members of the reading club's executive noticed very to the point: 'It is strange for me that no gentleman from Sambir or from the area came here. Peasants from other villages could come here while gentlemen – no. They know peasants only when it is about money.'³³⁶

³³⁴ Vanivs'kyi, "Z Sambirshchyny," *Svoboda*, 1903, No.3.

³³⁵ "Vizytatsii," *Ruslan*, 1902, No.123.

³³⁶ "Zi Sambora," *Dilo*, 1905, No.3.

In this pronouncement the legacy of Ivan Mykhas, who said something very similar in 1892, was manifesting itself, proving that the problem was not simply in Mykhas.

The relationships between Mykhas and the radical leadership must have cooled down significantly after 1899. In his letter from 6 November 1900 Mykhas asks to excuse him for not visiting Pavlyk, while being in L'viv, because of the lack of time. He inquired about who was going to come for his court process, promising that the case will be interesting and characteristic of the argument between the radicals and liberals:

Because we are saying that those against us are executioners of humankind, enemies of enlightenment and progress, spread lies ... in one word they are total demoralizers. While our enemies say that we, the radicals are destroying even the best house and disturb the peace: to prove this the leader of the liberal (boot-lickers [*hyzunovychi*]) party in the district printed an appeal...³³⁷

Still hoping to win the court case, Mykhas decided to move from the village of Morozovychi. The decision must have been hard for him.

From his later texts we know that the large tabular estate in Lanovychi was parceled, and Mykhas bought a 70 johcs' farm on its lands. Was it somehow connected with the Khlopets'kyi's management of this estate? We do not know. But his new farm was almost three times bigger than his land plots in Morozovychi, although even back there he was among the richest peasants in the community. The huge difference was in the fact that now he did not live inside the community. Although technically belonging to the community of Berehy, he was in fact living between Berehy and Lanovychi, very close to the village of Zraisko.

Mykhas described his moving to the new place, three Austrian miles away from Morozovychi, in the following words:

I have sold my precious fatherland and saved myself from inevitable ruin, and settled in the field, alone, on the wide endless field. And I live alone as a hermit, as an exile, but in peace. But quite often the thought crosses my mind about the bitter payment for the best ideas. And this way days pass for me, and I only console myself that the life is an eternal struggle between death and existence.³³⁸

In our discussion of Ruthenian politics we saw that the village of Berehy was active in them. Although being a bit distanced from organized Ukrainian life, it

³³⁷ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.42.

³³⁸ Iarema Hirnychenko, *Mizh molotom i kovalom*, 11.

supported Ruthenian candidates, and its mayor cooperated with Mykhas in the latter's attempt to establish a peasant organization in the Sambir district. In the inter-war period it was said that "the village of Berehy belonged to the most cultural in the Sambir district. Before the war the *Prosvita* reading club had 800 books."³³⁹ The reading club in Berehy originally was founded in 1899, it was founded by Sen'ko Chyzh, the brother of the professor of the teachers' seminary in Sambir, Il'ko Chyzh. This Il'ko Chyzh had written memoirs which were never published, and the manuscript itself could not be found.³⁴⁰ In 1899, when an "industrial and farming" meeting was organized by the *Prosvita* branch, there were 10 peasants from Berehy who participated in it. Enlightenment in the village was said to be spread by both the priest and the mayor, Makar.³⁴¹

On 24 March 1901 Mykhas wrote to Pavlyk from his new residency. In this letter in the name of Sambir radicals he agreed with Pavlyk's ideas and proposed himself as a candidate for the Diet elections: "the ground here is already prepared for the peasant, and perhaps we shall put me as a candidate because I have the best chances." In the Staryi Sambir the peasant Il'ko Linyns'kyi from Lavriv was proposed, a "very righteous man, it is just that he trusts some priests," and Mykhas asked to send him several issues of *Hromads'kyi Holos*. Mykhas asked Pavlyk to change the politics of *Hromads'kyi Holos*: "do not tease Russians [*katsapy*] so much, and tolerate them more, because I am sure that they still have a better character than these scoundrels 'people-looters' [in Ukr. *narodoluptsi* a pun on "people-lovers" – *narodoliubtsi*]." This was his own experience; he referred once more to the affair with Bobers'kyi that forced him to leave "the fatherland of his ancestors (*pradidna vitchyna*)."³⁴²

We know that when in 1900 a peasant meeting in Sambir took place to decide on the candidates from the Fourth and Fifth curia, Mykhas spoke against the priests and provoked resentment among many gathered. Mykola Hankevych, a social-democrat, was proposed as a candidate from the fifth curia, while the decision about the candidate from the fourth curia at the request of Ivan Mykhas was postponed till the next meeting. Perhaps he tried to become the candidate from the Fourth curia himself.³⁴³ In 1901 the roads of Mykhas and Zubryts'kyi intersected, and Mykhas appears as an enemy of national-democracy. Both of them were candidates in Diet elections, but none of them actually won. Mykhas' slogan was "do not trust anyone who is not a peasant."³⁴⁴

³³⁹ Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv Sambirs'koho povitu*, 59.

³⁴⁰ Ibid.

³⁴¹ "Pys'mo z Sambora," *Dilo*, 1899, No.86.

³⁴² TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.44.

³⁴³ *Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobycki*, 1900, No.40.

³⁴⁴ "Z rukhu vyborchoho v kraiu," *Dilo*, 1900, No.237.

Despite establishing quite a successful farm, it seems that Mykhas was very unhappy living outside of the community. He tried to compensate this by working in the neighboring village of Berehy. He established there an orchestra of wind instruments. This orchestra would give the best performance in the national celebration in Sambir in 1914. However, this engagement could not substitute for his engagement in Morozovychi affairs; Mykhas started learning English and was preparing to emigrate to America.³⁴⁵ Although participating in social and cultural life of the community of Berehy, Ivan Mykhas remained a stranger there. While back at home his ancestral land strip was close to the church, at the heart of the village, his new settlement was not even part of the village. And we know that the difference between the core of a village and hamlets was to a large extent defining one's position in the community.³⁴⁶

In his new place of residency Mykhas continued to struggle with outlaws, for whom his wealth was very attractive. Already in 1900 his four horses had their tails cut off by an unknown closer gang practicing this trade in Mistkovychi, Berehy, Babyna, and Lanovychi, where in 1899 180 horses lost their tails.³⁴⁷ In 1902 a request for a station of gendarmerie was published in the local weekly. It was said that Babyna-Lanovychi-Berehy was the most dangerous place in the district to live in. Berehy's community council could not do anything about it because of the fear of revenge, while the community council in Babyna was itself involved in these crimes. On 30 December 1901, when Ivan Mykhas was coming back from Sambir at night, his cart was attacked by two men between Babyna and Berehy. One of the attackers held the horses, and the other one hit Mykhas' head. Mykhas managed to break away and find shelter in Vasyl' Detsyk's house in Berehy. Detsyk with his servant and son-in-law followed the robbers and recognized them as Ivan Shuvar and Ivan Strubys'kyi.

For disclosing the guilty Vasyl' Detsyk had to be on guard at nights because they threatened him with arson, and finally, because of fear had to apologize to them. Mykhas was warned that he would do better if dares this attack and does not go with this case to the court, because otherwise even after several years revenge will come either as arson or as poison, which already was the experience of Vasyl' Kozbur from Berehy.³⁴⁸

At the beginning of the twentieth century the Radical Party started recovering from the crisis of 1899. This recovery was connected with the new turn in radical approaches and organization. A more demagogic wing was taking the

³⁴⁵ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.222, a.4

³⁴⁶ Ivan Franko, "Velykyi shum," 216.

³⁴⁷ Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobycki, 1900, No.33.

³⁴⁸ R., "Głos z pod Sambora," Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobycki, 1902, No.1.

upper hand. It was represented by Kyrylo Tryliovs'kyi. Structurally, the network of peasant activists was replaced with the fire fighting *Sich* organizations, which together with fire fighting training and practicing of gymnastics were immersing into the symbolism and vocabulary of Cossack times. The most important difference between radical *Sich*'s and national-democracy's *Sokil*'s was that the former allowed only secular people to be their members. In this way Tryliovs'kyi hoped to secure the new organization from clerical influence.³⁴⁹

Already in 1901 in his letter to Mykhailo Pavlyk Kyrylo Tryliovs'kyi said:

With the help of *Sich*'s I hope to establish the Radical Party anew. The time is very good for this because national-populists are compromised by their *partejman*-s, such as Huryk,³⁵⁰ with strikes it is quite right now and only emigration to Prussia surrounds them with some kind of aureole.

There was also a decline of the older radical newspaper Hromads'kyi Holos, based on a personal network and stable peasant correspondents. But the new radical newspaper, Khlopska Pravda published by Tryliovs'kyi, ceased to exist very soon, not getting even a single subscriber, as Tryliovs'kyi mentions in the same letter.³⁵¹ By 1904 the popular *Sich* song, *Hei, tam na hori Sich ide* became a second anthem of the Radical Party sung together with the older revolutionary song *Shaliite, shaliite, skazheni katy*, which was accepted as the anthem of the party back in the 1890s.³⁵²

It is worth to note that while “getting rid of the intellectuals” in 1899 the Radical Party, although suffering a heavy crisis, went on the road to becoming a modern disciplined political party. The new Radical Party concentrated on the minimal program of the Radical Party from 1890, saying that Drahomanov supported only that program and was not too happy with the maximum-program, which was overtly socialist. The crisis of 1899 was represented as the desertion of the intelligentsia when the party became truly peasant. Now the Radical Party got strong ground in the *Hutsul* region, *Pokuttia* and part of *Podillia*, where *Sich*'s flourished, “the best organization we have ever had.”³⁵³

The Radical Party in the 1900s accepted tactics of stricter discipline. Their slogans became “let's organize ourselves.”³⁵⁴ Radicals were against the corner

³⁴⁹ Petro Tryliovs'kyi, (ed.), Hei tam na hori “Sich” ide!.. Propam'iatna knyha “Sichei” (Winnipeg, 1965), 18.

³⁵⁰ Peasant activist and Diet deputy.

³⁵¹ TsDIAuL, f.663, op.1, spr.231, 44.

³⁵² Iuvylei 30-litnoi diial'nosti Mykhaila Pavlyka (1874-1904). Z portretamy iuvyliata i ieho Ridni (L'viv: z drukarni Narodnoi, 1905), V.

³⁵³ “Po vyborakh”, Hromads'kyi Holos, 1907, No.47.

³⁵⁴ “Orhanizuiemosia,” Novyi Hromads'kyi Holos, 1904, No.1.

scribes just like the administration, and there was not more toleration for independent peasant action than in the case of the government. When President of the Higher Land Court Dr. Tkhurzchnicki issued an instruction against the corner scribes, radicals propagated it and wanted lower courts to pay more attention to these scribes.³⁵⁵

When with the editorial board of Hromads'kyi Holos the so-called "Peasant Office" was opened with the aim of advising peasants legally and free of charge, it was stated that the chancellery "will advise only in political matters and general social, but it was warned that the office was not going to play an attorney in the disputes between neighbors about land, boundary and so on."³⁵⁶ It seems that there was no place for all the petty complaints of the party's peasant activists anymore. The rhetoric of the Radical Party was becoming more and more radical. They were representing Galicia as the land of "the nobility's governments, illiteracy, lawlessness, and holy propination" jealously supported by the government." Peasants were not respected, and the number of criminal sentences was incredibly high.³⁵⁷ It was no longer about concrete injustices; the link between injustice and landlords was clearly established and the peasantry as a class with the help of its organization was supposed to fight landlords controlling the state structures. In 1907 the Congress of the Radical Party stressed in its resolution that the future is in union with Ukrainians from Russia. The Radical Party was supposed to help the latter to acquire both freedom and land.³⁵⁸

Peasant activists were slowly accepting the new rules of the game. Mykhas advised Pavlyk in 1901:

In Hromads'kyi Holos put articles like those in Monitor, for example that Jaworski got his colossal tax debts cancelled by the government, that the Provincial Presidium relived Count Potocki and Prince Sanguszko from tax, this is the water for our mill in electoral agitation. Your stand against priests works wonderfully in the province, write like this in the future!!!... and whatever you write in the interest of peasant (not of city workers) is also very good because who else if not the peasant on land, people live from the peasant, from his work! And from whose work the peasant lives?

At the end of his letter Mykhas comes back to the priests, who he says are "executioners, exploiters and spies" – "God! God! How dark must people be

³⁵⁵ "Protyv pokutnykh pysariv," Novyi Hromads'kyi Holos, 1904, No.14-15, 106.

³⁵⁶ Hromads'kyi Holos, 1907, No.33.

³⁵⁷ Kyrylo Tryliovs'kyi, Pro halytski sudy. Promova vyHoloshena v Radi Derzhavnii dnia 24 chervnia 1908 (Kolomyia, 1909).

³⁵⁸ Hromads'kyi Holos, 1907, No.1.

that [they] suffer in this way.”³⁵⁹ But most of his letter is directed against the outrageous deeds of the Polish aristocracy.

Now radicals considered themselves to be most consequent fighters against “Polish-noble hegemony.” The Viceroy assassinated by Myroslav Sichyns’kyi allegedly said: “found *Prosvita*’s, found *Sokol*’s but do not found *Sich*’s.” That is why all the true Ukrainian peasants had to join *Sich*’s.³⁶⁰ The radicals argued that *Sokol* was not the best choice – allegedly even Russophiles were among its members, *Sokol* was based on Polish patterns and even the name for the society was the same as with the Poles; *Sokol* was opportunist.³⁶¹ Tryliovs’kyi recalls that peasants were very attracted to *Sich*’s by the emblems worn by members, especially colorful bands worn through the right shoulder.³⁶² Perhaps this was true. However, there was another side of all this as well. *Sich*’s did not have regular urban uniforms – their members were supposed to wear folk dress. Only in the spring of 1910 new uniforms were introduced for urban *Sich*’s and for those villages where the folk dress was no longer in use.³⁶³ Getting inexpensive bands was much cheaper than obtaining the whole uniform. *Sich* from the very beginning had established itself in the villages, while *Sokol* for a long time remained an urban phenomenon.

Sich was not only about history, Cossack names and customs which the peasants could now experience. It was not only about the most radical and sharp politics being a venue to challenge and probe the authorities. Exercises had to fight the “antimilitarist complex of people.”³⁶⁴ They were about discipline, military-like discipline, which was thought necessary for modern society. *Sich* was also about anatomy, about peasants’ bodies shaped according to the scientific premises about most efficient and beautiful in the human organism. Exercises were supposed to help everyone to obtain the best anatomy that would allow one to work and to enjoy oneself most effectively.³⁶⁵ Peasant bodies bent by heavy labor had to rise and straighten themselves just as the whole peasantry was expected to do.

Tryliovskii was advising honest mayors to introduce the following changes in their villages. “Youth usually wants dances and parties often. I do not want to

³⁵⁹ TSDIAUL, f.663, op.1, spr. 222, a.45.

³⁶⁰ “Kudy nas vedut,” *Novyi Hromads’kyi Holos*, 1904, No.2.

³⁶¹ “Sokoly’ ta ‘Sichy’,” *Khlopska pravda*, 1903, No.5-6, 41.

³⁶² Petro Tryliovs’kyi, (ed.), *Hei tam na hori “Sich” idel.. Propam’iatna knyha “Sichei”* (Winnipeg, 1965), 14.

³⁶³ *Ibid.*, 27.

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 18.

³⁶⁵ “V zdorovim tili zdorova dusha,” *Khlopska pravda*, 1903, No.5-6, 35.

take a stance against this, however, I think that from dance alone their fate will not improve, and *Sich's* will not develop better.” That is why, he says, it would be a good idea to introduce the following rule: before every dance the youth should exercise for an hour or practice with a syringe. This ruling was actually made in the village N. of Nadvirna District where youth before starting dances exercise for at least an hour.³⁶⁶ The whole account shows that at the beginning of the twentieth century the issue of moral reform and of discipline in the communities was pushed further than in the 1880s. But this was, by and large, done by people of a new generation, succeeding that of Ivan Mykhas.

Sich became so popular that national-democracy started founding its own *Sich's* in the villages. National-democracy took not only the name, but even the statute itself. In the statutes, published by Tryliovs'kyi, only some paragraphs were deleted, and they were registered as statutes of *Sich's* belonging to *Sokil*. Of the deleted paragraphs the most important one said that only secular people can be members of *Sich*.³⁶⁷ It is interesting that many *Sich's* originally founded as radical later switched to national-democracy. For example, the *Sich* in the village of Babyna, neighboring to the radical village of Berehy, was founded in 1908. In 1912, at its general meeting, this *Sich* accepted changes to its statute and became a branch of the *Sokil* society in L'viv. These changes to the statute included deleting words about “secular estate” of its members, and changes in the terminology, which was more Ukrainianized – for example *himnastychnyi* everywhere in the statute was changed to *rukbankovyi*.³⁶⁸

After the arrival of Ivan Mykhas the village of Berehy finally got of the legacy of Juda Bachmann and joined the radical movement. The old tavern burnt down in 1904, and its walls were demolished; the place where it stood was bought by a local *Sich*, although the administration did not allow registration of this plot in the *Sich's* name, only in the name of the *Prosvita* reading club or the *Iednist'* cooperative.³⁶⁹ The Berehy *Sich* was founded in 1905 by Ivan Detsyk, a native of Berehy who worked for quite some time as a village teacher in the Kolomyia district. Ivan Detsyk was the first *koshovyi* of that *Sich*; the first *osavul* was Ivan Chyzhevyyh and the first accountant – Ivan Hnatyshak. In 1908 this *Sich* was revived by Karlo Kobiers'kyi, originally from Berehy, but back in 1908, a student in the Sambir gymnasium, and later on a well known functionary of the Radical Party in inter-war Poland. Starting with 1908, in this *Sich* “the whole

³⁶⁶ K., “Chesnym viitam pid rozvahu,” *Khlopska pravda*, 1909, No.2, 10.

³⁶⁷ See for example statute of *Sich* in Dobrivliany, district Zalishchyky, TsDIAuL, f.146, op.25, spr.1038.

³⁶⁸ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.25, spr.1469.

³⁶⁹ Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv*, 39.

cultural movement of the village concentrated because the reading club declined.”³⁷⁰

Starting with 1908 the *kosbovyi* was Petro Pavka, and the scribe Mykh. Kozbur. Both were Mykhas’ friends, and Petro Pavka was a co-founder, together with Mykhas, of the wind orchestra in Berehy.³⁷¹ In 1910, a children’s *Sich* was founded for boys from 12 to 14 years old. In 1912 the flag of the Berehy *Sich* was consecrated, on which occasion the village was visited by Kyrylo Tryliovs’kyi himself. The flag was destroyed by the Russian military in 1914. In 1909 the *Sich* revived the village reading club, and a peasant became club’s chair.³⁷²

The best source on the activities of the village *Sich* organization is answers to the questionnaire sent to them in 1909. I analyzed those for the Drohobych and Sambir districts (and there was none in the mountainous Turka and Staryi Sambir, which remained the domain of national-democracy and Russophiles). They flourished in the Drohobych District, which was among those best represented. These organizations were conducted by village peasant radicals and had little connection to larger organizations. Their answers are usually composed by self-enlightened peasant activists, critical of the establishment of the national movement; they are soaked with rough peasant humor. *Sich* organizations were not limited to the literate. In Hai Nyzhni, for example, there were 10 literate and 20 illiterate among *Sich* members, and there was no instruction in literacy because “it is difficult to input one’s reason into someone else.” The enemy here was the priest-*katsap* and his “lamp-lickers.” Usually these village *Sich*’s had no regulations about drinking alcohol. One in Hai Nyzhni answering the question about temperance said that, perhaps, in the future some sobriety could be introduced. Russophile fire-fighting societies, the so-called *druszlyna*, were called *drabyna* (a ladder but also connoting the word *drab* (scoundrel in Polish)). There was little respect to the higher *Sich* authorities as well. To the question about receiving any awards one *Sich* answered: “aha, a horseshoe from the old heel” (*aia distala z staroho obtsasa pidkovu*). Sometimes peasants could misinterpret questions because of poor reading skills; for example, the question “who is making most difficulties for the *Sich*” was interpreted as “who works hardest for the *Sich*.”³⁷³

The *Sich* in Berehy in this questionnaire appears among the largest village *Sich*’s. In 1909 there were 10 women and 80 men among its members. They had meetings in the community’s chancery, around 1,000 Kronen of wealth and

³⁷⁰ Ibid., 69.

³⁷¹ This information was given to me by the daughter of Petro Pavka.

³⁷² Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv*, 69-70

³⁷³ TsDIAU, f.847, op.1, spr.2, a.174-175.

yearly membership dues of one Krone. The fire-fighting equipment consisted of one hydrant on wheels, 13 crooks, 4 ladders, 6 hand hydrants, pales, and axes, but there was no sport equipment. Fire-fighting exercises were practices every third Sunday, and there were very little sport exercises. Exercises were taking place on the common. In 1909 the *Sich* fought two fires and got 20 Kronen' reward from the Kraków insurance company. All the women and 70 men were literate, and there was no reason to teach the rest because they were "wasted people." They had one festivity on the common, organized two amateurish performances, and did caroling. A total of 37 members wore bands. Rev. Mel'nyk, farmer Andrii Savdyk, teacher Holeiko, and former *Sich* member Petro Kysilevych were the organization's greatest enemies. There was a choir, and they knew many *Sich* songs. Four times a year the *Sich* organized parties with dances. The Berehy *Sich* reported Ivan Mykhas and Karlo Kobiers'kyi among its biggest friends and non-members.

At first this *Sich* agitated in other villages and recruited new members there, but now the Berehy *Sich* was under criminal investigation and could not continue this kind of work. There also was a *Sich* in Pyniany, but in 1909 it was declining. The Berehy *Sich* had its own seal – an eight-cornered star with two hands in a handshake, holding a sickle, inside.³⁷⁴ From the Sambir district there was also a report from Kornalovychi, another village with a tradition of social protest. There were four women and 23 men in the Kornalovychi *Sich*. Of these two women and 15 men were literate. There was not much activity going on, however. The enemy of this *Sich* was a certain peasant of the Latin rite (and the village had a mixed, Polish and Ukrainian, population). The report mentions that there also was one more *Sich* in the district – in Side.³⁷⁵

Just like the radical and Ukrainian village of Dobrivliany had its adversary in the Russophile neighboring community of Hrushiv, the village of Berehy was fighting with its neighboring and larger village of Mistkovychi. The source of Mistkovychi's Russophilism can be traced back to the activities of Rev. Lev Kozanevych, an active member of the Kachkovskii Society.³⁷⁶ The *Sich* in Berehy was fighting local opposition as well, and that opposition inside of Berehy would ask the community of Mistkovychi for help against radicals. An article sent to the radical newspaper reported that in 1910, Andrii Sadyk, Petro Kysilevych and Mykhailo Sozans'kyi organized an attack on the *Sich* of drunk men from a Mistkovychi wedding. Around 30 people at night, around 11 PM, attacked the reading club with pitchforks, axes and scythes. *Sich* members barricaded themselves in the store. Three people were heavily wounded and

³⁷⁴ TsDIAU, f.847, op.1, spr.2, a.377.

³⁷⁵ TsDIAU, f.847, op.1, spr.2, a.378.

³⁷⁶ "Iz Sambora," *Slovo*, 1886, No.69-70.

seven more lightly.³⁷⁷ The report that appeared in the local Polish newspaper was different. It talks about the “formal battle” which took place on 18 February. A former member of the *Sich*, Petro Kysilevych, had a sister marrying to Mistkovychi. Allegedly the *Sich* forbade youth from Berehy to participate in this wedding. When the wedding procession was moving from Berehy to Mistkovychi the *Sich* blocked its way, and wedding guests broke the line, wounding three *Sich* members.³⁷⁸

After moving to Berehy Ivan Mykhas also became more active in district politics. In 1901 Ukrainians of the Sambir area finally managed to create their own political society, something Mykhas attempted to do back in the 1880s. The society was called the “Sambir Area Council (*Sambirs’ka okružhna rada*);” it was chaired by Danylo Stakhura, who established his office in Sambir in 1901 after the death of Lukiian Humets’kyi. Lukiian Humets’kyi died in 1901 as a member of the Russophile society “Defense of the Land.”³⁷⁹ The unwritten rule of nationally conscious Ruthenian attorneys was not to compete with each other, and have only one Ruthenian attorney in the district town. Because of this Stakhura had to leave Sambir to establish an independent practice, and could come back after Humets’kyi’s death. Stakhura coming in 1901 managed to form a wide political coalition among Ruthenians, as can be seen from the composition of the newly created society, which included conservatives, radicals, and Russophiles brought together by the leader of the local national-democracy.

The first executive included Ivan Rudnyts’kyi, a notary from Luka (a vice-chair), Rev. Hordyns’kyi from Kul’chytsi, Rev. Skobel’s’kyi from Prusy (a secretary), Ivan Mykhas, Mykhailo Artymovch from Biskovychi, and Ivan Pynishkevych from Torchynovychi. Substitutes of the executive’s members were Rev. Pohorets’kyi from Bilyna and Mykola Vroniak from Stupnytsia.³⁸⁰ In 1901 Stakhura also had several speeches at peasant meetings; one of them was held in Vaniovychi.³⁸¹ These rallies in the countryside were something the former leaders of both Russophiles and national-populists in Sambir never did, and only Ivan Mykhas tried to do something similar in his home village.

These activities were another attempt to break the ice in the Sambir area. In 1902 Bilen’kyi saw some movement in Sambir, but not much in the surroundings. Ukrainians were building their won residency for school students,

³⁷⁷ I. M. , “Napad na “Sich”, *Hromads’kyi Holos*, 1910, No.14. Perhaps, the author of this correspondence was Ivan Mykhas, a technician, and the son of our Ivan Mykhas.

³⁷⁸ *Gazeta Samborska*, 1910, No.5.

³⁷⁹ VR LNB, f. Ivan Levys’kyi, op.2, spr.2377.

³⁸⁰ VR LNB, f. Ivan Levys’kyi, op.2, spr.2995, a.3.

³⁸¹ VR LNB, f. Ivan Levys’kyi, op.2, spr.2995, a.6.

separate from the Russophiles. According to him the main problem was that peasant villages did not have leadership and petty gentry communities were demoralized. His only hope lied in the Consistory which would appoint Ukrainian priests and break the influence of the Russophiles.³⁸²

Whatever cooperation could exist between Mykhas and the district administration in the late 1890s, there is no trace of it left in the 1900s. In 1902 at a meeting in Sambir Mykhas “spoke against those Polish officials, who were inciting Latin-rite peasants against Ruthenians at the meeting organized by them, he rebuked the speaker of the district council, Balicki, who was the chair of this meeting.” Mykhas finished his speech with these words: “millions of village peasant hands will manage to suffocate the hydra of *hakata*.”³⁸³ This is one of the first instances of the usage of the Polish word *hakata*, designating German assimilationists, in the Ukrainian context, when it was applied to Polish anti-Ukrainian politics.

In the 1900s radicals had also become more tolerant of national-democracy, and close cooperation between national-democracy’s left wing and the radicals was established. For example, in 1903 the radicals recommended to the peasants to read *Khlopska Pravda* (their own unsuccessful newspaper), but also *Prosvita*’s books and calendars “which became significantly better in recent times.” It is interesting that the same recommendation said: “people would also like to find little more from current international politics, interesting news and economic advice,” and for this the best would be *Narodna Chasopys*’ – official, yet fat and cheap. Peasants were supposed to read that one for the facts “and about the political situation one can find in the Ruthenian publications.”³⁸⁴ It is interesting that now radicals were relying on peasants’ ability to read newspapers without buying the newspapers’ ideology.

If we go down to concrete actions involving the peasantry, the radicals cooperated with national-democracy in organization and in support of agricultural strikes, but even more so in the issue of *parcelation* (the sale of landlords’ estates by parts). The radicals supported national-democracy in its struggle with Polish “colonization” of Eastern Galicia and propagated national-democracy’s slogan “Buy the land!”³⁸⁵ Parcelation was envisioned by national-populists as a gradual solution of the agrarian question back in the 1880s, when, in 1882, Volodymyr Barvins’kyi in *Dilo* pointed to the massive debts on Galician great landholdings, which would eventually lead to their large-scale

³⁸² TsDIAuL, f.664, op.1, spr.9, a.17.

³⁸³ “Viche v Sambori,” *Svoboda*, 1902, No.45.

³⁸⁴ “Shcho peredplachuvaty dlia chytal’nil,” *Khlopska pravda*, 1903, No.4, 27.

³⁸⁵ Vasyi’ Sidel’nyk, “Kupuite zemliul,” *Khlopska pravda*, 1909, No.2, 7.

sales.³⁸⁶ The return of Mykhas to the pages of a popular newspaper published by national-democracy fitted perfectly this rapprochement between the radicals and national-democracy, and the general radicalization of the latter's majority.

In 1903 there was a meeting in Sambir, on which Evhen Olesnyts'kyi had a speech. It appears that Mykhas had nothing to say against the speaker and respected his opinion:

Mr. Ivan Mykhas from Lanovychi asked the speaker to explain the meaning of the last trip of Metropolitan Sheptyts'kyi to Rome, with which the rumor about his coming resignation from political motives was connected. The speaker assured that Sheptyts'kyi's position in Rome is strong and that there is no reason to talk about his resignation.³⁸⁷

In 1903 Mykhas also participated in the meeting of the Sambir *Prosvita* branch and had a talk precisely on the parceling of land.³⁸⁸ In 1904 Mykhas' speech "On Parcelation" was published in *Svoboda* and also reprinted as a separate brochure. The speech starts with history:

Many of you gentlemen peasants are saying: 'how unwise our parents were', when earlier they could buy a lot of land almost for nothing but did not know how to use the moment. Similarly, our children will speak with pity about us... And [now] it is even worse, because the land is bought by Polish peasants, and from Polish peasants it would be much harder to get it back than from the Jewish hands.³⁸⁹

We see that the way he speaks about Polish peasants differs remarkably from the 1880s and 1890s when he was speaking about common peasant interests and the higher civilization of Polish peasants. He scares peasants with pictures of their children swelling from hunger because of not having land of their own. He points out the ongoing partitions of land, which becomes more and more expensive. Then he says that till very recently a similar situation was in Western Galicia, but then Polish peasants decided that only one son stays on the land and the rest become wage-earners, who after having earned money, would go to Eastern Galicia and buy land there.³⁹⁰ He saw the main problem in the fact that the Ruthenian people were afraid of leaving the "fatherland" (here used in the meaning of the inherited landholding):

³⁸⁶ Ivan Franko, "Obdovzhennia halyts'koi hruntovoi posilosti," *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.44 kn.1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 359.

³⁸⁷ Roman Sembratovych, "Viche v Sambori," *Dilo*, 1903, No.278-279.

³⁸⁸ Ia. A. H., "Z Sambora," *Ruslan*, 1903, No.286.

³⁸⁹ Ivan Mykhas, "O partseliatsyi. Vidchyt," (a separate offprint), 97.

³⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 98.

But I am saying that a man should risk a little bit and be able to bear all kinds of misfortunes; he must be harder than steel, burning [with the wish] to work and to believe in the future, believe that he can defeat all kinds of misfortune and misery. The dexterous will always find space for himself and manage misfortune. If only parents were not ordering their sons to pasture cattle till the age of twelve! Do not use your children as your slaves “while I am alive!” Exercise them from very young and give them freedom to conduct independently their own farming or practice some craft. Let them learn their own reasoning and dexterity; let them learn through practice and from books and newspapers.

The Ruthenian peasants! Leave at once this ‘good old’ principle that ‘my father, grandfather and great grandfather were working on this land, how would I leave it; this is my ancestral fatherland!’ – That is how Ruthenian peasants speak. But I am saying to you beloved brothers peasants:

If God gave to us Ruthenians a talent to live from the land, we should work in such a way that the whole Ruthenian land [one day] would belong to the Ruthenian people.³⁹¹

He called upon the peasants not to be afraid of leaving home. Mykhas’ solution for peasant landlessness was in moving to other districts, and not to other lands. He proved this thesis with the examples of successful Ruthenian farmers:

In the Sambir area a certain Mykhailo Luts’kyi from Luka had 100 Joch. 100 Joch is already a very good farm. But he sold these 100 Joch for 40,000 Gulden and bought the estate with 700 Joch for 70,000 Gulden. It is true that he had to borrow 30,000 Gulden but the sale of timber from the newly bought estate alone brought him back 15,000 Gulden. Now, after seven years of farming he had no debt and was selling yearly 2,000 kortsy of corn alone. His estate is now worth 150,000 Gulden.

Petro Bilyns’kyi in Chaikovychi had 50 Joch. He sold them for 30,000 Gulden and bought 300 Joch in Lanovychi. It is true that he had to borrow 24,000 Gulden but if he cuts the forest he bought, if he sells the timber – there will be not even a Kreuzer of debt left. He bought it so good that he paid only 34,000 Gulden but now this estate is worth at least 70,000.

Hryhorii Sen’kus from Neudorf had 24 Joch. Because of Ruthenian politics a robbing band wanted to ruin and pacify him. He sold his farm two years ago for 12,000 Gulden, and bought 160 Joch in Sushytsia for 12,700 Gulden. Now people offer him 22,000 Gulden for that estate but he does not want to sell – it appeared that this was an oil land.

I myself, thanks to the scoundrels, who because of Ruthenian politics organized against me a band of oinkers and thieves (*kbrumivsko-zlodiiisku*), had to leave my ancestral, exemplary farmed fatherland. I sold 22 Joch, and for this bought 70 Joch in Lanovychi, out of the village. Now the value of my land doubled and I live in peace from the scoundrels’ band.

³⁹¹ Ibid., 99.

It is a pity that others did not follow my example, because Polish peasants in Biskovychi were selling 2 to 3 Joch and for this money were buying from 8 to 12 Joch in Lanovychi.

The community of Berehy sold trees from 5 Joch of the community forest, then it found some more from the community's estate several thousand from various other sources and for this money bought in Lanovychi 52 Joch of forest for 17,500 Gulden. Only timber in this forest is valued at 20,000, and land will be left to them for free. Because of my advice the community of Berehy bought 52 Joch of forest, and the community of Lanovychi bought 89 Joch for the pasture for 15, 000 Gulden.

Then Mykhas gives other examples. A year ago in Lanovychi 800 Joch were sold for 140,000 Gulden, and no one wanted to buy it, although the downpayment was only 15,000 Gulden. Mykhas gave an impetus to parcelation, which in fact brought 190,000 Gulden. In Tur'ie 360 Joch of forest, mill and sawmill were sold for 18,000 Gulden. Luckily two Ruthenians from the intelligentsia bought it. Mykhas advances his plan, according to which the richer peasants, who have land scattered all over the community, have to sell it to their poorer co-villagers and look for the better opportunities elsewhere.³⁹²

Now it is not the native village that is a fatherland of the Ruthenian peasant. The fatherland of the Ruthenian peasant is the whole Ruthenian land! This Ruthenian land Polish peasants want to take from us, thus we should save it. Ruthenian peasant! Save Ruthenian land, save your own children. If you do not move beyond the boundary of your own village the Polish peasantry (*mazurnia*) would cover Rus', and then your grandsons would clean Polish peasants' horses and pasture Polish peasants' geese.³⁹³

The faster peasants were going to buy the land the better. A certain Czech, Jan Winsz, bought 240 Joch' estate in Strilbychi for 6,000 Gulden, and now the Ruthenian peasant was paying him for the same estate 28,000 Gulden.³⁹⁴

Polish peasants flood our land because they are more conscious, braver and more artful than Ruthenian peasants. We are lazy, distrustful of any good advice and believe at once the first available lie, the first available maneuver of the wily enemy of the Ruthenian peasants.

When in Lanovychi Polish peasants did not want to allow Ruthenian peasants to take part in parcelation, they said that the landlord was selling the land,

³⁹²Ivan Mykhas, "O partseliatsyi," *Svoboda*, 1904, No.9.

³⁹³ Ivan Mykhas, "O partseliatsyi. Vidchyt," 101.

³⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 103.

because the Russians had sequestered it for the landlord's participation in the Polish uprising anyhow. The land would go for free, and the landlord was selling it only to get at least some money.³⁹⁵

Then Mykhas turns to the abolition of *robot* and the servitudes' issue. "The *robot* could be abolished without indemnification but in the meantime our parents overslept the affair and Ruthenian people had to pay millions for the abolition of *robot*."³⁹⁶ A total of 25 communities had the right to 3,000 Joch of forest in Sprynia, Zvir and Volia Koblians'ka, but "our parents said: 'we did not grow up that forest, it is too far for us, we do not want it.'" Of 25 communities only 5 – Berehy, Berezhnytsia, Chukov, Morozovychi and Zvir – resisted and got a dozen Joch. Now Chukov, Berehy and Berezhnytsia were selling timber from 1 Joch of servitude forest for 800 and 900 Gulden.³⁹⁷

We have already met this argument about the missed opportunities and peasant unwillingness to use the moment in Mykhas' 1880s texts; however, now it is not so much about peasants' work ethic and capitalism, as about the struggle for possession of the land. Mykhas insists on the break up of old communal ties. In the new community of the nation, it does not matter from where and to where you move, if it is still Ruthenian land.

We see that too many prominent radical peasant activists were fairly rich farmers. This seems to support Keely Stauter-Halsted's thesis about the new strata of middling farmers who were interested in bridging the peasantry with the national movement.³⁹⁸ Being a rich peasant must have helped Mykhas to win the respect of other peasants. When a certain farmer Koval's'kyi was a candidate for parliamentary deputy in 1911, peasants were only pretending to listen to him, while laughing behind his back: the farmer who lost 12 Joch of the father's field would not be able to represent peasant interests in the parliament.³⁹⁹ It is interesting that Mykhas' former friend Sen'kus, whose enterprise he mentions as the result of such enrichment, in the 1907 elections already figured as a tabular landholder, and not as a representative of the community.⁴⁰⁰ The same was the situation of Ivan Mykhas.

Ivan Franko noticed this trend back in the 1880s, saying that soon those who bought parts of the tabular estates would have more political power in the elections than whole communities. Peasants that settled on the parceled

³⁹⁵ Ibid.

³⁹⁶ Ibid.

³⁹⁷ Ibid.

³⁹⁸ Stauter-Halsted, *The Nation in the Village*, passim.

³⁹⁹ "Peredyborchyi rukh," *Dilo*, 1911, No.110.

⁴⁰⁰ "Shche pro dopovniaiuchy vybir posla v Starim Sambori," *Dilo*, 1907, No.18.

landlords' estates had granted votes in the elections in the fourth curia (They did not have to go through the two-steps' procedure.). In the 1870s and 1880s these granted votes were especially numerous in Western Galicia, where they were influencing elections' results significantly. But at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century they became important in East Galicia as well. Here the issue was connected with the Polish peasants' colonization directed on the landlords' estates, colonization, which was supported by the Polish nationalist parties, and which meant that the electoral presence of the Polish peasants was much larger than the demographic one.⁴⁰¹

At least once Mykhas had also come back to his native parish. In 1906 Mykhas opened a meeting in Vaniovychi "to have a council on our misery and how to remedy it."⁴⁰² On 23 July 1906, there were also new elections of the community council in Morozovychi. Eight years of Mykhas' rule were followed by seven years of Dedyks' rule, and it was reported that "the community suffered from the old council all kinds of misfortune, the school ceased to exist, the church was closed, the common was devastated." But this time again, because of false ballots half of the new community council consisted of members of the old one.⁴⁰³

This Vaniovychi meeting was one in a wave of meetings organized in the district in favor of the introduction of the general franchise for parliamentary elections. Besides Vaniovychi, in December 1905 only these meetings took place in Maksymovychi, P'ianovychi, and Torhanovychi. In Torchynovychi, Vykoty, Dorozhiv and Luka councils of invited people took place. At the same time the Polish Peasant Party organized meetings in Susidovychi and Kornalovychi. At the meeting in Susidovychi Semen Vityk spoke.⁴⁰⁴ In this issue local Russophiles cooperated with Ukrainians. The meeting in Dorozhiv in January 1906 was attended by around 100 farmers. Stakhura and Rev. Vasyl' Skobel's'kyi spoke. Stakhura in his speech attacked mayors, and present farmers started shouting that mayors were thieves. A certain Ivan Dvorian, a major, objected to that, was thrown out and was called an oinker. The meeting was dissolved by the state commissar. The conservative Polish local newspaper lamented that these meetings incited one social class against another. Stakhura himself started his speech in Dorozhiv by mentioning *robot* and landlords.⁴⁰⁵ It is

⁴⁰¹ Ivan Franko, "Halyts'ka statystyka vybocha z rokov 1876 i 1883," 390.

⁴⁰² "Sprava vyborchoi reformy," *Svoboda*, Dodatok do ch.1, 1906.

⁴⁰³ Hromadianyn, "Z Morozych," *Svoboda*, 1906, No.43.

⁴⁰⁴ *Gazeta Samborska*, 1906, No.1.

⁴⁰⁵ "Wiec w Dorozowic," *Gazeta Samborska*, 1906, No.1.

interesting that the newspaper was dissatisfied with the reaction or the lack of the reaction to it on the behalf of the gendarmes present there.⁴⁰⁶

On the 31st of October, 1906, there was a district meeting in the “People’s House” in Sambir attended by 150 people. It was chaired by Stakhura, and vice-chaired by Mykhas. Dr. Novakovs’kyi and Rev. Onyshkevych spoke. Farmer Pelekhayti and the Jew Ber took part in the discussion. Finally Mykhas read out the resolutions which were accepted. To the list of the resolutions already sent from L’viv, another two were added:

- that the Polish circle in the parliament is one to be blamed for the inciting of hatred between Ruthenians and Poles;
- that the loyalty of the Ruthenians to the Habsburg dynasty has been strongly undermined in recent years.

The meeting ended with a singing of Fanko’s song “*Ne pora*.”⁴⁰⁷ It seems that the activation of political life in Sambir was connected with the city’s growth. From 1890 to 1900 the population of Sambir increased from 14, 324 to 17, 026; the growth rate was 20.7%, which was only a little less than the same rate for Kraków and L’viv. Sambir’s main competitors in the area, Boryslav and Drohobych, had a much smaller growth rate.⁴⁰⁸

At the Congress of 1907 Ivan Mykhas reported some improvement in the situation of the radical movement in the Sambir area. He stressed that the national-populists were clericals. The Sambir area “was reviving after a short decline, mainly because Stakhura’s influence is declining with every year.”⁴⁰⁹ However, Mykhas had also realized that national-democracy had changed. On the eve of the general elections Mykhas reported from the Sambir area that Rev. Onyshkevych travels in the area and sometimes even “speaks radically against the priests.” Mykhas himself would buy his argument if not for the fact that Rev. Onyshkevych was greeted by Rev. Bobers’kyi and the latter advised peasants to vote for Rev. Onyshkevych, and Rev. Bobers’kyi was “a renowned exploiter.”⁴¹⁰ It seems quite obvious that the realignment of the parties for the 1907 elections was quite confusing. We have plenty of testimonies that national-democracy in 1907 had a much more radical program than at any point before. Of those who were elected as deputies from national-democracy, many were former members of the radical party. And the case of Rev. Onyshkevych proves that not only former radicals accepted a radical rhetoric.

⁴⁰⁶ *Gazeta Samborska*, 1906, No.4.

⁴⁰⁷ “Sambirshchyna,” *Svoboda*, 1906, No.44.

⁴⁰⁸ *Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobycki*, 1901, No.15.

⁴⁰⁹ “Spravozdanie z’izdu,” *Hromads’kyi Holos*, 1907, No.3.

⁴¹⁰ [Ivan Mykhas], “Z peredyborchoho rukhu,” *Hromads’kyi Holos*, 1907, No.31.

Before the general elections to the parliament in 1907 radicals spread the following short program:

- 1) buying out of large estates
- 2) of all taxes only one general progressive tax should be left
- 3) Galicia should be divided into Western and Eastern, and from the latter, together with the part of Bukovyna, a Ruthenian province should be created
- 4) securing freedom of the press
- 5) introduction of Ruthenian language as a language of administration
- 6) full freedom of conscience
- 7) abolition of the permanent army
- 8) increasing Ukrainian national consciousness in Austria and Russia.⁴¹¹

Liberalization of the franchise gave new power to the older popular leaders:

A new era has arrived, the era of elections to the parliament on the basis of a general, equal and secret franchise. 'Heartly defenders of peasants' grew in the villages as mushrooms after rain. With sweet words and promises they wanted to win voters. But people figured out the patriots with pedigrees and were uniting not around someone else but around their 'antichrist-radical.' Respected candidates found that the decisive vote is in the hands of the deceased Mykhas and no wonder than the deputy of *ludowcy*, Mleczek, was asking-begging the deceased about help. He even gave a written promise that if Ukrainian voters would wish he would resign from his mandate. But the deceased foretold how the politics of *ludowcy* would end and said at the councils: 'you will see that *ludowcy* would betray as they only now on the eve of elections, are our friends.' And this came true.⁴¹²

In 1907 in Sambir Russophiles proposed their own candidate, Rev. Hrushkevych from Rakova; "especially farmer Mykhas was knocking into priests' heads not to go against the people's will because if people go against them, it is not clear who would do better."⁴¹³

Mykhas' reappearance in politics was connected with the influx of new radicals drawn mostly from the ranks of student youth. These young radicals rediscovered Mykhas as their ideal peasant-activist. Reinforced with new intelligentsia cadres, Sambir radicals organized a meeting in Sambir in 1907 that gathered representatives from 37 villages of the Sambir district. The chair was an engineer, A. Hal'ka, and secretaries were comrades Horniatkevych and Stakhura. Perhaps, Stakhura mentioned here was the son of Stakhura. It was decided to found a political organization on the statutes of *Narodna volia* in

⁴¹¹ "Do vybortsiv!", *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1907, No.22.

⁴¹² Iarema Hirnychenko, *Mizh molotom i kovalom*, 13.

⁴¹³ "Z Sambirshchyny," *Svoboda*, 1907, No.14.

Ternopil'. Artur Palii was elected to the chair of this new society. At the meeting Ivan Mykhas had a talk on economic problems. The following resolutions were accepted:

- 1) to oppose the opening of the Russian and Romanian border for foreign cattle, and in favor of the opening of the Prussian border for the Austrian one;
- 2) to close the borders for exporting timber from Galicia and the nationalization of private forests to protect them from devastating usage;
- 3) to stop suspend temporary taxes because of bad harvests;
- 4) to provide emergency aid for peasants;
- 5) to request the Ukrainian parliamentary club to take care of exemplary punishment for the Russophile court councilor Teofil' Iasenyt's'kyi from Sambir, who acting as investigating judge on 19 June 1907, tortured and abused peasants from Torhanovychi to have them confess to crimes;
- 6) to have the Viceroy's Office organize elections of two councilors to the district council;
- 7) to request Ukrainian deputies to make efforts to abolish ritual fees;
- 8) to conduct action for the general elections to the Diet;
- 9) to send a letter to the deputy Mleczeko, asking him to clarify his position and request a report from him;
- 10) to ask the *Prosvita* branch why there were no meetings of *Prosvita* for 2 years;
- 11) to transfer *pip* Bobers'kyi from the Sambir district;
- 12) village referents were ordered to rise against "Russophile renegades."⁴¹⁴

These resolutions were an interesting mixture of the wider program of the radicals, with current demands of peasant organizations, and with Mykhas' old grievances.

Despite the fact that radicals were fighting Rev. Iavors'kyi, Hromads'kyi Holos felt sorry for his failure in the elections, saying that there could be two Ruthenian deputies elected from his electoral district, and instead of it, only Semen Vityk and *wszechpolak* were elected.⁴¹⁵ In the general elections of 1907 Sambir and Staryi Sambir district belonged to two different electoral districts. In the Sambir area radicals supported the Polish Peasant Party whose candidate Mleczeko won the elections.⁴¹⁶ However, it appeared that the Polish Peasant Party formed an alliance with an All-Polish party and the radicals decided to

⁴¹⁴ "Z tovarystv i zboriv", Hromads'kyi Holos, 1907, No.86.

⁴¹⁵ "Po vyborakh", Hromads'kyi Holos, 1907, No.46.

⁴¹⁶ For the first time *ludowcy* tried to run their own candidate in the Sambir district in 1901, this was Polish peasant Ziemniak. Already back then he tried to get support from local Ruthenian politicians. In his electoral speech Ziemniak was saying: "Here you see a farmer and Polish peasant. I call myself Polish peasant with pride and I am not ashamed of this!... I know Polish-Ruthenian relationship. I do not want to Polonize Rus', neither want I to Ruthenize Poland!..." – "Z ruchu wyborczego," Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobycki, 1901, No.36.

fight the Polish Peasant Party in the next elections (the Stapiński affair).⁴¹⁷ National-democracy used this affair to state that the Polish Peasant Party betrayed Ruthenian peasants and Polish peasant deputies entered the same club with Polish nobility, “to rule together over the Ruthenian people.” The conclusion was: “We Ruthenian peasants can count only on our own forces, because Polish peasants now are the same enemies of ours as the Polish nobility.”⁴¹⁸ Perhaps pressure from the Ukrainian peasant constituency can explain Mleczo’s decision to leave *Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe*, not agreeing with Jan Stapiński’s policy after the latter signed an agreement with Polish conservatives in 1908.⁴¹⁹

Not only the Polish Peasant Party but also Polish national-democracy a la Roman Dmowski was working with the peasantry. Władysław Popiel, the owner of the Cherkhava estate, and Stanisław Głabiński organized peasant meetings, and their meetings were much more crowded than meetings of the Polish socialists.⁴²⁰ Poor peasant poets were found and brought to perform in Sambir where the Polish public donated money for them.⁴²¹ Polish students from the Sambir gymnasium under the influence of Polish national-democracy started enlightening expeditions into nearby Polish villages.⁴²²

In 1908 Mykhas decided to become a candidate in the Diet elections. On 9 January (the last day of Christmas) there was a meeting of the local peasant organization, to which 39 villages belonged. Representatives of 19 villages voted for Mykhas. One peasant voted for Anatol’ Kyshakevych from Silets’. Rev. Khomiak and national-democratic priests were against Mykhas; together with two other peasants, they proposed Andrii Chaikovs’kyi as a candidate. Another meeting taking place on 16 January also proposed Ivan Mykhas, and Rev. Onyshkevych, chairing the meeting, had to acknowledge this. Meetings in Babyna, Vil’shanyk, and Pyniany also voted for Mykhas.⁴²³ On 23 January there was a big meeting in Sambir, in which around 400 people participated, and Dr. Lev Bachyns’kyi spoke there on the role and significance of the Diet. The

⁴¹⁷ “Po wyborakh”, *Hromads’kyi Holos*, 1907, No.48.

⁴¹⁸ “Liudovtsi zradly khlopsku spravu,” *Svoboda*, 1908, No.15.

⁴¹⁹ Janusz Szaflik Albin and Ryszard Józef, *Listy Jana Stapińskiego z lat 1895-1928* (Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: zakład imienia Ossolińskich, wydawnictwo PAN, 1977), 118-120.

⁴²⁰ “Wiece włosciański w Samborze,” *Gazeta Samborska*, 1906, No.6.

⁴²¹ *Gazeta Samborska*, 1906, No.17.

⁴²² See memoirs of Stefan Uhma – he mentions work in purely Polish villages Chukva, Susidovychi, Strilkovychi, Biskovychi and Sambir suburbs; mixed Lanovychi, Voiutychi, Uhertsi, Maksymovychi; and Polish colonies that appeared on the parceled tabular estates – Volia Baranets’ka, and Vil’shanyk - BJ 9847 III, s.146.

⁴²³ “Sambirshchyna za tov. Ivanom Mykhasom”, *Hromads’kyi Holos*, 1908, No.5.

meeting voted for Mykhas, and despite three announcements, not a single hand was raised for Andrii Chaikovs'kyi.⁴²⁴

On the other hand we know that in the 1908 elections Chaikovs'kyi was originally put as a candidate on the list of the National Committee.⁴²⁵ Those agitating for Chaikovs'kyi were the Revs. Pohorets'kyi and Khomiak, as well as Mr. Silets'kyi. Meetings in Luka and Hordynia (petty gentry communities) supported Chaikovs'kyi.⁴²⁶ However, because of Mykhas' action, Andrii Chaikovs'kyi had to make the following statement:

With this I certify that I am resigning from being a candidate from the fourth curia in the district of Sambir-Luka because of the disloyal agitation developed against my person by Mr. Mykhas with his radical staff, at meetings as well as in Hromads'kyi Holos.⁴²⁷

In pre-elections in 1908 cheating around the composition of the lists of electors took place. Hromads'kyi Holos complained that the biggest cheating took place in the villages, where priests and scribes were Russophiles. The Russophiles advanced their own candidate, a certain cantor Pelekhatyi, whom radicals called a "puppet." In the village of Rohizna Pelekhatyi put a dozen "dead souls" on the voting list. He himself worked as a community scribe in three villages. Of these three, in Rohizna and Berestiany he did not get a single vote. Only the dean, Rev. Kozanevych, who glorified Felix Sozański, the chair of the district council, was favoring him. Rev. Khomit'skyi in Bylychi did not want people to go to the meeting; "in many villages people during the sermon were leaving the church saying that priests went mad." In some other villages priests were afraid of giving a sermon. Radicals complained that social-democrats were supporting Andrii Chaikovs'kyi and advised people to listen to the sermons of the famous clericals Revs. Bobers'kyi, Sianots'kyi, Pohorets'kyi, Bordun, Hordyns'kyi and others.

Mykhas' electoral rally this time covered almost all the villages of the district. On 26 January a meeting took place in Lanovychi, in which peasants from Kovynychi and Zarsko had also participated. On 27 January there was a meeting in Baranchytsi to which peasants from Khlivchytsi and Siadkovychi came. On 28 January there was a meeting in Volia Baranets'ka, on 29 in Maksymovychi, to which peasants from Pianovychi came, on the 31 in Berestiany, to which peasants from Rakova and Sadkovychi came. And on the same day there was a meeting in Rohizna. On 1 February there was a meeting in

⁴²⁴ "Sambirshchyna", Hromads'kyi Holos, 1908, No.8.

⁴²⁵ Svoboda, 1908, No.6.

⁴²⁶ Svoboda, 1908, Nos.6,7.

⁴²⁷ Svoboda, 1908, No.10.

Bylychi and Chyzhky, on 2 February in Torhanovychi, to which peasants from Morozovychi and Vaniovychi came, on 4 in Voiutychi and on 5 in Nadyby. All the meetings vowed to vote for Ivan Mykhas.⁴²⁸

Nonetheless, Ivan Mykhas lost the elections. The outcome was the following:
Felix Sozański – 114
Mykhas – 36
Pelekhatyi – 13⁴²⁹

The election showed how weak the influence of Russophiles among peasants was. It could be seen in the behaviour of voters from Dorozhiv, for a long time the center of Russophilism in the area: the “eternal elector and arch-oinker Antin Khomyn” together with Pavlo Zlupko, the subscriber of the Russophile Russkoe Slovo, voted for the Polish candidate.⁴³⁰ Although Mykhas lost these elections, some other peasant veterans became Diet deputies – Pavlo Dumka and Ivan Sanduliak. Although a younger one, Ivan Makukh, born in Dorozhiv, was elected as a Diet deputy.

After the elections Hromads'kyi holos wrote that in the Sambir area a radical candidate failed without any harm for the radical movement in general, and even with its benefit. There were 28 big meetings in the villages and 3 district meetings. Andrii Chaikovs'kyi withdrew himself from the list of candidates, despite the fact that he was supported by social-democracy. Mleccko and Polish peasant party voted for Sozański.⁴³¹ Mykhas' biographer wrote about these elections: “This victory of the enemies cannot be their triumph, because this victory is not moral, due to the cheating and terror. The consciousness of peasants which was shown in these, albeit unhappy elections, guarantee that this was their last victory.”⁴³²

Mykhas died that year almost immediately after the Chernykhiv tragedy, one more in the series of bloody events represented as a new escalation of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict. He died on the 22d of June 1908, as “one of the most conscious radicals.” By that time he was one of the party's oldest members; “there was no graduate of the gymnasium in the Sambir area who would not go to comrade Mykhas after graduation to introduce himself and to present what he planned to do for the people and to ask for advice in that direction.” During the electoral rally Mykhas caught a cold and never recovered from it, dying in the 46th year of his life. Mykhas got sick back in early spring 1908 on his return

⁴²⁸ “Sambirshchyna,” Hromads'kyi Holos, 1908, No.11.

⁴²⁹ “Vyslid Holosovannia,” Hromads'kyi Holos, 1908, No.14.

⁴³⁰ “Ot Sambora,” Russkoe Slovo, 1908, No.11.

⁴³¹ V., “Vyborchi obrazky,” Hromads'kyi Holos, 1908, No.15.

⁴³² Iarema Hirnychenko, Mizh molotom i kovalom, 14.

trip from a meeting in the village of Ozymyna.⁴³³ At the burial comrade Volosienka (one who never returned money to Sanduliak for the latter's artwork) spoke from the executive of the Radical Party and comrade Paliu from the district organization.⁴³⁴ The peasant rival of Ivan Mykhas in the elections, Stefan Nykolaievych Pelekhatyi, born in the village of Opari in 1872 and working as a cantor in Raitarevychi, the residency of the famous Russophile priest, died in 1911 in the Sambir hospital.⁴³⁵

It was said that Mykhas left pieces of memoirs about his activity. Pieces from Mykhas' memoirs were published by Iarema Hirnychenko in Hromads'kyi Holos, and then as a separate brochure.⁴³⁶ However, there is no style of Mykhas in that brochure, and pieces from Mykhas are connected by Hirnychenko's narrative. It seems that original peasant memoirs did not fit into the style of the modern memoir. There is no narrative from the first person. Mykhas tries to objectify his experiences, and this was a problem for the editor. If we look at the so-called Polish peasant memoirs, they were written by people who no longer were peasant, just as with the memoirs of the Ukrainian Galician peasant activist Starukh, an active participant in revolutionary events, the manuscript of which is preserved in the TsDIAuL's NTSh collection. Many "peasant memoirs" have been lost, as, for example, the autobiography by Iura Solomiichuk mentioned by Petro Shekerykiv Donykiv.⁴³⁷

After the death of Ivan Mykhas radicals in the villages around Sambir tried to bring reading clubs under their own control. For this goal *Sich's* served very well. In Pyniany, all the members of *Sich* enrolled in the reading club, and radical Vasyl' Shtabura became the chair of the reading club. There were 55 members, and the reading club subscribed to both Hromads'kyi Holos and Svoboda. In Vil'shanyk the reading club had 104 members, but the mayor wouldn't allow it to sell wine. The same was the case in Babyna and Side.⁴³⁸

The village of Morozovychi tried to return to politics independently of its pastor. Iarema Hirnychenko wrote that "blinded oinkers needed 10 years to start seeing. They united with the leftovers of radicals and renewed the decayed reading club founded by the deceased Mykhas."⁴³⁹ Morozovychi peasants, even

⁴³³ M. Z., "Ivan Mykhas (U 20-tu richnytsiu smerty)," Hromads'kyi Holos, 1938, No.45.

⁴³⁴ Hromads'kyi Holos, 1908, No.41.

⁴³⁵ Golos Naroda, 1911, No.36.

⁴³⁶ Iarema Hirnychenko, "Mizh molotom a kovadlom. (Obraz z khlops'koi polityky)," Hromads'kyi Holos, 1908, Nos.43-44.

⁴³⁷ Petro Shekeryk-Donykiv, "Kameniar Hutsul'shchyny," Hromads'kyi Holos, 1928, No.3.

⁴³⁸ K., "Z Sambirshhcyny," Hromads'kyi Holos, 1909, No.8, 6.

⁴³⁹ Iarema Hirnychenko, Mizh molotom i kovalom, 12.

those who were making attempts at Mykhas' life, in the end allegedly said: "Mykhas was right, there is no one to defend us, we are sorry for him." Iarema Hirnychenko justifies them: "They were doing everything in the blindness manipulated on the holy rope."⁴⁴⁰

It is interesting that although so many prominent radical activists of the 1920s and 1930s came from the Sambir area, there were only a few radical villages. In 1909 *Sich's* were in Berehy, Torhanovychi, Pyniany, and Kornalevychi (opened on 25 April 1909). *Sich's* in Kul'chytsi and Side were barely active, and in Babyna, Ozymyna and Vils'hanyk, they could not be opened. Rev. Mel'nyk was the main enemy of *Sich's*. *Sich's* were often organizing festivities for lads and girls. On 7 April there was a meeting of the district organization of the Radical Party in Sambir, at which it was decided to celebrate the First of May. In the celebration three villages participated: Berehy, Torhanovychi and Side. Someone threatened the teacher in Pyniany, trying to force him to teach children in Ruthenian, and for this the captain fined *Sich* members.⁴⁴¹

Rev. Mel'nyk fought radicals from Berehy and described his struggle in a series of articles in Ruslan. Several letters from him to Oleksandr Barvins'kyi have been preserved. In the letters he speaks about numerous denunciations of Berehy villagers in the circle court in Sambir about the offending the Majesty, blasphemy, and racketeering. "Comrades" were teaching recruits not to care about the oath or listen to orders. Rev. Mel'nyk said that it was the tactics of the "Black hand," and that was how Berehy radicals called their organization. Most denunciations perhaps were written by Rev. Mel'nyk himself, who urged Barvins'kyi to attract the attention of "higher spheres" to this case. Rev. Mel'nyk obviously had problems with his villagers because of his articles and denunciations, and he wanted his articles to be published anonymously.⁴⁴²

In a year after this Hirnychenko wrote an article dedicated to Ivan Mykhas. The article is an example of how the newspaper's rhetoric changed after the death of Ivan Mykhas. Instead of detailed reports on the villages, a lot of demagoguery appears. Youth was said to follow the road of struggle with the "dark spirits" shown by Mykhas. This "dark spirits" is the phrase he picked up from Mykhas.⁴⁴³ At the same time we know that the real radical organization in Sambir was created only with the death of Ivan Mykhas. Being the old type of peasant activist he, perhaps, resented all kinds of centralized urban-based

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., 13.

⁴⁴¹ "Z radykal'noho rukhu v Sambirshchyni", Hromads'kyi Holos, 1909, No.18.

⁴⁴² VR LNB, Barv.5268.

⁴⁴³ [Iarema Hirnychenko] Ia. H., "V rokovyny smerti Ivana Mykhasa" Hromads'kyi Holos, 1909, No.25.

organization. Both radical political and *Sich* district organizations were created in Sambir only in 1909.⁴⁴⁴

The problem of the Sambir radical organization was that in a year after the death of Ivan Mykhas it suffered another heavy loss. On 16 July in L'viv, Artur Pali, a member of the Main Executive of the Ukrainian Radical Party and a member of the Main Sich Committee, died. Artur Pali was born in Pidbuzh in 1884, graduated from the Sambir gymnasium and studied law at L'viv University. Pali chaired Sambir district's radical organization, and his burial took place in Sambir. For the burial four *Sich's* arrived: from Torhanovychi, Pyniany, Berehy and rustical Kul'chytsi. Ukrainian MPs – Dr. Lev Bachyns'kyi, Rev. Onyshkevych and Ostap Postryhach (from the fraction of Ukrainian radical youth) – gave speeches. From the peasants, comrade Mykola Rohuts'kyi spoke.⁴⁴⁵

After the death of Artur Pali the leader of the local organization became Karlo Kobiers'kyi, who was also the author of the majority of correspondences from Sambir to Hromads'kyi Holos after 1909. Karlo Kobiers'kyi, a native of Berehy, in his work seems to return to old tested methods in his work. Correspondences remained anti-clerical, ridiculing “miracles,” like the one in Pianovychi, where the image of the Mother of God appeared in the field well and brought in thousands of pilgrims, even from Hungary: “Polish peasants and gypsies, but mostly women (*baby*).” The whole thing brought profit “only to the pastor, the Jew and thieves.”⁴⁴⁶

When there was another Ukrainian meeting in 1911, Rev. Onyshkevych allegedly acknowledged that the whole political work in the district was done by Mykhas and Pali. Rev. Onyshkevych spoke against the radicals, but Karlo Kobiers'kyi countered him, explaining the politics of the party. A certain Mr. Koval' from Viatskovychi proposed the resolution according to which radical deputies had to enter the common Ukrainian club, “but radicals reminded him at once how two years ago after falling down comrade Mykhas in Diet elections he ate *kovbasa* with the Sozański's oinkers.” According to the radicals, *Prosvita's* branch in Sambir had died. The society “Village Farmer” organized only one veterinary course. In the whole Sambir area only youth and the *Sich* in Berehy were still actively working.⁴⁴⁷

How did Mykhas' enemies do after his death? The wing represented by the Ruthenian-Catholic Union transformed in 1913 into the Ukrainian Christian-Social Party. The union and the party were half-fictional entities, while the

⁴⁴⁴ “Organizuiemo mohuchu partiui!”, Hromads'kyi Holos, 1911, No.2.

⁴⁴⁵ Hromads'kyi Holos, 1909, Nos.30-31.

⁴⁴⁶ K. Kobiers'kyi, “Chudo v Pianovykhakh”, Hromads'kyi Holos, 1911, No.6-7.

⁴⁴⁷ K. Kobiers'kyi, “De-shcho zi Sambirshchyny”, Hromads'kyi Holos, 1911, No.43.

activists of this trend were connected by virtue of their dependence on Barvins'kyi himself. Rev. Rabi was also one of Barvins'kyi's clients enjoying his protection and help.⁴⁴⁸ Even Rev. Ivan Iavors'kyi, who was the leader of national-democracy in the Staryi Sambir district, asked Barvins'kyi for two Iavors'kyis to be excluded from the gymnasium in Przemyśl, one of them being his relative excluded in 1905 and another one, his own son, excluded in 1908.⁴⁴⁹ Trying to gain more power, the union and the latter party had to rely on the alliances with more conservative national-populists, who were not connected organizationally with either the union or, later, with the party.⁴⁵⁰

The emissary of Barvins'kyi in Sambir remained Teodor Bilen'kyi. His correspondence with Barvins'kyi shows the difficulties of the conservatives, and how distanced from the villages they were. As a professor of the teacher's seminary, "having children of the richer farmers in school we hear many complains about poverty in the villages, although the worst pre-harvest season is still ahead of us." And in the same letter, "About poverty in the villages, especially near the mountains, cities have no idea... Even richer peasants with a dozen Joch have to eat barley bread."⁴⁵¹ Bilen'kyi is conscious of the growing distance between the villages and the cities; he reports that societies in the villages are lost. All the credit unions are ruined, and only those which switched to the cooperatives exist and trade.

One of the main purposes of the conservatives was to fight Russophiles and have no compromises with them. According to Bilen'kyi, "Sambir is the main outpost of the Russophiles of the hardest kind."⁴⁵² But in practice Sambir clericals waged their fights with the radicals. Both Russophiles and conservatives relied on priests as their agents in the countryside, and in this respect they saw independent peasant activists as their most important enemy. Russophiles in the Sambir area were crushed not so much by the activities of the clericals as by the series of court trials accusing Russophiles of state treason, cases involving hundreds of witnesses and sowing "a great fear among Muscovites."⁴⁵³ Perhaps the main reason for the decline of this national orientation was its growing incompatibility with loyalty to the state.

⁴⁴⁸ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, 2187/p.35.

⁴⁴⁹ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, 2864/p.171, a.5-8.

⁴⁵⁰ Just like Ukrainian Christian Socialism Polish one in Galicia never took hold there, clergy was little interested in this kind of activities and it was limited to one-time actions. Andrzej Kudłaszyk, *Katolicka myśl społeczno-polityczna w Galicji na przełomie XIX i XX wieku*, 249.

⁴⁵¹ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.628/59, a.2.

⁴⁵² VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.628/59, a.8.

⁴⁵³ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.53.

With radicals it was different; in the Bilen'kyi's correspondence they figure much more prominently than the Russophiles. He writes: „We really need action against the radical trend, because it takes many victims, makes development more difficult, and introduces ferment, leaving real work aside.” However, the clergy was avoiding any engagement in this kind of work. Circumstances were much different from those of 15 or 20 years ago; the press was everywhere, and brochures were spread in the thousands. Bilen'kyi complained: “the half-learned do not take it critically but believe in everything printed.” That is why the conservative press, brochures and teachings were required. “People can be influenced; they are not yet too much soaked with new calls.” But the clericals did not have anyone like Ivan Mykhas; Bilen'kyi wrote that Mykhas “traveled through the villages, organized [peasants], and shouted that we had to organize without a peasant and a landlord [without the distinction of social status], was attracting pupils and students and wished to become a Diet deputy. He died before the elections.”⁴⁵⁴

Bilen'kyi with his conservative sympathies could build his network only on priests fed up with radical activity in their parishes. Rev. Mel'nyk from Berehy had the biggest problem. In 1911, when the Christian-Social Party was founded, Bilen'kyi reported that the CSP in this area could count on Rev. Bobers'kyi, Rev. Mel'nyk, and Rev. Bordun from Vykoty. Also he said that they should bring in Rev. Petryk from Babyna; he is very mobile (*rukhlivnyy*) and lives in friendship with Rev. Onyshkevych, organizing the district economically (But as we know in Babyna radicals managed to co-exist with national-democracy peacefully.). As of now Petryk was not showing enmity to the CSP.⁴⁵⁵ We also know that Bilen'kyi had some personal connection with Babyna, working with the village's reading club back in the first half of the 1890s. In yet another letter he states the need to get to Rev. Petryk once more. Rev. Petryk's influence among clergy was also based on him being a relative of Bishop Konstantyn Chekhovych.⁴⁵⁶ Finally, the Christian-Social group crystallized, consisting of Revs. Mel'nyk, Ortyns'kyi, Pohorets'kyi, Nehrebets'kyi and Dr. Herynovych.⁴⁵⁷ Volodymyr Herynovych was a friend of Bilen'kyi and also professor of the teachers' seminary in Sambir.⁴⁵⁸

Rev. Mel'nyk was fighting radicals in the press and at *Prosvita* meetings, because Berehy was “the center of radicalism in the Sambir district.” Another

⁴⁵⁴ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.628/59, a.23.

⁴⁵⁵ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, 626/p.59, a.135.

⁴⁵⁶ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, 626/p.59, a.137.

⁴⁵⁷ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.55.

⁴⁵⁸ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, 892.

renowned radical was Kul'chyts'kyi from Kul'chytsi, but local priest Rev. Hordyns'kyi was able to keep the parish under tight control. However, when it came to the mobilization of masses and popular politics, limits of the parish became an obstacle difficult to cross. Searching for a popular base, conservatives were driven to the petty gentry, "the type of sub-mountainous gentry, which is interesting and important for Ruthenians." Bilen'kyi calculated that there were around 100 in the Sambir gymnasium and 306 in the residential school where he taught. "These are not obedient children of peasants but proud, arrogant and boastful [kids], [any of them despite being] so small already feels its nobility better than any count."⁴⁵⁹

Bilen'kyi also felt that they had to print much more things targeting particularly the peasantry; he saw that peasant men and women in the market bought six copies of Nowy Wiek, to find something about the war. If only there was any Catholic press, it could be distributed "in markets, pilgrimages, and other meetings in a thousand copies."⁴⁶⁰ In his another letter Bilen'kyi says that their political society must to establish popular newspaper for the people, in the case of electoral reform or dissolution of the Diet. If not newspaper then at least a series of popular articles in Ruslan, or leaflets targeting the peasants were desperately needed.⁴⁶¹ Finally, in 1914, on the eve of the First World War, the decision was taken to start a popular newspaper of the Christian-Social Party, "to win the sympathies of the people."⁴⁶² But because the war broke out, this newspaper was never published. The Christian-Social Party was still thinking about a way of working with the masses, and the best object for Bilen'kyi seemed to be the Sambir wage-laborers from the suburb "Blikh." He planned to open some kind of bureau of mediation of work.⁴⁶³ These plans show that Ukrainian Christian-Socialists tried to be very much like other Christian Socialists of the Austrian part of the Empire but could not reach down to the masses because the latter remained the domain of more radical politicians.

Rev. Rabi, whom Mykhas had liked so much in the 1880s for his work as the administrator of Vaniovychi parish and whose transfer he pitied, accusing the Consistory, became a parish priest of Sambir and the supporter of the conservative and clerical party. He had some close connection with Sambir captain Kaczkowski, and before the latter was transferred from Sambir, he successfully influenced his politics.⁴⁶⁴ Although at the meeting of *Besida* Rev.

⁴⁵⁹ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.628/59, a.14.

⁴⁶⁰ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.628/59, a.24.

⁴⁶¹ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.628/59, a.29.

⁴⁶² VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.51.

⁴⁶³ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.14.

⁴⁶⁴ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.4-5.

Rabii was against the subscription to Hromads'kyi Holos and stated that he recognized only the National-Democratic and Christian-Social Party, he refused to become an official member of the CSP.⁴⁶⁵

Radical politics after the death of Mykhas did not become less provocative. In the village of Berehy a "Christian" reading club was founded, and this was the reason for the conflict that erupted at the 1912 meeting of the Sambir *Prosvita*. A student, Kobiars'kyi, (perhaps, Karlo), was removed from the meeting place on the order of Dr. Stakhura. Stakhura's visit to Berehy for the opening of the Christian reading club ended with rumors that he also worked for the Christian-Social Party. This was the end of the alliance between national-democracy and radicals in the Sambir area, a situation that the conservatives were going to use for their own ends.⁴⁶⁶

This conflict between radicals and national-democracy was again a generational one. Mykhas' connections with the gymnasium students were bringing fruits. Radical youth refused to participate in the evening dedicated to Mykola Lysenko.⁴⁶⁷ This conflict between radical youth and the national-democratic establishment in Sambir was very intense till the beginning of World War I.⁴⁶⁸

Bilen'kyi's reports from 1913 describe the desperate position of conservatives. He states that there is no way for conservatives to go to elections without the help of national-democracy. And these elections were important for him because he figured as a possible candidate from the Christian-Social Party for Sambir and Staryi Sambir.⁴⁶⁹ However, such cooperation was unlikely. First of all this was because of the presence of a powerful Student Union, which united all the students in the district and became an independent political force with its own hall and library.⁴⁷⁰ They could count on Rev. Hordyns'kyi, who would work in the petty gentry's villages. But in the Staryi Sambir district there was no one to challenge the influence of Rev. Ivan Iavors'kyi.⁴⁷¹ Many active priests, such as Rev. Petryk from Babyna, had declared their adherence to national-democracy, and there was little hope that they would cooperate with the conservatives.⁴⁷²

⁴⁶⁵ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.15.

⁴⁶⁶ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.4-5.

⁴⁶⁷ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.12.

⁴⁶⁸ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.44.

⁴⁶⁹ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.20.

⁴⁷⁰ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.21.

⁴⁷¹ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.21.

⁴⁷² VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.23-4.

It appears that in 1913 Russophile villages were the smallest problem to the Ukrainians. And there were not that many of these. Bilen'kyi includes among these villages Tur'ia, Sushytsia Rykova, Lopushanka Khomyna, partly Strashevychi, Groziova "and some others."⁴⁷³ As we see, most of the villages are actually located in the Staryi Sambir political district. Bilen'kyi planned to run as a candidate in the Diet elections, but Rev. Iavors'kyi refused to support Bilen'kyi because a certain Gerych, a peasant well known in the area, was proposed as a candidate. Bilen'kyi complains: "To go against a peasant in the current condition of fierce conflict means giving a weapon in the enemy's hands and cut all the prospects for the future, the possibility to work for the activists of our Union."⁴⁷⁴

Nonetheless, Bilen'kyi sent Stakhura to Rev. Iavors'kyi and found that the latter was not going to run as a candidate. Then he found out more about Gerych:

He is a retired *wachmistr*, was in America, came back, bought up to 50 Joch of land and became a successful farmer in Linyna Mala. He is the right hand of Rev. Iavors'kyi and together they organize a district. A supporter of Rev. Iavors'kyi, a certain Sen'kus, whom I know very well from the first years of my work in Sambir, was talking about this to me as well. He tried to avoid the topic when I told him that I was going to be a candidate, but because of old acquaintance told everything about their work.⁴⁷⁵

It is interesting that Bilen'kyi says that he would prefer general elections over curial ones. In general elections he could go from village to village with several people agitating, but in curial ones this kind of rally would not help.⁴⁷⁶ In curial elections he would need an organization on which to rely.

"Normal" national-democracy, without conservative and clerical inclinations, as in the Sambir area, was able to incorporate peasant activists on its side. And the Stary Sambir district was an example of such "right" development of the national movement. This area in the Staryi Sambir district was a site of constant agitation. When in 1900 the forestry in Spas started regulation of mountainous streams (The results of this construction can be still enjoyed by tourists in the Spas area.), a certain Ivan Makukh got the position of supervisor for 30 Gulden a month. Being a professional cantor, he taught those working there religious and folk songs. Asked by peasants from the neighboring village of Tershiv, he

⁴⁷³ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.26.

⁴⁷⁴ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.29-30.

⁴⁷⁵ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.31-32.

⁴⁷⁶ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.32.

founded the *Prosvita* reading club and wanted to start a store for which purpose had rented a house of Abraham Meier and put 10 Gulden as down-payment. Jews complained to the district administration, Makukh lost his job, and with his family he had to come back to Liubycha Korolivs'ka in another district selling 6 Joch he bought in Tershiv. Coming back to finish the sale, he was arrested in Saryi Sambir and released only when promised not to show up again in the district.⁴⁷⁷ We saw that all the peasants whom Mykhas respected, but who supported priests, were also from this area.

An example of such a peasant can be found in the village of Stril'bychi, where Rev. Iavors'kyi lived. It had its own enlightened peasant activist, from the dynasty of Pukach, who figured prominently in the village history throughout the second half of the nineteenth – beginning of the twentieth century. It is interesting that Ivan Pukach, this peasant activist, actually bought a farmstead where the old-style village leader used to live. He bought the farmstead of Fedio Kunyk, who being the richest in the village, was helping people in times of starvation, twice a week giving free dinners for poor people from the area. Ivan Pukach, who “finished six gymnasium's classes, [was a] conscious, respectable man, exemplary and nationally conscious leader of the village,”⁴⁷⁸ represents the national-democratic version of peasant activist while Mykhas – the radical.

The conservative camp was trying to increase its influence by promoting more conservative national-populists against those more radical. When in 1914 there was a question of sending a representative of the Consistory to the Sambir School Council, the Ukrainian candidate was Rev. Petryk, while Bilen'kyi was trying to promote either Rev. Hordyns'kyi or Rev. Pohorets'kyi, both petty gentry.⁴⁷⁹ In the end Rev. Petryk was hated by the Christian-Socialists, Rev. Mel'nyk in particular, because of his connections with radicals from Berehy, to whom he allegedly served as an advisor.⁴⁸⁰

The only real achievement of clerical conservatives was the creation of a petty gentry organization. This conservative camp was actually organizing the petty gentry. In 1905 Bilen'kyi wrote to Barvins'kyi:

The majority of gentry are swift and clever people, who fill out the schools, are eager to get a better education, that is why our task is to invent some kind of organization for them, because in the current one they participate very little. We should organize a conference of the more prominent Ruthenians from the gentry, in this area – [to invite] Rev.

⁴⁷⁷ “Z piv-azijkskoj administratsii,” *Dilo*, 1901, No.30.

⁴⁷⁸ Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Strilbychakh*, 38.

⁴⁷⁹ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.47.

⁴⁸⁰ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, spr.627/p.59, a.55.

Hordyns'kyi from Kul'chytsi, a councilor Kul'chyts'kyi, Rev. Turians'kyi, and someone from Ortyns'kyis and these would bring in others.⁴⁸¹

Mainly because of the local petty gentry, conservatives tried to found a Ruthenian gymnasium in Sambir.⁴⁸² Finally, the society of petty gentry was founded by one of the conservative-clericals, Rev. Pohorets'kyi, but this was done independently of their politics and appealed rather to the estate patriotism of the petty gentry. In 1908 Ivan Mykhas attacked Rev. Pohoretsky as the most profound “skinner” (*lypi*) in whose parish two corpses were in not sealed burials – the relatives did not have enough money to pay the priest for this service.⁴⁸³ It is interesting that the dean Rev. Detsko, himself of peasant origin, who several times investigated complaints of Pohorets'kyi's parishioners, supported Mykhas' statement. But we shall consider the story of this organization in the next chapter.

The closest the radicals came to the realization of their program came in 1919, in the Western Ukrainian People's Republic. The village of Berehy remained one of their centers, but the interesting thing is that in 1919 the daughter of the local priest, Miss Mel'nyk, and the wife of one of the leading radical activists, Kozbur, cooperated while gathering donations for the soldiers of the Ukrainian Galician Army.⁴⁸⁴ Was it a sign of established cooperation? Perhaps. When the First World War started, the village of Berehy gave nine volunteers to the Legion of Ukrainian Sich Riflemen.⁴⁸⁵ In the inter-war period the son of Rev. Mel'nyk became a district leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, and the village of Berehy was one of the most active in the nationalist underground and one in the district to suffer the heaviest losses. In the meantime, in 1919, there was a meeting in Sambir organized by the district directory of the Radical Party. The meeting voted for the following resolution: confiscation of the all the land without compensation, leaving the defined maximum, and favoring private property. The secretary of the meeting was comrade Kozbur from Berehy. And although there was no one from Morozovychi, the chair of this meeting was comrade Fitsiak from Torhanovychi, the village next to Morozovychi and also praised by Ivan Mykhas.⁴⁸⁶

⁴⁸¹ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, 626/p.59, a.79.

⁴⁸² VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, 626/p.59, a.83.

⁴⁸³M. Iu., “Or Sambora,” *Russkoje Slovo*, 1908, No.3.

⁴⁸⁴ *Naddnistrrians'ki visty*. Organ povitovykh Komisariativ v Sambori, Starim Sambori i Turtsi. 1919, No.20, 3

⁴⁸⁵ Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv*, 69-70

⁴⁸⁶ *Naddnistrrians'ki visty*, No.25, 5.

The reading club in Vaniovychi under Rev. Bobers'kyi did not leave any traces in the *Prosvita* collection. We have only a report on the activities of this reading club from 1926-7, when peasants were in the committee of the club; it did not have either a shop or a coop, only a "Luh" society.⁴⁸⁷ Unlike this one, the reading club in Morozovychi left more documents in files of *Prosvita's* central executive. It is interesting how lasting the legacy of Mykhas and Rev. Bobers'kyi was. In the inter-war period the Morozovychi reading club remained radical, its library contained works on socialism, religion and priests, and peasants enjoyed reading stories and novels about the peasant insurgency in Russian Ukraine during the Civil War.⁴⁸⁸

In the 1930s Ivan Fylypchak who wrote a history of Berehy on the request of Berehy peasants mentioned that

A sincere gratefulness the village feels till now to the deceased peasant progressive activist Ivan Mykhas (he had a farmstead near the village). Thanks to his efforts the community of Berehy acquired 50 Joch of forest in Lunevychi. He was a good advisor of the village. In 1925 a grateful community extolled his memory with a celebration in his honor and wanted to raise a cross on his grave but never received permission for this.⁴⁸⁹

It was not clear who did not allow for the cross. Perhaps it was not the Polish administration but the local priest without whose permission nothing could be done at the cemetery. Visiting the village and searching for Mykhas' grave, I could not find it, although there are peasant graves that date back to the 1880s. Berehy, being nationalist in the Second World War, was radical in the inter-war period: "From the foundation of *Sich* and till now the majority of the citizens went under the sign of ideology of Ukrainian social radicalism; a certain number follows national democracy."⁴⁹⁰

The village of Berehy produced 21 people who joined the ranks of the *intelligentsia* by 1935, and among them was a technician, Ivan Mykhas, perhaps the son of Ivan Mykhas.⁴⁹¹ We know that Ivan Mykhas, a student of the L'viv Polytechnic, testified during the Ukrainian-Polish student fights in L'viv University, when Ukrainian student Adam Kotsko was shot, that he saw Poles shooting at Ukrainian students.⁴⁹² According to the stories I was told in Berehy,

⁴⁸⁷ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.1407.

⁴⁸⁸ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, 11-20.

⁴⁸⁹ Ivan Fylypchak, *Istoriia sela Berehiv*, 73.

⁴⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 74.

⁴⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 72-3.

⁴⁹² "Ukraïns'kykh akademikiv sudiat'," *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1911, No.11.

Mykhas' sons sold the farm and left the village around 1906. A side branch of Mykhas family was left in Vaniovychi. A woman, whose maiden name was Mykhas (And now there is no one with this surname either in Morozovychi or in Vaniovychi.), told me that her sister after the Second World War by accident met the son of Ivan Mykhas in a bus. He was an engineer and had some important assignment. He promised to visit her in Vaniovychi, but he never did.

Another son of Mykhas was a certain Iosyf Mykhas. In 1911 the society "Village Farmer" sent 16 lads, "sons of our more prosperous farmer," for practice on farms in the Czech lands.⁴⁹³ One of those sent was Iosyf Mykhas from Berehy, and because originally there were no Mykhas' in Berehy, it must have been Ivan's son. The Czech farmer, for whom he worked, gave him good references. Iosyf even participated in the *Sokol* assembly in Prague, where he took part in exercises. Moreover, after the end of his farming practice, he entered agricultural school in Bohemia.⁴⁹⁴ So, perhaps he never came back to Galicia.

When I started asking about Mykhas in Berehy and looked for his grave, no one could help me. Only with time, through the toponym *Mykhasivka*, which was the place of Mykhas' farmstead, some villagers recalled stories about him. There is not much known and nothing remembered about him. The daughter of *koshovyi* Pavka was the only one to recall that he was an activist contributing to the village's cultural life. Another woman remembered him being a politician fighting with the Poles, and that he was about to become a *pan* in Kornalovychi (Was he about to buy an estate or to become a mayor there? I have never figured it out.). The common knowledge was that he was very rich, and the current sexton of the local church, pretending to have some materials there and know a lot, said that he "must have been a Jew, or a landlord." The fields of his former farmstead were also an object of admiration. The legacy of Mykhas helped Berehy's collective farm to get the land of his former farmsteads. The secretary of the district Party organization gave it to Berehy and not to Lanovychi with its Polish population, justifying it by Mykhas' "belonging" to the village of Berehy. In Morozovychi the only people who knew about Mykhas were his relatives and old couple remembering the festivities organized by the Radical Party in the 1920s in his honor. Just as in the case of Berehy, Mykhas' former fields were known as *Mykhasivka*, and one peasant was able to show the place on which his house stood, although now of course a new building stands there. For most villagers in all these villages the surname Mykhas is unknown.

⁴⁹³ *Narodne Slovo*, 1911, No.500.

⁴⁹⁴ *Hospodars'ka Chasopys'*, 1912, No.4.

Chapter 8

SUSTAINING THE NATION'S BODY

Is the Ruthenians' situation indeed so hopeless? Should we agree with the Polish state idea and reserve for ourselves only minority rights – on the land once ours, and now – Polish? Is not there a way to at least maintain our current situation of national possession? Cannot we somehow retake what we lost to Poland in consequence of the Polonizing politics of the state?¹

For those observing closely Ukrainian Galicia at the beginning of the twentieth century a profound transformation of the place and the place's "human material" was obvious:

These colorful masses flocking from everywhere for a *vicbe*, have already passed the condition of simple ethnographic material, these mountaineers strange in appearance, reminding one of the red-skin Americans, with long hair, wearing embroidered leather jackets, with hatchets in their hands, came out with eloquent impromptus on topics on the political agenda, expressed a clear understanding of complicated political relationships and the social question, revealed in their speeches deep national self-consciousness, astonishing tact and political breeding (*vospitannost'*)...²

It was also said that:

After the Czech lands, eastern Galicia represents, perhaps, the most astonishing example of the great vital power of the national principle, when it serves as means of communion of wider masses of people to the assets of world culture.³

¹ Viacheslav Budzynovs'kyi, *Khlopska polityka*, t.3, 121.

² *Galichina, Bukovina, Ugorskaia Rus'*, sostavleno sotrudnikami zhurnala "Ukrainskaia zhizn'" (Moskva: Zadruha, 1915), 269.

³ *Ibid.*, 266.

In this chapter I shall try to look into this more general transformation, the sight of which was somewhat lost in the discussion of the particularities of the local context in the preceding chapter. After looking at representations of and by Ivan Mykhas, who was a marginal figure and an aberration from the ideal course of action envisioned by the leaders of the Ukrainian movement, we shall look at the mainstream practices that made Mykhas aberrant. We shall start with the structure and space whose existence in the 1880s was postulated as central for the development of Ukrainian national movement. We shall start with the reading clubs united under the umbrella of the *Prosvita* society.

But doing this we should remember that village reading clubs were something more than just tools of the national movement. Prosvita shared a lot with the province's other enlightening organizations. The proclamation of the Polish Peasant Party in 1895 stated that "voluntary associations are the measure of civilization, of the political reasonability and extent of economic prosperity or humanitarian willingness." And Galicia in 1895 had 1277 of them, only ten being political.⁴ On the other hand, the reading clubs were not the only form of organization existing in the villages, and Ukrainian discourse was no longer dominated by this exclusive concern with the enlightening of the peasants. The appearance of the cooperative movement and an emphasis on particular peasant "corporate" or "estate" interests were also part of that Ukrainian discourse. The land that influenced the ideas about education for adults in Galicia was Denmark, and this was the country that served as an example of the successful molding of a new rural style of life and organization of agriculture.⁵ The second part of this chapter will deal with this component of the transformation, which seems to signal appearance of a particular vision of the peasant class and includes an attempt at its materialization.

The last section of this chapter will return to Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi and try to look at his work and his texts from the 1890s -1900s. We shall look at how the new strategies and new politics of social transformation devised by the Ukrainian project looked in the particular case of Rev. Zubryts'kyi's activities in the region.

Reading Clubs in the 1890-1900s: Maintaining the Public Sphere

In 1893 the Provincial Exhibition housed a pavilion of Ruthenian organizations. In this pavilion the central place was occupied by the *Prosvita* board. It boasted that it had published 170 books with an average edition of 5,000 copies, not

⁴ "Do wyborców w całym kraju," *Gazeta Samborska*, 1895, No.16.

⁵ Potoczny, *Oświata dorosłych*, 15-16.

counting prayer and song books. In total it published more than 1,000,000 books. The society had 7,000 members, of whom 3,548 were peasants, 916 – Church brotherhoods and societies, 766 – priests, 523 – teachers of elementary schools, 141- women, and more than 1000 – representatives of other estates. The exhibition included a map of Galicia, showing the development of the society, the development of reading clubs, and the circulation of members and books.⁶

The growth of *Prosvita* in the whole of Galicia is represented in the following table:

Table 8-1 “Development of *Prosvita* in 1890-1912”⁷

Year	Number of Reading Clubs	Yearly increase of Reading Clubs	Approximate Number of the Reading Clubs' Members	Number of Society' s Members	Yearly Number of New Members
1890				≈5,000	+770 (454 – peasants)
1891	82			≈5,800	+909 (489)
1892	112	+30		≈6,700	+628 (355)
1893	230 ⁸	+118		≈7,400	+505 (241)
1894				≈7,900	+573 (313)
1895			9,000	≈8,400	+572 (287)
1896	342			≈9,000	+896
1897	522	+180		≈9,900	+1,333
1898	704	+182		≈11,000	+1,133
1899	816	+112		≈12,000	+944
1900	824	+108		≈13,200	+1,182
1901	944	+120	>50,000	14,208	+1,000
1902				≈15,200	+1,003
1903	1,339	+295 (in two years)		16,100	+1,203
1904				≈17,500	+1,359
1905	1,550			≈18,400	+941
1906	1,693	+143		19,402	+1,070
1907	1,924	+198		20,818	+1,379

⁶ *Providnyk po vystavi kraievii u L'vovi z osoblyvym ohliadom na viddil etnografichnyi i na pavilion ruskykh narodnykh tovarystv* (L'viv: z drukarni NTSh, 1894).

⁷ This table composed on the basis of the *Prosvita* reports.

⁸ Of these 190 indeed active.

1908			
1909	2,286	+262 (in two years)	89,950
1912	2,611		

From this table it becomes clear that since the reform of 1891 the society was envisioned as a network of reading clubs. As we see from this table by 1897 *Prosvita* had not developed too extensively. The almost zero starting ground in 1891 should be explained by the change in the society's statutes, when reading clubs already affiliated with the society had to be reregistered. The network of *Prosvita* reading clubs in the mid 1890s does not exceed the number of Ruthenian reading clubs in the mid-1880s. But between 1897 and 1903 the number of the reading clubs almost tripled and between 1909 and 1914 more than quadrupled. At the same time the table shows not the story of steady growth, to which we are accustomed, but also indicates obvious periods of slow-down in the expansion of reading clubs. Moreover, against this table the problems the Sambir branch of the society experienced in the 1890s do not look as something totally falling out of the picture.

In this section I'll try to describe the development of the *Prosvita* society's reading clubs in the Sambir area and look into what was going on in individual reading clubs. To do this we should turn back to the reform of 1891. Now the reading clubs could be founded as *Prosvita* reading clubs, they did not have to be founded and only then apply for membership there. Moreover, these reading clubs now could become sites where various other organizations could appear. After the reform Kost' Levyts'kyi issued a small booklet in the series of *Prosvita* publications entitled What Should *Prosvita* do on the Basis of the New Statute. The answer was the following. The society changed from "enlightening" to "enlightening and industrial" because "we need to save our brother-breadmaker and to give him not only science but a real benefit from that science: daily bread!"⁹ This would be reached by the creation of a network of reading clubs, which had to be founded in every community and organized into branches according to the court districts.¹⁰ Branches "should take over leadership in the districts and lead people to science and well-being, they should be apostles of enlightening and industrial science."¹¹ Branches' executives were expected to search in the communities for "sincere and enlightened" people, who would take care of the reading clubs.¹²

⁹ Kost' Levyts'kyi, Shcho maie robyty Prosvita na osnovi novoho statutu (Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.140) (L'viv, 1892), 4.

¹⁰ Ibid., 6-7.

¹¹ Ibid., 9.

¹² Ibid., 10.

The work of individual reading clubs was envisioned as follows: "The reading club has to be guided by an enlightened and sincere leader, namely a priest or someone else from intelligentsia, and if there are no people like this in the community, then a wise peasant or townsman."¹³ All the Ruthenian members of the community were expected to enter the reading club. Reading clubs had to win the absolute trust of the community, so that the latter "will not dare to do anything without a council in the reading club." Reading club also had to become "a live guide of everything written in books and periodicals." Around the reading club various granaries, stores, banks, farming and industrial unions had to be formed. Because "every union is based on the coordinated work of people who have the same needs and goals," the implicit assumption was that all the Ruthenian members of the communities share the latter.

On the one hand reading clubs were seen as institutions that would automatically generate progressive ideas; once attached to their network the villagers would share in the progress:

We have, be it said for their glory, villages where one can find a dozen members of the Kachkovskii society or of *Prosvita*, there are many copies of the history of Rus', there are several "Lives of the Saints," only show there a good book and say: this is a good book worth buying and people will snatch it up immediately. No wonder that people live better, have better cattle, a better and more spacious house, an ordered household, the farmer has a better plough and harrow, better clothes on him, and better food on his plate, because people there stopped walking in the darkness and fell in love with the light of science, and what they learn from books, from writing, they understand with their own reason and start living according to it. In such a village people are on the good road; the power of darkness will not bring them back on the old trail, on which they crawled earlier, they are integrated into new order (*poriadky*), and everything derives from the light in their heads, everything from their reason and science. During elections there is no need for any agitator with flattering promises to show up in such a village, people there know too well these painted foxes and kick them out of the village once they enter.¹⁴

On the other hand, the widespread feeling and common knowledge of the society's activists was that if left alone peasants will lead the reading club to decline. In 1903 a conservative author reporting on the little progress with reading clubs in the Sambir district says: "Till more conscious persons on the spot, in the village, take over leadership, there will be no guarantee that the founded store or reading club will not decay (*zasniyt'sia*) from the very beginning."¹⁵ But we have seen the same attitude in Levyts'kyi's program of the

¹³ Ibid., 15.

¹⁴ "Skazhim sobi pravdu!," *Poslannyk*, 1899, No.4.

¹⁵ N. N., "Z Sambirshchyny," *Ruslan*, 1903, No.157.

development of *Prosvita* reading clubs after the reform of 1891. Perhaps the reform of 1891 also meant an end to the more or less autonomous development of village reading clubs and was meant not only to foster the development of these and extend their network, but to place them under the firmer control of the leadership of the national movement, to create a mechanism securing the hegemony of the urban intelligentsia, priests and teachers.

But no one, of course, would state this aspect of the reform explicitly. The need for educated people in the leadership of the reading clubs and other organizations usually was explained purely pragmatically:

Our people have already recognized how it is difficult to found a reading club. You have to apply for the statutes, put stamps on them, wait till the Vice-Roy's Office deigns to accept this as information -- all of this makes peasants lose interest.¹⁶

With more complicated organizations, like Reifeisen banks, it was even worse. The best option was when some educated person would follow all the necessary procedures, while the peasants simply sign and elect the executive.

We saw the problems of the Sambir *Prosvita* in the first half of the 1890s. In 1895 *Prosvita* reading clubs in the Sambir area existed only in seven villages -- Berehy, Morozovychi, Kul'chytsi, Berezhnytsia, Cherkhava, Bilyna Velyka, Stupnytsia. We can note that at least four of them were in villages with a large petty gentry population, and we know that at least one of them (Kul'chytsi) was in fact a petty gentry reading club.¹⁷ During 1894-1899 chairs of the Sambir branch were Lev Roshkevych, Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi and Prof. Volodymyr Sliuzar.¹⁸ In 1898 *Prosvita* in the Sambir district included seven reading clubs, with 102 members, none of whom were women. If the branch did not look too bad it was because of the Staryi Sambir district, where we could find 11 reading clubs, with 630 members, 183 of whom were women.¹⁹

Even the poor and mountainous Turka district in 1899 had more reading clubs than the Sambir one -- eight.²⁰ In 1899 there were 726 *Prosvita* reading clubs but a closer look at separate districts shows that the situation was not as good as it would appear from the statistics. The report on reading clubs from the Turka district was saying that reading clubs had problems because of peasant ignorance

¹⁶ Mykhailo Novakovs'kyi, chlen "Pros'vity", *Spilky dlia oshchadnosty i pozychok (systemy Raifaizena)* (Vydannia Prosvity ch.240) (L'viv, 1900), 29.

¹⁷ "Visti Prosvitni," *Chytal'nia*, 1895, No.23.

¹⁸ *Spravozdanie z diial'nosti tovarystva Prosvita* (L'viv, 1899).

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ *Svoboda*, 1899, No.4.

but profited from the presence of good and sincere priests. The overview of the reading clubs in that report gives us the following picture:

In **Iavora** the reading club was conducted by “peasants-petty gentry” themselves. There was a community store as well. The local pastor, Rev. Stoialovs’kyi, was a member of the reading club but did not play an active role. Recently some conflicts between the upper and lower parts of the village erupted and hindered the development of the reading club;

In **Iasenytsia Zamkova** the reading club was founded by Rev. Mykhailo Dobrians’kyi;

In **Khashchiv** there were good peasants and the local reading club could develop well, but the pastor, Rev. Borys, was seriously ill and so traumatized by family misfortunes that he could not do any work there;

In **Borynia** the reading club had Rev. Moroz, the most active priest in the district, but district captain Biliński was obstructing his activity;

In **Bitlia** the reading club was founded by the late Dr. Kornylo Chaikovs’kyi, but after his death was decaying.²¹

In the second half of the 1890s the founding of reading clubs was conducted under the influence of national-populist priests from the Staryi Sambir district. Among them were Revs. Ivan Iavors’kyi and Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi. On 15 June 1897 a reading club was opened in the village of Stril’bychi, residence of the well known Ukrainian politician Rev. Ivan Iavors’kyi. There were 600 people present and all of them could not fit into the house of Andrei Matsiak, housing this reading club. Rev. Iavors’kyi spoke about reading clubs, Rev. Zubryts’kyi – about stores, Rev. Bylyns’kyi from Voloshynova – about granaries. After every speech those assembled sang “Peace to You, Brothers.” Three peasants also talked. After the official part, there was some food offered during which the youth danced and partied.²² The village of Voloshynova mentioned here prior to Rev. Bilyns’kyi had as its pastor Rev. Iavors’kyi, who decided to build a three-room house near the church, which would house the reading club and community chancery. It was said that the pastor “speaks Polish because he is an old man, but his heart is passionate for his people.”²³

In 1899 a reading club was opened in the village of Horodylovychi. This was work of Dmytro Shcherba, local cantor, *Dnister* agent, and community scribe. The club was housed in a private house and had from the very beginning 50 members and a store. On the opening of this club guests from Khyriv and Stril’bychi came.²⁴ The most “successful” villages for the national movement were those

²¹ *Svoboda*, 1899, No.96.

²² “Rukh politychnyi, prosvitnyi i ekonomichnyi ruskoho narodu,” *Svoboda*, 1897, No.27.

²³ “Z Staromiskoho povita,” *Dilo*, 1891, No.220.

²⁴ *Svoboda*, 1899, No.23.

where “enlightenment” was spread by both priests and mayors in close cooperation. This was the case in Stara Ropa, where in 1899 the reading club was opened in new premises. The building also housed the community chancery, store and firehouse. During the opening speech the priest was praising mayor Vasyl’ Basarab as the best example to follow.²⁵

Already in the 1890s *Prosvita* in the Sambir area was significantly larger than the Kachkovskii society. In 1893 the Kachkovskii society branch in Sambir had 118 members. Of these 33 were not paying membership dues and the proposal was advanced to exclude them from the society. Rev. Skobel’s’kyi, knowing perfectly well the situation of the society, proposed to let them stay in the society, but to deprive them of the society’s books.²⁶ Ukrainians were representing the Kachkovskii society as a strictly hierarchical society, based on the domination of the priestly caste. The meeting of its Sambir branch which took place in the hall “Ruthenian Talk” was depicted as follows: “Around 20 peasants stood on the left side, while on the right side the intelligentsia, including 14 priests, occupied chairs and a sofa.”²⁷

The general meeting of the Sambir branch of the Kachkovskii society took place on 29 February 1892. Rev. Vasylii Skobel’s’kyi, pastor of Prusy, became the new branch’s chair. The executive included Rev. Ilarion Hmytryk, Prof. Nykolai Lashkevych, Teodor Ripets’kyi and Vasylii Plaskach. Kornylii Chaikovs’kyi and Nykolai Kaniuk were elected as executive members’ substitutes. The peasant Rybak from Raitarovychi proposed to send a deputation to Bishop Pelesh, which would ask him to take into personal defense “our ABC from the phonetic craze (*napastiin*).” New members of the Kachkovskii society in that year were three peasants from Mistkovychi, one from Torhanovychi and Vinkentii Khlopets’kyi, an attorney in Sambir.²⁸

In 1900 there were 1100 reading clubs affiliated with Ruthenian organizations in Galicia. Two thirds of them belonged to *Prosvita* and one third to other organizations, mainly to the Kachkovskii society. It was also said that there were 300 to 400 reading clubs founded on separate statutes and not belonging to any organization. Territorially, there were 12 districts that had more than 20 reading clubs of *Prosvita* (Przemyśl district had the highest number— 37), 25 districts had more than 10 but less than 20, and 17 districts had less than 10 reading clubs. Both Sambir and Staryi Sambir districts belonged to the second group. Stare Misto district, which in 1890 had only one reading club now had 11.²⁹

²⁵ *Svoboda*, 1899, No.28.

²⁶ I. K. S., “Ot Sambora,” *Galichanin*, 1894, No.201.

²⁷ “Z Sambora,” *Dilo*, 1892, No.211.

²⁸ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.70, a.1.

²⁹ “Chyital’ni ‘Prosvity’,” *Svoboda*, 1900, No.3.

We have seen how reading clubs started in Sambir district. In Staryi Sambir district they started in the area around Lavriv, which for quite some time had been connected with the Ruthenian politics and movement. In 1900 a reading club was founded in Spas, in the house of Antin Tershakovets', who also was a vice-chair of the reading club. There were 35 members, 10 girls, 12 lads and 13 married men.³⁰ However, after a year the reading club was reported to have problems. The executive of the club was not showing up. An accountant had not reported on his activities. The secretary, one of the richest farmers in the village, did not want to pay membership dues for himself and his son. There were also "some wise heads, saying: 'if that reading club was supposed to be a good thing – then our spiritual father would also drop by, or at least order people to attend it; but he does not go there himself and does not say anything to people.'" Relections were arranged and the new chair was Luka Stril'byts'kyi, local agent of the "Dnister" insurance company. The reading club was subscribing to "Svoboda" and "Misionar'."³¹ By 1899 all the towns of Stare Misto district, except Fel'shtyn, had reading clubs – Stare Misto, Khyriv, and Spas had them while one in Stara Sil' was preparing to open that year.³²

In the first years of the twentieth century the growth of *Prosvita* reading clubs in the Sambir and Staryi Sambir districts looked as follows:

Table 8-2 "Development of the *Prosvita* reading clubs in Sambir and Staryi Sambir districts in 1900-1904"

	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904
Staryi Sambir	14	15	15	19	23
Sambir	6	8	9	14	31

Sambir was the district in which during 1904 more reading clubs appeared than in any other Galician district. It was also the year when the Sambir district outdid Staryi Sambir district in respect to the number of reading clubs.³³

This transformation in the Sambir district was connected with the coming to Sambir of Danylo Stakhura. On 1 November 1901 the general meeting of Sambir's *Prosvita* branch took place. The chair, Rev. Hordyns'kyi, had to state that already for the third year in a row this meeting was gathering only a small number of people. Nevertheless, he was happy to see a greater number of intelligentsia on

³⁰ *Svoboda*, 1900, No.9.

³¹ *Svoboda*, 1901, No.13.

³² "Rukh v ruskykh tovarystvakh," *Dilo*, 1899, No.120.

³³ "Nasha prosvitnia orhanizatsiia v rotsi 1904," *Dilo*, 1905, No.13.

the meeting, “because it was the proof that the goal of the society is not foreign to them, that concern with the general well-being is in its heart. Against this background the absence of the peasants is striking, for them calls of the branch for reasons that are not entirely clear do not leave any impression.”³⁴

At this meeting the small number of members was especially visible because precisely that year Staryi Sambir district created its own branch. The meeting showed that the *Prosvita* branch in Sambir in 1901 had only 112 members. The new executive elected for 1902 included Danylo Stakhura, and among the substitutes of the executive’s members we see Anatol’ Kishakevych from Silets’ and Sen’kus from Neudorf. The newly elected executive gave a directive “to wake up the peasantry.”³⁵ Stakhura was deeply dissatisfied with the situation and one could find barely 12 *Prosvita* reading clubs in the district. It was said that during his first year of work for the local *Prosvita* branch he was traveling every Sunday from village to village in a peasant cart. During that year the local *Prosvita* increased by 226 members.

On 28 December 1903 Stakhura was elected chair of the branch and stayed in this position till he left for abroad in 1919. His closest cooperators in *Prosvita* work were Frants Silets’kyi, a retired teacher, and Oleksa Dukhovych, a retired school inspector, and Stakhura’s dependent Evhen Kolodych.³⁶ This was the meeting of the *Prosvita* branch to which 200 peasants from the area came, something unheard of since the branch was founded. The meeting was chaired by Rev. Hordyns’kyi from Kul’chytsi.³⁷ In 1903 there were 46 reading clubs for 89 villages, but it also meant that in other 43 villages there was not a single *Prosvita* member.³⁸

Activists of the national movement from other regions of Galicia were stating the problematic development of the Sambir *Prosvita* network as well. One of these observers was Rev. Stefan Onyshkevych, a Ukrainian MP, who attended the jubilee of the Sambir *Prosvita* branch in December 1904. After this celebration he wrote a letter to *Prosvita*’s executive requesting the latter to turn its attention to the “sad condition of the local branch, which showed up during the jubilatory meeting.” He was upset with the sharp confrontation between the two parties: “radical” and “national-populist.” These parties spoke against each other, were compromising and destroying themselves mutually. “To the first one gymnasium, university students and all the more conscious peasants belong. To the second one – priests, professors, officials, but they have almost no support from the

³⁴ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.96.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ivan Fylypchak, *Pamiati Danyla Stakhury*, 8.

³⁷ IA. A. H., “Z Sambora,” *Ruslan*, 1903, No.286.

³⁸ Ivan Fylypchak, *Pamiati Danyla Stakhury*, 10.

peasants. The older party holds controls *Prosvita* and does not allow radicals to participate in it.³⁹ This confrontation exploded at the jubilatory meeting on 8 December, when a radical student, a delegate of the Siches, attacked older activists. There were too few peasants at the meeting and there was an urgent need to appease these two fractions and bring them to some kind of cooperation.⁴⁰

It appears that Stakhura managed to organize more active members of the urban intelligentsia and started systematic work with the surrounding Sambir villages. Few of those who cooperated with him engaged in what they called “making reading clubs.” Roman Pasichyns’kyi, for example, reported: “The work advances forward lively – today I go to Vil’shanyk ‘to make’ reading club there.”⁴¹ Danylo Stakhura was himself very active in such “making” – in 1904 he “made” reading clubs in Kornalovychi, Pyniany, Lukavytsia, Lopushna and Hordynia.⁴² The “crusade” did not stop in 1904. In 1905 Oleksa Dukhovych reported on the founding of reading clubs in Blazhiv and Hordynia.⁴³

In 1905 reading clubs of the Sambir branch looked as follows:

Vaniovychi – founded in 1901 by Rev. Nykolai Bobers’kyi, 80 members, 45 of them lads, membership dues of 20 Heller a year, subscribing to 11 periodicals, housed at the premises of the Church Brotherhood, had one festivity on Shavechnko’s anniversary, prepared the comedy “Drunkard,” which was shown at home and in Stril’bychi, prepared a St. Nicholas party and Christmas theater (*vertep*) with caroling, had its own store.

Kornalovychi, founded in 1904 by Rev. Lev Fedorovych, membership dues – 1 Krone, subscribing to Svoboda and Postup, 91 members, housed by Mykola Hrushchak, who was also its chair.

Sikerchytysi, founded in 1904 by Rev. Lev Fedorovych, 40 members, dues – 1 Krone 20 Heller, “this village is small but enlightened.”

Vykoty, founded in 1903 by Rev. Dmytro Bordun, 52 members, dues of 1 Krone, subscribed to Svoboda and received three more periodicals from the priest. Housed by the Community House.

³⁹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.144.

⁴⁰ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.145.

⁴¹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.109.

⁴² TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.112.

⁴³ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.127.

Torhanovychi, founded in 1903 by “local people,” 40 members, dues of 1 Krone, two periodicals, located in a private house, two parties with music, “executive is in the hands of peasants themselves but nevertheless it develops correctly.”

Cherkhava, founded in 1882 by Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi, had 29 members, dues of 1 Krone, located in the Community House, was subscribing to five periodicals, all its members were able to read.

P'ianovychi, founded in 1904 by Rev. Syl'vestr Baranets'kyi and M. Vysotskyi, 27 members, dues of 1 Kronen 20 Heller, two periodicals, located in a private house.

Maksymovychi, founded in 1904 by Dr. Stakhura and two farmers, dues of 1 Krone 20 Heller, private house, four periodicals and 41 members.

Ol'shanyk, founded in 1904, at first it was located in the community house, but then the community council removed it from there and moved to a private house, 53 members, two periodicals, “if only a sincere soul was found in the village, this reading club would develop very well.”

Lopushna, founded in 1904 by Rev. Iosyf Tatomyr, 15 members, dues of 1 Krone 20 Heller, there was no school and the village was far from Sambir that is why “there were little prospects for activity.”

Horodyshche, founded in 1904 by Rev. Mykhailo Turians'kyi, 33 members, 1 Krone 20 Heller, 2 periodicals, in a private house.

Berehy, founded in 1899 by Rev. Ivan Mel'nyk, community house, 20 members, three periodicals, dues of 1 Krone.

Pyniany, founded in 1904 by two farmers, 54 members, 1Krone 20 Heller, 2 periodicals.

Morozovychi, founded in 1892 by Iv. Mykhas, “Later (after Mykhas moved out of the village) declined totally up to 20 November 1904.” Allegedly Stakhura and one more farmer returned it back to life, 30 members, private house, 50 Heller of dues, three periodicals.

Zvir, founded in 1904 by the local priest, 21 members, dues of 60 Heller, private house.

Chukva, founded in 1903 by the priest, 55 members, 50 Heller of dues, 4 periodicals, is building its own house.

Berezhnytsia, founded in 1904, 52 members, 1 Krone 20 Heller, store.

Tatary, founded in 1896 by Rev. Mykola Nestorovych, "after a prolonged decline" revived in 1904, 36 members, dues of 1 Krone, private house, two periodicals.

Kul'chytsi, founded in 1892 by Symeon Tsmailo Kulchyts'kyi but declined after he left the village, revived in 1904 by Rev. Dmytro Hordyns'kyi, 50 members, dues of 1 Krone, *Sokol* is being founded as well as granary.

Bilyna Velyka, a reading club that declined was renewed here in 1904 by Rev. Petro Pohorets'kyi, 46 members, dues of 1 Krone 20 Heller, four periodicals, located in the cantor's house, "does not manifest the goal ascribed by the statute, one can say that Bilyna's gentry is not flocking yet to this hearth of culture."

Biskovychi, founded in 1904, 15 members, dues of 1 Krone, private house and "unsure future just as applies to all the Ruthenians here, who are turning into renegades."

Bilynka Mala, chaired by Rev. Pohorets'kyi.

Burchytsi Stari, founded in 1904, 42 members, 1 Krone, private house, this reading club was considered to be too far from Sambir (23 km.) and it was said that the only hope of this reading club lay in the appointment of a new pastor.

Lukavytsia, founded in 1904 by Rev. Iv. Tatomyr, 30 members, dues of 1 Krone 20 Heller, private house, developing well.

Side, founded in 1904 by Rev. Mykhailo Turians'kyi, 40 members, 1 Krone 20 Heller, difficult conditions because of illiteracy.

Babyna, founded in 1897 by Rev. Plechkovych, this reading club "is impossible to bring back to life. Prof. Bilen'kyi could not even organize the founding meeting."

Luka Shliakhots'ka, founded in 1904 by local petty gentry, 35 members, subscribing to Svoboda, dues of 1 Krone 20 Heller, “its prospects are very good.”⁴⁴

In total in 1905 there were 29 reading clubs with 1100 members for 61,475 local Ruthenians.⁴⁵ From this list it also becomes clear that the absolute majority of the reading clubs in the Sambir district was founded by priests – 17 against six for those clubs where “founder” was indicated.

In 1906 all the reading clubs were checked by the branch’s executive, and all the reading clubs were forced to buy Shevchenko’s portrait and to put up a board sign saying “*Chyital'nia Prosvity*.” Reading clubs in Berezhnytsia, Bilyna, Vykoty, Vaniovychi, Lopushna, Tatary, Torhanovychi, Cherkhava and Chukva got stores, and the reading club in Babyna stopped selling vodka.⁴⁶ After inspector Kulisz left the position of district school inspector Ukrainian teachers Mykhailo Kobiers'kyi, Stepan Silets'kyi, Vasyl' Zhyga, Mykhailo Dvorian, Ianush, Ivan Pukach and the brothers Koblians'ki actively joined organizations of the Ukrainian movement. All of them went through the secret Ukrainian student groups while receiving their education.⁴⁷

One of the reading clubs founded in 1904 was in Kornalovychi, a mixed Ruthenian-Polish village, mentioned several times in this thesis as a village with a long tradition of social protest dating back to the pre-1848 era. This was one of few villages with radical *Sich* societies in them. The documentation available on the founding of this reading club reveals interesting moments. There is a list of the founding members from 23 March 1904, and all of these members are peasants: Vasyl Betsa, Mykhailo Pysar, Nykolai Tkhoryk, Nykolai Hrushchak, Dmytro Lystopad, Hryn'ko Havryliak, Ivan Betsa, Vasyl' Ianushevych, Hryn'ko Bunio, Mykola Volians'kyi.⁴⁸

But from the correspondence with the Central Executive of the *Prosvita* society it appears that this reading club was founded by Danylo Stakhura, who sent all the relevant documentation on the founding of this one and of the reading club in Sprynia. It appears that Danylo Stakhura was then in the middle of one of these periodic crusades aimed at the founding of new reading clubs and revitalization of old ones. He was asking for a list of all the reading clubs in the Sambir district: as we see, the local branch of the society could conduct its activities without even having a list of the reading clubs.⁴⁹ The reading clubs

⁴⁴ “Z tovarystv,” Dilo, 1905, No.84.

⁴⁵ Dilo, 1905, No.62.

⁴⁶ Ivan Fylypchak, Pamiati Danyla Stakhury, 10.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 11.

⁴⁸ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3039, a.30.

⁴⁹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3039, a.31.

received the usual complement of *Prosvita* publications. Some books were still from the 1870s – “Staryi Efrem” or “Roskazy pro nebo i zemliu.” Those more recent were often sent in five and six copies.⁵⁰

On 12 June the festive opening of the reading club took place. Oleksa Dukhovych (a retired inspector of elementary schools) and Roman Stefanovych (attorney candidate) attended the opening as representatives of the Sambir branch. Yearly membership dues were established at 1 Krone and the club subscribed to the newspaper *Postup* (Progress) published in Kolomyia. The executive looked as follows: Mykola Hrushchak (chair), Mykola Iatsymirs’kyi (vice-chair), Vasyl’ Betsa (secretary), Petro Ianoshevych (accountant), Mykola Volyns’kyi (librarian), Andrukh Pits’ and Tomko Viznyk (members). From the start 91 members registered with the reading club, but Stakhura was sure that even more were about to join it, because the “village is nationally conscious and a sincere soul – assistant priest Rev. Lev Fedanovych contributed to it.” Among the executive’s members Vasyl’ Betsa and Mykola Hrushchak were those most concerned with the fate of the reading club. The club was located in the house of Mykola Hrushchak and received *Svoboda*, *Haidamaky*, and *Postup*.⁵¹ It also seems that Ruthenians managed to dominate the community council. At least this was the case in 1927, when Polish pressure was much stronger and Polish minorities in the villages were supported by the Polish state. The enemy of the reading club was Kornalovychi’s landlord Felix Sozański, but it was said that he did not have any influence in his own village.

It would seem that such a reading club was destined to flourish. But this was not exactly the case. The report for the year 1905 showed that its membership in October 1905 was 90 people (60 literate and 30 illiterate), or 50 men, 17 women, 13 girls, and 10 lads. The library had 203 books and 160 of them were borrowed by the members during the year. The peasants’ favorites were 1) Stories and tales, 2) History of Rus’-Ukraine, 3) Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi. Perhaps, under the influence of the assistant priest the reading club was subscribing to *Svoboda* and *Misionar’*, and was receiving for free *Dilo*, *Dzvin*, *Ruska khata*. The reading club moved to the house of Vasyl’ Betsa, had meetings on Sundays and holidays, and the executive had five meetings that year.⁵²

In 1907 the reading club’s membership decreased to only 35 members, it had 250 books and was still chaired by Mykola Hrushchak. The new credit-industrial union was founded but still had to start its work. There was *Sich*, several private non-Jewish stores, and two private roof-making enterprises. It is interesting that a Polish “farming circle” was founded in the village in 1902 but did not prosper. In

⁵⁰ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3039, a.33.

⁵¹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3039, a.35.

⁵² TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3039, a.37.

the school instruction was conducted in Polish, but Ukrainian was used in the sessions and book-keeping of the community council.⁵³ Only in 1908 the reading club recovered its membership, which now reached 102.⁵⁴

Another object of a crusade of Stakhura's in 1904 was the reading club in Morozovychi founded by Ivan Mykhas. Since 1899 this reading club had not shown any signs of activity and had to be revived in 1904. Stakhura reported on that to *Prosvita's* Central Executive: "This reading club, which has been in decline for several years, has returned to life in the following way. After prolonged preparations we managed to organize a general meeting on 20 November 1904, for which from the Sambir branch Aleksandr Dukhnovych and Frants Silets'kyi arrived. From the neighboring reading club in Vaniovychi student Volodymyr Bobers'kyi together with villager Ivan Zvirzhyns'kyi and some others arrived." Thirty members registered at that meeting. The reading club was located in Hryts' Baida's house and subscribed to *Svoboda*, *Zoria* and *Postup*.⁵⁵

The report of the reading club for the year 1905 said that it included 30 men and 5 lads. All of these were literate. Membership dues were 50 cents, it had only 11 books and all these books were read gladly. *Zoria* was the villagers' favorite. There was also a store in the house of Il'ko Sarakhman. Pylyp Sagalo was chair and Nykolai Dunnyk secretary.⁵⁶ Nykolai Dunnyk could be a grandson of the only literate plenipotentiary of the village in the servitudes' issue of the 1860s. In 1906 the Central Executive of *Prosvita* sent to the village the second shipment of about 70 books (the first one was sent when the reading club was founded by Mykhas). This shipment was accompanied by a letter. The letter was retelling the history of Rus', which once was rich and mighty and now had to rebuild itself anew. The parallel was drawn between the history of Rus' and the history of Morozovychi's reading club. Books were sent because from the Sambir branch's report the Central Executive found that the reading club had only a few books.⁵⁷

In 1908 the reading club had 50 members; it was renting its store from another owner. The library possessed 81 books, but there was no choir, bank or granary.⁵⁸ The report for the year 1910 shows the following data. The chair of the reading club was Andrii Gada, vice-chair – Mykhailo Vovk and secretary – Vasyl' Sarakhman, son of Stefan, accountant – Hryts' Baida, and librarian – Vasyl' Sarakhman, son of Il'ko. Substitutes of the executive's members were Ivan Sagalo and Petro Sarakhman. The reading club consisted of 40 men, 14 women, 13 lads

⁵³ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3039, a.38.

⁵⁴ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3039, a.39.

⁵⁵ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, a.42.

⁵⁶ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, a.41.

⁵⁷ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, a.36-39.

⁵⁸ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, a.43.

and 17 girls, all of whom were literate. They met on Sundays and holidays, read books and newspapers, sung and played games. There were no performances and no circle of amateurs to prepare them. Reading club members read Pys'mo z Prosvity, Svoboda, Narodne Bahatstvo. The library had 107 books, four of which were acquired in the previous year (obviously four books from the *Prosvita* series). 139 books were borrowed in 1910 by 24 men, 5 women, 14 lads and 3 girls. Married members were paying 50 cents, lads – 40, and girls – 30, 40 members paid their dues in 1910 and 14 did not pay. The main source of the reading club's income was caroling, there was no separate building for the reading club, there were no other Ukrainian societies, but neither were there any Russophile or Polish societies. There was a one-class school with Ruthenian language of instruction; Ruthenian was also used by the community council.⁵⁹

There is also a protocol, rarely met in the documents, of one general meeting of the reading club in Morozovychi. On 9 January 1910 the reading club in Morozovychi had its general meeting. It was opened by Andrii Gada, who said that in 1909 the reading club developed poorly. Few new members came, of new acquisitions only Lives of Saints and festive pictures were bought, which consumed all the money of the reading club. Andri Gada proposed to elect Metodii Bobers'kyi, university student, as the chair of this meeting. (And Metodii Bobers'kyi was the alleged author of the brochure against Ivan Mykhas). There was also seminary student Myroslav Ripets'kyi as a delegate of the Sambir branch of *Prosvita*. The discussion made obvious that there was a problem in the use of reading club facilities by non-members. Ivan Sagalo said that older club members were complaining about children attending the reading club but not registering as members. He proposed that children, who do not pay membership dues, have no right to stay in the reading club. It also appears that by 1910 reading club recovered the building it originally had (since 1892), because the second proposed resolution was that “girls who want to party have to be members, for girls who are not members there is no place in the reading club. If non-members, lads and girls, want to dance in the reading club they have to pay for the floor and for the inconvenience of the reading club's members.”

Petro Sarakhman, son of Stefan, proposed for the non-members to pay 1 Krone for the floor. For this proposal to be accepted a roll-call vote had to be conducted because there were many non-members present in the hall. Dances could take place only till 11 PM. After this Metodii Bobers'kyi talked and there were minutes of his speech:

Chair Metodii Bobers'kyi knows the history of this reading club – no one comes to it. It is sad for all the farmers in Morozovychi and everyone had to realize the purpose of the reading club. The community is a great man, everyone should know that the reading club is also a community. [People]

⁵⁹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, a.2.

long ago realized the importance of the society, the speaker said that communities existed even before the Christ's birth. Contemporary communities are not anything other but the creation of that older kind of association. – The obligation of every adult is to be a member of the reading club... Our power lies in association if we all shall become organized – then we shall be in charge. In association we also learn to love our neighbor. We can help our brother and advise him. Let's learn love for the native land, for the native language. Than everyone who will dare to ridicule that language will be forced by us to respect our language. Other villages have nice houses, large libraries, people there get together and know how people live in the larger world. Let's act in such a way that we shall have no complaints like those we have heard today. If we are united we shall move forward. The speaker does not regret that Dr. Stakhura has not arrived, because if he came he would have to be ashamed of this – because as a neighbor he had to do something in this direction and help.⁶⁰

Sagalo after this was shouting against the community council, which did not care about the reading club. He said that last year there were 40 members while this year even some members of the executive had not paid their membership dues. This fragment allows us to look beyond the celebratory statistics of the society. We can see the difference between registered members and those paying membership dues, we can sense the feeling of insecurity and constant need to sustain the right development of the reading club, not to let it decay. In 1915 Russian troops stationed in the village demolished the reading club, using its timber as fuel. The building was built in 1882 (old tavern), was insured with *Slavia* (Prague-based insurance company, used by the Russophiles not willing to use Ukrainian *Dnister* – this must had been Ivan Mykhas's work) for 2000 Kronen.⁶¹

Unlike the one in Morozovychi the reading club in Mshanets' had no problems of continuity – a caring pastor, actively engaged in the community life, controlled its development. Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was also the author of all the reports from that reading club and its chair. In 1900 this reading club had 50 men, 4 women, and 3 lads. Half of the members were literate and half not. The reading club's library had 166 books and yearly volumes of older periodicals. Of them 120 were borrowed during the year. The peasants' favorites were Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, Abraham Lincoln, Horyt' (Fire), Calendars, Old Ruthenian Tales, Contempt of Honor, Brazilian Well-Being, Superstitions. This reading club was subscribing to Svoboda and the *Prosvita* series, while receiving for free Dilo, Hospodars'ka hazeta, and Misionar'. The first two were provided by the chair and the third by the District Council.⁶² Meetings took place on Sundays and holidays,

⁶⁰ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, a.44.

⁶¹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3890, a.48.

⁶² TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3928, a.14.

when either Rev. Zubryts'kyi or the secretary of the reading club would read aloud.

During the first years of the twentieth century there was no visible growth of that reading club. In 1902 there were 49 men, three women, and four lads (22 literate and 24 illiterate), 181 books, of which 200 were borrowed. The reading club subscribed to Svoboda and Zoria, while it had Dilo and Misionar' from the priest and cantor. The reading club was located in the private house of Aleksandr Dem'ianovs'kyi, which the members visited every day to borrow books and newspapers or for a talk. Larger meetings took place on Sundays and holidays when one person read aloud and others listened. "This year the improvement of the soil and drainage of the field were the most discussed topics." But the peasants did not decide to undertake either of these, fearing high costs and the chance of receiving a worse part of the drained field.⁶³

In 1908 the membership increased a bit – there were 60 members. The same number was for the year 1909.⁶⁴ The report from 1910 shows that the membership of the reading club increased to 103, and these were exclusively married men (35 literate and 68 illiterate). There were 130 books and 120 of them were borrowed during the year. The community council gave a separate house to the reading club but it still had to be registered under the reading club's name. That year the community store "Village Trade" and the "Reifeisen's Union" were supposed to be opened.⁶⁵

In Kul'chytsi Rustykal'ni the reading club was founded in 1907. The incentive to found this reading club was given by Rev. Dmytro Hordyns'kyi. It is an interesting thing that officially there was no division into Kul'chytsi Rustical and Kul'chytsi Shliakhets'ki – both parts of the village constituted a single administrative community. But, obviously, the petty gentry reading club was not open to the peasants. The petty gentry reading club already in 1905 had 37 men, three women, 13 lads and two girls among its members. Of these 56, only two were illiterate. The reading club subscribed to Postup and Svoboda and were receiving for free (perhaps, from the pastor) Dilo, Ruslan, Narodna Chasopys', Ekonomista, Rolnik. That reading club had also the History of Ukraine-Rus' by Barvins'kyi and almost all the books by the farming union. The chair of this club was Rev. Hordyns'kyi and in the executive petty gentry with the same surname – Kul'chyts'kyi.⁶⁶ In 1907 the newly founded reading club in peasant Kul'chytsi had among its members 22 men and six lads. Of these 28, 21 were literate. Its library had 90 books and was subscribing to Svoboda and Khliborob, for free they were

⁶³ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3928, a.15.

⁶⁴ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3928, a.21-22.

⁶⁵ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3928, a.23.

⁶⁶ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3250, a.35-37.

receiving Dilo and Ruslan.⁶⁷ In 1910 the rustical reading club had more than 100 books.⁶⁸

The minutes of this reading club's meeting shows that just as in the case of Vaniovychi and Morozovychi the son of the local pastor was trying to control the activity of the reading club. The minutes of the general meeting of this club were written by the seminarian Hryhorii Hordyns'kyi. Hryhorii Hordyns'kyi said that until recently Kul'chytsi Rustykal'ni "was considered to be one of the darkest communities" in the Sambir district:

Beneficent influences of the reading club manifested itself very soon, during the parliamentary elections, when all the citizens against old traditions gave their votes for their Ukrainian candidate, Rev. St. Onyshkevych. After this they became concerned with their own house.⁶⁹

After this speech farmer Hryhorii Kachmar thanked Rev. Hordyns'kyi and his son Teofil' for the work they had done. Teofil' answered with a speech reminding peasants that only in struggle "we can win for us some rights." The weapons in this struggle had to be – a school for the youth and a reading club for those older.⁷⁰

At the general meeting of *Prosvita* in 1908 Rev. Dmytro Hordyns'kyi claimed to have founded the two reading clubs in his village. However, "readers" sent a refutation showing that reading club in petty gentry's Kul'chytsi was created even before his arrival, and when the reading club in peasant Kul'chytsi was founded he was present only as a delegate of the Main Executive, and not one of the founders. The person sending this article was obviously very antagonistic to the group of clerical conservatives in the Sambir area. Another object of the correspondent's attack was Rev. Rabi, whom the author also accused of becoming Ukrainian only to be able to marry and now returning to the Poles.⁷¹

The reports from the Sambir and Saryi Sambir districts on the activities of reading clubs concentrate on the amateur performances, evenings dedicated to famous Ukrainian poets and writers. These performances, peasants' recitations, and, especially, peasant choirs singing in the reading clubs were intended to prove that the peasants indeed had become "cultured." On 28 April 1901, the reading club in Spas had a soirée dedicated to Taras Shevchenko. "Respected peasants-members of the club's executive" were reciting Shevchenko's poems by heart.⁷²

⁶⁷ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3250, a.42.

⁶⁸ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3250, a.43.

⁶⁹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3250, a.44-45.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Svoboda, 1908, no.29.

⁷² Svoboda, 1901, No.18.

In Vaniovychi in 1903 the daughter of the peasant Ivan Hryb read Rudans'kyi's poem "Another's child is not your own."⁷³

But besides, these "cultural" things, to which the reading clubs were expected to introduce and accustom peasants, there was something else. The successful reading clubs would become the centers of the community power field. We have plenty of proofs that at the beginning of the twentieth century reading clubs were not satisfied with a simply neutral attitude on the part of the community authority. They expected help for their organizations from the community administration and criticized, for example, Mykhnivets's mayor, who had expressed his position as: "I do not know how either to read or to write, and do not meddle with you."⁷⁴ Around the successful reading club an alliance of mayor, priest, and (in some cases) of the teacher would form. The successful reading club would determine the policy of the community council.

In 1908 in the Sambir district there were 87 communities and 49 reading clubs. They housed two choirs, two amateur drama circles, nine stores, two credit banks and two granaries. Kornalovychi was the only village with a reading club larger than 100 members and 200 books – it had 102 members and 210 books. Staryi Sambir district had 56 communities, 37 reading clubs, two amateur drama circles, eight stores and two credit banks. But there were three reading clubs with membership larger than 100 members – those in Lishnia (132), Posada (125) and Staryi Sambir (130).⁷⁵

In 1909 the Sambir branch reported the existence of 46 reading clubs and actions towards the founding of another seven. The list of the reading clubs looked as follows:⁷⁶

Table 8-3 "Reading Clubs of the Sambir *Prosvita's* Branch as of 1909"

Location and chair	Members	House	Library, books	Choir	Drama circle	Store	Notes
Babyna Stefan Tovranyts'kyi	80	com. ⁷⁷	214	–	–	–	Farming-industrial union, and wage-earners' union
Berehy Rev. Ivan Melnyk	20	com.	150	–	–	1	<i>Sich</i>
Berezhnytsia Ivan Berezhnytskyi - Popovych	52	com.	–	–	–	2 priv.	
Bilyna Mala	30	com.	100	–	–	–	

⁷³ Vanivs'kyi, "Z Sambirshchyny," *Svoboda*, 1903, No.3.

⁷⁴ "Z Mykhnivtsia," *Nova Sich*, 1906, No.30.

⁷⁵ "Chyital'ni tovarystva 'Prosvita'," *Dilo*, 1908, No.122.

⁷⁶ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4894, a.3-5.

⁷⁷ Com. – community's, priv. – private.

Ivan Kurynda							
Bilyna Velyka Rev. Petro Pohoretskyi	21	priv.	70	–	–	–	Trading union
Biskovychi Orest Inyshkevych	–	–	–	–	–	–	Founded this year from Ruthenian families ⁷⁸
Blazhiv Ivan Lagdan	–	–	–	–	–	–	Revived this year
Burchytsi Stari Kyvola Biliav							The club has declined
Vaniovychi I Osyp Simash Leskiv	78	priv.	218			2 priv.	<i>Sokol</i>
Vaniovychi II Sarakhman	80	priv.	64	–	1		<i>Sokol</i>
Vykoty Rev. Dmytro Bordun	85	own	151				Union for farming, trade and craft
Vil'shanyk Petro Ivanyna	30	priv.	80				
Volia blazhivska Mykhailo Pasichnyk	31	priv.	63				
Voityuchi Rev. Ivan Lieashevych	33	priv.	65				This village also had reading club of Kachkovskii society, Polish farming circle and credit union
Vytskovychi Iurko Pukas	74	own	130				
Holodivka and Mokriany Petro Bets	22	Priv.	115				
Hordynia shliakhotska Ivan Bylinskyi							Did not report this year
Horodyshe Petro Bilinskyi	25	com.	64				
Dorozhiv dolishnii Hryts Stetsiv	40	priv.	81				Two reading clubs of Kachkovskii society
Zvir Rev. Mykhailo Iuz'vak	30	priv.	126			Union	
Kornalovychi Mykola Hrushchak	35	priv.	250				
Kornychi Salamo Iurkiv	21	own	60			Union	
Krudelyky Steefan Savruts	44	priv.	64				
Kulchytsi Rustyka'l'ni Rev. Dmytro Hordynskyi	30	own	95			Union	<i>Sokol</i>

⁷⁸ The village had a Polish majority

Kulchytsi Shliakhotski Rev. Dmytro Hordynskii	70	own	135	1	1	1	<i>Sokol</i>
Luka Osyp Bilynskyi							Reading club of Kachkovskii society
Lukavytsi Ivan Luzykovich						Union	No report
Maksymovychi Osyp Terlet'skyi	15	priv.	94				
Manastyrets' Andrii Iurkovych							Has declined
Mistkovychi Stefan Ladanai	52	priv.	64			Club's own	<i>Sich</i>
Morozovychi Andrii Gada	54	com.	107				
Ortynychi Ilko Ortynskii	23	priv.					
Pyniany Vasyl Shtabura	60	com.	100			Union	<i>Sich</i>
P'ianovychi Maksym Vysotskyi		own					Has declined
Rohizna Ilko Boroda	20	priv.	50				
Sambir Rev. Mykhailo Iuziovyk	73	priv.	150				<i>Prosvita's</i> branch, Ruthenian Pedagogical Society, Village Farmer, Ruthenian Talk, People's Trade, People's House, <i>Sokol</i> .
Silets Rev. Dmytro Horodys'kyi	40	priv.	135				
Sikerchyski Pylp Hordynskiy							Has declined
Sprynia Hryts' Mytsak							No report
Stupnytsia Volodymyr Kryskiv	31	priv.	82				Saving Bank from Diet's Presidium
Torhanovychi Rev. Stefan Vityk	60	own	144			Club's own	<i>Sich</i>
Shade Ivan Nemirovskiy	58	own	168			Union	<i>Sich</i>
Cherkhava Ivan Turetskyi	33	com.	213			Union	
Chukov Hryts' Pak	30	own	40			Union	
Together	1500	9	3662	1	2	16	

In 1909 Oleksa Dukhovych died and Prosvita's network in the district started showing signs of instability. In 1910 six reading clubs were doing "very well," 13 – "more or less," 13 were "very weak," and 13 disappeared altogether. The total

membership reached 1395. Seven reading clubs were founded, but there was “no way to introduce them to life.” The only person working with the reading clubs at that time was the young student Les’ Ripets’kyi.⁷⁹ In 1909 the village of Nedił’na also decided to found a *Prosvita* reading club.⁸⁰ And this was obviously a political move – coming after the case of Nedił’na’s alleged defection to Roman-Catholicism. When in 1909 in Vaniovychi the second *Prosvita* reading club was founded at the request of Metodii Bobers’kyi, the pastor’s son, 24 peasants signed the petition, 11 in Cyrillic and 13 in Latin script.⁸¹

In 1910 a reading club was founded in Radlovychi, the village with which Ruthenian activists like Rev. Iosyf Lavrets’kyi and Rev. Kornylii Iavors’kyi experimented back in the 1870s. That reading club by 1914 had its own building built on the common pasture, a Reifeisen bank, saving bank, and workers’ union.⁸² This founding was also part of the offensive of *Prosvita* against the Russophile village. Before the *Prosvita* reading club was founded there, the village of Radlovychi had a Kachkovskii society reading club and a Russophile fire-fighting *druzhyina*.⁸³

In 1911 the *Prosvita* branch in Sambir got a new court councilor, Vasyl’ Okun’-Berezhans’kyi, from Olesnyts’kyi’s school in Stryi. There were festivities dedicated to Shashkevych’s anniversary – they took place in 34 communities and around 10,000 people participated in them. In 1912 the district had 57 reading clubs and six others were founded. There were 16 priests and 48 teachers belonging to the network of national-populists. The lack of women’s participation in the actions was noted as a problem and gap in the development of Ukrainian movement in the region.⁸⁴

Another problem was, as already mentioned, the polarization of the local Ukrainians into two camps – conservative-clerical and radical. The situation of classical national-democratic activists like Stakhura, trying to maintain some middle position, was not easy in such circumstances. In 1912 Stakhura wrote to the Central Executive of *Prosvita*:

The clergy is too hypersensitive to words of criticism, while the student youth in its speeches deliberately provokes the clergy and causes disorders at meetings. Peasants, in their turn, sit quietly and only listen: what is going to be the outcome, and till the very end they do not express their own

⁷⁹ Fylypchak, Pamiati Danyla Stakhury, 13.

⁸⁰ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.25, spr.2647.

⁸¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.25, spr.2126.

⁸² TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4675, a.22.

⁸³ VR LNB, f. Oleksandr Barvins’kyi, 626/p.59, a.116.

⁸⁴ Fylypchak, Pamiati Danyla Stakhury, 15.

opinion, so that from their behavior one cannot guess if they support the clergy or are against them... From their behavior it is hard to figure out if the Sambir peasantry is radical or national-democratic. And when the priests spoke sharply against the student youth, the peasants were not supporting them.⁸⁵

The Sambir branch's report from 1911 shows that the local branch saw its own problems clearly. In 1910 there was another meeting of invited people from the Sambir intelligentsia. They decided that "a circle should be organized from more intelligent forces from Sambir and the Sambir area, which would take upon itself the obligation of visiting reading clubs of *Prosvita* in the district in order to awaken national consciousness and spread enlightenment with speeches and talks."⁸⁶ To discuss the proposed changes in the statute of *Prosvita* on 26 May a council of reading club delegates and society members was called but only 15 reading clubs sent them: Berezhnytsia, the two reading clubs from Vaniovychi, Voiutychi, Vykoty, Vits'kovychi, Zvir, Hordynia Shliakhets'ka, Kulchysy Shliakhets'ki, Maksymovychi, Mistkovychi, Pyniany, Rohizno, Sambir, Stupnytsia. Also eight other society members were present. "Because of such a large absence of both reading club delegates and society members we needed steel nerves not to fall into apathy and continue our work on the elevation of enlightenment of our district."⁸⁷

Of 86 district's villages only half, 48 villages, were embraced by 49 reading clubs but even these villages "were far from being called villages truly organized in an enlightened way." Those blamed were the reading clubs' executives, which "do not try to understand (and in some villages do not want) the duties imposed on them by the statutes of *Prosvita*."⁸⁸ These reading clubs, except those in Voiutychi, Vykoty and Mistkovychi, had a miserably small number of members. The members were not paying membership dues. "Reading club executives were not paying the slightest attention to the libraries and were not trying to increase them..."⁸⁹

The oldest reading clubs in the district were Cherkhava (1882) and Berehy (1890). The youngest one was in Bykiv (1911). The highest membership dues were paying by one of the Vaniovychi reading clubs.⁹⁰ That reading club was also subscribing to the largest number of periodicals (7). Second place was shared by

⁸⁵ Ibid., 16.

⁸⁶ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4896, a.1.

⁸⁷ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4896, a.2.

⁸⁸ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4896, a.4.

⁸⁹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4896, a.3.

⁹⁰ I wonder if the existence of two reading clubs in Vaniovychi did not reflect the division of the village into more prosperous and poorer peasants.

Vykoty, Mistkovychi, Babyna and Sikerchytshi (5). Kornychi and P'ianovychi had the smallest number of periodicals (1). The largest number of women among their members was had by reading clubs in Mistkovychi (29) and in Morozovychi (18), the smallest number in Kul'chytsi Rustykal'ni (2), and there were no women in Dorozhiv, Kornychi and P'ianovychi.⁹¹ But the largest concern of the branch's leadership was with the work done in these communities. Courses for the illiterate were arranged only in Torhanovychi, and performances took place only in Ortynychy, Kul'chytsi Shliakhets'ki and Vaniovychi.⁹²

This was also the period when Rev. Bobers'kyi's son Metodii became active in the Sambir *Prosvita* branch. The chronic problems of the society could not be overcome till the beginning of the First World War. Reading clubs stubbornly did not want to develop autonomously and "normally." Constantly, up to half of the reading clubs were either in decline or on their way to decline. Nevertheless, this did not prevent the society from growth and boasting of successes. Perhaps such a situation was not unique and limited to the Sambir district only. In 1913 the branch reported already 57 reading clubs, of which eight were founded in 1912, 33 were developing well and 24 were in decline.⁹³

The central executive of the society was actually actively intervening into the affairs of Sambir branch. In 1909, when the central executive found that reading club in Lopushanka had been dissolved in 1904, the branch was reminded: "Taking into consideration that every abandoned position is for us a great national loss we request you to engage with this village."⁹⁴ In 1910 the central executive sent a letter to the branch in Sambir, which was expressing concerns with the development of the branch. The branch had existed for 19 years but the results were not remarkable; the central executive wanted to see more work done by the branch. Of 45 reading clubs listed under the Sambir branch only six were developing well, and 13 – "more or less." 26 were showing either very small signs of life or had declined totally. The central executive pointed towards the neighboring Rudky district, where the newly founded Komarnyky branch was far more successful in its activities.⁹⁵ Sometimes, the central executive would return founding documents of reading clubs sent by the Sambir branch. It happened in the case of the village of Kovenychi – there was no stamp of the branch on these documents, and all the signatures, including "crosses" were written by the same hand.⁹⁶

⁹¹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4896, a.13.

⁹² TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4896, a.8.

⁹³ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4896, a.10.

⁹⁴ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.152.

⁹⁵ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.155.

⁹⁶ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.161.

In April 1912, a meeting of the Sambir intelligentsia was called. The main concern of this meeting was raising the number of *Prosvita* members. The meeting decided to establish discounts for poorer peasants and for reading clubs with fewer than 20 members. It was also decided to establish mobile libraries, which could travel from village to village.⁹⁷ In 1912 reading clubs were founded in Mokriany, Lukovytsia, and in Radlovychi (the upper part of the village).⁹⁸ On the opening of the reading club in Radlovychi Danylo Stakhura and Ivan Hopishchak came as representatives of the branch's executive. Rev. Rabii and Dmytro Hanchars'kyi also came as representatives of the urban intelligentsia. 40 villagers registered, the executive was elected, *Svoboda* and *Osnova* subscribed to. The reading club was located in the house of Dmytro Skirka. Danylo Stakhura was afraid of making any predictions, because the first reading club founded in this village a year and half ago declined "because neither members not executive members were interested in the existence of that reading club." The chair of that reading club, Ivan Serednyts'kyi, a community scribe, did not want to report to the branch's executive. The new reading club was founded in a different part of the village (upper against lower was the usual division in mountainous and sub-mountainous villages). The initiative came from two newcomers – a certain Poznans'kyi and Naidiuk, who have seen how to conduct a reading club and perhaps would conduct it better.⁹⁹

Just before the war *Prosvita* embarked on founding its reading clubs in villages dominated by Russophile politics, villages that usually had in them reading clubs of the Kachkovskii society. In March 1912 a reading club was founded in the "katsapske village of Torchynovychi" and in the village of Novotychi, where the pastor was one of the "pillars of Russophilism," Rev. Vasyl'ii Skobel's'kyi. In this case "the initiative came from the villagers themselves."¹⁰⁰

Besides founding reading clubs, reviving them and trying to visit them from time to time, the Sambir branch did not do much else. In 1910 the Sambir *Prosvita* branch organized in Vykoty courses about credit and consumers' unions (the latter meant stores). Free housing and food for those enrolled were provided. There were 20 peasants from 16 to 42 years old. 18 of them passed the exam. The courses were in the organization and history of the cooperative movement, book-keeping and accounting in cooperatives, knowledge of goods, handwriting, farming, veterinary science, history, literature.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.216-17.

⁹⁸ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.223, 225-9.

⁹⁹ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.211.

¹⁰⁰ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.4892, a.213.

¹⁰¹ "Kurs dlia spilok kredytovykh i spozhyvchykh v Sambori," *Dilo*, 1910, No.154.

The Staryi Sambir district had fewer problems with continuity in the development of the reading clubs, but this was because of the tight control of priests-activists over their activity. We saw that this was the case in Mshanets'. Rev. Ivan Iavors'kyi in Stril'bychi dominated village life till the First World War. On the eve of the First World War he managed to have Ms. Lumbek, the local teacher, removed. She, allegedly, did not care at all about the school and led a dissolute life.¹⁰² When the branch of Prosvita was founded in Staryi Sambir in 1901 that branch included the following reading clubs: Volia Koblianska, Horodovychi, Liashky Murovani, Mshanets', Posada Dolishnia, Staryi Sambir, Strilkovychi, Strilky, Tershiv, Tysovets', Fel'shtyn – altogether 10 reading clubs. In 1910 the list of the reading clubs in Staryi Sambir district looked as follows:¹⁰³

Table 8-4 “Reading Clubs of the Staryi Sambir Prosvita-s Branch as of 1910”

Location, Chair	Members	House	Library	Choir	Drama Circle	Store	Notes
Busovys'ka, Iurko Toporivskyi	40	priv.	130				
Volia Koblians'ka, Volod. Dobrianskyi	79	own	62			1	
Horodovychi Senko Hal'chyn	70	own	250			1	
Koblo Stare, Rev. Iosyf Sabaran	28	priv.	88				
Koniv Rev. St. Tarasovs'kyi	75	priv.	90			1	
Lynyna Mala, Rev. Ivan Shevchyk	69	priv.	120			1	Reifeisen bank
Luzhok Horishnii Pavlo Dmytryshyn	103	priv.	80			1	
Liashky Murovani Rev. Vasyl' Olyvka	92	own	92		1	1	Village Farmer
Mshanets' Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi	103	own	130			1	Union Store Village Farmer
Nedilna Rev. A. Tryshkovskyi	74	priv.	75	1			Founded in 1909
Posada Dolishnia Dmytrii Torchynivskyi	200	own	83	1	1		
Staryi Sambir Rev. Danylo Lepkyi	120/56	own	106 184	1	1		
Strilbychi I	64	own	196			1	

¹⁰² Ivan Fylypchak, *Shkola v Strilbychakh*, 30, 33. This “dissoluteness” of the female teachers in village schools seems to be a recurrent trope of the contemporary discourse. In 1900 a 24 year old teacher in Kornlaovychi killed and tried to bury secretly her illegitimate child. - *Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobyci*, 1900, No.22.

¹⁰³ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.5263.

Rev. Ivan Iavors'kyi							
Strilbychi II Vasyl Kostur	56	priv.	104			1	
Strilky Vasyl' Labych	87	own	107			1	
Terlo Rev. Roman Komens'kyi	49	priv.	93	1	1		
Tershiv Rev. Leonard Shomeliar	100	own	10			1	
Tysovytsia Ivan Gerych	52	own	72				Founded in 1909
Turia Iosyf Plish	30	priv.					
Felshtyn Iosyf Shums'kyi	75	own	400			1	Credit union
Total	1560	11	2138	4	4	11	

If we compare this list of reading clubs with the one from Sambir district two things become obvious: first of all, the much higher percentage of clerical chairs of reading clubs in Staryi Sambir district and, secondly, the absence of community houses as the place where reading clubs were located in the village.

The history of the reading club in Staryi Sambir itself was as follows. It was founded in 1898 at the initiative of Rev. Teodor Krushyns'kyi.¹⁰⁴ The reading club founded in 1898 was, perhaps, a member of both the Kachkovskii society and *Prosvita*, but when the parish priest of Staryi Sambir became Rev. Danylo Lepkyi he expelled the reading club from the building of the Church Brotherhood and the Russophiles had to buy another one. The first chair of this new reading club affiliated only with the Kachkovskii society was Rev. Danyil Kutsii, pastor of Linyňa Velyka.¹⁰⁵

In 1908 the Staryi Sambir *Prosvita* reading club had 130 members: 50 men, 12 women, 32 lads and 26 girls, all of whom were literate. There was also a library of 70 volumes, and the reading club was subscribing to *Dilo*, *Ruslan*, *Svoboda*, *Osnova*, *Misionar'*, *Narodne Slovo*, *Hospodar*, and *Dzvinok*. More than 100 books were borrowed during the year.¹⁰⁶

In the Staryi Sambir district the main problem for the development of the network of *Prosvita* reading clubs was said to be the Russophilism of the priests. On 15 December 1907 a reading club was opened in Busovyska, the place where, according to tradition, the most powerful vampires lived. The impulse for this was given by the opening of a reading club in the neighboring village of Luzhok

¹⁰⁴ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, 5267, a.3.

¹⁰⁵ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.95, a.12.

¹⁰⁶ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, 5267, a.12.

Horishnii. Despite the fact that the local priest was against this reading club, Revs. Danylo Lepkyi and Onufrii Gadzevych from Stryi Sambir arrived for the opening together with their reading club's choir. Rev. Ivan Iavors'kyi came from Stril'bychi with his son, a student of law. Ivan Shevchuk came from Linya Mala, Rev. Kachmar from Sushytsia Rykova, Rev. Shemeliak from Tershiv, Dr. Sekelia from Stryi Sambir, and peasant delegates from *Prosvita* reading clubs in Luzhok Horishnii, Linya Velyka, and Posada.¹⁰⁷

The local *Prosvita* also provided a foundation from which all the other initiatives and organizations sprang. In 1909 Stakhura persuaded Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi to found a branch of the "Village Farmer" in Sambir.¹⁰⁸ The tables with the statistics of reading clubs also provide detailed information on other organizations attached to them. All the organizations attached to *Prosvita* reading clubs can be roughly divided into economic institutions and organizations and into sport and fire-fighting societies. The development of the network of these credit, agricultural, fire-fighting and other unions was represented as a means of survival: "We do not want the only way of salvation for the Ruthenian people to be running across the sea or death from starvation. We want to awaken a belief that with the help of union (*spilka*), by common forces, the misery can be fought successfully."¹⁰⁹

It was said that

a man, who finished village school can easily learn to keep the accounting books. And now our intelligentsia is so densely spread across the districts that every willing person can find someone to show him how to do deal with the books.¹¹⁰

The new cooperative institutions were supposed to provide a space for the activities of more enterprising peasants, they were the institutions allowing peasants to learn accounting, to engage into commerce,

The first economic society to penetrate the countryside successfully was the insurance company *Dnister*. We have seen its agents in the villages back in the 1880s. In 1893 the following were the delegates of *Dnister*: Nykolai Lashkevych, professor of the gymnasium in Sambir, Vinkentii Khlopets'kyi, an attorney, Rev. Frants Rabii, Rev. Aleksandr Nesterovych, Rev. Lev Kozanevych, vice-dean in Mistkovychi, Rev. Mykola Bobers'kyi, Rev. Iulian Chaikovs'kyi, Rev. Dmytro Bilyns'kyi in Bilyna, Rev. Ivan Drymalyk in Voloshcha; and the following were agents: Volodymyr Khlopets'kyi, an owner of real estate in Sambir, Rev. Severyn

¹⁰⁷ Narodovets', "Starosambirshchyna," *Osnova*, 1907, No.51.

¹⁰⁸ Ivan Fylypchak, *Pamiati Danyla Stakhury*, 12.

¹⁰⁹ Mykhailo Novakovs'kyi, *Spilky dlia oshchadnosti*, 3.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 22.

Polians'kyi in Mokriany, Rev. Andrii Detsko in Luka, Mykola Bilyns'kyi Tarasovych, tabular landowner from Bilyna.¹¹¹ It was said that in the 1890s the Sambir agent of *Dnister*, Doctor Khtsiuk, contributed to the involvement of local Ruthenian peasants into Ukrainian politics.¹¹² The insurance company, however, which brought small profits to its agents, was not meant to turn into some larger organization. But it is worth noting how dominated by clergy these profitable positions were.

In 1890 some kind of cooperative stores existed only in the following localities:

Sambir district: Hordynia, Luka, Prusy, Silets'

Stare Misto district: Turche

Turka district: Dydiova, Lokot'

Drohobych district: Dobrivliany, Horutsko (2), Krynysia, Luzhok Dolishnii (2), Letnia, Nahuievychi, Voroblevychi.¹¹³ In 1911 there were 35 various Ruthenian cooperatives in the Sambir court district alone.¹¹⁴ In 1910-1911 there also were Ukrainian credit unions in the Sambir district: in Babyna, Vykoty, Bilyna Velyka, Raitarovychi, Kornalovychi and Luka. At the same time there also were 12 Polish credit unions.¹¹⁵ All the Ukrainian credit unions were directed by priests.

Sokil was founded in Sambir on the initiative of Danylo Stakhura, well known to us by now. He addressed the *Sokil* executive in L'viv as early as 1902 asking for the statutes. In 1904 the first village organizations of *Sokil* were founded in Kul'chytsi and Vaniovychi. But *Sokil* itself remained unpopular among the villagers and was limited largely to towns. Among its 37 members in 1911 there were no peasants. Perhaps this is the reason why *Siches* subordinated to *Sokil* were founded. In 1912 the *Sich* committee was founded and united *Sich* organizations in the villages.¹¹⁶

In 1910 Stryi district had 40 branches of the *Sokil* society, L'viv district 37, while Sambir had only four and Stryi Sambir only one.¹¹⁷ But already in 1912 *Sich* and *Sokil* societies were reported in 18 communities of the Stryi Sambir district. There were 820 men and women in the *Sich* societies of the district. All of these were *Sich* societies from national-democracy. Stryi Sambir *Sich* used Cossack dress, while Mshanets' *Sich* created its uniform on the basis of the local clothing style; it had woolen jackets but Cossack headgear. The *Sich* in Mshanets' was

¹¹¹ *Chytal'nia*, 1893, No.11, 146.

¹¹² Stefan Uchma's memoir - BJ 9847 III, s.46.

¹¹³ "Nashi kramnytsi," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1890, No.1.

¹¹⁴ *Dilo*, 1911, No.5, 19.

¹¹⁵ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.25, spr.6099.

¹¹⁶ TsDIAuL, f.312, op.1, spr.616.

¹¹⁷ "Sokil's'ki Tovarystva," *Osnova*, 1909, No.1.

organized by Petro Zubryts'kyi, the son of Rev. Mykhailo. This *Sich* was “showing great discipline”; although farther from Staryi Sambir than any other *Sich* in the district, it always showed up for district events with all the members.¹¹⁸

In Mshanets' the *Sich* was founded in 1911 as branch of the *Sokil* society in L'viv. Among its founders figured Mykhailo's son Petro Zubryts'kyi as well as the following peasants: Mykhailo Parashchak, Ivan Gula, Ivan Zalishchak, Senko Dubyi, Teodor Hrytsyna, Ivan Sukhyi, Kyrylo and Ihnat Piznak, Mytro Petrychkevych, Iatsko Sen'kiv, Vasyl' Dzhurak, Andrii Gula, Teodor Vovkanych. All of these signed the founding minutes of the society themselves.¹¹⁹

It was said by the Russophiles that various Ukrainian sport and fire-fighting societies were used more for various skirmishes with their opponents than for the purpose declared in their statutes.¹²⁰ And it is clear that the boom in these organizations was occurring in the years immediately preceding the beginning of the First World War. This was also the period when frequent fights between the Russophile and Ukrainian peasants were reported. The example of this can be found in the village of Torchynovychi –located on the road from Sambir to Staryi Sambir, between Bachyna and Torhanovychi. It was said that the village of Torchynovychi till 1907 “was not infected by the Russophiles,” but in that year Rev. Hanasevych founded a reading club of the Kachkovskii society. After he left, Russophilism here was supported by Rev. Il'nyts'kyi with his sons. The Ukrainian orientation in the village was supported from neighboring Vaniovychi. In 1909 the following conflict was reported:

On the third day of the Christmas holidays three students from neighboring Vaniovychi came, and, visiting the store of Ivan Maksym, started, on the wish of those present there, to read them a nice story “Do Not Give Up To the Misfortune” (*Ne piddavaisia bid!*). For this a band under the leadership of Prots', the chair of the Kachkovskii reading club, attacked them and beat them up. Moreover a cart was sent from Rev. Il'nyts'kyi to Bachyna, which brought from there a gang of drunk Russophiles (*zapytykb katsapiv*). On the New Year Russophiles from Bachyna again organized an attack on Torchynovychi, and this time the Russophile Vas'ko Poliukha broke with a stone the skull of Sen'ko Koval'chak.¹²¹

An interesting glimpse into the Sambir countryside can be found in the memoirs of Andrii Chaikovs'kyi about the events of 1918 in the area. After Ukrainians took over L'viv and proclaimed the Western Ukrainian People's Republic he started preparing the takeover of Sambir. The city was Polish with suburbs settled

¹¹⁸ “Sokil's'kyi i Sichovi zdvyh,” *Dilo*, 1912, No.205.

¹¹⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.25, spr.7686.

¹²⁰ “Luka,” *Golos Naroda*, 1912, No.8.

¹²¹ “Vid Sambora,” *Dilo*, 1909, No.18.

by Polish peasants, and there was no Sambir regiment stationed in the city, therefore he went to the villages to recruit volunteers.¹²² He spent the night in his native village Zakuttia and in Hordynia, where he enjoyed great popularity. Then he moved to Kornalovychi, where the “*Prosvita* chair” was Mykola Hrushchak, his “*Kriegskamerad* [war buddy] from Bosnia.”¹²³ He also went to other villages, Sekerchysi and Bilyna in particular. Somehow he, and not Danylo Stakhura, was elected as a commissar of the republic. At first Staryi Sambir was taken without problem and then Sambir captured in a military encounter with local Polish forces. The Polish outpost here had to surrender.¹²⁴ From the village of Kornalovychi came Osyp Shkrumeliak, peasant son serving with artillery, who was promoted to *lehorunzhyi* for the battle near Nyzhankovychi.¹²⁵

But there were also problems which could be traced back to the pre-1914 period. The district commissariat had constant problems with neighboring Drohobych district “ruled” by social-democrat Semen Vityk, who refused to cooperate with them and even once arrested a Sambir official, a certain Plaskach.¹²⁶ There were also problems with the organization of the government in the villages: there were no candidates for village commissars and those wishing to govern were “unsure people.”¹²⁷ During the First World War the Russians exiled Stakhura to Simbirsk, then in 1918-1919 he was a mayor of Ukrainian Sambir, and then in 1919 he emigrated to Prague, where he spent the rest of his life.¹²⁸

Ukrainian and Russophile reading clubs were not the only ones existing in the Sambir area. Polish communities of the region were covered by the reading clubs of the Circle of People’s Schooling. Up to 1901 these reading clubs existed only in Biskovychi (lower part of the village), Sambir (lower town) and Chukva. In 1902 three reading clubs were founded – in Strilkovychi, Uhertsi, and Voiutychi. In 1904 five more were founded – in Dubrovka, Lanovychi, Nadyby, Sambir (middle town) and Stupnytsia (Polish part of the village). In 1905 reading clubs were founded in Maksymovychi and Volia Baranets’ka. In 1906 they were founded in Dubliany, Ol’shanyk, P’ianovychi and Radlovychi, in 1907 – in Novoshytsi, in 1908 – Biskovychi (upper part of the village), Kalyniv, Ol’shanyk, Rakova and Sambir, in 1909 – in Oleksevychi, in 1910 – in Hlyboka,

¹²² Andrii Chaikovs’kyi, *Chorni riadky. Moi spomyny za chas vid 1 lystopada 1918 do 13 travnia 1919* (L’viv: Chervona kalyna, 1930), 12.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 13.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 13-16.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 31.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 28, 64.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 81.

¹²⁸ Ivan Fylypchak, *Pamiati Danyla Stakhury*, 17.

Kornalovychi, Raitarovychi and Neudorf, and in 1911 – in Berestiany.¹²⁹ As we see, all the "Polish" villages of the region were covered by these reading clubs. But the numbers of the society's members in the regions were low. As of 1912 there were only 385 members.¹³⁰ Among them we meet a significant number of local landowners. Perhaps this fact would explain the relatively low membership of the society.

We should also remember that prior to the outbreak of the First World War *Prosvita* had never managed to monopolize the purely Ruthenian countryside either. Its most important competitor was the Kachkovskii society. As I have already mentioned the organization of *Prosvita* was superior to that of the Kachkovskii society. However, when we look at the numbers claimed by the Kachkovskii society the difference will not appear as too striking. In 1910 *Prosvita* had 2,323 reading clubs, and in 1907 the Kachkovskii society had 1,434.¹³¹

Many villages had two reading clubs – Ukrainian and Russophile. In Voloshcha the Kachkovskii society reading club had 160 members.¹³² Both societies tried to represent their supporters as the best part of the village and their opponents as scum. In Voloshcha it was said that young hooligans, "eternal students," were supporting the *Prosvita* reading club.¹³³ But the remarkable size of the society's membership in Voloshcha was, perhaps, the outcome of the 1911 "offensive" of the Russophiles, who, in connection with the parliamentary elections, tried to reinforce their influence. Back in 1906 in the village of Voloshcha with 1600 Ruthenians, the local pastor claimed to have eight subscribers to Russkoe Slovo.¹³⁴ In 1911 the peasant Bilyk from the village of Prusy, a center of Russophilism and the residence of the Russophile leader Rev. Skobel's'kyi, was reported to have said in pure Russian at the meeting of the Kachkovskii society that "the best weapon is the Russian book."¹³⁵

Saryi Sambir itself, even after Ukrainians took over the old building of the local reading club, remained a center of Russophilism. When in 1906 a Kachkovskii society reading club was opened in Sushytsia Rykova, seven carts with guests from Saryi Sambir came. That reading club had 50 members from the very

¹²⁹ Rozwój koła tow. szkoły ludowej w Samborze od założenia 2 czerwca 1894 i sprawozdanie za r.1911 przedłożone walnemu zgromadzeniu dnia 28 marca 1912 r. (Sambor: nakładem koła T.S.L., 1912).

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Potoczny, Op. cit., 161.

¹³² "Ot Luky," Russkoe Slovo, 1911, No.18.

¹³³ "Ot Sambora," Golos Naroda, 1911, No.16.

¹³⁴ "Ot Sambora," Russkoe Slovo, 1906, No.46.

¹³⁵ "Ot Sambora," Golos Naroda, 1911, No.8.

beginning, even though the local Ukrainian pastor was against it.¹³⁶ Mainych also had a Kachkovskii society reading club.¹³⁷

In Sambir itself on the eve of World War I, Russophiles controlled the “Ruthenian Casino,” the Kachkovskii Society branch, the society “Well-Being” (*Dobrobyt*), the bank of the *Ryżnytsia* society, the branch of the Prague-based *Slavia* insurance company and a girls’ boarding school. To compare, Ukrainian national democracy controlled *Prosvita* reading clubs and circles of the “Village Farmer,” village *Sokils* and *Siches*, the residence “School Help,” “The Girls’ Institute,” a kindergarten and the bank “People’s House.” The radical party, “small but lively,” tried to take over already existing institutions.¹³⁸

Sometimes even *Prosvita* reading clubs could turn into ones of the Kachkovskii society. When Rev. Henryk Polians’kyi came to the village of Paporotna, district Dobromyl’, he had found there a reading club on the *Prosvita* statutes, established by the administrator of that parish, Rev. Kul’chyts’kyi. But he persuaded local peasants to change this reading club into one of the Kachkovskii society.¹³⁹

In January, 1901 a reading club of the Kachkovskii society was founded in Luzhok Dol’nyi. On its festive opening all those most active in the society’s Sambir branch were gathered. The meeting was chaired by Rev. Vasylii Skobel’s’kyi from Prusy, the vice-chair was Rev. Ivan Livchak from Ozymyna Mala, the secretary – Dem’ian Zakharchyk from Lishnia. The local pastor Rev. Chyrnians’kyi spoke, and 84 members entered the reading club and paid their membership dues.¹⁴⁰ In 1901 a reading club was also opened in the village of Zارايسко, near Berehy.¹⁴¹

We cannot be sure, but it seems that this peak of the society’s activities around 1900 was connected with the chair of the Sambir branch in that period, the attorney Lukiian Humets’kyi.¹⁴² For 1900 we have more or less regular reports from the Sambir branch of the Kachkovskii society on its membership. Lists of those who paid membership dues for 1900 include peasants from Mistkovychi, Stupnytsia, Prusy, Berezhnytsia, Novotychi, Torchynovychi, Zارايسко, Dorozhiv (the largest number of members), Bukova, Radlovychi, Rakova, Berestiany (here the only reading club that paid membership dues was located), Strashevychi,

¹³⁶ Pen., “Ot Sambora,” *Russkoie Slovo*, 1906, No.8.

¹³⁷ “Ot Luky,” *Russkoie Slovo*, 1911, No.20.

¹³⁸ “Dopys' z Sambirshchyny,” *Ruslan*, 1913, No.11.

¹³⁹ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.63, a.9

¹⁴⁰ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.64, a.3.

¹⁴¹ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.65, a.20.

¹⁴² TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.70, a.5.

Kovynychi, and Bykiv. In total there were around 50 peasants.¹⁴³ Perhaps this is also a geography of Russophile influences in the district.

In 1906 Revs. Lev Shchavins'kyi (chair) and Illia Hmytryk (secretary) reported 207 members of the branch and 12 reading clubs – in Baranchytsi, Berestiany, Bukova, Zaisko, Luka, Prusy, Radlovychi, Raitarevychi, Rohizna, Sambir-Serednia, Staryi Sambir and Cherkhava. “What the number of members is in individual reading clubs the executive has no idea.”¹⁴⁴ A contemporary Polish official characterized Rev. Shchavins'kyi as “a Ruthenian who grew up on Polish culture, a man of honor, respected by the people.”¹⁴⁵

In 1908 another revitalization of the Kachkovskii society was attempted. It reported society members in the following locations, without specifying their numbers:¹⁴⁶ Babyna, Baranychi, Berehy, Blazhov, Viatskovychi, Kornychi, Hordynia, Koblo Stare, Koblians'ka Volia, Kul'chytsi, Mistkovychi, Olshanyk, Pianovychi, Torhanovychi, Torchynovychi, Cherkhava, Chukov, Bukova, Bylychi, Vovche, Bolozva, Tovarnia, Kunev, Chyshky, Liutovyska, Voiutychi, Nadyby, Vykoty, Humenets, Dubrovka, Liashky Murovani, Shumna, Rakova, Berestiany, Stara Sil', Zasadky, Sushytsia Velyka, Fulshtyn, Khyriv, Bilych Horishnii and Bilych Dolishnii, Zvir, Voloshynova, Lavriv, Luzhok Horishnii, Busovyska, Linya Velyka and Mala, Sprynia, Staryi Sambor, Strashevychi, Sushytsia Rykova, Tershiv, Spas, Bilyna Velyka, Bykiv, Voloshcha, Horodyshche, Dorozhov, Dubliany, Luka, Luzhok Dolishnii, Mokriany, Prusy, Silets', Stupnytsia, Tatary.

This revival was connected with the election of Staryi Sambir-based Dr. Iosyf Krushyns'kyi to the chair of the branch. We see that many villages from the Staryi Sambir district are mentioned.¹⁴⁷ Next year, in 1909, the first report from that branch for the 1900s providing the number of society members was sent to the Central Executive. That number was given as 311, but it was said that the number “is reported approximately, because there is no list of members anyhow, and the Central Executive, despite our numerous requests, has not sent the list from its book-keeping.”¹⁴⁸ One more time the branch started founding reading clubs – in Torchynovychi, Zaisko, Mistkovychi, Liutovyska, Tur'ia and Rakova. And we know that, for example, in Zaisko the reading club was already founded in 1901. Just as there was no evidence of exact membership, there was no evidence of reading clubs. In July 1907 the branch's executive reported that

¹⁴³ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.70, a.26.

¹⁴⁴ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.70, a.59.

¹⁴⁵ BJ, sygn.10038 IV.

¹⁴⁶ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.70, a.35.

¹⁴⁷ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.70, a.38.

¹⁴⁸ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.70, a.47.

About reading clubs, stores, credit banks in the branch's area the branch executive cannot give an accurate report. We know only that reading clubs exist and make more or less progress in the locations: Baranchytsi, Berestiany, Bilychi, Bykiv, Zraisko, Luka, Nadyby, Radlovychi, Raitarovychi, Rakova, Rohizno, Sambir, Sambir-Serednia, Staryi Sambir, Strashevychi and Cherkhava. About the founding of fire-fighting teams in the Sambir area nothing is known.¹⁴⁹

As we see, in 1907 in both Sambir and Staryi Sambir districts only 16 reading clubs of the Kachkovskii society were active, while we know that in 1908 there were 96 *Prosvita* reading clubs in these districts.

The largest concentration of the peasant members of the Kachkovskii society in the region, the village of Dorozhiv, witnessed the society's peasant membership constantly decreasing; in 1907 Rev. Maliarkevych reported that only 22 society members were left there.¹⁵⁰ While only a year ago, in 1906, this village with a population of 3,000 and four churches was reported to have 26 subscribers to Russkoe Slovo, and 30 members of the Kachkovskii society.¹⁵¹ The questionnaires from time to time distributed by the society's central executive were never filled out by the reading clubs from the Sambir area, and in general, answering these questionnaires was the exception rather than the rule.¹⁵² In July 1911 Rev. Hryhorii Hlibovyts'kyi sent membership dues from the Staryi Sambir district. There were two peasants who paid them in Hroziava, one in Bachyna, a priest and seven villagers from Strashevychi, reading club and three members from Staryi Sambir, one from Stara Ropa and one from Holovets'ko.¹⁵³

Although there were only few questionnaires filled by the reading clubs of the Kachkovskii society, there was one sent by the Ukrainian reading club, and making fun of the society. It was sent from the location "Cover Misery (*Prykeriy Bida*)" with postal office in "Green Bush (*Zelena Loza*)" belonging to the branch "Tavern." It was said to be founded "on the statutes of an elm tree at the time when oaks were getting green." The name of the reading club's chair was Antichrist and the name of one caring a lot about the reading club was *Antypko*, i.e., a devil. The last meeting was reported to have taken place during the Devil's marriage. The number of members during the founding was "00000000000000000000," and now it was reported to have reached "000000000000000000000000." There were periodicals – "Antoshko's letter and the rest from Hell," a dog's choir conducted by a donkey, and real estate – a reed

¹⁴⁹ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.70, a.48.

¹⁵⁰ TsDIAuL, f.182, op.1, spr.70, a.57.

¹⁵¹ "Iz Sambircshchyny," Russkoe Slovo, 1906, No.2.

¹⁵² TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.114.

¹⁵³ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.174, a.7-8.

registered to *Katsap* (derogative for a Russian). The rest of the answers were sustained in the same tone.¹⁵⁴

The village of Torchynovychi, where the local priest was an ardent supporter of Russophilism and where some fights were reported back in 1909, became the scene of more serious conflict in 1912 connected with the founding of a *Prosvita* reading club in that village. Rev. Il'nyts'kyi, the local pastor, organized the community council to condemn this initiative. The resolution of the council said that

Saver Dudivka, and especially, Mykhail Koval'chuk, by their demoralizing behavior – namely by drinking in time of Lent on the money brought by Dudivka from America, try to attract to them some people and to cause in the village, peaceful until now, discord and scandal.

Despite such a harsh resolution these two villagers founded the *Prosvita* reading club and scheduled a pompous opening for it on the 31st of March. Around 300 villagers incited by the priest went to the railway station in Vaniovychi to let not even a single Ukrainian in the village. Because no one showed up there, they went to the tavern to drink, despite the Lent, and watch out for strangers to pass by.

At the evening of that day the black hundred was notified that several people gathered in the store of Iatsko Penizhkevych¹⁵⁵ – because of this Iurko Poliuta started trumpeting the alarm and in several minutes a crowd of 500-600 people flocked to the house of Iatsko Penizhkevych – they started throwing stones and knocking out doors with stakes, shouting 'give us those *mazepists*.' Eight people locked in the house climbed under the roof and defended themselves for half an hour till the gendarme came and liberated them.¹⁵⁶

Nonetheless, the Russophiles were losing this battle. The battle itself was caused by the successful invasion by *Prosvita* of the former Russophiles' domain. The problems *Prosvita* had were not the sign of its weakness, rather of the opposite. *Prosvita* cared about knowing both the strong and weak sides of its reading club network, was constantly monitoring its development, cared about feedback and reacted to it. These were the characteristics of a viable organization lacking in the case of the Kachkovskii society.

In the 1890s-1900s when the Ukrainian movement in the region had a few secular activists, Russophile activists remained largely priests, with the attorney

¹⁵⁴ TsDIAuL, f.180, op.1, spr.181, a.16.

¹⁵⁵ We should remember that this store was mentioned already in 1909 as a site of Ukrainian activities.

¹⁵⁶ "Sambir," *Vpered*, 1912, No.17.

Humets'kyi being the only exception. The Russophile Ruthenian Council in 1891 had exclusively priests as its trusted persons in the regions we are interested in. Sambir district: Revs. Iliarii Dmytryk (catechist), Teodor Ripets'kyi, Lev Kozanevych (Mistkovychi), Ioann Maliarkevych (Dorozhiv), Ioann Drymalyk (Voloshcha), Iulian Chaikovs'kyi (Horodyshe); Staryi Sambir district: Revs. Voloshyns'kyi (Strashevychi), Shchavins'kyi (Stare Misto), Tuna (Liashky Murovani), Skorodyns'kyi (Sushytsia Rykova); Turka district: Revs. Prukhnys'kyi (Turka), Turchmanovych (Ripiany), Salamon (Komarnyky), Venhrynovych (Borynia), Izydor Pasizhyns'kyi (Zadil's'ko).¹⁵⁷

The Russophile orientation remained primarily conservative, and those “young Turks” with a radical social and political agenda never appeared among its leaders. Russophiles shared with the Polish conservative camp and Polish nationalists concern about the Ukrainians’ radical and socialist populism. They reported that in the Sambir region Rev. Onyshkevych’s agitators were promising to the peasants forests, pastures and landlords’ fields, pointing towards Russia, where the peasants allegedly took everything over and the tsar had to agree. Ukrainian agitators were also promising the right to keep firearms, abolition of taxes, pension plans for former soldiers and older peasants.¹⁵⁸ One of the older Russophiles, Nykola Antonevych was saying:

Reading clubs of *prosvita* [sic!] turned into hot beds (*vobnysbcha*) of radicalism and its relative socialism, they turned into nests of our *Sich* members, who know perfectly how to cut off the horsetails, pick the cabbage, demolish the fences and break the windows of their brothers.¹⁵⁹

But even among the clergy the hegemony of the Ukrainian orientation was being felt. A manuscript novel-like memoir of a certain Topil'nyts'ka, the widow of a clerk from Staryi Sambir and mother of a Russophile priest, describes the martyrology of her son the Russophile priest and the triumph of the Ukrainian orientation in the Staryi Sambir district. Her son, Vasyl' at first became an assistant in Ploske and already there encountered problems – the pastor of the parish to whom his church belonged was a Ukrainian (Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi). Topil'nyts'ka complains that Ukrainians were denouncing her son. The relationships between him and the local as well as provincial church leadership became especially aggravated after he talked in Russian at a party at his grandfather's place. Vasyl' would have liked to become a catechist in Staryi Sambir school, and he had the support of the district captain and school inspector, but Rev. Lepkyi, parish priest of Staryi Sambir, gave support to the

¹⁵⁷ TsDIAuL, f.196, op.1, spr.101, a.12.

¹⁵⁸ Nykolai Iv. Antonevych, *Nashe nynishnie polozhennia*, ch.1 (L'viv, 1907), 61.

¹⁵⁹ Nykolai Iv. Antonevych, *Nashe nynishnie polozhennia*, ch.2 (L'viv, 1910), 15-16.

Ukrainian candidate, Rev. Hadzevych. Rev. Levyts'kyi, the dean, was also of the Ukrainian orientation and sent him from Ploske, where he was an independent assistant, to Oriova, where he worked as an assistant for the Russophile priest Rev. Iamins'kyi.

Allegedly, the peasants from Ploske were bidding farewell to him with flowers and sang "You fell a victim of unequal struggle..." His audience with the Metropolitan only proved to him that all his problems were deriving from that Russian speech at his grandfather's place. Without a permanent position, burdened with a family for whom he could not provide a decent living, the man died in Tershiv. Those present at the burial in Tershiv were Russophiles from the Staryi Sambir district: Revs. Vasyl'kevych, Bylyns'kyi (Voloshynova), Kutsii (Lynyna), Stoialovs'kyi (Iavora), Polians'kyi (Holovets'ko), Skobel's'kyi (Losynets'), Kachmar (Sushytsia Rykova), Krupskiyi (Lomna).¹⁶⁰ We may note that the first two priests were those whom local Ukrainians characterized as cooperating with the district administration and Polish candidates.

An interesting thing is that despite all these tensions clearly visible already in the 1890s, in Sambir Ukrainians were able to accommodate the Russophiles in their own political organization for a long time. Only in 1911 did the Russophiles manage to create their own "Sambir regional council." The main moving force beyond it was Rev. Vasylii Skobel's'kyi. In it were also Revs. Shemerdiak and Perchynskii, the cantor Pelekhatyi and some other less known figures.¹⁶¹ This was also the year when the Russophiles started their "offensive" in the region in connection with the parliamentary elections, but in the end they lost them.

There were various kinds of Russophiles and some of them felt they had much in common with the Ukrainian orientation and Ukrainian project. One of these was Rev. Izydor Pasichyns'kyi, who had graduate from Drohobych gymnasium just before Franko did. He was the son of the parish priest from Zadiil's'ko in Turka district and a Ruthenian activist from the 1848 generation. His archive includes some ethnographic notes and an incredible amount of never published poems. He favored the founding of the reading clubs, and called for an agreement between Ukrainians and Russophiles. In his poems he was also praising Diet deputy Kost' Telishevs'kyi, a Ukrainian, and peasant deputy Iosyf Huryk, of Ukrainian orientation as well.¹⁶²

In 1908 Rev. Pasichyns'kyi thought of himself as a "hard" Ruthenian, but was against anyone calling him a "*katsap*" (pejorative designation of a Russian). He was answering the accusations of the Przemyśl-based newspaper *Selianska Rada*: "What I was born that I shall die // Without turning into something else." He

¹⁶⁰ LODA, f.1245, op.1, spr.28.

¹⁶¹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.25, spr.5400.

¹⁶² LODA, f.1245, op.3, spr.3.

protested against being called a *katsap*, but at the same time stated that Rus' is one, Great, White and Little, called Ukraine. But the very same year he expressed his dissatisfaction with the "hard foreheads" whom he had served for 40 years. They are lazy and do not care about the people.¹⁶³ Moreover, he liked Ukrainian organizations like *Sich* and wrote a poem dedicated to Kyrylo Tryliovs'kyi, "otaman of Cossack regiments."¹⁶⁴ In 1911 as well he wrote: "I am neither a *katsap*, nor Ukrainian // Ruthenian from my forefathers...."¹⁶⁵

In 1923, after the Ukrainian-Polish war, he became Ukrainian, but was writing to his "old Russian friends": "I love equally // Little Rus' and Ukraine... I am a son of the indivisible Rus' // Great and Little // Son of the free Ukraine // Which is not holy as well [as Rrus'] (*takozh ne sviato*)."¹⁶⁶ He was greatly impressed by the Ukrainian-Polish war and the heroism of the soldiers of the Ukrainian Galician Army. This war seems to be the event that made of him a Ukrainian; he praised the heroism of Ukrainian soldiers, who came from local poor peasant families, and wrote his first poems glorifying love of Ukraine.¹⁶⁷ During the Ukrainian-Polish war the commander of the Ukrainian gendarmerie in Fel'shtyn was a certain Shemerdiak, son of a Russophile priest, "respected by the Poles and hated by the Ukrainians," and the grandson of Rev. Vitoshyns'kyi, dean from Blozva.¹⁶⁸

However, not all the Russophiles could make such a transition to the Ukrainians, and even the Ukrainian-Polish war did not change their attitude. Rev. Kornylo Iavors'kyi, Lukiian's brother was saying in 1919:

Today everything is different – we are surrounded by Ukrainians, people foreign to us. All Ukrainians are fanatics and even chauvinists in their heads, they are going to grow and we to decrease. The old people have died, and the young have a different spirit, they are educated by different air; the consistory, the metropolitan, all are Ukrainians, even if not in spirit they pretend to be because it will pay off and is fashionable... There is no idea so stupid that it would not be accepted among Ruthenians... Ukrainians spit on history, spit on the script, spit on religion and rite, because the first accomplishment of the famous Ukrainian Parliament in Stanislaviv is the appropriation of land from the clergy, and the Ukrainian Khomyshyn introduces the new calendar.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶³ LODA, f.1245, op.3, spr.6, a.11-12

¹⁶⁴ LODA, f.1245, op.3, spr.6, a.27, 35.

¹⁶⁵ LODA, f.1245, op.3, spr.6, a.66.

¹⁶⁶ LODA, f.1245, op.3, spr.16.

¹⁶⁷ LODA, f.1245, op.3, spr.7, a.161-165.

¹⁶⁸ Ks. Józef Watulewicz, *Z pamiętników proboszcza łac. w Felsztynie. Skrzeszonych w latach wojny światowej 1914-1919* (Przemyśl, 1920), (odbitka z rocznika III T. P. N. w Przemyślu), 65.

¹⁶⁹ VR LNB, f.o/n, spr.3964, a.107, 111.

It seems that in this case the line between those who accepted Ukrainian identity and those who stayed with their Russian or Russophile one was also the line dividing those more radical and more sensitive to social problems from the conservatives, for whom the Ukrainian movement was not only about Ukraine, but also about radicalism/socialism/anarchism. To understand from where this attitude comes we should turn our attention to the social rhetoric of the Ukrainian discourse.

The Peasant Class

The main thesis of this section is that at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century in an attempt to become part of the modern world, the Ukrainian movement was successfully building the peasant class. There were attempts to articulate a new definition of the peasantry, emphasizing its position in the new mode of production, its importance to the society in general and to the Ukrainian nation in particular, and its class struggle with the landowning nobility, a struggle which, according to these articulations, was part of the dismantling of the old order. Peasant cultural and economic organizations were created, periodicals and books published, strikes organized and parties founded. All of the above was very different from the peasant actions in 1846, 1848 and at the beginning of the constitutional era. The representations of this new peasant class were actually created in opposition to the backward, ignorant, patient peasant burdened with the heritage of subject-dependency from the recent past. The peasant of these representations was also imagined as radically different from the authentic peasant bearer of the national tradition that was appearing in the representations of contemporary anthropology and ethnography. The new peasant was imagined as “civilized,” “organized,” “conscious” and well integrated into the capitalist economy.

This class formation is totally absent from the historical accounts. There are several reasons for that. First of all, most of those writing about the peasant class in Ukrainian Galicia were writing in the tradition of Soviet Marxist historiography, closed to the two “paradigmatic” shifts in the history-writing about classes: those inaugurated by E. P. Thompson’s The Making of the English Working Class, with the relocation of research focus from structures to relationships and experiences, and by Gareth Stedman Jones’ Language of Class: Studies in English Working-Class Formation, who turned researchers’ attention from the places of living, working and struggling to the language and representations of class. Another characteristic feature of Soviet Marxist historiography was its emphasis on the social differentiation of the peasantry, its deepening split into poor, middle and rich peasants – a feature and indicator of the development of capitalist relationships in the countryside. The peasantry in

this historiography was seen as a remnant of the feudal era which would eventually split into rural bourgeoisie and rural proletarians. In the meantime, while staying intact, the peasant class exhibited action and consciousness not somehow different from the feudal times (despite the fact that it was increasingly corroded by the developing capitalist relationships.) This attitude towards the peasantry was not limited to Soviet historiography alone.

Although there was a remarkable rethinking of the term “class” by historians in the context of Western social history, it was limited to works dealing with the working or middle class and very little was done on the peasantry. Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that western historians practicing social history were primarily interested in Western Europe and Northern America. They saw and described the decline and elimination of the peasantry, its inability to pursue the kind of sustained, purposeful, self-conscious and self-confident action that characterized working class movements.¹⁷⁰ While workers were facing and opposing the new hegemonic class – the bourgeoisie, peasants continued to wrestle with the marginal and obsolete landowning aristocracy. There was no dynamic change, no “process” in this struggle and the “relationships” of the peasants were far from central in the capitalist mode of production. While the working class was “making itself,” the rural poor from E. P. Thompson’s essays resort to traditional methods sanctified by custom to oppose the new political economy of capitalism.¹⁷¹

Another problem was that peasantry in general was seen as the domain of anthropologists rather than historians. It was analyzed in terms of particular relationship between the city and country and conceptualized in terms of being a stage in the development of humankind – occupying a middle position between primitive and modern societies.¹⁷² Quite often peasant society was used in opposition to class society, which supercedes it.¹⁷³ Surprisingly, something very similar could be observed in the Soviet case. In Soviet scholarship the peasantry was the foremost focus of ethnographic research and was seen as a true repository of traditional national culture. Ethnographic research on the peasantry

¹⁷⁰ See, for example, Eric J. Hobsbawm, “Peasant and Politics,” in *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, v.1, No.1, 1973. Perhaps, the only exception in this general trend has been the work of Teodor Shanin who stresses that certain counter-trends in the development of the capitalist economy, the significance of peasant communities and culture “made peasant cohesiveness as a potential basis for political class formation stronger than the predictions of the Russian Marxists or of the American strategists would have led us to believe.” Teodor Shanin, “Peasantry in Political Action,” in Teodor Shanin (ed.), *Peasants and Peasant Societies. Selected Readings* (Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987), 357.

¹⁷¹ Edward Palmer Thompson, *Customs in Common* (London: Merlin Press, 1991).

¹⁷² However, as Michael Kearney brilliantly showed, the peasantry by its very presence and vitality was undermining the anthropology of the peasantry. Michael Kearney, *Reconceptualizing the Peasantry/ Anthropology in Global Perspective* (Westview Press, 1996).

¹⁷³ Richard L. Rudolph (ed.), *European Peasant Family and Society: Historical Studies* (Liverpool, 1995).

was avoiding themes connected with the transformation of the peasantry. The new ethics and lifestyle of the socialist peasantry were not supposed to have much in common with the peasantry pauperized and torn by conflicts from the period of developing capitalism. The socialist peasantry was seen as the product of the socialist state rather than of its own transformation. The peasantry was never seen as a full-fledged match for the working class; it was not supposed to offer a viable and dignifying class identity.

Numerous volumes on class struggle in Galician countryside from 1800 to 1914 diligently avoided everything that could suggest the formation of a new rather than the dissolution of an old class. Concentrating on the incidence of resistance and violence as indicators of mounting class contradictions and the instability of the social system, researchers avoided the encounter with the language of class embedded and functioning in the social system, not just disrupting but also stabilizing it. One great shortcoming of this approach was the failure to notice and explain the difference between the Ukrainian peasantry in Galicia and the Ukrainian peasantry in the Russian Empire at the turn of the century, which was not, I believe, limited to the “level of national consciousness.”

Another reason for not noticing this class-formation lay in the particular circumstances in which it occurred. This formation was occurring in the context of the national movement, and the language of class in this case was intertwined with the language of nationalism. Those writing modern Ukrainian history either in the national or in class paradigm¹⁷⁴ shared the same assumption that nation and class were autonomous and antonymous principles of the organization of modern world. Having learned that even the most “independent” working class movements of the Western Europe were involved in the web of discourses on race, nation, state and gender, we can approach this interaction of social and national in the Ukrainian discourse in Habsburg Galicia from a new perspective, seeing it as “normal” and more modeled on Western European patterns than historians have ever been ready to acknowledge.

The class formation in question can be traced in various fields and in different ways. For those favoring economic explanations and explanations involving the structure of the relationships of production, there was a change in the peasant position in relation to the means of production – the transformation of peasant landholding into capitalist property. The change started with the legal separation of peasant landholdings from the landlords’ lands during the Theresian and Josephinian reforms and continued well into the 1860s, when all the limitations on the alienation of peasant landholdings were removed. These changes, in turn were accompanied by the integration of Galician peasants into the global market,

¹⁷⁴ For this see John-Paul Himka, “The National and the Social in the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-20: The Historiographical Agenda,” *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 34 (1994): 95-110.

especially felt in the 1870 and 1880s with the development of the Galician railway network.

These changes were inseparable from the changes in discourses about peasants and modes in which peasants were governed, integrated into the political and social system. We have also traced major landmarks in these changes – again from Enlightened Absolutism, through absolutism not that enlightened, to the revolutionary discourses of 1848, the liberal discourses of the 1860s, and up to the 1880s, when radical discourses concerned with the peasants appeared. Ruthenian politics and projects from the very beginning were interconnected with these shifts and, starting with the 1860s-1870s, attempts were made to develop specific Ruthenian policies targeting peasants. These were largely an answer to the disappointment with liberal politics and liberal capitalism and were considered in the chapter dealing with the politics of “paternalist populism.”

The immediate precursor to the Ukrainian discourses about the peasant class from the 1890s-1900s was the discourse of the 1880s analyzed in Chapter VI. The new generation that at that time entered Ruthenian politics saw its task as doing all in its power to cure the social body of nation, its peasantry. There were different approaches as well. Some of the intellectuals were using explicitly bodily imagery more, imagining the nation as an organism whose body was the peasantry, and others paid more attention to the dynamics of production and the structures in which the peasantry was exploited. But for both any further action had to be based on the study of that social body, policies had to be based on knowledge, on texts describing and classifying their object. Later, the taxonomy produced by that knowledge had to be used by the network of institutions and organizations which would inhabit the grid constructed by these knowledge-producing efforts.

It is important to remember that members of this new generation, those who believed in the importance of socio-economic factors, were not just radicals. Although immediately after its formation the Radical party was representing itself as the only defender of peasant interests and the medium for their voice, since 1899 it generally recognized that national democracy was also defending peasant interests and its role became limited to the anti-clerical wing of the more general Ukrainian peasant front. National democracy actually produced elaborations of peasant ideology from both more radical (Evhen Olesnyts'kyi) and more clerical (Rev. Tyt Voinarovs'kyi) wings.

The word “class” was used by Galician Ruthenians prior to the 1880s, but it was used in a liberal framework, when the goal of the politics was to make people’s action independent from their class background; equality was understood as the equality of individuals. Mykhailo Drahomanov was, perhaps, the first one to broach the idea of fostering “class consciousness.” He was the one who stated that the “national Ruthenian revival is impossible without the development of the

spirit of self-respect in the so-called simple class up to the consciousness that this is indeed an upper class, one on whose work everything is founded...¹⁷⁵

Drahomanov had also seen this activity as part of making Europeans from Galician Ruthenians. Remarking on the activities of the Radical Party in the 1890s he says that: "... even Galician peasants themselves are not what they used to be - in our gray peasants a European arises."¹⁷⁶ The development of class-consciousness, however, was just one component in the complex of projects of "modernizing" the Galician Ruthenian peasantry, the most important of which was, perhaps, their liberation from the traditional religion and church-based worldview by means of rationalism. The younger generation of Ukrainian activists grouped around them was getting acquainted (through Drahomanov's mediation as well as directly) with Marx, Lassalle, Proudhon, Darwin and Spenser. The class formation they propagated had always been intertwined with other projects of civilizing the peasantry, of making it European, of marching together with world civilization. This was something liberal paternalist priests from the 1860s and 1870s tried to achieve following the recipes of Benjamin Franklin, through the development of individual consciousness and capitalist ethics.

This confluence of different modern projects reaching out to the lower classes was not a unique Ukrainian invention. In the Polish case class consciousness of the peasants was also built simultaneously with a national one. Polish peasant activists recalled about the end of the nineteenth century: "Peasant class consciousness was being forged in me by Przyjaciół Ludu ("Friend of People"); Polak ("The Pole") at the same time developed patriotic feelings in me and showed the images of Poland's resurrection."¹⁷⁷

In the previous section we analyzed the fate of another important project from the 1880s: the creation of a public sphere in the countryside, resting upon the network of village reading clubs, a public sphere on which Ukrainian society in Galicia was supposed to rest. What was the relationship of peasant class formation with this public sphere? While some peasant activists saw this emerging public sphere as dominated by the Ukrainian intelligentsia and clergy (Ivan Mykhas) and felt that its aim was to control rather than to support peasants, in general this public sphere was the space in which the articulation and construction of the peasant class took place. Even radical peasants did not reject the system of the network of village reading clubs and rather tried to appropriate this space for themselves.

Class formation required different kinds of organizations than reading clubs, something more like trade-unions and cooperatives was required. This was

¹⁷⁵ Kruhlov, Drama intelektualne, 233.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 315.

¹⁷⁷ Jan Madejczyk, Wspomnienia (Warszawa: LSW, 1965).

stressed in 1910 by Evhen Olesnyts'kyi in his talk "How should our agricultural organization look?"

We were founding various societies from which farmers also were making use, but none of these was devoted exclusively to the peasants and their interests, none was fit for an organization, for the uniting of the whole breadmaking class into one single whole.¹⁷⁸

The organization "Village Farmer," for which Olesnyts'kyi was delivering this talk, and which published it in its series, was supposed to become such a peasant organization. The society "Village Farmer" by 1909 had more than 80 branches. In 1912 at a meeting in Staryi Sambir Rev. Iavors'kyi had a talk about "Village Farmer" as "the estate organization of the peasants." The peasants present there showed great interest, many entered the society immediately and representatives from eight villages took application forms and statutes to found the organization's circles in their villages.¹⁷⁹

"Agricultural Circles" dominated by the Poles were not good for the Ruthenian purpose, not only because they were Polish but also because they did not work as a disciplined class organization:

We need a different organization, our own, one that would organize all our peasantry (*khliborobstvo*) into one body, in one powerful, disciplined community, conscious of its goal. That is why from our breadmaking estate we should create one, united army, one powerful, disciplined military, because only this way can it reach power and importance.¹⁸⁰

While envisioning this kind of development Ukrainian activists were well aware of the difficulties and differences between the peasants and the workers: "Workers live in mass, together, while the peasantry is dispersed. We'll need more work to organize our peasantry in its own interest and to unite it into one mighty force."¹⁸¹ Similarly, Viacheslav Budzynovs'kyi, another representative of national democracy's left wing pointed towards the difficulties of organizing class action in the countryside and the advantageous position of urban workers in this respect.¹⁸² Because of these differences the network of village reading clubs was so

¹⁷⁸ Evhen Olesnyts'kyi, Iaka maie buty nasha ril'ncha orhanizatsiia? Promova na Zahaľnykh Zborakh filiï Tovarystva hospodarskoho "Sil's'kyi Hospodar" v Stanyslavovi (Biblioteka "Sil's'koho hospodaria" ch.5) (L'viv: z drukani I. Aikhnbel'rgera, 1910), 4.

¹⁷⁹ Hospodars'ka Chasopys', 1912, No.2.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 5.

¹⁸² Viacheslav Budzynovs'kyi, Khlops'kyi straik (Chernivtsi: nakladom redaktsyi narodnoi hazety "Pratsia," 1897), 8.

important. This network produced and sustained the space in which the class action of the peasantry could take place.

The peasant class was imagined as the class of small-scale agricultural producers, owning their farmsteads. While village reading clubs were creating a public sphere ideally turning peasants into the bourgeoisie's equals, knowledgeable and participating in critical discussion, class organization, which was supposed to provide Ukrainian politics with a peasant army cemented by class interest and disciplined by class consciousness, would bring to the peasants direct economic benefits. Olesnyts'kyi in his talk identifies two intertwined causes of the peasants' miserable living conditions: political and economic. While political causes were connected with the domination of the province by Polish great landowners whose economic as well as national interests were antagonistic to those of the peasants, economic causes were deriving from the domination of the economy in general by capitalist dealers:

Disorganized and powerless, our farmer must accept the price imposed on him by the purchaser; he has no importance on the market, no opportunity to define the price of what he has produced by hard labor and by the sweat of his brow; he is dependent on the enforced prices, which are imposed on him by the well-organized second-hand dealer.¹⁸³

Contrary to what has been written on the Galician peasantry, its class organization was imagined in opposition not so much to the world of great landowners but to the world of capitalist sharks. This aspect figures especially prominently in the right-wing conceptualizations of the peasantry influenced by Austrian Christian-Socialism (Rev. Tyt Voinarovs'kyi).

But even if influenced by Christian-Socialism, these conceptualizations remained part of the theoretical baggage of national democracy and were never accepted wholeheartedly by the Ukrainian Christian-Socialists, who remained a conservative-clerical group, too attached to the style of gentry-dominated politics they had learned in the first decades of Galician autonomy. In this respect Ukrainian Christian-Socialists were conserving the heritage of early Ukrainian national populists. The difference between these earlier national populists and later national democrats to a large extent lies in the exclusion/inclusion of this class component in their respective ideologies. It is also important to realize that in this respect there was no difference between national democracy and the radicals. Both shared basic ideas of how the peasantry should look and how this could be achieved. It is interesting that neither conceptualization of the peasantry and its place in modern world nor the pro-peasant practices of right-wing national-democrat Rev. Tyt Voinarovs'kyi were disputed by the Radical party. Only social democracy argued against it. Rev. Voinarovs'kyi was the one who

¹⁸³ Olesnyts'kyi, *Iaka maie buty nasha ril'nycha orhanizatsiia?*, 9.

elaborated most fully on the place of the peasantry in the capitalist economy, and, perhaps, considered himself to be a peasant ideologue. At the same time he was no socialist and, though not belonging to the clerical-conservative party, can be safely located on the right wing of the political spectrum of national democracy.

First of all, Rev. Voinarovs'kyi positioned himself in the camp of the "enemies of capitalism." For him capitalism represented the alienation of price from the process of production and deprived producers of the ability to control the establishment of the price. Capitalists establish the price, and the only thing that influences the process is capitalist competition, in which they engage "as wild beasts." Capitalists are represented as the parasites for whom the bulk of the society works. Voinarovs'kyi's capitalism is not an exceptionally modern mode of production; its appearances can be discerned in the most distant past and various rulers and law-makers tried to deal with it since the time of Moses. Nonetheless, modern economy in his work is seen as very original because of capitalism's virtual hegemony over it and the embodiment of capitalism's rules into the legal system supporting this economy.

For Rev. Voinarovs'kyi the biggest problem in capitalism was the alienation of labor, or to be more precise, the transformation of work into merely labor. According to Voinarovs'kyi, growing proletarianization is not going to remedy the situation. It brings only further alienation of work, and proletarians, once alienated, will never be able to bridge this gap back. Actually any kind of hired work means alienation and only work for oneself is free work and can bring true satisfaction.

But the power of Voinarovs'kyi's argument was not in the field of pure theory but in the popular appeal of his argument in the context of the local conditions of the peasantry. Rev. Voinarovs'kyi proposed an alternative to the doctrine of those who prophesied the proletarianization of peasantry, the development of large estate-farms and large-scale involvement of hired labor (the Prussian way). According to him this doctrine was anti-peasant; the peasantry was represented as an obstacle on the way to progress in agriculture. Rev. Voinarovs'kyi stated that the larger the estate the less productive it becomes: "concentration of production in agriculture is impossible." This line of thinking correlated very well with developments in Galician agriculture. Peasant households competed successfully with large estates, and while the latter concentrated on grain production for export, peasants monopolized cattle-raising and supplying food to local urban markets. According to Voinarovs'kyi, the substitution of peasant labor with hired labor would increase the price of agricultural products and make food an unaffordable luxury. Peasants could work for recompense much lower than that of urban workers only "because they work free, and aside from God do not know anyone else

above them, because they have become integrated with nature so much that when detached from it life loses all attraction for them.”¹⁸⁴

The peasantry was seen as a unique class able to preserve this free work bringing satisfaction and improving relationships between people in general in the midst of booming capitalist relationships. For Rev. Voinarovs’kyi the emancipatory struggle of the proletariat was not going to change the situation. The proletariat had been lured into the capitalist relationships: there was growing consumption and the desire for luxurious goods was apparent among the proletariat. The proletariat no longer (if ever) thought about free work and looked only for better paid work, shorter and easier. The contemporary social order and contemporary relations between workers and capitalists could not bring any final solution to the question of work.¹⁸⁵ Rev. Voinarovs’kyi was in favor of state intervention to restrain capitalists and build a just social system. According to Rev. Voinarovs’kyi, a separate solution of the agrarian question was impossible; it had to be part of a general transformation of social relationships.

This critique of capitalism appeared only after the peasantry en masse accepted basic capitalist teachings. It came after the period of great effort to overcome alleged peasant laziness, neglect of profit, lack of entrepreneurial skills and business attitudes. By the time Voinarovs’kyi was writing his texts, the production, consumption, and behavior patterns of peasants had changed as well as their mental map of the world. And this was in the new conditions in which the difference between peasants and others could be articulated and exploited by the national movement. Voinarovs’kyi’s language of class echoes some ideas advanced by early Galician socialists, Franko in particular. Back in the early 1880s Franko saw the task of socialism „to awaken, i. e. to advance labor and to give it more importance than capital.”¹⁸⁶

It is worth noting that Rev. Voinarovs’kyi in representing the peasantry as a class able to survive in capitalist conditions had stressed that the enemies of the peasantry were mainly capitalist mediators, who monopolized access to the market and were establishing their own prices. But at the same time Evhen Olesnyts’kyi, besides these capitalist mediators, had also identified Polish landlords as those preventing Ukrainian peasants from efficient action and exploiting them. This emphasis on the landlords as the most important peasant enemies was a characteristic feature of the representations by the Radical party and left-wing national populists. The double emphasis allowed the incorporation of both wealth poles of village communities: rich farmers (for whom sales of their production were of the foremost importance) and poor wage-laborers (for whom

¹⁸⁴ TsDIAuL, f.682, op.1, spr.67, a.10.

¹⁸⁵ TsDIAuL, f.682, op.1, spr.67, a.45.

¹⁸⁶ Bass and Kaspruk, *Ivan Franko*, 91.

of the foremost importance were payments for their work on the landlords' estates). The success was obvious on both fronts: great waves of agrarian strikes that erupted in the 1900s in the areas where landlords' grain-producing estates were concentrated forced landlords to raise wages and take into account peasant demands, while the mammoth network of cooperatives took over and handled both sales of agricultural products and goods consumed in the villages.

Something else should be noted about the selection and representation of the peasantry's enemies. The first anti-capitalist representation had anti-Semitic connotations, and the second one – anti-Polish. But the second one slipped from socio-economic discourse to racial and biological as easily as the first one: "When the estates with foreign, parasitic populations disappear, then we shall have no one and nothing to fight. This is our small ideal, and we have already done something for its realization."¹⁸⁷ At this point, on the intersection of discourses about class and nation the specificity and novelty of Ukrainian nationalism in comparison with the Ruthenian activities of 1848-1880 and in comparison with the mainstream Polish nationalism is clearly seen.

Agrarian strikes also show that the struggle against the landlords was conceptualized in a new way; the strike was a method peculiar to the capitalist formation. As examples of successful strike struggles, England and America were cited, and it was said that Galician peasants had the chance to reach the same kind of success. The capitalist economy endangered landlords' position even more than that of peasants:

If we did strike, the landlords would be in worse problems than factory-owners whose workers went on strike, because they would be threatened with much greater losses.¹⁸⁸

Besides strikes, boycott was propagated, and this time Ireland was given as an example. Galician peasants were provided with the example of people who suffered not less than Galician peasants but learned some lessons from that and now were struggling for the betterment of their lives.¹⁸⁹ Of course, this boycott, if applied, would be directed not so much against the landlords as against co-villagers.¹⁹⁰

In his brochure on strikes that appeared in 1897, the radical Viacheslav Budzynovs'kyi, who in 1899 would join the newly created national democracy, was charting the larger goals of the peasant struggle. First of all, these strikes had to be directed against the landlords, who would have not only to raise wages but

¹⁸⁷ Franko, "Khoma z sertsem i khoma bez sertsia," 22.

¹⁸⁸ Budzynovs'kyi, *Khlopskyi straik*, 24.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 32-42.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 43-49.

also yield to the community demands in the matters of using local resources such as water, forest and pasture. Secondly, peasants had to direct their struggle against the renters of state and church lands to make their enterprises unprofitable. Then both the state and the church would have to rent these lands to the peasants on much better terms. "In this way Ruthenian people can become *the owner of all the land in the province*!"¹⁹¹

Besides these social classes that were the enemies of the peasantry, Ukrainian ideologues pointed to the government and state as towards structures enabling the rule of the parasites:

If the landlords and the government are the same, then we can know once and for all that when the landlords are against us, the government will always help them and is not going to defend us from the landlords' injustices and swindles at the elections.¹⁹²

Galician agrarian strikes indeed erupted in the 1900s just as envisioned by Viacheslav Budzynovs'kyi at the end of the 1890s. The difference between these strikes and contemporary peasant upheavals that swept Romania and the European part of the Russian Empire at the beginning of the twentieth century lay in the absence of peasant organization in the case of the latter two. In Russia and Romania peasant disturbances resembled bloody peasant *Jacqueries*, like the one predicted by Drahomanov for Galicia and not occurring there. The action became a manifestation of peasant power and the triumph of the Ukrainian project. Moreover, the strikes showed the solidarity of peasants: wealthier peasants were supporting the strike, in which wage-earners were primarily interested. It seems that this was a manifestation of a new kind of solidarity, not one of the "traditional" peasant community but of the new peasant class.

After the first large-scale strike in Eastern Galicia occurred in 1902, the National Committee of national democracy requested from Viacheslav Budzynovs'kyi, the chief propagator of strike struggle, a separate book on this event. In his book Budzynovs'kyi took care to stress that this strike of poorer peasants working as wage laborers on the landlords' estates was supported by the rich peasants as well as by the Ruthenian intelligentsia. Significantly, he entitles his book not the "peasant strike" but the "Ruthenian strike."¹⁹³ He also says that

Rich peasants were against the strike only in the communities that are not nationally conscious and where they, because of national unconsciousness, thought that their interests are the same as interests of the landlords.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 49.

¹⁹² Budzynovs'kyi, *Khlopskyi straik*, 55.

¹⁹³ Viacheslav Budzynovskiy, *Ruskyi straik v 1902 rotsi* (L'viv: nakladom "Svobody," 1902), 9.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 10.

The rhetoric Ukrainian politicians and Ukrainian periodicals used during the strike of 1902 was one of struggle, sometimes bloody. Strikes ended with mass trials, which sentenced hundreds of peasants. Whatever the reason for the strike, in its representations it became inseparably connected with the Ukrainian national movement.

The Ukrainian national movement itself was eager to claim the strike as its accomplishment. It stated that these strikes were prepared by Budzynovs'kyi's publications from 1896-1897, by the articles in Svoboda and Hromads'kyi Holos, and by the discussion and resolution at the Congresses of the Radical Party (starting with 1897) and at the Congress of the National Democratic Party in 1901, when it was decided to start a mass strike in 1902. The first communities to strike were those with reading clubs and subscribing to Svoboda. It was also said that in the districts where Russkoe Slovo had greater influence than Svoboda, either no community (Zhovkva) or only a few communities (Brody) went on strike.¹⁹⁵ The Ukrainian movement also pointed out that only nationally conscious mayors and rich peasants were showing exemplary solidarity with the peasants on strike. Legal defense and economic help to the peasants participating in strike was organized by the National Committee.¹⁹⁶

The National Committee appealed to the rich peasants, saying that they

should remember that if peasants-wage earners do not stick with them, we will not achieve a decrease of taxes, will not achieve abolition of unjust payments and will not achieve cheap parcelation of the landlords' estates at the cost of the state.¹⁹⁷

In the aftermath of this first peasant strike Viacheslav Budzynovs'kyi also started publishing the series "Peasant Politics" (*Khlopska polityka*) intended to provide material on political questions that could be used by the organizers of peasant meetings and rallies, by averagely_educated peasants and used in agitation among less educated peasants.¹⁹⁸

After the strike of 1902 the Viceroy's Office decided to check what kind of influence Budzynovs'kyi's brochure had. It learned that Budzynovs'kyi's brochure „The Ruthenian Strike in the Year 1902” was distributed in great numbers among the communities and reading clubs. One captain reported:

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 80-81.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 85.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 95.

¹⁹⁸ Viacheslav Budzynovs'kyi, foreword to "Khlopskyi straik," in Khlopska polityka, series 1, t.1 (L'viv: z drukarni Narodovoï, 1902).

The brochures as I have confidentially checked are sent from L'viv to trusted people and Ruthenian reading clubs and people gathering there in great numbers in the evenings in winter time read them arduously.¹⁹⁹

Not only were peasant actions represented as a national concern, but peasants became part of the nation's symbolic representations. New peasant holidays, like that "of the ear of rye," were established and celebrated as national events.²⁰⁰ Peasants as a social group and various positive traits associated with being a peasant were celebrated as well. According to the national ideology, the independent position of peasants hindered them from being corrupted by power, and they were contrasted to those working in offices, bureaucrats and city folk in general.²⁰¹ Ivan Franko wrote the "Song of the Ruthenian Peasants-Radicals," in which the national liberation of Ukraine is connected with the work of the Ukrainian peasantry – independence was the miracle that would appear from the poor peasant huts.²⁰² Even in international conflicts Ukrainian periodicals sympathized more with those who were seen as more "peasant": this was the case with the Boers, who were seen as peasants and whose name was translated as "peasants."²⁰³

It is interesting that Polish governmental circles also played with the idea of peasant class interests and tried to use them against the Ukrainian movement. This discourse explained the impoverishment of agriculturalists by global trends. A brochure warned peasants against „agitators, students, attorneys and scribes” who were disturbing peasants and thought that the peasant was stupid. “The peasant has, as it is said, his own peasant reason, and although he does not have that bookish urban great education, he is not in any case stupid.” The peasant can be an educated and good farmer-agriculturalist “and God save us all our life from such “great” urban knowledge.”²⁰⁴ Peasants had their own good knowledge: about gardening, cattle and land, and with the acquiring of that knowledge only farming agricultural societies could help, no one else.²⁰⁵

Especially dangerous were *Prosvitas*:

¹⁹⁹ TsDIAuL, f.146, op.6, spr.108/4, a.185.

²⁰⁰ *Stanislavivs'ki Visty*, 1912, No.38.

²⁰¹ See for example the story about a woman visiting the post office, where no one responds to her greeting or offers her a seat, and so on. Mykhailo Iatskiv, "De pravda?," *Buduchnist'*, 1909, No.8-9.

²⁰² *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1900, No.2.

²⁰³ *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1900, No.5.

²⁰⁴ *Holos khliboroba selianyha, nakladom khliboroba Nykolaia P.* (L'viv: z drukarni Shchasnoho Bednarskoho), 10-11.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 12.

Prosvitas are led by the peasants, but although they themselves are farmers, they incite themselves so much to become deputies and care less about the well-being of their own village, or maybe they are content with the fact that they get something sometimes at the meetings and pretend to be very wise, and they want the stupid peasant to be even stupider because then they could command him even better; but among the wiser, and among gentlemen, they are stupid themselves.²⁰⁶

But by the end of this brochure it was clear that it tried to break the solidarity of peasant communities and appealed to the richer and older peasants. The brochure was explaining that it would be no good if only peasants were in the Diet.²⁰⁷ It argued against the democratization of the franchise: “this would be a catastrophe for the peasant, if a peasant-farmer had to vote together with the lad.” The lad would stop obeying the farmer then.²⁰⁸

General emphasis on the importance of the peasantry went hand in hand with peasants’ gaining a more prominent role in the accounts of national history. On one hand national history with a particular emphasis on the peasantry was used in political agitation and political brochures for the peasants. On the other hand the history of Ukrainian peasantry was written with the culmination in 1848, the year of emancipation. Ivan Franko himself in 1897 (the year of „the bloody Badeni elections”) finished the book “Serfdom and Its Abolition in Galicia,” whose purpose he described as follows: “For a long time I wished to present to our peasantry the history of the peasant estate, told clearly, accessibly and without too much [pseudo-]learning.”²⁰⁹

About the abolition of robot he wrote the following:

The more our people will attain the consciousness of their rights and interests, the more majestically will he celebrate the memory of the day which gave him the opportunity of development, gave him human and economic freedom.²¹⁰

Then followed the story of serfdom, which was presented as the enslavement of the peasantry by the nobility, accomplished with the support of state authorities through the legal system of the Polish state: “this was a terrible hell. And it was increasing not decreasing.” Cossacks and *haidamakas* in this new Ukrainian

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 13.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 13-4.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 16.

²⁰⁹ Ivan Franko, “Peredmova do pershoho vydannia “Panshchyna ta ii skasuvannia 1848 r. v Halychyni,”” in *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, t.47 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 8.

²¹⁰ Franko, “Panshchyna ta ii skasuvannia 1848 r. v Halychyni,” 8.

history appeared as defenders of the simple people and of the nation at the same time. It said that *haidamakas* “were persecuting landlords and Jews, tried to revenge the injustices of the oppressed people, to liberate Rus’ from the Polish noble order, and the Rus’ faith from contempt.”²¹¹ The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth failed because of the injustice against peasants that existed there.

Primitive rebels from the past, not only Cossacks (which became a quite respectable estate at the end) but especially *haidamakas* – peasant runaways and Zaporozhian Cossacks, social bandits of the eighteenth century – were those with whom Galician peasants started to identify themselves. At first the word *haidamaka* (which has definite negative connotations in Polish and is associated with banditry and bloody massacres) was used by Polish officials, politicians and publicists to label what they saw as radical tendencies of the Ukrainian movement. Polish discourse was quick to notice how different in this respect the Ukrainian movement was from the Russophiles: “The work of Ukrainians and radicals is different from the work of the supporters of Moscow, because if the latter were conspiring, the former started to work with the people, instruct them in their spirit and organize.”²¹²

This discourse was especially prominent in 1907, when the rapprochement between the Polish landowners and Russophiles was being prepared as grounded in their common opposition to the radical Ukrainian politics. Ukrainians were represented as those preparing revolutionary disturbances and unrest.²¹³ It was said that the Ukrainian movement was showing its real face, glorifying anarchism; even *Dilo* was said to have in its editorial board an admirer of anarchism (perhaps, Mykhailo Lozyns’kyi). The violent face of the Ukrainian movement allegedly was revealing itself in various bloody incidents such as those in the village of Topil’nytsia where at a meeting Russophile priests were beaten. It was also said that the logical Kroneing of the Ukrainian movement will be the anarchist ideal.²¹⁴ *Prosvita* reading clubs were said to have no other newspapers except the social-revolutionary and anarchist *Hromads’kyi Holos*, *Zemlia i Volia*, and *Svoboda*.²¹⁵

These representations of political conflict were turning eagerly to racialized explanations. Anarchism was seen as some inborn feature of the Ukrainian nation, seen throughout Ukrainian history and grounded in the fact that Ukrainians were the race of “steppe half-breeds,” for whom having no law was the best possible condition. While Russia had managed to destroy Cossack

²¹¹ “Khlopy i khlopska sprava,” *Bat’kivshchyna*, 1896, No.10.

²¹² “Polsko-ruskie stosunki,” *Prawda*, 1907, No.32.

²¹³ “Widmo anarchii ruskiej,” *Gazeta Narodowa*, 8.10.1907.

²¹⁴ “Hajdamacy-anarchiści,” *Gazeta Narodowa*, 14.09.1907.

²¹⁵ “Ucrainica,” *Dziennik Polski*, 30.09.1908.

anarchism it was allegedly showing up in Galicia, and Galician *Siches* were not different from the *Sich* of 1768. These explanations of the Ukrainian type were drawing on the views of Franciszek Rawita Gawroński.²¹⁶

A fascinating thing is that categories of these explanations were eagerly accepted by the Ukrainian movement and became part of the peasant self-identification. “We are *haidamaky*” became the idiom used in the songs written for *Sich* organizations and in the articles of Ukrainian newspapers; the social and anti-Polish connotations of this historical transparency made the word popular among Ukrainian peasant: even folk tales using it were recorded – the particular *haidamaky* attitude in one of these tales appears as a feature distinguishing Ruthenians from other nations.

Ruthenians have always been fighting; there were Cossacks and they fought, there were *opryshky* and they fought; and Ruthenians are called *haidamaky* because they do not allow others to spit into their meal and fight if needed. And Ruthenians will be *haidamaky* till the end of the world, because Jesus Christ appointed this to them.²¹⁷

The state administration, which preferred not to see the transformation of the peasantry and still viewed it as an ignorant and hard-to-control mass, was also stating that the peasants eagerly embrace historical roles of Cossacks and *haidamakas*. The captaincy in Nadvirna district preferred to see the *Siches* and Tryliovs'kyi's success thus: “Dark people... tell themselves... that to that society *Sich* will belong ‘Cossacks’ who on signal will rise to slaughter the Poles and Jews.” The rumors were largely spread by radical teachers in the area.²¹⁸

In this context the myth about the centuries-long era of serfdom and its abolition was created. Just as in the case of national myths this social myth belonged to the new kind of myths that were supposed to shape peasant experience. There was no natural continuous tradition of enmity to landlords, no continuity in the struggle against landlords, and no spontaneous commemoration of the abolition of serfdom. In most cases when peasants mentioned emancipation or their attitudes on the issue are reported, they seem to be concerned not with the alleviation which the abolition of robot brought, not with the abolition of their dependency on landlords, but with new methods of exploitation, with impoverishment and heavy taxes which seem to come after 1848. This attitude was a serious concern for the Ukrainian movement and was

²¹⁶ “Psychologia ukrainizmu,” *Głos Narodu*, 6.09.1912.

²¹⁷ Volodymyr Hnatiuk, “Halyts'ko-Rus'ki Narodni Liegandy,” *Etnohrafichnyi Zbirnyk*, t.12 (L'viv, 1902), 115. This is a tale about how different nations were going to free Jesus Christ on his way to Golgotha – some nations allegedly wanted to buy him out, others to steal him, and Ruthenians to fight to rescue him.

²¹⁸ *TsDIAuL*, f.146, op.8, spr.307, a.8.

sometimes used by its left wing: “1848 brought us shame, new slavery and exploitation.”²¹⁹

But in fact the servitudes cases were the last major issue in which the interests of the peasants physically crisscrossed those of the landlords. With the end of the servitudes cases, the estates became effectively separated from the communities and the conflict of interests was not easily visible: it had to be explained and demonstrated to the peasants. Moreover, with time, a nexus of common interests started to appear between both as representatives of agriculture (issues of taxes and regulations on the import and export of cattle and agriculture production). The anti-capitalist and pro-peasant discourse exemplified by Rev. Tyt Voinarovs'kyi correlates perfectly with this shift of the focus of peasant enmity. More or less self-sufficient and independent from the landlords, the farmers who constituted the bulk of peasant activists were interested in fighting those who were trying to monopolize trade and credit, regulate tariffs and taxes and not the landlords with whom they had nothing to do. (This does not mean, however, that they would not seize an opportunity to grab the landlords' land, if it came).

When peasants thought about the landlords' estates they were separating themselves not just from the landlords but from the whole population of the estate, which in fact suffered from these landlords the most. Proverbs said: “Every estate serviceman is a drunkard,” “Every estate servicewoman is a prostitute or drunkard,” “Every estate servicewoman is a prostitute.”²²⁰ The appearance of the anti-landlord folklore and statements was the work of movement. (The proverb “Where the community builds a church, the lord builds a tavern,” was remade from the old one: “Where God builds a church, the Devil builds a tavern.”)²²¹ The anti-landlord ideology of the Ukrainian movement was based not so much on everyday life conflicts as on the wish to undermine the Polish landowners' political hegemony.

As I have tried to show elsewhere in the thesis, there is very little reason to believe that in the popular mind Poles were connected with the landlords. Ruthenian Peasants when differentiating between various nations saw as a different nation not only Polish landlords but also Polish peasants – *mazury*. These *mazury* figure in all the folktales dealing with national character.²²²

Besides the link between the peasantry and the nation based on the fact that the peasantry was the new nation's most important material, there was also the link based on the fact that the nation project was a spatial project. The power of the national project was partly based on its territoriality; it was a spatial project which

²¹⁹ Mykhailo Lozyns'kyi, “S'viato svobody, chy nevoli?” *Hromads'kyi Holos*, 1901, No.21, 161.

²²⁰ Ivan Franko, “Halys'ko-Rus'ki Narodni Prypovidky,” *Etnohrafichnyi Zbirnyk*, t.16 (L'viv, 1905), 535.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 465.

²²² Ivan Franko, “Liudovi viruvannia na Pidhir'iu,” *Etnohrafichnyi Zbirnyk*, t.4 (L'viv, 1898), 201.

fitted perfectly well the idea of a modern state based on sovereignty over a certain territory. National project in this sense worked as a prospective national state claiming its right to monopolize politics and influence policies on certain territory. One of the most important differences between nation and class as organized social bodies is the fact that the former is concerned with space and the latter with place.²²³ But the place of peasants was the nation's space. The peasantry was a landholding class, holding as the individual property of its members the nation's sacred property. The continuous boundaries of a nation without a state were the boundaries of the land in the possession of its peasantry.

The nation constructed the link between its own territory and peasant landholdings. This link went not only from peasant landholdings up to the image of the wider motherland,²²⁴ but also from the nation's territory down to peasant plots: the peasants' property of land plots was allegedly making the land in general dear to peasants:

The laboring Ukrainian people went through 600-year-long serfdom-slavery, went through purgatory and hell, sprinkled their native land richly with tears, sweet and blood, and they did so only because that land was too precious for them and they wanted to hold it in their possession for any price.²²⁵

This possession of land guaranteed to the peasantry independence in production, and to the nation its survival. In the Ukrainian case the concern with *Nationalbesitzung* was a concern with maintaining land in the hands of the Ukrainian peasantry. Again, this was not a particular Ukrainian invention: the borders between nations in the nineteenth century were drawn as the borders between a land's autochthonous population, between villages.

All kinds of advice were published to show the peasants various methods of "how our peasants could remain on their plots."²²⁶ Land was said to be "our only treasure, the only source of the existence of our people." This concern with land can be found even in the anecdotes published by popular newspapers. An example of such a joke is the following. The catechist asks: "Tell me Davyhnyda [flea-crusher], why did Jacob marry two daughters of Laban?" Davyhnyda: „Perhaps, he wanted to get a couple more Joch of the land."²²⁷ There were good

²²³ David Harvey remarks: "Working-class movements are, in fact, generally better at organizing in and dominating place than they are at commanding space." David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity. An Enquiry into the Origin of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1990), 236.

²²⁴ For this model see footnotes 240-241 to Chapter 6 of this thesis.

²²⁵ Danylo Zhuravel', *Iak zemlia nasha staie ne nasha, bezplatnyi dodatok do "Novoho Slova" ch.97* (L'viv, peredruk z "Dila"), 17.

²²⁶ "Iak vderzhatys' nashym selianam na svoikh hruntakh," *Samopomich*, 1910, No.3.

²²⁷ *Osnova*, 1910, No.24.

reasons for the nation's concern with peasant landed property: in 1890-1900, 85,379 Polish peasants migrated from Western to Eastern Galicia; between 1900-1910 their number reached 93,292.²²⁸ This colonization was accompanied by discrimination against Ukrainian peasants in the parcelation of landlords' estates: of 276, 000 ha only 38, 000 ha became the property of the Ukrainian peasantry.²²⁹

The peasantry became central to the nation's self-representation. "The National-Ruthenian Catechism" by Hryhorii Vretsiona published in 1894 in the popular series of *Prosvita* had a section explaining "Why are the breadmakers the most important estate for us?" The explanation was simple: they constituted the majority of the Ukrainians, they had in their hands "vast expanses of land," they feed all other the estates and fill these other estates with new cadres.²³⁰

The existence of the peasantry was not seen as a hindrance to the nation's economic prosperity. The example of England was presented in this way: when serfdom was abolished there, peasants did not get the land and had to rent it from landlords. Better incomes were gained in the city, and this caused the majority of peasants to leave the land. Because of the lack of labor force landlords turned arable land into pastures. But now the English government was discussing a project to buy land from landlords and rent it at a cheap price to farmers.

In this way England wants to create an estate of peasants-breadmakers, because its government became convinced that one can manage some time without the peasant-breadmaker but the moment can come when the home-produced grain will become absolutely necessary and even the richest land can face famine.²³¹

But the future Ukrainian nation was not seen as a one-class nation either. Other classes were supposed to be born from the peasantry, but their birth in this case would be harmonious, only productive and needed classes would appear, the nation would get rid of parasites and avoid class conflict.

It is interesting that while the Russophiles continued appealing to the examples of England and America, Ukrainian National Democracy decided that it was building something different, their peasant Ukraine had to be less capitalist, and in the search of "peasant Eden" it was pointing towards Norway, Denmark, and, especially, New Zealand. While the first two historically had a strong peasantry the example of the last one was especially fascinating because it has landlords, "even greater than ours," but state legislation got rid of them. This brochure ended by saying that

²²⁸ Danylo Zhuravel', *Iak zemlia nasha staie ne nasha*, 15-16.

²²⁹ Pavlykovs'kyi, *Zemel'na sprava u Skhidnii Halychyni*.

²³⁰ Hryhorii Vretsiona, *Narodno-ruskii katekhizm* (Vydannia Prosvity kn.175) (L'viv, 1894), 31.

²³¹ "Khlopokii Hospodarstva v Anhlii," *Ruskoie Slovo*, 1907, No.23.

Only when there will be one Ruthenian national party, which will want to organize in Rus' an order like the one in New Zealand, when the whole Ruthenian nation will follow the voice of *Svoboda* and the "National Committee," when only candidates of the "National Committee" will become deputies from the Ruthenian districts, only then will we be able to constrain our oppressors to clear the Ruthenian house of exploitation and misery, just as it is cleared from the house of the New Zealander.²³²

Scandinavian lands were also praised because of the cooperative movement. Cooperation in general in Galicia was seen as an alternative to capitalism: "Cooperation lays mines under the foundation of contemporary capitalism, mines necessary for the future, molding at the same time cooperative ground of the new world for the new knighthood."²³³

Encouraging peasants to make profit, the cooperative movement used slogans like "Peasants, undertake sales of alcohol!"²³⁴ It seems that by that point the peasantry was seen as able to determine by itself what was healthy and appropriate and what was not. In 1909 among the 168 credit and 59 non-credit unions united in the Province's Union of Inspection (*Kraievyyi Soiuz Reviziinyi*) there were three non-credit unions from the Sambir district – the Russophile *Ryznytsia* in Sambir (a huge enterprise founded in 1893 with the shares held largely by priests) chaired by a priest and two unions chaired by peasants – one in Vykoty and one in Babyna (founded in 1907 and 1908), and only one credit union – the People's House in Sambir chaired by a priest.²³⁵ In 1911 there were already 17 credit and three other unions in the Stryi Sambir district (including one in Mshanets') and 20 unions and in the Sambir district of 415 unions in 12 court districts.²³⁶

Cooperation in the case of Galician Ukrainians was seen not only as means to improve the peasants' economic situation but to change the general world order: "Ideal and cooperation! In my imagination these two words intertwine harmoniously."²³⁷ Cooperatives, it was hoped, would form a system that would change the whole social order. An economic periodical explained that "as cooperative systems we define the direction, which in voluntary cooperation sees not only the means for carrying out certain improvements, but a whole program

²³² Viacheslav Budzynovs'kyi, "Khlopskyi rai v Novii Zelandii," in *Khlopska polityka*, series 1, t.1 (L'viv: z drukarni Narodovoï, 1902), 28.

²³³ Edward Milewski, *Sklepy społeczne* (Lwów, 1910), 205.

²³⁴ "Chy bratysia selianam do shynkarstva?," *Golos Truda*, 1910, No.1.

²³⁵ "Zvit Tovarystva 'Kraievyyi Soiuz Reviziinyi' u L'vovi," *Ekonomist*, 1909, No.1.

²³⁶ "Zvit z diial'nosti," *Ekonomist*, 1911, No.2.

²³⁷ V. A. Posse, "Idealy kooperatsii," *Ekonomist*, 1908, No.10.

of reform of the social order.” Ukrainian cooperation traced its origins back to Fourier and Owen, who “realized that with the help of voluntary unions people could be changed completely as well as the world.”²³⁸

With cooperation, and even without it, Ukrainians peasants in Galicia were improving their lives. These improvements, claimed by the national and peasant organizations as their accomplishments, entered textual representation together with depictions of peasant impoverishment and oppression, explained as the doing of the Polish landowners and the government controlled by them. It was because of them that the improvement was so slow and so unstable. In the last decades of the nineteenth century the agricultural advance of Galician peasants was seen in the decrease of the proportion of land used for common pasture and the increase of the land used for more progressive crops:²³⁹

Table 8-5 “Percentage of Land under Selected Cultures in Galicia in 1873-1893”

	1873-1883	1884-1893
common	18,44%	15,76%
clover	2,03%	4,07%
mixed and fodder	1,53%	2,16%

In 1886-1895 average harvests of wheat, rye, barley and oats were less than the average in Austria. But these were grown largely on the estates of great landholders. At the same time the average potato harvests in Eastern Galicia were 1.45 times higher than in Austria. The situation was similar with cabbage and hemp. All three crops were grown largely on peasant landholdings.²⁴⁰ Good farming was another way to save the nation’s most important resource, the land.²⁴¹ Peasants were encouraged to rent land and thus earn money for increasing their own property.²⁴²

Growing urban centers with better transportation provided an expanding and reliable market for the production of peasant households. Russophile priests were saying that “now our peasant women should not complain about the lack of income, their work has become so expensive that even in Paris and Vienna similar work is not paid better.” The author was giving examples of the prices for

²³⁸ “Koooperatyzm,” *Ekonomist*, 1908, No.7.

²³⁹ “Rozvii selians'kykh hospodarstv v skhidnii Halychyni 1848-1898,” *Ekonomist*, 1904, No.4.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, No.2.

²⁴¹ *Khliborob*, 1911, 41.

²⁴² “Shcho to iest' 'bohatstvo' i iak do neho doity?,” *Ekonomichnyi Listok*, 1910, no.8.

poultry, piglets, eggs and vegetables.²⁴³ It also became clear that Galician agriculture became an integral part of the world market. In 1907 a newspaper was warning peasants “because of the world deficit of cash to be more careful with debts.”²⁴⁴ While landlords’ estate concentrated on grain production, the cattle trade was almost exclusively in peasant hands. We saw Mykhas’s concerns with the regulations on trading and exporting cattle. Ruthenian pork monopolized the Viennese market, and Ukrainian deputies were lobbying for farmers’ interests in the parliament. In 1911 Evhen Olesnyts’kyi declared in parliament on the behalf of Ukrainian deputies: “We represent here agriculturalists, who constitute small landed property in eastern Galicia, those whose conditions are worse than those of the poorest industrial worker, and those who from all the sides and in all directions are exploited and are the last people that can be perceived as exploiters themselves.”²⁴⁵

The following table represents the situation with cattle-raising in the court districts around Sambir. In the numerator the numbers for village communities are given and in the denominator for the estates, including the cattle of the estate’s servants, foresters and other estate employees.²⁴⁶

Table 8-6 “Cattle Hold by Peasants and Estates in 1907 in the Sambir, Luka and Staryi Sambir court districts.”

Court District	Horses	Horned Cattle	Sheep	Pigs
Sambir	11923/1616	28499/4086	42/232	11210/1031
Luka	5052/435	9598/1059	14/58	2927/56
Staryi Sambir	4215/190	18925/757	3620/27	3495/168

At the end of the nineteenth century polemics erupted about the productive capacities of Ukrainian peasants. K. Soltan Abgarowicz from Dubenko near the town of Monastyrys’ka sent a letter to *Dilo* arguing that Ruthenian peasants did not know how to work. He cited the example of an entrepreneur who in his well was employing two Ruthenians instead of one Polish peasant, giving them the same salary only to make them used to such heavy but well-paid work. But no one stayed – some were leaving because of poor health, others continued to eat

²⁴³ “Babske hosodarstvo,” *Russkaia Rada*, 1906, No.8.

²⁴⁴ *Ekonomichnyi Listok*, 1907, No.7.

²⁴⁵ Evhen Olesnyts’kyi, *V oboroni khlopa-khliboroba. Promova vyholoshena 13 zhovtnia 1911 pry debati nad vnesenniam v spravi dorozhnechi* (Biblioteka Sil’s’koho hospodaria chyslo 17) (L’viv: nakladom “Sil’s’koho hospodaria”, 1911), 5.

²⁴⁶ o. Tyt Voinarovs’kyi, “V dili otvorennia hranyts’ dlia vvozu khudoby,” *Dilo*, 1907, No.214.

potatoes only and were getting sick, yet others were spending all their salary on drink. He also argued that estate servants in Eastern Galicia were working less than their counterparts in Russian Ukraine.²⁴⁷ In some way this argument followed one that developed in North America around Ruthenian immigrants, who were often accused of laziness, celebrating too much, and lacking proper work habits. In both cases the argument implied some racial inferiority of the Ruthenians.

Because of this the argument could not be left without an answer. It was answered by Syl'vestr Lepkyi (literary pseudonym Marko Murava), the author of popular publications, Greek-Catholic priest, the grandson of a peasant and son of village teachers, who had been living in the village since 1851. He was pointing to the difference in goals between a professional worker and a peasant. In the case of the peasant, any earning was in addition to his own farming. Even the poorest wage-earners among the villagers were renting several garden beds in the corner of the field, not relying on pure earnings: "Yes, this is not productive and it does not raise a professional worker, but is it harmful in a province with no demand for workers?" Moreover, Lepkyi showed that in grain-producing areas the agricultural labor of the Galician peasants was as productive as those of agricultural workers abroad. In the neighborhood of towns and in the forests productivity was lower because peasants were saving their strength for lighter work: "This demoralization is a simple economic calculation: 'one that goes slower will reach farther.'" If they indeed worked worse than other nations then no one would hire them to work seasonally in Hungary, Podillia and Romania.

He was also saying that emigration was caused not only by economic factors: "Here the same trend is visible as in Ireland: moral oppression is heavier than the economic one." Lighter work in the mountains did not mean a weaker race, to the contrary – it was producing a stronger type of people. They did not drink even half the vodka they used to drink 40 years ago. In Podillia during the harvest time that lasted only for two weeks peasants were said not to sleep at all. Peasants were working less on the estates simply because they were not well paid. While in the 1850s a servant-lad was receiving 30 Gulden, 720 sheaves of grain, a piglet, fuel, the right to keep his cow and calf on the pasture, from 0.5 to 1 Joch of garden and holiday presents, now he was supposed to work for 40-50 Gulden a year alone.²⁴⁸ The conclusion was simple – Ukrainian peasants in Galicia were not somehow inferior to the workers from other nations and races.

A particular image of the peasant was created in the discourse of the national movement, an image which peasants were expected to accept eagerly as a truthful reflection of themselves, an image that would become an integral part of peasant identity. As an example we can take the series of articles "Peasants and the

²⁴⁷ "Iak pratsiue nash selianyn?," *Dilo*, 1898, No.253.

²⁴⁸ [Syl'vestr Lepkyi] Marko Murava, "Iak pratsiue nash selianyn?," *Dilo*, 1898, No.273, 274, 275.

Peasant Cause,” which exemplifies the concept of the peasantry as developed by the national movement. The peasantry was defined as “the oldest, the most important and the most needed estate on Earth:”

If there was no peasant-agriculturalist people would not have anything to eat, the arable land would turn wild, there would be no one to pay taxes for general needs and provide recruits to the army....That is why peasants are the estate that [people] should respect very much and for whose well-being they should care.

The peasantry was presented as the backbone of civilization; peasants were the first settled element on whom human civilization developed:

Not a vagabond-Gypsy, nor a trader-Jew, nor even all kinds of lords, but the peasant-agriculturalist settles down on land, breeds there a family, makes it the fatherland for his children, on which he wants for himself and for his family divine and human teaching and a just order.

Peasants were described as those caring most about good public order and religion. It is said that peasants themselves divided the land in communities and introduced courts, were trying to get churches and provide schooling for their children. Peasants were taught that they were as human as gentlemen and they had to respect themselves. For clergy respect was also needed, but: “In your own house, in your land, in purely peasant affairs – you are masters and no one else!”²⁴⁹

Finally, it was said that Ukrainian peasants were more conscious than other strata of the Ukrainian nation. After the general elections of 1907, the radical newspaper Hromads'kyi Holos stated: “Just as in the villages consciousness and political reason stand very high, so in our towns stand horrible ignorance and oinkery [*kbrunistvo* – from *kbrun*’ – “oinker”].” It was said that with the exception of Ternopil’, townsmen in their “political development” stood where peasants were 20-30 years ago. The majority of our townsmen did not have any newspaper in their hands.” Ukrainian peasants were said to be more conscious than Polish peasants in Galicia. This was proven by the numbers of ballots given for the winning candidate. While in Polish districts of 330,000 votes 25,000 were given to the candidates that failed, in the Ukrainian case of 415,000 only 2,500 were “wasted.”²⁵⁰

There were also changes in the vocabulary used to talk about peasants. I have tried to analyze the rhetoric about peasants in the last decade of the nineteenth century; I was especially interested in the way the words *seliany* and *khlopy* were

²⁴⁹ “Khlopy i khlopska sprava,” Bat'kivshchyna, 1896, No. 7.

²⁵⁰ “Po vyborakh,” Hromads'kyi Holos, 1907, No. 43.

used. It appeared that the usage of the word *khlop* declined and it was universally replaced by the word *selianyn*. This change has several important aspects. First, the new term, which literally means *villager* is distinctly Ukrainian, different from Polish *chłop* and Russian *krest'ianin*. Secondly, the word has certain connotations which point to the peculiarities of the Ukrainian project. Certain regularities can be traced in the usage of *khlop* and *selianyn* at the time when they were used simultaneously. It appears that the word *khlop* was used when social difference and injustice were emphasized, while *selianyn* was used in connection with peasant dignity and political action. The term *khlop* went out of usage because of its connotations of backwardness, subject-dependency and lower status in general. *Khlop* was the peasant of the past, while *selianyn*, built on the same principle as the word "burger" and literally indicating a citizen from the village, was the peasant of future. The term *selianyn* also shows that the new class was built not for the sake of class struggle, but to protect corporate interests, to elevate this class' members.

The different image of peasants was visible not only in the texts produced by the Ukrainian project for internal consumption but also in its representations to the outside, in all kinds of manifestations and parades during which the nation was narrating itself to the outside. The struggling nation of the 1890s and 1900s little resembles the ethnographic repository of national virtues and cultural riches from the earlier period. While the visit of Archduke Rudolf and the transfer of the remains of Markiian Shashkevych to L'viv (1893) were staged as displays of ethnography, the Ruthenian pavilion at the Provincial Exhibition had two sections: ethnographic and organizational; and the centennial celebrations of Markiian Shashkevych's (1911)²⁵¹ and Taras Shevchenko's (1914) births turned into parades representing the organized nation. Peasants marched in detachments of nation-wide organizations. Instead of ethnographic costumes they were dressed in the uniforms of disciplined societies, and the focus of manifestations shifted from the liturgy to the performance of the participants' bodies and the body of participants.

When Archduke Rudolf was visiting Galicia, Ternopil' was the town where local Ukrainian activists were powerful enough to stage the greeting of the Archduke. The whole thing was organized largely by Oleksandr Barvins'kyi. Near the palace where Rudolf had to stay a peasant choir of more than 100 directed by Rev. Vitoshyns'kyi waited. As soon as the prince appeared on the balcony after checking in, he was greeted with a loud cry of *Slava*, and the choir performed the national anthem together with a cantata by Vakhnianyn. The singing allegedly

²⁵¹ For the reburial of Markiian Shashkevych in 1893 and Shashkevych's celebration of 1911, see Andriy Zayarnyuk, "Mapping *Halychyna*: Constructing the Ukrainian National Space in Habsburg Galicia," in Susan Ingram, Markus Reisenleitner, Cornelia Szabó-Knotik (eds.), *Identität/Kultur/Raum: Kulturelle Praktiken und die Ausbildung von Imagined Communities in Nordamerika und Zentraleuropa* (Wien: Turia+Kant, 2001), 123-140.

impressed everyone, especially the fact that it was performed by the villagers: “Not only the archduke and his closest circle, but countless people gathered there had an opportunity to convince themselves that our nation is capable of high cultural development. The choir consisted of 122 singers from 11 villages and Ternopil’ itself. The main core was formed by villagers from Denysiv (the village with the first reading club to join *Prosvita*), Kypchyntsi (famous for its involvement in national and, later, radical activities) and Vyshnivchyk.²⁵²

The next day the archduke attended the exhibition in the city garden, where Ukrainians staged an ethnographic show which was “giving on a small scale the true picture of the Ruthenian nation in Galicia, its mode of living, craft, farming and its culture in general.” Picturesque groups of peasants represented various ethnographic types of Ruthenian peasantry and were placed among the buildings representing respective groups. When the archduke finished visiting these groups from the side alley, the singing started and the procession of “harvest reapers” and “mowers” appeared singing. Then the ritual of harvest celebration (*obshyntyky*) was performed and interpreted for the archduke by Oleksandr Barvins’kyi himself.²⁵³

In 1914 the hundredth anniversary of Taras Shevchenko’s birth was celebrated with the greatest manifestation Ukrainians had ever had in L’viv. A similar complex of celebrations was held around the province. In Sambir a parade was organized on 10 May 1914. Shevchenko’s portraits were displayed in the windows of “Ukrainian homes.” Garlands with blue and yellow bands hung from the balconies and Ukrainian flags were waving on the roofs. The celebration started with the blessing of the flag of the Sambir *Sokol*. The Liturgy, served by Revs. Rabii, Petryk and Onyshkevych, followed. After the Liturgy, an orderly march, which included peasant cavalry, was organized through the city to the building of “People’s Trade.” On the building a plaque was dedicated with words from Shevchenko’s “Testament”: “Rise up and tear apart the chains.” Orchestras from the villages of Kalyniv (Kaiserdorf) and Berehy played, and delegations from other districts participated.²⁵⁴

After this the exercises of the *Sich* and *Sokol* societies were organized in the village of Pyniany. These exercises brought together 250 societies’ members and more than 3,000 people from around the district. There were *Sich* societies from Babyna, Pyniany, Vukoty, Kornalovychi and Kruzhyky. The petty gentry *Sokol* from Kul’chytsi represented itself as a cavalry detachment. The only missing district organization was the “independent” *Sich* from Berehy. Rev. Onyshkevych

²⁵² Oleksandr Barvins’kyi, *Spomyny z moho zhyttia*. Ch. I “(Obrazky z hromadians’koho i pys’menn’skoho rozvytku Rusyniv v 60-ykh rr. XIX st. z dodatkom perepysky St. Novakovycha, M. Lysenka i P. Kulisha)” (L’viv: Nakladom Iakova Orenshtaina v Kolomyi, 1912), 365-66.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, 368-370.

²⁵⁴ “Shevchenkove sviato v Sambori,” *Ruslan*, 1914, No.50.

blessed *Sich's* flag, and the societies marched to music to the reading club in Babyna, and further – to Kalyniv, where again there were performances and speeches.²⁵⁵

The peasant class was supposed to gain the sympathy of all progressive people and parties. Ukrainian National Democracy very often published articles from Polish socialist periodicals and from the speeches of Daszyński and Breiter. In the case of Mykhas we saw that peasant politicians quite often cooperated with the Polish peasant party, at least until Stapiński's compromise. It was stressed that they were fighting not the Polish nation but Polish landlords. Only closer to the beginning of the First World War, when the influence of the Polish National-Democracy was growing, were Ukrainian peasants said to be fighting not only against the landlords but against aggressive Polish nationalism, which tries to destroy the Ukrainian peasantry and colonize Ukrainian land.

At the end of his 1911 speech in the Viennese parliament Evhen Olesnyts'kyi said:

Our Ruthenian peasant-farmer is the poorest among poor. He is also a worker, but his work has no protection. He is deprived of organization, of means to protect his interests and advance step by step to the improvement of his condition. And this farmer, the kernel of our nation, this is our basis and foundation. In his development and his fate our hope lies and prospects for the better future, and it is our holy duty to stand on guard for [its] vital interests till the last drop of our blood.²⁵⁶

Radical students viewed peasants as lower class heroes struggling for a better future. Radical gymnasium students went to the villages, listened to peasant activists (these gymnasium students formed the core of the new generation of the Radical party, one that came into prominence in the interwar period). It is not an accident that many of those most active in the post-World-War-I struggle for Ukrainian independence had a radical background. The newspaper of gymnasium students published the following account of a student who went to the village to conduct agitation:

Then for the first time I saw the eyes of those going to struggle. ... A village house, short with small window-frames. The house was bent down to the ground, as sad as peasant fate. Through the open doors people crowded in. Their hands black and their figures crooked. But a fire was lit in their eyes – the hope for a better fate. And I hid my “uniform” under a peasant coat and watched and listened: for the first time I saw the eyes of those going to struggle.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁵ “Shevchenkiv's'ki sviata,” *Dilo*, 1914, No.83.

²⁵⁶ Olesnyts'kyi, *V oboroni khlopa-khliboroba*, 16.

²⁵⁷ R. K., “Try spomyny,” *Iskra*, 1903, No.2.

There is little doubt that the identification in the categories of nation and class was empowering peasants. Both categories were designating powerful social entities, action in the name of which was considered to be legitimate in modern world. National and class interests were identified and articulated, as well as links between these interests and problems Ukrainian peasants in Galicia encountered in their daily lives. On the other hand, besides creating space for effective collective action, these categories were restructuring national public sphere around single pole, turning it into structured space, where disciplining and homogenization was taking place, a space of power “generating forces, making them grow and ordering them, rather than one making them submit or destroying them.”²⁵⁸ The public sphere enabling groups to represent themselves, to state and negotiate their interests was collapsing into a frozen field where rather nominal group differences were preserved and subjected to rules “by which this sphere constructs itself as a unified entity.”²⁵⁹

On the one hand the Ukrainian movement was declaring its desire to get direct access to the peasants, to educate leaders from them, to make them capable of independent judgment. They were asked not to rely anymore on priests or intelligentsia but on themselves, not to be afraid of their lack of education: “Christ’s apostles also were not learned people.”²⁶⁰ In the Diet and in the Parliament peasant deputies appeared once more, this time in Ukrainian clubs. Peasant deputies were valued by the movement, invited to give talks when a particular need was felt for a peasant to appeal to other peasants. Stakhura, for example, invited peasant Diet deputy Iosyf Huryk to Sambir for this particular purpose, which testifies to the problems Sambir Ukrainians had with their peasant component.²⁶¹ On the other hand, the numbers of peasant deputies never reached those of 1848 for the Viennese parliament and of the 1860s for the Galician Diet; despite the fact that the word “peasant” and its poetic metaphors were used in Ukrainian newspapers more often than ever before or after this period, peasant correspondences disappeared from Ukrainian popular newspapers.

Sometimes the newspaper was excusing itself:

We ask our respected correspondents very much not to have grudge against us that we publish so few correspondences. Because of the hot pre-elections

²⁵⁸ Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality. V.1: An Introduction* (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), 136.

²⁵⁹ Harold Mach, “Phantasies of the Public Sphere: Rethinking the Habermas of Historians,” *The Journal of Modern History*, 72, March 2000, 166.

²⁶⁰ “Chest’, komu chest’,” *Svoboda*, 1897, No. 18.

²⁶¹ VR LNB, f.Zaklyns’ki, 298, p.41, a.1-2.

time we have too much work and a lot of necessary political material so that we cannot dedicate ourselves to correspondences.²⁶²

But in fact this was a stable trend and not a temporary one. The great difference is obvious between the 1880s and the 1890s. In 1896 in Bat'kivshchyna there were 19 correspondences published in 24 issues. 11 issues were without any correspondences at all. Of these 19 one was a report from a *Prosvita* branch meeting, one was a talk given on a city meeting, two correspondences were from the cities, and three reprinted from Dilo. Of the twelve left there was one for sure written by a teacher and another one by a priest. Thus in the whole year there were only ten correspondences sent from villages and possibly written by peasants. In this it differed greatly from Bat'kivshchyna in the 1880s, which included more than a hundred peasant correspondences per year. The newspaper Svoboda which replaced Bat'kivshchyna was characterized by a similar absence of peasant correspondences. A similar tendency could be observed in radical newspapers, in terms of the peasant correspondents neither Hromads'kyi Holos nor Khlopska Pravda ever matched the short-lived first radical newspaper for peasants, Khliborob.

The disappearance of the peasant correspondences, less concentration on local conflicts and local stories did not mean that the civilizational transformation of the villagers stopped or slowed down. To the contrary, a new, more formalized and ordered discursive field was changing not just the social and intellectual but also the material landscape of the villages rapidly and steadily. The new class had new living conditions, it was not supposed to preserve its old ethnographic ways. New kinds of entertainment were invented, new pleasures and desires entered into peasant communities. A modern life style was an integral part of the new consciousness:

In the house of our peasant instead of the earlier tawdry pictures of saints you'll find nice icons, you will find a table, a chest, a lamp, an icon and a bed nicely made. And what is more important, one will find in the village house a book, a newspaper, one, two, and three. The peasant who has books and newspapers knows how to value his honor, no one will dare to be rude with him [in original – *mudiaty i tykaty*] because everyone sees that he is enlightened, that he knows his rights and knows how to defend them.²⁶³

Enlightenment for the villagers was not only a means to better their life but also to change the perception of them by others. The presence of books and newspapers was a sign of civilization and Enlightenment, telling others that they are dealing with citizens conscious of their rights and not with dark pre-modern

²⁶² Svoboda, 1908, No.4.

²⁶³ Hromadianyn, "Davniishe a nyni," Russkoie Slovo, 1908, No.7.

beings.²⁶⁴ This representation of the nation to the outside was among the foremost concerns of the national project. Before the census of 1900, *Prosvita* published a brochure in the series of its popular publications explaining the goal of the census and stressing the importance of active participation in it – “otherwise a false and not the truthful condition of our nation at the end of the nineteenth century will appear before the world.” It also included advice on the procedure of the census, stressing who had the right to indicate the language used by family members.²⁶⁵

But not everything modern was equally welcome, only the production authorized by the national movement was encouraged, while the kitsch and mass culture penetrating villages were ridiculed in the national press: “Instead of the holy icons I saw in poor houses newspapers’ front pages, pages from fashion magazines and journals, etc., which might be thrown in the garbage by ‘gentlemen.’” In one house there was a picture on the wall with figures without any headgear holding their hands together around an apple tree with the legend: “Proletarians of all countries unite.” This was said to be in the house of an experienced farmer, a sexton who had served as a sergeant in Moravia. The farmer thought that these figures were saints, and the picture itself was bought from the local Jew for six Kreuzer.²⁶⁶

The transformation the peasantry underwent was not just about knowledge, enlightenment and not even about moralizing, it was also about acquiring the whole complex of “modern” attitudes. Perfectly in line with the argument of Philip Aries, the reformers were teaching peasants new attitude towards children, they pointed towards wise people who argued in favor of such an attitude and:

showed the great importance of the family education of children, and the first foundation of this education is the view that children are the same humans as adults, that children, their personal dignity and their needs should be respected to the same extent as those of adults, that only behaving with them mildly, sincerely, wisely, as with our equals, entering into their mode of thinking, we can raise them to be honest, sincere, truthful and truly free people.²⁶⁷

There were exemplary villages to which the Ruthenian movement referred, with community space reordered according to the new principles. One of them was

²⁶⁴ Ibid.

²⁶⁵ Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Pro spys liudnosity (konskryptsyyu)*. V dodatku “Staroruskkyi opovidannia” ch.V i VI (pererobiv Ivan Franko) (Vydannia Prosvity ch.245) (L'viv, 1900), 4, 11.

²⁶⁶ T. Bohachevskii, “Najbidnishii,” *Dilo*, 1900, No.21.

²⁶⁷ Ivan Franko, “Foreword” in Khrystyian G. Zal'tsman, (transl. by Teodor Bilen'kyi), *Knyzhka prykazok pro te, iak ne nalezhyt' sia povodyty sia z dit'my* (Vydannia Prosvity ch.243-244) (L'viv, 1900).

Voitytchi in the Sambir area. It was “nice and clean.” The village’s central street was named after Shashkevych during the hundredth anniversary of his birth in 1911. Down the street one finds a dairy processing 500 liters of milk daily.²⁶⁸ In the centre of the reformed village besides the church one will find the “community house” housing under one roof the reading club, community chancery, granary, and prison. There was supposed to be a community school nearby as well, and quite often these two new buildings were built on the spot where earlier the tavern stood. The common pasture in the village aside from its primary function now also fulfilled the role of an exercise field, on which members of either *Sich* or *Sokol* practiced. The transformation of the villages appears even more remarkable if we take into consideration the slow improvement of living conditions in the towns. Only in 1908 did Sambir get electricity and sewage in some parts of the town.²⁶⁹

New peasant songs about peasants and the nation appeared, full of metaphors and epithets directly taken from the discourse on the peasantry of the Ukrainian project: “Our fate is bound up with the election, we should stand firmly, // Not sell our right and morality for sausage. // Peasant power and customs are from the peasant himself.”²⁷⁰ The new peasant was invented simultaneously with the Ukrainian, the properties of the peasant class had to become part of every peasant’s individual identity: “The land will stay and the plot will not perish // And no one will overthrow a peasant from peasant status (*khlopa z khlopa ne skyne*).”²⁷¹ “Not in a rich gentleman’s palace // Our ancestors-heroes were born. // Under a peasant roof Rus’ was christening them // And Ruthenian might [is] in peasant hands!”²⁷²

Ivan Sanduliak, well known to us, wrote “The Peasant Carol,” which was published in *Hromads’kyi holos* in 1900 and used the melody from the popular carol “Wondrous News.” The wondrous news of this carol was “the awakening of the peasant class from the sleep.” The carol orders:

Let’s everywhere make strikes for the lords and boycotts for the oinkers’ //
Let the *szlachta* know that Rus’ is not dying yet // It sends its radical
deputies to the diet // To the diet, to the parliament and to the district
council: // Do not let them [take] your bread and already cooked food
from your mouth! // ... So that the Cossack spirit is renewed among us //
That the echo will be heard from the Sian to the Kuban’.

²⁶⁸ Vandrivnyi, “Dopys’ z Sambirshchyny,” *Ruslan*, 1912, No.184.

²⁶⁹ “Dopys’ z Sambora,” *Ruslan*, 1908, No.99.

²⁷⁰ *Hromads’kyi Holos*, 1900, No.8

²⁷¹ *Khliborob*, 1911, 35.

²⁷² *Khliborob*, 1911, 35.

The ideas in this carol common to the Ukrainian national movement were followed by a specific Radical agenda: “And you ‘Missionary’ get on your feet and run from // Because we love God but you not in the least. // And you, Jesuits (*pozquity*) go to Rome to warm yourselves, // Do not grind horseradish under our noses, we are not your children.”²⁷³ Perhaps, this was the first Christmas carol using nationalist themes and concerned with contemporary politics; the practice would be widespread in the interwar period. In 1907, during the struggle for universal male franchise, the first patriotic Christmas carols were published, in which the self-characterization *baidamaka* was proudly used.²⁷⁴

Besides all this radicalism, the ideology of the newly formed peasant class emphasized political action and participation in parliamentary politics. In 1905 a peasant meeting in L’viv organized by the Radical party signed a letter “from Ukrainian peasants of Galicia to the peasants-deputies of the State *Duma* (parliament) in Petersburg.” The letter said: “We have figured out that peasants-breadmakers of all the states of the whole world should know each other and strive to mutual solidarity, at least of the kind that exists among industrial workers of the civilized world.”²⁷⁵ The letter expressed special concern with rumors that the peasant deputies in Russia were ready to forget about political matters, concentrating on the agrarian question. “One should fight for political freedom and only then can a better economy come.”²⁷⁶

Parallel to these parliamentary politics was a concern with the growing powers of the state. For the Ukrainians it became clear that the state in the modern world is controlled by those in control of the state apparatus, and having the Poles dominating the state administration in Galicia was said to be not much different from having there a Polish state.²⁷⁷ Budzynovs’kyi argued that despite all the successes of the Ukrainian movement Poles were closer than ever to the elimination of Ruthenians in Galicia; having developed a strong administration, they acquired all the necessary means for large-scale Polonization of Eastern Galicia. The polonized administration was ready to proclaim Galicia a “Polish kingdom.”²⁷⁸

Budzynovs’kyi warned those misled by the “advance” of the Ruthenian movement, those who believed that nothing can destroy the Ruthenians, who survived centuries of the Tatar, Polish and Russian yoke:

²⁷³ *Khlopska pravda*, 1903, No. 1, 2-3.

²⁷⁴ *Svoboda*, 1907, No.1.

²⁷⁵ TsDIAuL, f.663,op.1, spr.179, a.288.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, a.213-14.

²⁷⁷ Budzynovs’kyi, *Khlopska polityka*, t.3, 104.

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 110-118.

Not our days but our hours are counted. Examples from history, namely from the times of Poland, do not mean anything, because back then there were totally different conditions and turns in the development of nations, and there were no contemporary means to destroy nations.²⁷⁹

Now the Poles, according to Budzynovs'kyi, "had received at their disposal the power of the European state machine."²⁸⁰

What for the development of the organic world is the work of the sun's light and heat, so now for the cultural development of nations is the work of the power of the state. This light, this heat of the nation's sun now shines only for the Poles, warms only the Poles. We are developing without the sun's heat and light and therefore must vegetate and die uselessly without achieving maturity.²⁸¹

Education was under Polish control, and despite all the efforts to enlighten the Ukrainian peasantry, Polish peasants had better access to high schools and Poles had more students of peasant origin. While the absolute number of Ruthenian students will grow, their relative number will decline if compared with Polish students.²⁸² Similarly with the land – the uneven distribution of the fiscal burden, the privileging of Western Galicia in melioration, river regulation, road construction, will lead to the decline of the Ruthenian peasantry and improvement of the living conditions of the Polish one:

Even if not a single Ruthenian will allow himself to be Polonized, the Ruthenian land will become Polonized. This will happen simply because nowadays land is a commodity that does not possess its own national consciousness or national resistance.²⁸³

The link between class and race in nineteenth century discourses has been noted by many scholars. Benedict Anderson saw modern racism as originating from the racist theories of the nobility, and thus basically anti-modern and different from nationalism. On the other hand, Eric Hobsbawm, who would not deny the racist connections of modern nationalism, also speaks about the appearance of theories of "*biological* class superiority" connected with the nineteenth century

²⁷⁹ Budzynovs'kyi, *Khlopska polityka*, t.4, 3.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., t.4, 4.

²⁸¹ Ibid., t.4, 6-7.

²⁸² Ibid., t.4, 15-19.

²⁸³ Ibid., t.4, 84.

bourgeoisie's class formation: "From master to master-race was thus only a short step."²⁸⁴ Hobsbawm believes that nineteenth century racism

is perhaps best explained as a mechanism by means of which a fundamentally inegalitarian society based upon a fundamentally egalitarian ideology rationalized its inequalities, and attempted to justify and defend those privileges which the democracy implicit in its institutions must inevitably challenge. Liberalism had no logical defense against equality and democracy, so the illogical barrier of race was erected: science itself, liberalism's trump card, could prove that men were *not* equal.²⁸⁵

The Ukrainian case seems to indicate that race was looming large in the representations of both nation and class. Both were increasingly seen as the sites in which "power is situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population."²⁸⁶ Both were laying claims to exercise "power to *foster* life or disavow it to the point of death."²⁸⁷ We saw this concern with survival and bodily images in our analysis of the 1880s. With class representations of the 1900s it was not different.

The Ukrainian discourse claimed that the "peasantry with its vitality and healthy organism revives all other social strata. And not only among us, but in every nation, the healthiest cohort of intelligentsia comes from the peasant estate."²⁸⁸ Moreover, the Ukrainian peasantry by now was better from all others from this racial point of view, the belatedness of the Ukrainian nation-formation had its advantages:

The German peasant is a leftover, a remnant from the birth pool of the German race. Everything that was more interesting, energetic, intelligent already long ago transferred to *Bürgertum*.

The Ruthenian peasantry is an unopened reservoir in which the elements that had risen from it in other old nations still ferment.²⁸⁹

Racial representations in the Ukrainian case seem to be tightly connected with modern social science and the modern understanding of national and class differences, differences that help to bound spaces optimal for the exercise of the life-giving and life-taking projects of modern political power. Racism was the

²⁸⁴ Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Capital: 1848-1875* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976), 248.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 268.

²⁸⁶ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, v.1: "An Introduction," 137.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 138.

²⁸⁸ "Tak zemlia staie nenasha," *Dilo*, 1912, No.87.

²⁸⁹ Ia. O-s'kyi, "Z podorozhi po Halychyni. Kinematohrafichni znymky," *Dilo*, 1913, No.59.

logical consequence of the discourses and strategies employed by the Ukrainian project.

But this racial foundation of the discourses on class and nation, race being understood as a social construction of difference creating spaces for the exercise of bio-power, also meant that the formation of nation and class was accompanied by a profound fear to land on the wrong side of the constructed boundary. The same text which stated the importance of the peasantry as a resource of biologically healthy forces, expressed this fear in calculations that three fifths of the Ukrainian peasants in Galicia were “proletarians” and only 20.19% corresponded to the condition designated by German word “Bauer.”²⁹⁰

Ivan Bylyna recalled his own traumatic experience as a gymnasium student of peasant origin trying to come to terms with the peasant part of his identity. The student’s imagination was oscillating between the class pride of descending from natural men living in harmony and the fear of degeneracy, the possible consequence of the alcoholism and syphilis plaguing the Galician countryside.²⁹¹ This schizophrenic experience led him later to fight against all expressions of uncritical populism. He criticized, for example, Oleksa Prystai for his idealization of peasant life and exaggeration of the discrimination against peasants.²⁹² The case of Ivan Bylyna, gymnasium teacher and officer of the Ukrainian army in 1918-1919, testifies to the power of the representations discussed. It also indicates the connection between them and the genocides that took place in Galicia in the 1940s, but to discuss this connection in more detail means to go chronologically and thematically beyond the scope of this thesis.

Dealing with Petty Gentry

I would also like to say several words on how the Ukrainian movement in the 1900s was solving the problem of the petty gentry and its uneasy relationships with the peasant class. In all the chapters of this thesis the petty gentry and its uneasy position vis-à-vis the Ruthenian movement and Ruthenian peasants have been considered. From the very beginning of the constitutional era the Polish camp tried to criticize the Ruthenian movement using the petty gentry. As early as 1861 a letter from the petty gentry from the village of Horodyshche criticizing Ruthenian Diet deputies was published.²⁹³ Reacting sharply to this letter, the Ruthenian movement at the same time laid its claim to the petty gentry.²⁹⁴

²⁹⁰ “Tak zemlia staie nenasha,” *Dilo*, 1912, No.87.

²⁹¹ Ivan Bylyna, *Moja spovid'* (Ternopil': Buduchnist', 1928).

²⁹² VR LNB, f. o/n, spr.4036.

²⁹³ Mykhail Kropyva, “Iz Ozymyny, blyz Horodyshcha kolo Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1861, No.10.

²⁹⁴ “Iz Sambora,” *Slovo*, 1861, No.10.

Chapter VI showed that during what one might call the “turn to the social,” the Ukrainian national movement proposed a solution which said that the petty gentry was part of the peasant class, its interests were the same as those of the bulk of Ukrainian peasantry. On the other hand we also know that at the beginning of the twentieth century there was an Association of the Ruthenian Gentry in Galicia which worked with the petty gentry and was allied with clerical-conservative wing of the national movement.²⁹⁵ I would like to finish this section with a short consideration of how the petty gentry was dealt with in the 1900s by the Ukrainian movement.

The Association of the Ruthenian Gentry in Galicia was founded in 1907, but commenting on its founding the Polish newspaper *Czas* said about the petty gentry that “the older ones even now consider themselves to be Poles of the Ruthenian rite, the whole youth, however, belongs to the Ukrainian party.”²⁹⁶ The founding of this Association was the accomplishment of Rev. Petro Pohorets’kyi, himself of petty gentry origin, and the parish priest in the petty gentry village of Bilyna Velyka. Back in 1898 one of the Russophile priests complained in his article to *Galichanin* that the petty gentry accept only priests of petty gentry origin, and consider all other priests to be of lower origin. The problem was aggravated by the fact that the majority of petty gentry communities had the right of presentation of the priest to the parish.²⁹⁷ We have also seen that all national initiatives in petty gentry villages were the work of priests who were of petty gentry origin themselves. Against this background the advantageous position of Rev. Pohorets’kyi becomes clear.

Rev. Pohorets’kyi started working on founding a particular petty gentry organization as early as 1906. In his history of the Gentry Association Ivan Fylypchak says that the need to work with the petty gentry was felt by Frants Silets’kyi and other *Prosvita* activists who found it difficult to found reading clubs in the petty gentry villages. It was evident that enlightenment efforts were much easier in the peasant villages:

Not because gentry villages were less conscious than peasant ones, to the contrary – in gentry villages national consciousness and passion were greater than in peasant ones, but to the gentry soul “their man” had to speak, an intelligent gentry!²⁹⁸

²⁹⁵ Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 214-15.

²⁹⁶ “Ruska szlachta zagonowa,” *Czas*, 21.09.1907.

²⁹⁷ V. I. S., “Ot Sambora,” *Galichanin*, 1898, No.198. This article was also arguing that the petty gentry was of a different ethnic origin than the majority of Ruthenians – the author believed that the eastern part of the Sambir district was settled by the descendants of Tatars.

²⁹⁸ Ivan Fylypchak, “Tovarystvo ‘Rus’koi Shliakhty v Halychyni’,” *Ukrains’kyi Beskyd*, 1939, ch.28, s.2.

Allegedly, several petty gentry villages had reading clubs associated with the Kachkovskii society, and it was almost impossible to change them into those of *Prosvita*. One of these villages was the village of Chaikovychi, where both *Prosvita* and Kachkovskii society reading clubs functioned. Then Silets'kyi came up with the idea of founding instead of these two reading clubs one "Gentry Casino." Rev. Pohorets'kyi wrote the statute and the idea of founding a Gentry Association appeared. Some "progressive gentry" were against this idea, "saying that it is an anachronism in contemporary times to think about a separate gentry association." But others – Silets'kyi, Rev. Pohorets'kyi, Rev. Hordyns'kyi from Kul'chytsi, Iosyf Ruchka-Kul'chyts'kyi (court councilor in Sambir) and Andrii Chaikovs'kyi – supported the idea. Andrii Chaikovs'kyi drafted the statute of the society, modeling it on the one of the associations of Orthodox gentry in Bukovyna.

It is interesting that Andrii Chaikovs'kyi, who had nothing to do with conservative and clerical circles, was supporting the initiative. He actually also warned Rev. Pohorets'kyi:

When the time comes to have the statutes approved, the article should be sent to *Dilo*, to take precedence over [national] democrats so that the latter will not spoil the thing, and to show the benefit from this society for our cause... Be prepared that politics will allow rather for 100 peasant than for one petty gentry society.²⁹⁹

However, the fears of national democracy's reaction were exaggerated. National democracy refused to give a list of its trusted persons which Rev. Pohorets'kyi was going to use in his attempt to get the statistics of petty gentry, because it was a party secret. However, the National Chancery gave a list of the districts with clusters of petty gentry: Sambir, Staryi Sambir, Turka, partly Drohobych, Rudky, Lisko, Sianok, Kalush, Stanislaviv, Bohorodchany, Tovmach, Horodok, Horodenka, Pechenizhyn and "perhaps two or three more." They also gave a list of people whom Rev. Pohorets'kyi could approach in this matter. In general the Chancery's response to this undertaking was positive. They would only be happy if Rev. Pohorets'kyi managed to bring the petty gentry, "a much neglected part of our nation," to national organization.

But national democracy in this case was approached not by Rev. Pohorets'kyi, whose clerical and conservative sympathies were well known, but by Rev. Tatomyr, himself a national democrat.³⁰⁰ A position very similar to that of the National Chancery was expressed by the attorney Novakovs'kyi from Bohorodchany, who responded to Rev. Pohorets'kyi's inquiry: "Every new

²⁹⁹ LODA, f.1245, op.2, spr.18.

³⁰⁰ LODA, f.1245, op.2, spr.18, a.8.

organization will cause the rise of national consciousness and resistance to the enemies' influences."³⁰¹ On 10 May 1907 the statute of the Gentry Association was accepted by the Vice-Roy's Office. It was printed in 100 copies in Sambir and sent to all the gentry communities in Galicia and "progressive" intelligentsia members of gentry origin.³⁰²

We should also remember that 1907 was a year of electoral reform and intense electoral struggle. Perhaps the National Committee knew that without support from the petty gentry a Ukrainian candidate had little chance to win in Sambir district. In 1907 at a meeting in Chaikovychi Rev. Onyshkevych spoke to the local petty gentry. The Ruthenian student Kul'chyts'kyi was appealing to the petty gentry to follow the example of the petty gentry from Kul'chytsi and promise to vote for Onyshkevych. Rev. Onyshkevych was also supported by the local pastor Rev. Stetsiv, not a petty gentry himself.³⁰³

When the society was founded it was referred to the reserved attitude of Ukrainians towards gentry and said that

such behavior of the Ruthenians is a great injustice to our gentry, because in its essence this gentry stays Ruthenian just as it used to be and loves ardently its Ruthenian motherland. It has only this one peculiar feature that it does not want to fraternize with others and is more closed in itself and lives with its gentry traditions, because of this it shies away from our Ruthenian societies and in general does not go in alliance with us – not to run into the rebukes and derision of our peasants.³⁰⁴

The Association's statute stated that "the goal of the Association is education, enlightenment and raising of the well-being of the Ruthenian gentry in Galicia, excluding all political matters." On 19 September 1907 the first general meeting of this society was held and 37 members showed up for it. In his talk Rev. Pohorets'kyi said that "the goal of our society is to remove with the help of education our petty gentry from the contemporary decline and to elevate it again to the leading position in Ruthenian society, the position which it used to occupy in ancient times." Rev. Hordyns'kyi gave a short history of the petty gentry, seeing its origin in the boyars of ancient Rus', while Rev. Borkovs'kyi from Vysots'ko said that he "considered the contemporary impoverished gentry to be the flower of our national soil but a flower without smell and color."³⁰⁵

³⁰¹ I.ODA, f.1245, op.2, spr.24.

³⁰² Fylypchak, "Tovarystvo 'Rus'koi Shliakhty v Halychyni'," *Ukrains'kyi Beskyd*, 1939, ch.28, 2.

³⁰³ "Vyborchyi Rukh," *Svoboda*, 1907, No.16.

³⁰⁴ "Deshcho pro 'Tovarystvo rus'koi shliakhty v Halychyni'," *Osnova*, 1908, No.6.

³⁰⁵ Fylypchak, "Tovarystvo 'Rus'koi Shliakhty v Halychyni'," *Ukrains'kyi Beskyd*, 1939, ch.29, 2.

At this general meeting the first executive of the society was elected. It featured Rev. Petro Pohorets'kyi as the organization's chair, Rev. Dmytro Hordyns'kyi as vice-chair, Frants Silets'kyi as secretary, and Oleksandr Baranets'kyi as a treasurer. Petro Bilyns'kyi from Luka, Mykola Novosel's'kyi from Bilyna Velyka, and Petro Horodys'kyi from Hordynia were elected as members of the executive. Petro Bilyn'skyi Tarasovych from Sambir and Vasyl' Tsmailo-Kul'chyts'kyi, a student, were elected as substitute members. The agitation in the villages did not go well, and therefore the planned deputation of the Association's petty gentry to Bishop Chekhovych had to be cancelled. Throughout 1908 meetings were organized in the Sambir district. They were most successful in Chaikovychi, Hordynia, Luka, Ortynychy and Kul'chytsi. In Staryi Sambir district the petty gentry was organized by Rev. Ivan Iavors'kyi.³⁰⁶

In 1908 numerous meetings were organized among the petty gentry in the Turka district:

The petty gentry here wanted an organization, but under the influence of the so-called "hard" or Russophile camp of the priests-petty gentry, who were holding the district at that time without sharing with anyone else; it did not show much desire to join the petty gentry in the Sambir area with its national-populist (Ukrainophile) attitude.³⁰⁷

Rev. Pohorets'kyi in the report from 1909 on the activity of his society stated that the society had an immense success in the petty gentry villages. The main problem was very similar to the one Mykhas had back in the 1880s: "Except for the Ruthenian gentry intelligentsia no one is interested in our affairs." While the peasants had their reading clubs, Rev. Pohorets'kyi preferred to have petty gentry organized into the "gentry casinos." The first one was established in 1909 in the village of Chaikovychi.³⁰⁸

In February, 1909 the second general meeting of the society took place. More than 200 of 248 registered members showed up for it. This meeting decided that "Gentry Casinos" had to be founded as the Association's reading clubs. At this meeting Danylo Stakhura was present and listened to the discussion. It was said that at the end of the meeting he

became convinced that [this association] is bone of our bone, blood of our blood, part of the Ukrainian-Ruthenian nation, and as such wants to work for the whole nation and become its leaders, and from this all of us should be happy and help this society by all possible means.³⁰⁹

³⁰⁶ Fylypchak, "Tovarystvo 'Rus'koi Shliakhty v Halychyni'," Ukrains'kyi Beskyd, 1939, ch.30, s.2.

³⁰⁷ Fylypchak, "Tovarystvo 'Rus'koi Shliakhty v Halychyni'," Ukrains'kyi Beskyd, 1939, ch.31s.2.

³⁰⁸ LODA, f.1245, op.2, spr.24.

³⁰⁹ Fylypchak, "Tovarystvo 'Rus'koi Shliakhty v Halychyni'," Ukrains'kyi Beskyd, 1939, ch.31s.2.

In 1909 a popular Ukrainian newspaper said that

Our Ruthenian gentry, when it sees people sincere to work with it and not those who turn to it with curses only when looking for the votes at the elections, those people and their work it knows how to honor adequately.

As an example the newspaper indicated the village of Kul'chytsi, where in 1907 the 50th anniversary of the pope's ordination was celebrated, after which the bad community council was changed. Amateur performances were reported from this village, in which girls were very active.³¹⁰

On the other hand, not everything went so easy with Rev. Pohorets'kyi's project. In his home village the local teacher with the help of local "peasants" (it seems both petty gentry and peasants) founded a reading club under the name of "Ruthenian Talk" because the *Prosvita* reading club chaired by Rev. Pohorets'kyi was not showing much life:

Everything would do well and progress forward if not for our pastor, who distracts our people from the society and says to register into some gentry society, introducing in this way discord between local petty gentry and peasants, while our society united everyone into a single family and strives to have no differences among local people and to let harmony rule.³¹¹

It was reported that the reading club in Bilyna Velyka was opened twice with great pomp, and twice it had declined:

Six people registered as members and paid entrance fees, electing the pastor as chair. The reading club was located at the cantor's house; several days passed and the cantor kicked out all those who gathered in his house for the reading club – and this was the end.

When the decision was taken to found another one, a delegation was sent to the pastor and asked for the statutes, but he refused to give them: "I shall not give you the statutes; if you wish a reading club, then found a peasant one, while I shall hold a gentry reading club." That is why this new reading club was founded on the statutes of "Ruthenian Talk." It was said that the new reading club was flourishing and if not for the pastor it would be the best one in the district. The

³¹⁰ "Sambirshchyna," *Narodne Slovo*, 1909, No.164.

³¹¹ *Narodne Slovo*, 1909, No.168.

new reading club had a national-democratic orientation, subscribing to Narodne Slovo, Hospodar, Svoboda, Zerkalo.³¹²

In 1909, trying to expand his organization to other Galician regions, Rev. Pohorets'kyi sent a questionnaire about the petty gentry's situation. It was reported that in the Dolyna district there were five villages with a mixed population of petty gentry and peasants. The petty gentry was marrying as a rule among themselves but in Ukrainian politics went together with peasants and shared reading clubs. On the level of attitudes it was reported that the petty gentry "thought of themselves as something better than peasants," while peasants "considered petty gentry to be oinkers and ridiculed them." Petty gentry here as a rule were poorer while the peasants were richer. In Buchach district there were three villages where petty gentry were not mixing with peasants. In one village they were relatively richer, in two others poorer. But there was nothing remarkable about them. In the Bohorodchany district there were 3 villages with respectively 1/3, 1/6 and 1/20 of population being petty gentry. Only in one did the petty gentry live quite separately and did not mingle with peasants. National consciousness was quite high, while the political orientation was radical. The petty gentry as a rule were richer than peasants. We see that in places other than the Sambir area the petty gentry could even become radical.

The last of the available answers is very interesting, because it came from Stryi Sambir district and was written by Rev. Ivan Iavors'kyi from Stril'bychi. He described the situation there as follows:

Bachyna, Russophiles, 345 people, pure petty gentry;
Rosokhy, Ukrainians, 800 people, pure petty gentry;
Libukhora, Ukrainians, 500 people, pure petty gentry;
Terlo Shliakhots'ke, Ukrainians, 500, pure petty gentry;
Topil'nytsia Shliakhots'ka, Ukrainians, 400, pure petty gentry

Besides these petty gentry community, petty gentry lived mixing with peasants in Lopushanka, Tur'ie, Voloshynova, and Bilych; however, in mixed villages the petty gentry "were increasingly losing their distinctiveness." In these villages the petty gentry belonged to the same organizations as peasants did. In Bachyna there was a Kachkovskii society reading club and a fire-fighting company.³¹³

In 1909 the association's executive also worked on the Stryi and Drohobych districts. But this was also the year when Rev. Pohorets'kyi stepped aside from the work in the association. Supposedly, he caught some throat sickness, but perhaps problems in his own parish caused this as well.³¹⁴ The consistory's files on Rev. Pohorets'kyi show that from the very beginning of his appointment as

³¹² "Z Sambirshchyny," Dilo, 1909, No.25.

³¹³ LODA, f.1245, op.2, spr.24.

³¹⁴ Fylypchak, "Tovarystvo 'Rus'koi Shliakhty v Halychyni'," Ukrains'kyi Beskyd, 1939, ch.32, s.2.

pastor of Bilyna, he had problems with the local peasants and even some gentry. It was said that for his appointment he bought the votes of the petty gentry – the right of accepting the pastor in this case lay with the local community.³¹⁵ It was said that for his appointment he developed “unheard of agitation” with money and drinks.³¹⁶ Rev. Pohorets’kyi received this parish when the former pastor, Rev. Dmytro Bilyns’kyi, was removed from office for drinking and “demoralization” of the parishioners. Rev. Dmytro Bilyn’skyi was born in Bilyna Velyka, and, perhaps, had here his supporters.³¹⁷

The majority of the complaints against Rev. Pohorets’kyi came from the local peasants. He was accused of charging excessive ritual fees.³¹⁸ The community council of the “peasant” village Bilynka Mala belonging to the parish of Bilyna Velyka accused Rev. Pohorets’kyi of publicly abusing the local community council for wishing to leave the parish of Bilyna and join the parish of Tatory.³¹⁹ Rev. Andrii Dets’ko, local dean and pastor of Luka, eagerly supported these complaints of the parishioners and his investigations found Rev. Pohorets’kyi to be guilty. His position is perhaps best explained by his own peasant origin and problems he had with the petty gentry part of his parish, which was complaining against him just as the peasant part of Rev. Pohorets’kyi’s parish did against their pastor.³²⁰ Anyhow, court and church investigations against Rev. Pohorets’kyi went through the whole of the 1890s and 1900s, at least until 1911, and involved excessive charges for rituals, land speculations, abuse and usury.³²¹

The general meeting of the Gentry Association that took place on 24 February 1910 showed that the society’s membership increased by 200 and the first women appeared among the society’s members. The new chair was Rev. Dmytro Hordyns’kyi, who was behind all the Association’s activities in 1911-1912. Meetings were organized in Horodyshche, Stupnytsia and Silets’. In Chaikovychi the casino’s anniversary was celebrated, while Kul’chytsi celebrated the anniversary of Petro Konashevych Sahaidachnyi, the Cossack hetman, who was a native of this village.³²²

In 1911 a Russophile offensive was attempted in the Sambir area. Russophiles found a petty gentry candidate, a certain Ivan Volchko Kul’chyts’kyi, and tried to

³¹⁵ APP, ABGK, sygn.5672.

³¹⁶ APP, ABGK, sygn.4273.

³¹⁷ APP, ABGK, sygn. 5764.

³¹⁸ APP, ABGK, sygn.4047

³¹⁹ APP ABGK, sygn.4277.

³²⁰ APP, ABGK, sygn.4048.

³²¹ APP, ABGK, sygn. 5810.

³²² Fylypchak, “Tovarystvo ‘Rus’koi Shliakhty v Halychyni,’” *Ukrains’kyi Beskyd*, 1939, ch.33, s.2

use him to attract petty gentry. Mykhail Volchko Kul'chyts'kyi, perhaps his relative, said at the meeting:

We Kul'chytsites until recently trusted our pastor Rev. Hordyns'kyi and deputy Rev. Onyshkevych, but now we have recovered our sight and shall not allow bastards to trick us with Ukraine....You should know that from now on we do not give a damn for Ukraine and have returned on the historical road, from now on we are Russians.³²³

Something similar was reported in Chapeli, where mayor Ivan Demkovych Chapel's'kyi was supporting Kul'chyts'kyi, and the petty gentry from Russophile Bachyna were also supporting Kul'chyts'kyi.³²⁴ In Luka the Russophile Kachkovskii society flourished among the peasants while the petty gentry seemed to support the Ukrainians. When Rev. Skobel's'kyi came with a "magic lantern" show, the petty gentry hired Jews and hooligans from Boryslav to throw stones at him, but members of the Russophile *drushhyna* shut them up.³²⁵

It seems that the Ukrainian movement achieved real success in this area with the founding of economic and farming organizations, around and after 1910.³²⁶ In 1914 in Bilyna Velyka and Ortynychy, two strongholds of a specifically gentry spirit and of the Gentry Association, circles of "Village Farmer" were founded.³²⁷ It seems that after Rev. Pohorets'kyi left the leadership, the organization became less concerned with gentry particularity. On the other hand, the Ukrainian movement's symbols appealed to the petty gentry as well. Rev. Petryk, no sympathizer of conservatives, in 1913 believed that "the consistent work of the leaders of the gentry in the Gentry Association was crowned with success and all the ridicule of the society and its leaders should stop."³²⁸

On 26 May 1912 a meeting in memory of Sahaidachnyi was organized in Kul'chytsi, in which more than 100 villagers participated. It was decided to erect a monument to him in the village.

After the meeting a procession was formed led by gentry women from Kul'chytsi. After them *Sich* and *Sokol* members from neighboring villages, and then columns of the peasantry and womenfolk, local as well as from elsewhere in the area. With the sound of songs and orchestra the procession

³²³ *Golos Naroda*, 1911, No.17.

³²⁴ *Golos Naroda*, 1911, No.18, 19, 21, 22.

³²⁵ "Luka," *Golos Naroda*, 1912, No.8.

³²⁶ *Hospodars'ka Chasopys'*, 1913, No.6.

³²⁷ *Hospodars'ka Chasopys'*, 1913, No.24.

³²⁸ "Dopys' z Sambirshchyny," *Ruslan*, 1913, No.11.

went to the banks near the church, where there was the house in which Petro Konashevych Sahaidachnyi was born.³²⁹

It seems that in 1912 the only petty gentry village in the Sambir district still voting for the Polish candidate was the village of Rosokhy.³³⁰ In 1913 the petty gentry from Kul'chytsi, Luka, Hordynia, and Bilyna were reported to show remarkable unanimity and to vote for the Ukrainian candidate.³³¹

Ivan Fylypchak, who was collecting material on the history of the petty gentry in the area and wrote some fiction about it as well, was sure that the decisive moment of its joining the Ukrainian movement was the beginning of the twentieth century. Social realities were making the petty gentry behave and feel like peasants did – in their relationships with the city and with the administration. Although he described some priests-Ruthenian patriots of petty gentry origin from the older generation he shows that the influence of the Ukrainian project was decisive: “Ukrainian history does not know this division [into gentry and non-gentry], and in the whole world it was abolished by the great French revolution.” He also speaks about the influence of Hrushevs'kyi and Lypyns'kyi. The culmination of his fictional work on the developments in the petty gentry villages of the region is also 1912, when one of the characters finally proclaims: “There should be no gentry and no peasants since now, only noble Ukrainian citizens.”³³²

The impression is that by this time the petty gentry was incorporated into the national movement bypassing the Association. At the general meeting that took place in May 1913 in Luka, which became the district's Ukrainian center and was close to the petty gentry villages, fewer than 50 members took part. They were from the neighboring villages of Luka, Bilyna, Ortynychi, Hordynia and Kul'chytsi.³³³ In 1914 when Shevchenko's anniversary was celebrated, Rev. Pohorets'kyi tried to organize a detachment of petty gentry cavalry which would participate in the Ukrainian parade in L'viv:

It was not realized because of the obstacles of the administration and the unfriendly attitude of some circles of Ukrainian society, which in general had a negative attitude to the organization of gentry, considering such an organization to be “backward” and an “anachronism.”³³⁴

³²⁹ “Vichevyi rukh,” *Dilo*, 1912, No.125.

³³⁰ *Dilo*, 1912, No.227.

³³¹ “Po vyborakh,” *Dilo*, 1913, No.146.

³³² Ivan Fylypchak, *Bratnia liubov kripsha vid kaminnykh stin. Povist' z zhyttia zahonovoi shliakhty z pochatku XX viku* (Sambir: nakladom filii tovarystav “Prosvita” v Sambori, 1937), especially, 117, 224.

³³³ Fylypchak, “Tovarystvo 'Rus'koi Shliakhty v Halychyni,” *Ukraïns'kyi Beskyd*, 1939, ch.33, s.2.

³³⁴ Fylypchak, “Tovarystvo 'Rus'koi Shliakhty v Halychyni,” *Ukraïns'kyi Beskyd*, 1939, ch.34, s.2.

It would be interesting to check how national identity and political loyalty of petty gentry communities look in inter-war Poland, when petty gentry was offered an opportunity to join privileged Polish nation and well-organized action was developed on behalf of Polish state towards this purpose. It seems that this action was not too successful and the majority of petty gentry continued to identify with Ukrainian nation and peasantry as a class even if maintaining its distinctiveness from and engaging into domestic strife with local peasants.

The frameworks for peasant action discussed in this last chapter and the action they enabled seem to be something different from the usual descriptions of the mode of peasant action:

The emergence of a common myth of transcendent justice often can and does move peasants into action as other forms of organization cannot, but it provides only a common vision, not an organizational framework for action. Such myths unite peasants, they do not organize them....

Where the power of the state remains intact, therefore, peasant movements are usually drowned in blood, and even if a millennial dream of justice persists among the peasantry, the short-term interest of the individual peasant inevitably takes precedence over any long-term ends.³³⁵

The peasants became organized, being peasant in the context created by the Ukrainian project connoted meanings very different from those it has in other modern discourses. This happened not only because of the smart discursive moves but also because of the daily work of the movement's activists. Some of them were "prodigal sons" like Ivan Mykhas and some of them were proper movement's agents like Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi.

Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi's Work

Although from Zubryts'kyi's newspaper articles it seems that his main problems were the district administration and landlords, from his correspondence with the Consistory we know that his most important foe was another Greek-Catholic priest, Rev. Dmytro Marchak. The conflict had little to do with national orientation. We know that, for example, the Russophile Rev. Kornylii Iavors'kyi, the vice-dean of Zhukotyn deanery, to which Mshanets' belonged, praised Rev. Zubryts'kyi for his zealous and tactful work with the parishioners, approved his stance against the state administration, with which the latter corresponded exclusively in Ruthenian, and asked the Consistory to help Rev. Zubryts'kyi with money.³³⁶ The conflict between Revs. Zubryts'kyi and Marchak involved different

³³⁵ Eric R. Wolf, *Peasants* (Englewood, 1967), 108.

³³⁶ APP, ABGK, sygn.5389.

approaches and different ways of using a priest's influence. We know about this conflict from Zubryts'kyi's complaints to the Consistory, also many of them, in his own words, "had been concealed by someone"; perhaps this was Marchak's uncle, a canon in Przemyśl.

Rev. Marchak, at that time independent assistant in the village of Holovets'ko Horishnie, was quite often drinking the whole night with some peasants from Mshanets'. Rev. Marchak participated in the speculations with oil fields, inclining peasants to sell their fields, sometimes distracting them from participation in the Liturgy. Marchak had been doing this for a dozen years, and Rev. Zubryts'kyi believed that "perhaps there is no one else as mean-spirited, malicious and greedy in the whole diocese." When a peasant was killed during a wedding in Hroziava, Rev. Marchak invited the murderers and promised them to arrange the charges dropped for a certain fee. When they paid, Rev. Marchak recommended to them an attorney in Sambir whom he knew. Rev. Marchak also promised the community of Galivka to free it from the obligation of building an elementary school. He was playing cards with gentlemen in Ustryky and pawned his watch there. To earn additional money Rev. Marchak was serving Latin-rite Vespers and Masses. He had his own agents in Mshanets' informing him on Rev. Zubryts'kyi's domestic affairs.

Rev. Marchak was spreading lies and slander about Rev. Zubryts'kyi. Once even Rev. Pavlo Matkovs'kyi ordered Rev. Mykhailo Prukhnys'kyi from Turka to investigate if Rev. Zubryts'kyi indeed during the Liturgy used instead of the "Most Holy Virgin" the word "girl" (*divka* instead of *diva*). Rev. Marchak was also spreading rumors about the social isolation of Rev. Zubryts'kyi, saying that everyone avoided Rev. Zubryts'kyi, while he himself visited him at least once a year. In 1896 Rev. Marchak said to Ivan Gudz', a farmer from Ploske: "Look. You are saying that priest from Mshanets' defends and backs you, while now he voted for a Pole and even took money." The peasant spread this rumor among the villagers. Because of Rev. Marchak clerical authority in general in this area was losing respect among the faithful.³³⁷

Rev. Zubryts'kyi asked for a transfer to another parish if his complaints against Rev. Marchak were left without investigation. Because of the lackadaisical behavior of the Consistory, peasants were saying openly that Rev. Marchak was smart and could get away with whatever he wanted. The parishioners themselves were disappointed because their own complaint against Rev. Marchak was left without any further investigation.³³⁸ On the other hand we know that in 1889 Rev. Marchak just like Rev. Zubryts'kyi and priests from Halivka, Pyniany and Holovetsko Dolishnie was accused by the district captain of attempting to

³³⁷ APP, ABGK, sygn. 4280.

³³⁸ APP, ABGK, sygn. 4284.

influence villagers during pre-elections.³³⁹ We also know that in 1894 the Consistory did order the dean of Zhukotyn to investigate Marchak's behavior.³⁴⁰ The complaint of one of Marchak's parishioners was investigated, but the community council supported Rev. Marchak and said that the complaint was the personal revenge of someone who wanted to become mayor again and had appropriated four Joch of the community's pasture.³⁴¹ In 1895 the captaincy actually fined Marchak for exceeding the fees for sacramental rites allowed by the patent of Joseph II. But the deanery's investigation showed that many peasants were paying voluntarily and the only one complaining was the same former mayor.³⁴²

The beginning of the 1890s seems to be the period when Rev. Zubryts'kyi tried to establish his authority in the area, not only in Mshanets', but also in many smaller villages: Halivka, Ploske, Hroziova. During that time he perceived all interventions in his jurisdiction very jealously. He complained about peasants, who did not understand him, came for advice only in extreme cases and had an exaggerated sense of their own importance, but nevertheless he was insisting on the need to find a way to them.³⁴³ At the same time, in 1893, he complained about the "demoralizing" behavior of the local teacher Maria Gilowska.³⁴⁴ But while in the case of Rev. Marchak he was seriously worried about the latter's influence, in the case of the teacher he was more relaxed and described her as hysterical and a helpless product of spoiled town life. In 1892 she wanted to decorate the school hall for an exam and sent people to bring her lilac; then she went with children to another village, into "someone else's forest" for fir branches, and there the children were trampling down the peasants' meadows. One of the peasants met her with children there, "disgraced (perhaps, swore at her in front of the children) her, and had almost beaten her up." In another instance she tried to make village lads cut their hair short so they also disgraced her and one even pulled her hair.³⁴⁵ By and large village teachers, usually female, in Zubryts'kyi's accounts appear as helpless and having little understanding of local life. In his other report he speaks of a teacher from Linyňa, who sent a peasant to town to fetch her salary and the peasant was cheated there.³⁴⁶

³³⁹ APP ABGK, sygn.5661.

³⁴⁰ APP ABGK, sygn.4272.

³⁴¹ APP ABGK, sygn.5672.

³⁴² APP ABGK, sygn.5673.

³⁴³ "Z Staromiskoho povitu," *Dilo*, 1891, No.53.

³⁴⁴ APP ABGK, sygn.5669.

³⁴⁵ "Z Staromiskoho povita," *Dilo*, 1892, No.144.

³⁴⁶ "Z Staromiskoho povita," *Dilo*, 1892, No.103.

Perhaps, the main reason for Rev. Zubryts'kyi's attitude to the teachers was their Polish nationality. Teachers raised in the Polish town culture automatically saw the civilization they had to sow and cultivate in the area as Polish. In 1893, for example, Rev. Zubryts'kyi struggled unsuccessfully against an order that the Mshanets' school celebrate both Ruthenian and Polish holidays.³⁴⁷ But in his critique of the teachers he was invoking the whole complex of gendered representations, in which female teachers stood against the male priest and male peasant culture. In general his critique of the school politics of Galician autonomy was justified. Despite the growth in the number of schools there were constant problems with teaching in them. Of 40 schools in the Staryi Sambir district only 15 had teachers and classes in 1898, and four of these 15 were located in the towns.³⁴⁸

The 1890s were also a time when Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi contributed a lot to Bat'kivshchyna, which had lost almost all its peasant correspondents from the 1880s. In 1892-1895 he published 11 articles there, some of them on quite important topics – about aristocracy, conservatism, peasant misery, the presentation of a priest to the parish, strategies of peasant self-defense and so on. One of these articles entitled “A Learned and Literate Man” (*Uchenyi i pys'mennyi cholovik*) is of special interest for us because it touches upon his own experiences as a “learned man” in the peasant village. He says that quite often contacts between peasants and more educated people end in conflict. Trying to defend themselves, peasants even invented a distinction between “inborn” and “learned” reason, arguing that the former is more important.³⁴⁹ Rev. Zubryts'kyi explores reasons for these conflicts, mentioning the striking difference in the standard of living, peasant envy, but also often too obvious “exploitation and abuse of the illiterate by the learned.” Peasants feel this abuse and react to it.

Zubryts'kyi's article, however, was intended not as a defense of peasants but as a defense of the learned: “But the view of learned men among our people is wrong in its essence.” The division between learned and unlearned does not imply automatically a different morality; among both one could find the honest and dishonest, the sincere and false. Because the article is printed in a popular newspaper Rev. Zubryts'kyi tries to prove the usefulness of learned people – he points to scientists risking their lives for the betterment of people's lives, to the inventions making these lives more comfortable. For him the turning point in the democratization of learning was the invention of the printing press. Now, after the abolition of robot, Ruthenian peasants could also join in that – they had to read a lot, think it over and apply the knowledge in their lives.

³⁴⁷ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], “Chy v chysto-ruskii shkoli v chysto-ruskim seli maiut' obkhodytysia sviata pol'ski?” Dilo, 1893, No.5.

³⁴⁸ “Pys'mo iz Staromiskoho,” Dilo, 1898, No.38.

³⁴⁹ M. Z. [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], “Uchenyi i pys'mennyi cholovik,” Bat'kivshchyna, 1894, No.4.

Zubryts'kyi acknowledges that there were many unneeded and superficial things published and popular publications had to be improved. He advised conducting popular publication in the following manner:

One has to pay attention to the people's customs and behavior, and when they are harmful to speak against them and uproot them, as for example in the case of fortune-telling and superstitions; to give instructive descriptions of one's own and other lands; to describe efforts of singular individuals in science and with that explain science itself; to tell in an accessible way stories about ancient times, customs of various peoples; to print descriptions of travels to far-away countries; to explain natural phenomena, the contemporary order and to show a way for liberation from oppression and misery.³⁵⁰

We see that Zubryts'kyi basically repeats the program of popular publishing by national-populists from the 1870s. He wants those working on reading clubs in the villages to pay attention to the taste of the readers and correct the publishing program according to these tastes. Further on in his article he speaks of science (learning) as a matter of competition in the modern world. Those villagers who defend themselves against learning quite often would like to stay in the past, which is impossible. Learning also means adaptation to the modern world, and if people try to retain old customs, "other people, more dexterous and swift, will take everything away from us."³⁵¹

In his article "Who is Bypassed by the Progress of Time?" Rev. Zubryts'kyi also says that progress bypasses peasants. He adduces document showing that already in 1827 the daily payment the state assigned to the villagers for the work they had to do on state estates besides robot was the same as the daily payment of an agricultural laborer in the 1890s. Rev. Zubryts'kyi suggests that perhaps progress bypasses the peasant, "because the latter does not demand it."³⁵² In this emphasis on progress Rev. Zubryts'kyi was following a trope common for Ukrainian publications:

In contemporary times everything not simply advances but runs ahead; and those who slow down will be trampled down by whoever comes next. It is true that this is evil, heartless injustice; but would you not push a person that hinders your way when you are in hurry and there is no other path? And in the times of the railway's movement and property's circulation, when everything makes money, needs money and desires money, it is no

³⁵⁰ Ibid., No.5.

³⁵¹ Ibid., No.5.

³⁵² [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], M. Z-kii, "Koho postup chasu pomynaie," *Dilo*, 27.11.1902.

use in standing on the road. You'll be trampled down without stopping the movement.³⁵³

In this a direct continuation from the 1870s can be seen. Progress appears in the Ukrainian newspaper as accelerating and threatening, in particular threatening for the peasants. Rev. Zubryts'kyi saw one of his tasks to be to help the peasant. His main areas of work remained the same as in the 1880s – the local community, the district, and ethnographic research.

These things were not perceived as contradictory to his priestly vocation. On the contrary, he was connecting the fate of the Greek Catholic clergy with the fate of the nation. This is clearly seen even in his position on such petty issues as the integration (*komasatsiia*) of scattered parish land, which was supposed to be one of the moves for the improvement of priests' economic position. He opposed the project of a separate integration for church land only, because such a project would affect peasant landholding as well. According to him, the solution could be only in a general integration process that would affect both peasant and parish land. The task of priests would be to prepare such a general integration in their parishes.³⁵⁴

It is also important to realize that he was not alone in this approach to the priest's vocation. The local mountains had several activist priests. One of his closer collaborators was parliamentary deputy Rev. Ivan Iavors'kyi from Stril'bychi, national democracy's leader in the Staryi Sambir district. Another place that became a basis of ethnographic research was the village of Dydiova. Dydiova's pastor, Rev. Ivan Kuziv, was the son-in-law of Rev. Antin Chapel's'kyi from Dobrivliany and also Franko's classmate.³⁵⁵ More to the south, in the Turka district, in the village of Zadiil's'ko, there was Rev. Isydor Pasichyns'kyi, ethnographer and poet, son of a Ruthenian activist from 1848 generation.

Rev. Zubryts'kyi's work in the community schematically looked as follows. After his appointment he discovered that peasants lived still very much in the world of folk-culture, where pagan categories are intertwined with Christian, and the former actually had an upper hand. Very much in accordance with his proposal for popular work, he started with the elimination of unneeded superstitions – one of these reforms was a prohibition to go with "*Koliada*" (Caroling).³⁵⁶ In this Rev. Zubryts'kyi was not unique. Quite often the reading club was represented in opposition not so much to the landlords or the administration as to the peasants'

³⁵³ "Nasha hospodarska neporadnist'," *Hospodar*, 1901, No.7.

³⁵⁴ [Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo] M. Z-kii, "Pro komasatsiui parokhiial'nykh i selians'kykh hruntiv," *Dilo*, 1894, No.149.

³⁵⁵ Volodymyr Chapel's'kyi, *Op. cit.*, 161.

³⁵⁶ VR LNB, f. Vasyli' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.23-24.

recent past. A sorcerer, a cunning man in many cases, was the most important enemy of the reading club.³⁵⁷

Then Rev. Zubryts'kyi opened a reading club in the village, in 1892 (the very same year that Mykhas founded his in the village of Morozovychi). The reading club became the space for a new kind of leisure and for a new kind of stories to be heard. Because of his efforts weddings decreased in length from two days to one, although he did not manage to eliminate vodka-drinking.³⁵⁸ Not only weddings but also christenings became events of smaller scale – the maximum number of godparents decreased to four from twelve.³⁵⁹

It seems that Rev. Zubryts'kyi's stay in the village made him very critical of anti-alcohol campaigns and at the end he resigned himself to not introducing total sobriety:

There were and still are strivings among us to distract people from vodka forever, but nowhere and never was this accomplished once and for all. There were one-time enthusiasm and strong determination, but what use are they? Everything passed quickly. Those who posed these demands were forgetting about them, and sometimes somewhere themselves had a glass of wine or pint of beer.³⁶⁰

The reading club was his means to have villagers reattached from the world of local knowledge to the world of standardized knowledge. We know that one of the first things this reading club acquired was a map of Ukraine-Rus', but Rev. Zubryts'kyi also wanted to buy a globe for the reading club, because "people are interested in far-away lands. And in our Galician Rus' only a few popular books are published with descriptions of other lands and peoples."³⁶¹

Being of petty gentry origin himself, Rev. Zubryts'kyi did everything in his power to eliminate the difference between petty gentry and peasants in his parish and to persuade both that they are members of the same class, the Ukrainian peasantry. There were several petty gentry families in Mshanets' – Stetskovych, Petrychkovych, and Iankovych; very close to them were the so-called *soltyś* families – Voloshchak and Dykman. These families were telling stories about the good old days, when their nobility mattered and they had separate rituals – for example, to bless their Easter bread, gentry families went inside the church while peasants waited for the blessing at the cemetery:

³⁵⁷ "Skazhim sobi pravdu," *Poslannyk*, 1899, No.3.

³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 25

³⁵⁹ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Z Staromiskoho [Kudy divaiut'sia neraz hroshi anshykh liudei]," *Dilo*, 1894, No.33.

³⁶⁰ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi] *Tovarysh narodnyi*, "Z Staromiskoho," *Dilo*, 1895, No.77.

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*

The other parishioners did not like this kind of behavior very much. They were always reproaching the gentry for bringing Easter bread to the church, [saying that] what used to be has passed and perhaps will not come back, and the gentry do not bear greater burdens for the maintenance of the church than other people. Even in the church they were quarreling with each other, joking and challenging each other. By the way, village gentry, “*kbodachkova shliakhta*,” everywhere are a log on the feet of our peasantry. They still hope that the good old times will come back, peasants will turn into subjects, and the gentry will get better and lighter lives.³⁶²

The petty gentry with their estate prejudices were on the side of the old order; they did not understand the progress of humanity. This was the reason why they were so often an “easy victim” of Polish agitators. He also says that “our influential people should always keep it in mind and necessarily erase these differences [between petty gentry and peasants].” Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi himself started his action against petty gentry consciousness on Good Friday 1895, when he forbade the petty gentry to bring Easter bread inside the church; the petty gentry remembered and was bitter about this affront for several years.³⁶³

On the other hand, in 1899 a Polish ethnographer and one-time village teacher in the district, Zofia Strzelecka Grynbergowa, said that “the gentry do not know what the gentry are and how they are different from others. The whole idea about nobility is expressed in the words: ‘Earlier when a peasant said ‘fool’ to the gentry he was sent to prison, and now it is different!’”³⁶⁴ According to her, in Topil’nytsia only old Mykola Matkovs’kyi (90 years old) knew some history: “There was Poland, but there was a king, who himself gave everything as a gift to a Moscow czarina and our Emperor. And the gentry have their nobility for being very good at war.” She also noticed that the peasants were speaking about the petty gentry disrespectfully and even stopped using the word *pan* while speaking with them. She was afraid that soon “our petty gentry will believe that they are worse than peasants.”³⁶⁵ Perhaps this was the result of the work of the activists of the Ukrainian movement.

In 1894 Zubryts’kyi had a project for advancing Ruthenian trade and industry and at the same time uniting townsmen with villagers. This was supposed to be done by making clothing and other items needed in the village and selling them there by Ruthenian townsmen.³⁶⁶ In the meantime Rev. Zubryts’kyi was trying to

³⁶² VR LNB, f. Vasyl’ Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.27.

³⁶³ Ibid., a.27.

³⁶⁴ Strzetelska-Grynbergowa, 345.

³⁶⁵ Ibid.

³⁶⁶ [Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi], “Z Staromiskoho,” 1894, No.1.

forge solidarity between local Ruthenian communities. First of all he showed that villages could not count on the administration, that the logic of class conflict was grouping all the villages on one side and their enemies on the other. Villagers from Hroziova, for example, supported the Polish candidate in 1890 not because of the one-time benefits but because they thought to win some long-time gains:

they thought that they could sit on the same chair as His Excellency and were deeply mistaken. As their reward they got ten fir trees from the state estates for school construction. But perhaps they thought that they deserved more or [maybe they thought] that they went to their own forest and [that is why they] took more trees [than was allowed]. But misfortune was waiting on them behind their backs. Every tree was counted for two Gulden and now they had to pay 20 Gulden.³⁶⁷

Rev. Zubryts'kyi was also showing how more nationally-conscious villages were discriminated against in the aid distributed to help villages suffering from harvest failures.

In 1890 the aid was distributed as follows:

Table 8-7 “Distribution of the Emergency Aid among the villages in Mshanets’ area in 1890”³⁶⁸

Village	Population	Aid (in Gulden)
Bystre	467	70
Halivka	525	100
Hroziova	985	180
Lavriv	270	40
Linya	1049	200
Mshanets'	986	50
Ploske	465	80

From this table it is clear that the village of Mshanets’ was discriminated against, and Rev. Zubryts'kyi explains that this was because of the stance villagers from Mshanets' took on elections. Moreover, this discrimination on the level of villages

³⁶⁷ “Z Staromis'koho povitu,” *Dilo*, 1890, No.28.

³⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

was accompanied by discrimination on the level of individual villagers. According to the captaincy's order one farmer could not have less than five and more than ten Gulden. But the mayor in Bystre ordered everyone to give him one Gulden from every ten received and 50 Kreuzer from five. He himself, as well as community's scribe and scribe's brother officially received ten Gulden each, although all belonged to the richest group of villagers. But even then the mayor gave to the scribe and his brother only 10 Gulden and left 10 for himself. In the tavern they argued about this and finally the scribe and his brother threw their money at the mayor. Something similar happened in Halivka, where the aid was taken by the most prosperous villagers. Mykola Nahyna, whose farm was worth 4,000 Gulden, who had even more money lent out to other villagers, and was even lending money to the local Jew for his speculations (a classical example of the rich peasant-usurer), was one of these. Another one was the father of the local cantor and local scribe.³⁶⁹

On the other hand, later, when he felt more secure and in power, he could discriminate against certain communities himself. Perhaps it was he who advised villagers from Mshanets' to boycott villagers from Bilych, who had voted for the Polish candidate. Villagers from Bilych could no longer stop in Mshanets' overnight during their trips to the market in Liutovys'ka.³⁷⁰

When Rev. Zubryts'kyi started regular gatherings with villagers and held talks about state matters and regulations, he found that this was something unheard of. He himself explains that "although there were priests, relatively good Ruthenians, in this area, nevertheless they maintained a distance from the peasants (*ne zapuskalysia zadaleko z muzhykamy*)."³⁷¹ That is why the relationships between priests and peasants were, as a rule, "a bit cold."³⁷¹ In this again the reading club became the space that was attended by both the priest and the peasants, elevating the latter to the level of good society.

That reading club in its first year had 35 members. The second year 20 more villagers joined it. It subscribed to *Bat'kivshchyna*, *Chytal'nia*, *Dobri Rady*, book series "Youth Library," *Poslannyk* and missionary books. In 1894 it had a library of 83 books, of which 48 were donated by *Prosvita's* executive.³⁷² Already in 1893 Rev. Zubryts'kyi reported on the unusual progress of the reading club and the stir it caused in the area. In the neighboring village of Hroziova the reading club opened on the 3d of April. And the store was about to be opened by Vasyl' Segyn, already known to us as a former student in Pochaiv, then an unofficial teacher in Mshanets' and Hroziova, and now a miller, stone master, making crosses for the

³⁶⁹ "Z Staro-miskoho povitu," *Dilo*, 1890, N0.37.

³⁷⁰ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Kil'ka sliv z nahody st. "Dila" pid z. "Lytsemiry," *Dilo*, 30.03.1901.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*, a. 28.

³⁷² *Chytal'nia*, 1894, No.18, s.145.

graves, burning bricks and living in a stone house himself. Other neighboring villages – Holovets'ko, Vytsiv and Bystre in Staryi Sambir district and Mykhnovets' and Khashchiv in Turka district – were also about to found reading clubs.³⁷³ This founding of reading clubs was accompanied by revolutions on the level of community councils. In Hroziova this local revolution was prepared under the slogan “Disorder like in our village cannot be found in any other!” But in this case the reforms did not finish their work and “the old” reelected the old council.³⁷⁴

In 1893 a school was founded in Mshanets', but as we have already seen it did not satisfy Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, it did not become part of the space opened up by the reading club and perhaps because of this conflict it was left without staff by 1898.³⁷⁵ The reading club functioned on Sundays and holidays, sometimes on Saturday evenings as well. Books, periodicals, and “issues that touch peasants” were discussed, and sometimes songs were sung. Quite often the club was visited by non-members as well. The peasant housing the reading club in his house was also running the reading club's store. In the first year the peasants read most willingly Chaikovs'kyi's novels “Abuse of Honor” and “Brazilian Prosperity (*haraszdj*).” Besides that “Superstitions and Fortune-Telling,” *Prosvita* calendars, Kobzar, Talmud, Poslannyk and missionary books.³⁷⁶ The chair of this reading club was Rev. Zubryts'kyi himself and the secretary Mykhailo Parashchak.

In 1897 this reading club hosted a talk on farming by Vasyl' Korol'. The talk appealed to the peasants because it was very much like a conversation. After the talk the farming of local peasants was checked and the lecturer showed practically how to work the field.³⁷⁷ In 1898 besides the already mentioned Chaikovs'kyi novels and book on superstitions and fortune-telling the list of villagers' favorite books included Our Disastrous Times (*Nashe lykholittia*), Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, Ruthenian reading anthology for the first and second grades of gymnasium, and Robinson Crusoe.³⁷⁸

It seems that after the 1890s the authority of Rev. Zubryts'kyi in Mshanets' had improved so much that it could not be challenged by anyone. In the first years of the twentieth century the following proverb was recorded in Mshanets': “Our priest has a plain floor, people flock to him like to Lord God (*U nashoho iegomoststia hladoika pidloha // Do niobo sia liude skhodiat, iak do Pana Boha*).”³⁷⁹ This

³⁷³ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], Chytal'nia, 1893, No.7, s.102.

³⁷⁴ “Z Staromiskho povita,” Dilo, 1892, No.41.

³⁷⁵ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3928, a.14.

³⁷⁶ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3928, a.10.

³⁷⁷ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3928, a.12.

³⁷⁸ TsDIAuL, f.348, op.1, spr.3928, a.13.

³⁷⁹ Ivan Franko, “Halyts'ko-Rus'ki Narodni Prypovidky,” Etnohrafichnyi Zbirnyk, t.18 (L'viv, 1905), 269.

was one version of a saying recorded in several villages, and in other villages the saying was used to refer to their mayor, who, perhaps, in these villages was more trusted than the priest. In the 1890s it was rumored that one of the local priests had become a vampire (Ukrainian *упыр*) after his death. What proved the seriousness of the case was the fact that even Rev. Zubryts'kyi was investigating the rumors: "Perhaps, this was true, the priests went to check it out. It is said that even the priest from Mshanets' went there."³⁸⁰

Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi had educated some young followers and got in close contact with the community's leadership consisting of more prosperous villagers. One of these prosperous peasants was Ivan Sukhyi, born in 1830 and married in 1851. He made his first capital by smuggling tobacco from Hungary, although did not smoke himself. He was also traveling every year to the Hutsul region to trade in sheep. In 1883 he married off his older son, who stayed at home, and married his daughter off to another household. He also wanted to marry his younger son to another household but his wife was against it. The younger son, Fedio, was for some time a cantor and married in 1891 staying at his father's household as well. Around 1905, Ivan Sukhyi built a new house with two rooms; one of these had a furnace with a chimney and the other one an English kitchen and a radiator. Both sons had children and, including servants, there were 14 people in this farmstead. The land was registered as the sons' property, although in fact there was one farm run by Ivan. Fedio had his own store and kept a bull licensed by the Royal and Imperial Agricultural Society, for which he also received aid from the district council. He was also trading in fertilizer, receiving it by train cars. For the money he made on it he bought 12 *pruty* of landlord's land in Halivka. Fedio Sukhyi was also active in various village organizations.³⁸¹

As we know Rev. Zubryts'kyi started participating in local politics immediately after coming to Mshanets'. He was the one who reported to the newspapers on all the elections in Saryi Sambir district. In 1894 he for the first became a candidate during additional Diet elections in this district. He himself said that it was done "not so much by the will of Saryi Sambir electors as because of pressure from the National Council in L'viv."³⁸² He failed and believed that this happened because of the lack of support from the local Ruthenian intelligentsia. In 1895 he tried again and this time failed because the Vice-Roy ordered district captaincy to favor the elections of the chair of the local district council, Kazimierz Bieliński. Rev. Zubryts'kyi complained about the lack of funds for these electoral campaigns but believed that this was "a less important thing. It is

³⁸⁰ Volodymyr Hnatiuk, "Znadoby do ukrains'koi demonolohii," *Etnohrafichnyi zbirnyk*, t.34, 51.

³⁸¹ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Velyka rodyna v seli Mshantsy Starosambirskoho povitu," *ZNTSh*, t.73, (L'viv 1906), 121.

³⁸² VR LNB, f. Vasyi' Shchurat, spr.922, p.27, a.28.

impossible to better the fate of our people at once, it is far more important to open their eyes.”³⁸³

Similarly, in 1895 in Turka district. Rev. Ivan Chapel’s’kyi, Antin’s son, failed as a Ruthenian candidate. In this case, because of his affiliation with the clerical-conservative wing of Ukrainian politicians, he expected some support from the administration. Nonetheless, a Polish candidate was run against him as well, a certain Osuchowski. Rev. Chapel’s’kyi was terrorized by the Jews in the service of the Polish candidate; the district administration was not going to defend him and thus, according to the Ukrainian oppositional newspaper *Dilo*, its “double face” was disclosed. Local oppositional Ruthenians, led by Dr. Kornylo Chaikovs’kyi, were not going to vote for him as well.³⁸⁴

Throughout the 1890s Rev. Zubryts’kyi was also a member of the “National Council,” the supreme body of the Ukrainian national-populists in Galicia. On its session in December, 1890, when the introduction of “new era” compromise was celebrated, he belonged to the group of opposition national-populists, who were wary of this politics from the very beginning. This opposition attitude was expressed in the speech he gave there.³⁸⁵

The elections of 1895 were the first “Badeni” elections. While all of Austria knew about the bloody parliamentary elections of 1897, the Diet elections were not that notorious in the outside world, but they were the first bitter experience of the Ukrainian movement with Badeni after the final break with the policy of the “new era.” But even local Ruthenian politics remained the business of only a few people. In 1895 in Stare Misto at the electoral meeting 14 peasants, one townsman, seven priests, several Jews, eight other “suit-men,” the district captain and a policeman were present. Of all these only eight had the right to participate in the elections from the fourth curia. Nine of those present chose Rev. Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi as their candidate.³⁸⁶

The long list of abuses from Turka district concerning the Diet elections of 1895 looked as follows: 1) at sessions with mayors, the district captain ordered them to be elected as electors so as not to allow priests to become electors; 2) electoral commissars had with them Jewish agitators whom they told for whom to agitate; 3) the pre-elections were as a rule organized in chanceries of the landlords’ estates, i. e. in the houses of Jews, owners or renters of the estates; 4) commissars were agitating and ordering pre-electors to vote for mayors and Jews, using all kinds of threats depending on the individuality of the pre-electors; 5) when in Borynia 50 voters elected Rev. Moroz and one farmer as electors the

³⁸³ Ibid.

³⁸⁴ *Dilo*, 1895, No.225; *Dilo*, 1895, No.229.

³⁸⁵ Ivan Franko, “Viche v Turtsi,” *Zibrannia tvoriv*, t.46, kn.2, 89.

³⁸⁶ *Galichanin*, 1895, No.195.

captain cancelled the elections, and without any notification the local baron Kingsberg conducted there new pre-elections at which several Jews elected as electors the Jew Teichmann and one German; 6) in Iavora pre-elections were assigned for 11 AM on 10 September. The whole community (60 men) gathered at the community's chancery waiting for the commissar while he reached an agreement with the local Jews who took the mayor to the tavern, got him drunk, and the commissar with possessor Schmucl Weiss, several Jews and two peasants at the mayor's place elected Leisor Kraus as an elector. A protest was filed against these pre-elections and an investigation was promised, but Kraus was left as elector; 7) in Botlia the commissar added to the mayor's list two votes which were cast for Fedir Hotsur not and the mayor got a majority of two votes; 8) in Hnyla commissar Hrichowski ordered people not to elect the priest because then the commissar would "fry them for taxes." However, Rev. Shvedzyts'kyi was elected with 70 votes, the captain cancelled this pre-election and organized another one where several Jews and a couple of peasants elected someone else; 9) in Tarnava many pre-electors were not allowed to vote; when Rev. Solohub demanded their rights the commissar Hrichowski reached for his blade; 10) in Husne Vyzhnie the whole community was waiting for the commissar but he organized secret pre-elections and did not allow the mayor to call in the community; 11) in Bahnovate the commissar came into the village secretly and organized pre-elections while the community with the priest was waiting for him in vain; 12) in Turka Rev. Salamon was not allowed to vote although he had the right; 13) after the elections of the deputy which was boycotted by the mayor of Botlia as well as many other electors, the mayor Teodor Strohan' got a letter from the captain stating that he was not fetching governmental correspondence from the postal office on time and because of that the district captain was sending a punishing messenger (*karnyi pislants'*) who would stay in the village until the mayor proves receiving governmental correspondence and will not explain the delay, all the expenses of the stay had to be covered by the mayor. The letter was written by the captain without actually checking the situation. When the mayor got the letter he rode to the captaincy with the postal book but had to wait there two days till the captain checked it and rescinded the punishment. The mayor mentioned to the captain that he recently lost a child, and the captain said that this was God's punishment for not voting for Mr. Osuchowski. Dr Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi adds: "In July of this year the captain's child died as well, but we are not going to judge why God allowed this to happen."³⁸⁷

Rev. Zubryts'kyi reported that district captains in the mountainous districts assumed much more power than they did in the lowlands. He also mentions in particular the Turka captain Biliński, who asked mayors to pay the gendarmes for

³⁸⁷ Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi, "Z povitu – turets'koho," *Dilo*, 1895, No.251.

their service during the elections.³⁸⁸ It seems that Staryi Sambir district was doing better on these elections because it did not have such a zealous district captain. The district captain was an older man, waiting to finish in peace the last year and a half of his service. Nonetheless, there was another side to this – he did not want any disturbances to spoil the end of his career and was forbidding Ruthenian meetings.

In 1896 the first peasant meeting planned in the district was forbidden in Stare Misto, and this was justified by the typhus epidemic that had broken out in several localities in the district. The place in which the meeting was to take place was used for slaughtering cattle, and this provided another reason. At first the meeting was to take place on 14 March, but Mykhas and Humets'kyi decided to call their meeting for 24 March; that is why national democracy from Stare Misto chose to have one common meeting. In Staryi Sambir those calling the meeting were Rev. Zubryts'kyi, Rev. Iavors'kyi, Volosians'kyi, a vice-mayor of Stare Misto, and the peasant Illia Linyns'kyi from Linyinka. 24 March was a market day in Stare Misto and many people were looking for meeting. Finding out that the meeting was forbidden, they complained: “They beat us and don't let us cry.” Zubryts'kyi was showing how corrupted were the mayors of district communities. When there were additional elections to the district council peasants elected Il'ko Linyns'kyi but the council would not let him in, filing a complaint against him to the Vice-Roy's office. Despite all the corruption and lack of control over the administration of communities, the peasants of the district were awakening and discussing the discrimination against them. The mayors were said to be elected against the will of the administration. “And the more the evil spirits advance against them, the greater is their energy, the greater their will to defend.”³⁸⁹

In 1896 an appeal to the peasants was mailed to the mayors of Turka and Stare Misto districts. The appeal was signed by “friends of the communities.” It was sent only to Ruthenian communities and sent from the Skole post office. The appeal spoke out against priests, was comparing payments to priests with robot obligations and referred to the Josephinian patent on *jura stolae*.³⁹⁰ The appeal was obviously the work of the district administration and was meant to undermine the authority of Ruthenian priests in these two overwhelmingly Ruthenian districts, where priests still maintained strong control over their communities.

Coming to the area later than Rev. Zubryts'kyi Rev. Iavors'kyi nonetheless became local Ruthenian leader. In 1897 Rev. Iavors'kyi founded a reading club in his parish Stril'bychi.³⁹¹ It seems that by 1900 Rev. Ivan Iavors'kyi managed to

³⁸⁸ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], “Strawne' zhandarmam za vybory,” *Dilo*, 1896, No.58.

³⁸⁹ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], “Pys'mo z Staro-miskoho,” *Dilo*, 1896, No.60.

³⁹⁰ Mykhailo Zubrytskii, “Pryiateli Hromad,” *Dilo*, 1896, No.103.

³⁹¹ “V staromiskim povitii,” *Svoboda*, 1897, No.26.

consolidate his power in the community. During elections to the community council, the district captain supported the old mayor and governmental commissar; the captaincy's clerk openly said that to the peasants, threatening to accuse them of rioting: "I know that there is someone among you who incites you against the royal and imperial authorities and against the Most Enlightened Monarch (*pan*) himself." To this Ivan Iakiv answered: "We know each other best because we have lived together since our childhood and we know who has been what and who is good for what. We are not children who can be talked into something good for someone else. We are going to do things that appear good to us."³⁹²

Revs. Zubryts'kyi and Iavors'kyi started fighting two priests who did not follow the people and other priests, namely Revs. Vasyl'kevych and Hrytsykevych who were founding their own committee.³⁹³ While Mykhas was trying to make amends with the district authorities and was proud of the fact they were interested in him, Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi conducted an uncompromising struggle with them. He was exposing the level of corruption, dirty deals benefiting local Jewish capitalists and discriminating against peasants.³⁹⁴ While up to 1897 he was fighting with the district authorities in his own communities and on the pages of Ruthenian periodicals, starting with 1897 he was co-organizing district rallies.

1897 was the year when the first peasant meeting was called in Stare Misto district. At first, before the elections, a meeting was called in Mshanets' and people were reported "to show great interest in such an unheard of event in this area."³⁹⁵ At that meeting ten villages from Stare Misto district participated, five villages from Lisko district, and seven from Turka district. Altogether around 500 villagers gathered.³⁹⁶ Then a meeting was called in Holovets'ko, where four priests and a hundred peasants gathered.³⁹⁷ The small number was explained by the fact that at the same time Holovets'ko Horishnie hosted a religious mission. Rev. Zubryts'kyi was among the organizers of that meeting. Peasants spoke against female teachers, against engineers, who harm farmsteads while constructing railways, against damage caused by military detachments, and against pouring sewage into the river. By and large Rev. Zubryts'kyi was disappointed with the peasants:

³⁹² "Pys'ma z kraiu," *Dilo*, 1900, No.76.

³⁹³ "Rukh politychnyi ruskoho selianstva," *Svoboda*, 1897, No.8.

³⁹⁴ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Z Staro-miskoho povita," *Dilo*, 1897, No.166.

³⁹⁵ "Rukh politychnyi ruskoho selianstva," *Svoboda*, 1897, No.2.

³⁹⁶ "Z rukhu vichevoho," *Dilo*, 1897, No.5-6.

³⁹⁷ D., "Rukh politychnyi ruskoho selianstva," *Svoboda*, 1897, No.28.

The peasants spoke little, and there were some who came out with simple nonsense and called the meeting's presidium "the most enlightened commission." For example, one poor man, obviously depressed by misfortune, came to the meeting's presidium, bowed and said: 'Most enlightened commission, please! There were bad times, I went to Podillia meanwhile people occupied my land and do not want to return it'...Or another one, after the talk on reading clubs, stepped forward and said: 'Most enlightened commission, please, all this is good, schools and reading clubs, but the only problems is: from where should we take funds for all this, because even without this a man cannot pay all the extractions!' He was so concerned with this and was relieved only when Rev. Iavors'kyi explained to him the organization of the reading clubs.³⁹⁸

Saryi Sambir district, which was totally Ruthenian, had an administration using only Polish, and in 1898, the idea was advanced to have a translator from Ruthenian to Polish in the district captaincy. However, the candidate for this position was a lackey of the district administration who worked as community scribe in four villages and did not know the Ruthenian language very well, and no one knew what his education was.³⁹⁹

During the elections of 1897 in Sambir-Stare Misto-Turka-Rudky electoral district the "hard Ruthenian" Dr. Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi stood against the Barvins'kyi group's candidate Modest Karatnyts'kyi. The outcome of these elections was as follows:⁴⁰⁰

*Table 8-7 "Voting in the Fourth Curia of the Sambir-Stare Misto-Turka-Rudky electoral district in 1897"*⁴⁰¹

District	Votes for Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi	Votes for Modest Karatnyts'kyi
Sambir	56	139
Stare Misto	86	45
Turka	2	151
Rudky	89	73
Total	233	408

³⁹⁸ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Viche narodne v Holovetsku," *Dilo*, 1897, No.148.

³⁹⁹ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Z Staromiskoho," *Dilo*, 1898, No.255.

⁴⁰⁰ *Dilo*, 1897, No.52.

⁴⁰¹ *Dilo*, 1897, No.52.

As we see, Stare Misto district showed even better results than the more organized Rudky district. At the same time neighboring Turka district showed unbelievable unanimity in voting for the governmental candidate. Crucial for such a difference between the two districts seems to be the position of the district administration. The district captain of Stare Misto was replaced after these elections, perhaps because he did not intervene in them enough. You'll see that later on I mention that Ricci was appointed in 1897. By contrast, the odious captain Biliński from Turka district did not hesitate to abuse powers of administration.

In 1897 in the village of Mykhnivets', neighboring Mshanets', the pre-elections looked as follows: the *konzipient* of the captaincy and the community scribe in Turka, Anton Nadolski, was sent to conduct them. Together with the local mayor Fedio Gavidan, six Jews and three peasants, he locked himself up in the tavern under the protection of the gendarme who did not let anyone else enter. Of those gathered in the tavern only two peasants and two Jews had the right to vote. At the same time there were around 80 peasants with the right to vote who could not get inside the tavern and who were told by Nadolski that it was already too late for them to vote. The mayor went from the village together with the commissar, scared of the peasants who were shouting: "That dog of a mayor sold us, stepped on Constitution, down with such a mayor." Nadolski also allegedly heard someone shouting "kill the mayor," and for this the peasants were brought to court.⁴⁰²

In 1899 the Ukrainian National Democratic Party was founded. This formalized the hegemonic position of the Ukrainian project among Ruthenians and provided for this project a perfect political structure. Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi became an active member of the party. The party's program, which was presented as "The National Program," stated:

We, Galician Ruthenians, part of the Ukrainian-Ruthenian nation that once had state independence and then has been fighting for centuries for its state-political rights and has never resigned and is not resigning from the right of being an independent nation, proclaim that the final goal of our national strivings is to reach the point at which the whole Ukrainian-Ruthenian nation will gain cultural, economic and political independence and with time unite in a single national organism, in which the majority of the people for their common good would manage their affairs: cultural, economic and political.⁴⁰³

In 1900 Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi was a candidate during the Diet elections from the electoral district Sambir-Rudky-Turka-Staryi Sambir. Russophiles ran their own

⁴⁰² "Za pravybory v Mykhnivtsi," *Dilo*, 1897, No.185.

⁴⁰³ "Narodna prohrama," *Svoboda*, dodatok do ch.52., 1899.

candidate, Aloizii Dobrians'kyi; only if he lost in the first round would the Russophiles ask their supporters to vote for Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi.⁴⁰⁴ The outcome was as follows:

Table 8-8 "Voting from the Fourth Curia in 1900 Diet Elections in the Sambir-Rudky-Turka-Staryi Sambir Electoral District."⁴⁰⁵

Political District	Zubryts'kyi	Dobrians'kyi	Gizowski
Sambir	-	96	6
Staryi Sambir	43	4	71
Turka	40	6	103
Rudky	59	23	72
Total	142	129	342

It seems that the support for Dobrians'kyi and not for Zubryts'kyi in Sambir district can be explained by the agitation of Ivan Mykhas. Rev. Zubryts'kyi himself complained that the latter was supporting the Russophiles in these elections. This remarkable outcome for the Sambir district can be also explained by the presence of the Russophile attorney Humets'kyi, who enjoyed popularity among peasants.

It seems that around 1900 Rev. Zubryts'kyi was especially upset by attempts to use tensions between the priests and peasants over the payments for rituals in political struggle. In 1900 the district captain Ricci initiated frequent sessions with village mayors. In October 1900 alone there were three such sessions. The captain spoke to the mayors in Polish, and some mayors were not able to understand his speech. He tried to persuade the peasants that they have to stick with the government. He, Ricci, personally was wishing the peasants only good, and was not taking money from them, unlike other peasants' "advisors" (obviously attacking in this way Ruthenian priests). Rev. Zubryts'kyi commented on this:

⁴⁰⁴ VR LNB, f. Ivan Levvys'kyi, op.2, spr.1296, a.44.

⁴⁰⁵ *Svoboda*, 1900, No.49.

Mister captain nevertheless takes others' money, that which people pay in taxes; he has nice clothes, cozy accommodation – a whole floor in the captaincy's building, he takes for himself more profitable commissions, takes from Spas barley and fodder for his horses, and for all this all he does usually is sit in his chancery or even occupy himself with agitation; often he dresses in a uniform and, taking army horses, he goes to Sozan' for *rendez-vous*.⁴⁰⁶

Ricci's negative attitude toward Ruthenian priests was seen from the very start of his work in the district. Immediately after his appointment in 1897 the gendarmes made a trip through the district's villages inquiring about how much priests charged for rituals. But this inquiry did not produce any results that could be used against the Ruthenian priests.⁴⁰⁷ In 1901 Rev. Zubryts'kyi in his article to *Dilo* ridiculed Ricci's claim to be of noble Italian origin and showed that he was, in fact, the son of a poor Austrian who came to Galicia and was selling icons at the markets.⁴⁰⁸

Already in the 1901 Diet elections the numbers returned to normal. The majority of the rural constituency in the Sambir district voted for the Polish candidate with the Ukrainian peasant Plaskach receiving the usual number of votes coming from "conscious" Ruthenian villages:

Sozański - 126 votes,
Plaskach - 21;⁴⁰⁹

In Saryi Sambir district the Polish candidate Agopsowicz won against the Ukrainian peasant Petro Lityns'kyi only by a small margin:

Lityns'kyi - 50
Agopsowicz - 56.⁴¹⁰

These elections were remarkable for the fact that some Ruthenian electors took money from Polish candidates but nevertheless voted for Petro Lityns'kyi. In the case of one of them "an honest farmer" (*chесnyi gazda*) [sic!] Vas'ko Liernatovych from Volia Koblians'ka, that he reneged was discovered by the Jewish agitators working for the Polish candidate who beat him and took the money back. These elections were also very expensive for the Polish candidate. Minimal payments for a vote were five Gulden, but at the end of the elections, when the votes became decisive, 100 and even 200 Gulden were given for one.⁴¹¹

⁴⁰⁶ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Z Starosambirskoho," *Dilo*, 20.10.1900.

⁴⁰⁷ "Pys'ma z kraiu," *Dilo*, 1899, No.22.

⁴⁰⁸ *Dilo*, 1901, No.187.

⁴⁰⁹ *Dilo*, 1901, No.188.

⁴¹⁰ *Dilo*, 1901, No.189.

⁴¹¹ *Dilo*, 1901, No.193.

Despite another electoral failure Ruthenian movement in the district was reported to advance. The name plates of the villages and towns in Ukrainian were placed beside Polish ones. And “oinkers” were reported to be beaten after the elections⁴¹² Even those peasants who collaborated with the administration were said to be conscious of doing indecent things.⁴¹³

In the Presidium of the People’s Council (*Narodna Rada*) of Staryi Sambir district in 1901 all the three main Ruthenian estates were represented:

Ivan Iavorsky, pastor from Stril’bychi

Iakov Iarema, townsman from Staryi Sambir

Vasyl’ Labych, farmer from the village of Strilky.

In 1901 the national movement felt strong enough to begin a campaign against the district administration. Ricci refused to give positions in the district for those voting for Ukrainian candidates, fraud perpetrated by officials was covered up by the district administration and only the intervention of Ukrainian deputies to parliament could help find justice.⁴¹⁴ In 1903 the Ruthenian list of candidates to the District Council in Sambir failed, and only a few Ruthenians were elected, as it was said, for decorative purposes, among them dean Rev. Kozanevych.⁴¹⁵ Despite all the complaints and manifestations against the captain he was not replaced by the Vice-Roy’s Office. Because of such a figure the years of popular upheavals 1905-1907 were especially turbulent in Staryi Sambir district. These were the years of the Russian revolution and the struggle for the introduction of general franchise. In 1905 someone broke Ricci’s skull one night; whoever was guilty of that offence was never found. The district captain posed as a victim of Ruthenian “radicalism,” while Ruthenians believed that the captain had enough enemies without the Ruthenians.⁴¹⁶

1905 was the year of massive peasant rallies and demonstrations. During the elections peasants had the courage to stand not only against the gangs of hired hooligans terrorizing voters but against the district captain himself. During pre-elections in the village of Bun’kovychi a Jew distributed cigars among the villagers and was challenged by the peasant Zan’kiv. Ricci, who was present at these pre-elections asked the Jew about the reason for the conflict and ordered him to give a cigar to Zan’kiv. Zan’kiv answered: “Thank you, mister captain. I have my own tobacco in the pouch, even if it is worth only two Kreuzer, but if you do not have your own I can share it with you, please!”⁴¹⁷

⁴¹² *Dilo*, 1901, No.187, 206.

⁴¹³ Mykhailo Zubryts’kyi, “Pys’ma z kraiu”, *Dilo*, 1901, No.147.

⁴¹⁴ Z. D. A., “Zi Starosambirskoho,” *Svoboda*, 1901, No.43.

⁴¹⁵ “Z Sambora,” *Ruslan*, 1903, No.43.

⁴¹⁶ *Dilo*, 1905, No.62.

⁴¹⁷ “Narodni vicha i manifestatsii,” *Dilo*, 1905, No.282.

In the two years that followed 1905 the number of meetings and rallies continued to increase. The propaganda on behalf of universal, equal and secret elections among the peasants did not emphasize immediate gains, but rather made use of notions of peasant respect and peasant power. In 1906 the so-called “Fighting Fund” was created to support peasant action, and individual peasants donated generously. In the village of Side 200 persons donated 214 Kronen, in Ozymyna 300 – 438, in Prusy 300 -358, in Bilychi 300 - 238, in gentry Kul’chytsi 150 - 188, in peasant Kul’chytsi 100 - 140, in Dorozhiv 1,500 Kronen were collected. Peasant meetings that year gathered from 200 to 1500 participants.⁴¹⁸ For comparison, the Russophile village of Raitarovychi in 1907 contributed donations from only 38 peasants, who collected 40 Kronen.⁴¹⁹

In 1907 more than 30 meetings were held in the Staryi Sambir district on the eve of pre-elections for the extraordinary Diet election. It was said that “prepared in this way, the people stood fast during pre-elections.” Despite the pressure from electoral commissars appointed by the district administration, only eight mayors became electors. Of these eight, two voted for the Polish candidate, two for the Ruthenian, and two abstained from the elections altogether. From 40 to 60 Kronen were offered to the electors for their vote, but they were rejected the offers. On the very day of the elections the price of a vote rose from 50 to 100 Kronen. Andrii, son of Pukach from Stril’bychi, was offered 200 Kronen for simply abstaining from the elections. All the priests, with the exception of Rev. Vasylykevych and the Vice-Marshall of the District Council, Rev. Kozanevych, voted for the Ruthenian candidate.

Unheard of inspiration embraced people after the outcome of the elections was announced. This was the first victory in our district for the whole time of the constitutional era. Singing *Shche ne vmerla Ukraina* [the Ukrainian national anthem], *Myr Vam brattia* [quasi-anthem from 1848], and *Hei tam na hori Sich ide* [anthem of the *Sich* societies], the procession moved from the building of the district council to the market square [where the town hall was located]. The electors were joined by twice as many peasants, who came to watch elections from pure interest and, numbering together 150 people, crossed the main street, market square and gathered all in one townsman’s house.⁴²⁰

The parliamentary elections of 1907 were even tenser: Ukrainian activists claimed to “barely avoid bloodshed.” Arrests were widespread and the abuse of administrative authority was the rule. It was said that earlier “the elections were

⁴¹⁸ “Narodni vicha i manifestatsii,” *Dilo*, 1906, No.28, 50.

⁴¹⁹ *Russkoie Slovo*, Dodatok do chysla 7, 1907.

⁴²⁰ “Shche pro dopovniaiuchy vybir posla v Starim Sambori,” *Dilo*, 1907, No.18.

open but the abuses secret, and now it is the opposite.”⁴²¹ In Saryi Sambir district peasants had elections were repeated three times, which was too much for the peasants participating in general elections for the first time, but they went to the polls. The Social Democrat Semen Vityk won, and Hryhorii Sen’kus, the old friend of Ivan Mykhas now based near Saryi Sambir, was accused by the National Populists from Saryi Sambir of electoral abuse and collaboration with the district administration during his agitation in favor of Vityk.⁴²² He was the third among the early Radicals from the region who was involved in compromise with administration.

In the 1908 Diet election in Saryi Sambir district the Ukrainian candidate lost:
Lewakowski - 71
Iavors'kyi - 38⁴²³

The situation with the elections in the Galician countryside seems to support Eugene Weber’s thesis that with time “open repression or fraud became a symbol less of subjection than of emancipation. So, perhaps, did the violence of organized gangs hired to keep electors from the polls.”⁴²⁴ But we should remember that the change in peasants’ voting behavior from being determined by personal short-term gain to being determined by the perceived national and class was not necessarily once and for all; a district electing a Ruthenian candidate in 1907 could elect a Polish one in 1908. The change was firmest on the level of representation.

The elections of 1908 were characterized by the administration's abuse not only in Saryi Sambir district; once again the blood of Ukrainian peasants was spilled, just as in 1897. Revenging this, a radical Ukrainian student Myroslav Sichyns'kyi murdered Vice-Roy Potocki. That murder started a wave of fear and governmental terror against Ukrainian organizations. Ricci and other district officials claimed to be receiving letters with death sentences from Ukrainian radicals only and went out with revolvers. Ruthenian Easter in Saryi Sambir district was celebrated under the surveillance of police and army patrols; singing Ukrainian songs in public was a serious offence.⁴²⁵ The Ukrainian press tried to present this as ungrounded panic. But we know that villages were exhibiting a more confrontational attitude in the usual disputes and were flooded with gendarmes.⁴²⁶

⁴²¹ *Dilo*, 1907, No.107.

⁴²² *Dilo*, 1907, No.108, 113, 115, 120.

⁴²³ “Vyborchi naduzhyttia,” *Dilo*, 1913, No.144, “Po vyborakh,” *Dilo*, 1913, No.146.

⁴²⁴ Eugene Weber, *My France. Politics, Culture, Myth* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 185.

⁴²⁵ “Tak vlasty „uspokoiuiut” naselennia?,” *Dilo*, 1908, No.102.

⁴²⁶ Iv. Iavorskyi, “Iz Starosambirshchyny,” *Dilo*, 1909, No.67.

There is no doubt that some radical student organizations were sending threatening letters. One preserved in the new Vice-Roy Bobrzyński's collection and signed Ts.K.U.M.S.Sh. stated that the parliamentary road of political struggle has not improved peasant fate and Sichyns'kyi has shown a new one: "History teaches that without revolution no nation can liberate itself. Revolution is only a physical consequence of the overturn that has occurred in people's minds." And further on:

We should not be just a litter (*pidstylka*) of history, we should create it consciously. We have to expand our world-view and initiate revolutionary propaganda among the people. We need an organized mass, conscious of its goal! Our next task will be to organize groups from younger lads in the villages, supply them with literature and thus elevate their cultural level and prepare for the great cause... Long live free Ukraine. No prisons. Land for the peasant. The factory for the worker. Let Eden on Earth flourish.⁴²⁷

The administration's success in the elections of 1908 also seemed to be the outcome of its alliance with the Russophiles. On the eve of the elections of 1911 Rev. Onyshkevych confronted not only Polish but also Russophile candidates. Russophile influences were fought with the help of meetings organized in the Russophile villages.⁴²⁸

Rev. Zubryts'kyi worked against the Russophiles actively and at least since 1900 publicly. He believed that the latter had no chances against national-populist Ukrainian priests. He was not afraid of the Russophiles' agitation against him because he believed that the authority of the priest depended on the work he does for his people and his nation. As an example he cited Bilych, the center of Russophilism in Saryi Sambir district. According to him, the local peasants were neglected by their pastor, they heard only "give money" and they followed this example during elections. During the last elections they voted for the Polish candidate who offered them money, while the peasants from Mshanets' voted for the Ruthenian candidate. But the peasants from Bilych go to the market in Liutovys'ka through Mshanets' and because of the distance stay there overnight. After the last elections the peasants of Mshanets' were not letting peasants from Bilych stay in the village overnight and explained that this was because of their stance during the elections. He also rebutted accusations of being a "radical," and showed that in the last elections Ivan Mykhas was in the alliance with the Russophile from Stare Misto, Dr. Iarema, and against Rev. Zubryts'kyi.⁴²⁹

During the elections of 1911 in Drohobych and Saryi Sambir districts,

⁴²⁷ BJ, sygn.8109/III.

⁴²⁸ "Peredvyborchyi rukh," *Dilo*, 1911, No.110.

⁴²⁹ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Kil'ka sliv z nahody st. "Dila" pir z. "Lytsemiry," *Dilo*, 30.03.1901.

Ukrainian Social Democrat Semen Vityk received 12,121 votes,
National Populist Rev. Iavors'kyi - 11,841.

In the 1913 elections to the diet, which were still curial, in Sambir district,
Polish candidate Sozański received 109 votes

Ukrainian national populist Rev. Volodymyr Petryk - 76

Russophile peasant Kryś'ko (from the richest stratum of the peasantry) - 5

In Staryi Sambir district,

National Populist Rev. Iavors'kyi received 71 votes

Polish candidate Lewakowski - 54

The results of the elections in Sambir district show that the Ruthenian petty gentry were voting for the Ukrainian candidate. Sozański was reported to have spent on these elections ten times as much money as on previous elections.⁴³⁰ It is also important to note that both successful Ukrainian candidates in these districts in 1913 were national populist priests working with the peasants and disliked by their conservative brothers in Christ. Peasant candidates, with whom the movement experimented for some time, were thought to be less successful. Peasants quite often laughed at other peasants running in the elections – this was the case with a certain Koval's'kyi, a candidate in the 1911 elections.⁴³¹ Obviously, priests had better means for mobilizing the network of Ukrainian patriots and organizations. Peasant candidates like the above-mentioned Koval's'kyi were also not too reliable. The movement characterized Koval's'kyi as “an unsettled spirit” who worked as a scribe and served several terms in prison.⁴³²

It is also important to note that the outcome of the elections was not so much the result of the peasants' growing consciousness as the result of the growing power and size of the Ukrainian organization. Ukrainian activists did not hesitate to manipulate peasant electors and abuse their authority, very as like the administration and Polish landlords did. Social democrats, for example, were saying that the priests in Turka district threatened peasants who would vote for Vityk with damnation and took oaths from peasants that they would not vote for him.⁴³³ On the other hand, the Russophiles were saying that Semen Vityk visited villages in Turka district and presented himself there as Archduke Rudolf, whom the peasants believed still lived and worked to improve their lot.⁴³⁴ We know that in the first years of the twentieth century peasants in this area suspected every

⁴³⁰ “Vyborchi naduzhyttia,” *Dilo*, 1913, No.144, “Po vyborakh,” No.146.

⁴³¹ “Peredvyborchyi rukh,” *Dilo*, 1911, No.110.

⁴³² *Golos Naroda*, 1911, No.15.

⁴³³ V. Malynka, “Z khlops'koho pekla,” *Zemlia i Volia*, 1911, No.30.

⁴³⁴ “Iz Sambora,” *Golos Naroda*, 1911, No.28.

stranger of bourgeois appearance of being Rudolf, the “Prince” they dreamed of⁴³⁵

Anyhow, it has been seen that despite the growth of secular intelligentsia, it was difficult to bypass priests as mediators between city and countryside. The secular intelligentsia concentrated in the cities had difficulties reaching out to the countryside. While in a district like Stryi, where villages were tightly connected with the district capital and lay along the important roads and railways with an easy connection to L’viv, the Ukrainian attorney Olesnyts’kyi residing in the district capital was able to organize a basically secular network, in districts like Turka and Staryi Sambir Ruthenian movements up to 1914 had to rely on the parish priests. Ruthenians felt the lack of activists working among the peasantry. When Rev. Iavors’kyi, who traveled through every village in the district and personally made the elections of 1907 a turning point in the district’s political life, was elected as a parliamentary deputy, fears were expressed that the district lost “its only Ukrainian activist.”⁴³⁶ This was an exaggeration, but in fact the elections of 1908 were lost by the Ukrainians.

One of the things that intrigues me about the story of Ruthenian activists in Staryi Sambir district is why Rev. Iavors’kyi and not Rev. Zubryts’kyi became the leader of the local Ukrainian patriots, a member of the National Committee of Ukrainian National Democracy and, eventually, a Diet deputy. One of the clues is provided by Ivan Franko, who, describing one of the meetings in the 1890s, praises Rev. Iavors’kyi’s oratorical skills and disparages those of Rev. Zubryts’kyi.⁴³⁷ This seems to be true even though in other reports to the Ukrainian press, as for example one from 1903, the style of Rev. Zubryts’kyi’s speeches is characterized as “accessible and clear.”⁴³⁸ It seems that Rev. Iavors’kyi spent less time writing reports to the Ukrainian press and doing ethnographic research but more time in actual political agitation. Yet he as well contributed to assembling the “Ukrainian heritage” – the collection of manuscripts of the former and contemporary Ukrainian National Museum in L’viv holds a group of nineteenth century documents from his parish, Stril’bychi.

Ukrainian politics in the districts were not as straightforward and as continual expanding as their representations were suggesting; the alliances and loyalties in the countryside shifted very often and those praised on one occasion could be represented as renegades on another. Vasyl’ Basarab, founder of the reading club in Stara Ropa, who organized a “revolution” there and became a mayor, was said to do so only to become a member of the district council, where he could get

⁴³⁵ Volodymyr Hnatiuk, “Peredmova,” *Etnohrafichnyi Zbirnyk*, t.6 (L’viv, 1904), II.

⁴³⁶ O. Ch., “Z Starosambirshchyny,” *Ruslan*, 1907, No.70.

⁴³⁷ Ivan Franko, “Viche v Turtsi,” *Zibrannia tvoriv*, t.46, kn.2, 89.

⁴³⁸ “Zahal’ni zbory ‘Narodnoi Rady’ v Starim Sambori,” *Dilo*, 1903, No.47.

some money on intrigues with the landlords. Rev. Iavors'kyi helped Basarab to become mayor, but when elections to the district council came Basarab worked against Rev. Iavors'kyi and even persuaded a shop-keeper from Stara Ropa to help him organize for the election of the Polish priest Mach from Khyriv. The shop-keeper was actually working in a store founded by the *Prosvita* reading club in Stara Ropa. After the death of Rev. Skorodyns'kyi the village of Sushytsia Velyka, which was known for its Ruthenian consciousness fell under the influence of the local estate manager, who made an alliance with the local teacher and mayor.

The Basilian monks in Lavriv, who had been a pillar of Ruthenianism in the past, at the beginning of the twentieth century lived in a very good relationship with the district captaincy and counted on its support in their suits with local peasants for land and for labor obligations. The Hrytsak family, which rebutted the monks' claims, was administratively punished by the captain for inciting to riot. In this conflict Rev. Zubryts'kyi sided with the peasants.⁴³⁹

Besides the Polish administration, Jews continued to figure as enemies of the Ukrainian movement in Zubryts'kyi's articles, although largely in his articles from the 1890s. Jews were not just tavern-keepers but also entrepreneurs; they had bought out licenses for the sale of monopolized goods such as salt and tobacco. They had deals with the Turka district captain, Biliński, who was defending them.⁴⁴⁰ These monopolies became especially important in the 1890s, when the village reform was going on and Rev. Zubryts'kyi tried to teach his parishioners about entrepreneurship. It is interesting that Rev. Zubryts'kyi also shows that many Jews were quite poor and that their life style was not much different from that of the peasants.⁴⁴¹

By and large Ruthenian activists attacked two categories of Jews – the landlords and great speculators, who made their fortunes in the 1870s on peasant debts and who had good connections with the state administration, and those petty middlemen, shop- and tavern-keepers, traders making money off the peasants and working for both the landlords and district administration in politics. In the 1870s a certain Aberdam Fischel made a fortune on peasant debts and bought the villages of Sushytsia Velyka, Terlo and parts of Linya Velyka. Even though he died in 1895, his forester and manager of the Linya estate, a Jew, controlled the village by controlling the village's access to the forest. He was a constant elector from that village during all the election in the 1890s.⁴⁴²

⁴³⁹ [Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi], "Z Starosambirskoho...", *Dilo*, 7.03.1901.

⁴⁴⁰ [Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo], „Pys'mo z turetksoho povita,” *Dilo*, 1897, No.184.

⁴⁴¹ [Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo], "Z Staromiskoho [Kudy divaiut'sia neraz hroshi nashykh liudei]," *Dilo*, 1894, No.33.

⁴⁴² "Z Staromiskoho," *Dilo*, 1895, No.262.

In 1892 the villagers of Mshanets', perhaps under Zubryts'kyi's influence, sent a petition to parliament. They requested lower excise taxes and salt prices, motivating their request by the fall of land prices and describing their daily hardships. It was said that sometimes in winter several peasants were sharing the same coat, that the assets of the majority of the villagers were worth less than 200 Gulden.⁴⁴³ Special emphasis was placed on the Jewish speculators – those having a certificate (monopoly) on salt trade were selling salt wholesale to Jews without certificates and the latter were reselling it, making 16 Kreuzer per piece. Moreover, these resellers to make money were filing down standard pieces of salt.⁴⁴⁴

But again the problem was not the system of state control over the sale of certain goods but the fact that Jews were monopolizing the sale of these goods and, in consort with the state administration, were working against the peasants. When the young farmer Aleksandr Dem'ianovskiy of Mshanets' (son of the village store-keeper, who owned the house used by the reading club) applied for permission to sell tobacco, his application was rejected.⁴⁴⁵ The same happened with the application of a villager from Dydiova, where Rev. Chapel's'kyi worked.⁴⁴⁶ Villagers opening village stores, either cooperative or private, were also repressed by the authorities.⁴⁴⁷ Before the Krone was introduced to replace the Gulden local Jews spread the rumor that bills would be exchanged at the rate of 80% of their nominal value and were buying them for 90 Kreuzer per Gulden.⁴⁴⁸ In 1893, the year after the reading club and community store were founded in Mshanets', the store had ten shareholders. The store's income for the year 1892 was 109 Gulden and 15 Kreuzer.⁴⁴⁹

Obviously, local peasants were wary of the enterprise, and Rev. Zubryts'kyi described angrily the attempts of Jews to undermine this weak enterprise. This was at a time when Rev. Zubryts'kyi tried to persuade other priests that with "tireless persuasion, instigation, together with sincerity and affection for the peasant, one will reach his goal."⁴⁵⁰ And we know that as late as 1907 it was said that

⁴⁴³ "Petytsiia hromadian Mshantsia Staro-Miskoho povita do Rady Derzhavnoi," *Bat'kivshchyna*, 1892, No.15.

⁴⁴⁴ "Z Staromiskoho povitu," *Dilo*, 1891, No.72.

⁴⁴⁵ "Z Staromiskoho povitu," *Dilo*, 1892, No.89.

⁴⁴⁶ "Z Turchanskoho," *Dilo*, 1892, No.96.

⁴⁴⁷ *Dilo*, 1897, No.6.

⁴⁴⁸ "Z Staromiskoho povita," *Dilo*, 1892, No.96.

⁴⁴⁹ *Chytal'nia*, 1894, No.13.

⁴⁵⁰ "Z-pod Liutovysk," *Dilo*, 1892, No.33.

commerce among the peasants is considered to be a profession if not totally dirty then at least not quite respectable. There are parents, who send their children to a tailor or to a smith believing that this way they will guarantee their secure future. To commerce only ignoramuses are sent, with whom no one else could manage to do something useful.⁴⁵¹

In their struggle with peasant enterprises Jews readily resorted to the peasant superstitions hated by Rev. Zubryts'kyi. Galician peasants saw Jews as powerful sorcerers, with whom readily only priests had enough power to compete.⁴⁵² We have already seen that Rev. Zubryts'kyi's authority among the local peasants had something of this magical power (the case of the priest-vampire). In 1892, the year the village store was founded, Abramko Hirt, a local Jew from Mshanets', spread the tale about the rabbi discovering the murderer. Rev. Zubryts'kyi was sure that this tale was directed against the younger generation of peasants influenced by him. Older peasants were telling these younger villagers: "You fool, do you not know that if the Jews go to the rabbi, he will read or recite such a prayer or curse that you would prefer to die." Rev. Zubryts'kyi said that because of this belief in Jewish powers, "our people will not undertake any business, around which the Jews have started meddling." To support the peasants' belief Jews were forever inventing new tales.⁴⁵³

This anti-Jewish discourse actually almost disappears in his texts from the 1900s. Perhaps, this was connected with the development of the network of Ukrainian cooperation undermining Jewish middlemen. Ukrainian discourse in general, which in the 1880s-1890s speaks about Jews as posing a danger to the Ukrainian peasants almost as great as Poles themselves, in the 1900s concentrated on the Poles. Probably, the Ukrainian-Zionist alliance during the parliamentary elections of 1907 was made possible against this background.

Critical of superstitions and the dark ways of the people, Rev. Zubryts'kyi nevertheless had to live with them, and it seems that sometimes he was on the verge of believing in them himself. For example, he tells the story about the parish of Nyzhankovychi, where every new priest soon becomes a widower. That is why it was vacant for quite some time. Finally, Rev. Dashkovych dared to apply for this position, arrived to Nyzhankovychi, and shortly thereafter his wife died. His other story is about the parish of Husakiv, which was known to be good for the priest for 14-16 years, but after that some misfortune had to happen. Rev. Vitoshyns'kyi died there after this term, and Rev. Khomyts'kyi became a widower. When Rev. Levyts'kyi was there for 13 years parishioners advised him

⁴⁵¹ I. Petrushevych, "Trudnosty torhovel'noho spil'nytstva," *Ekonomist*, 1909, No.5.

⁴⁵² Chmielowski, *Czarownicy, strzygi, mamony*, 25-26.

⁴⁵³ "Z Staromiskho povita," *Dilo*, 1892, No.14.

to go somewhere else, despite the fact that they liked him, and he moved to Iaroslav. Modern institutions, like schools, were not replacing fortune-tellers but coexisted with them, even in such a large village as Limna, which had had a school since 1820.⁴⁵⁴

Just like these modern institutions Rev. Zubryts'kyi was forced to live with the peasants' beliefs and understand them. I believe that this gave to his ethnographic research a particular sensitivity so often missing in the works of other Ukrainian ethnographers. He knew that his position as the local pastor influenced the kind of folk lore he was collecting. In 1899, sending Franko a song about robot, he complained that people did not want to tell him "dirtier things" and he was not "pressing" them for this.⁴⁵⁵ Quite often peasant ideas about dignity conflicted with the representations made of them; they did not want to be photographed, especially in folk costume. Volodymyr Hnatiuk could safely do his research in Mshanets', but in the neighboring village peasants were openly voicing their distrust of him and threatened him with murder.⁴⁵⁶ Peasant pride caused great problems for Rev. Zubryts'kyi when he tried to strengthen his authority among the villagers. He complained: "One can give up the conversation altogether after hearing: "I am a farmer with land, there is no one higher than a farmer-landowner" – *Ia sy gazda na grunti, nema starshoho nad gazdu.*⁴⁵⁷

Because of this sensitivity Rev. Zubryts'kyi was so often cited in this thesis. Because of him we can find bits and pieces about history known to the peasants, about the history villagers from Mshanets' knew before he came to the village: the partition of Poland was connected with the gentry's confederacies.⁴⁵⁸ Confederates allegedly pestered the landlords, who were so irritated by this that they decided: "Let's write to the tsar if we do not have our own; we shall give the land to him and will have peace." The point of this story from the peasant perspective was simple: "The landlords gave (*prydaly*) their land to the Austrian and it became alright. And now it is nice as well, now everyone is the same, landlords or peasant (*ty pan ty Ivan*)."⁴⁵⁹

Besides texts of direct relevance to the topic of this thesis, Rev. Zubryts'kyi left many others, dealing with the peasants' economy, complicated social structure,

⁴⁵⁴ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Budynty i maistry," *Zhytie i Slovo*, t.3, 71-75.

⁴⁵⁵ VR IL, f.3, spr. 1611, s.19-20.

⁴⁵⁶ Volodymyr Hnatiuk, "Peredmova," *Etnohrafichnyi Zbirnyk*, 1899, t.6, II.

⁴⁵⁷ "Z Staromiskoho povitu," *Dilo*, 1891, No.53.

⁴⁵⁸ And from other sources we know that these confederacies were felt by the state villages in the Sambir area in terms of money extractions and increased taxes – Roman Rybarski, *Kredyt i lichwa w ekonomii Samborskiej w XVIII wieku*, (Badania z dziejów społecznych i gospodarczych po redakcją prof. Fr. Bujaka, Nr.30) (Lwow, 1936).

⁴⁵⁹ Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, "Spomynty pro konfederativ," *Zhytie i Slovo*, t.1, (L'viv, 1894), 436.

material well-being, and the various strata of the local population. Those working on everyday life in the villages in the 1890s-1900s can find in his texts a great source for this kind of research. Even a simple list of the topics of his articles would take several paragraphs.⁴⁶⁰ He was also concerned with things over which national movement had little control and which challenged his as well as the movement's ideas about the proper development of the national project; one of these was the massive emigration from Galicia to North America, in which his village Mshanets' participated extensively.⁴⁶¹

One of my favorite Zubryts'kyi's studies is his attempt to describe the economic status of the villagers in his parish, which he knew so well – *Maietkovyi stan selian u Mshantsy starosambirskoho povitu v 1910 r.*⁴⁶² First of all he discards all the questionnaires of royal and imperial Galician economic society, which was relying on the data on peasants provided by the manorial estates. He does not trust state statistics either. The catastrophe of 15 July 1908, when hail destroyed the peasants' harvest and people in the whole area from Sambir down to the Hungarian border had to leave the village to look for charity, allowed him to survey peasants' wealth. Returning peasants, seeking aid from the state, provided detailed information on the sown and expected harvest. Besides that, they also provided information about money borrowed from them and lent by them to others as well as about interest on these sums. All this allowed him to create unique tables, which were left as long tables that list the villagers and their material assets; the data appeared so diverse that any generalization would constitute gross violence to it.

Rev. Zubryts'kyi was among those “practitioners” of the national project who felt a constant need to sustain it. In 1902, after several decades of the existence of popular publications, Rev. Zubryts'kyi was still stressing the need for them, just as he did a decade earlier. In his letter to Ivan Franko from 9 December 1902, praising Franko and Hrushev'skyi for making our nation “a reputation in the wider world,” he says: “but we should not forget about the popular masses and should give them a bit more and better intellectual food than is at present the case.” Zubryts'kyi proposed to popularize basic knowledge from the natural sciences, history and the history of culture. It would be good to publish scientific

⁴⁶⁰ See incomplete list of his works in Hryhorii Dem'ian, “Malovidomi storinky zhyttia i naukovi pratsi Mykhaila Zubryts'koho.”

⁴⁶¹ For this see Andriy Zayarnyuk, “Closing Modernity: Ukrainian Emigration and Images of America,” in Susan Ingram, Markus Reisenleitner, Cornelia Szabó-Knotik (eds.), *Reverberations. Representations of Modernity, Tradition and Cultural Value in-between Central Europe and North America*, (Frankfurt/M: Peter Lang, 2002), 175-98.

⁴⁶² Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, “Maietkovyi stan selian u Mshantsy starosambirskoho povitu v 1910 r.,” *Studii z polia suspil'nykh nauk*, t.III, 1912 [separate offprint].

fiction: “The masses desperately need more work dedicated to them than there is now.”⁴⁶³

We should not take Zubryts’kyi’s statement as proof of the low quality of popular publications; rather it is a testimony of the ongoing concern and sustained attention to them on the part of Ukrainian intellectuals and activists. Popular publications changed significantly since the 1870s. Let’s take a look at those published by *Prosvita* at the time Zubryts’kyi was expressing his concern with them. Popular books were being published about less known figures of “the national revival,” like Oleksandr Konys’kyi, and about famous heroes of the modern world, like Abraham Lincoln.⁴⁶⁴ They propagated ways to secure and insure the village from fires and showed the might of humanity the taming forces of nature.⁴⁶⁵ Practical advice now moved far ahead of the extended dialogues on the need to plow deeper. Advice was now given on how to integrate the scattered parcels of land that constituted peasant holdings,⁴⁶⁶ or how to protect oneself from epidemics.⁴⁶⁷ The description of modern diving technologies could be found side by side with stories from village life showing the intelligent organization of the village community.⁴⁶⁸

Now the reformers were not afraid of giving the peasants the old stories and apocryphal legends they were fighting against several decades earlier. In 1901 several apocryphal legends were republished from the book Narodovishchanie, originally printed in Pochaiv in the mid-eighteenth century. It was said that they were published not because of the truth one could find there, but because of the thoughts, views, beliefs and attitudes seen there.⁴⁶⁹ A popular history of Russia was published in the *Prosvita* series as well. An interesting thing was that this was a

⁴⁶³ VR II, f.3, spr. 1624, s.162.

⁴⁶⁴ Ivan Franko, Pro zhyttia i diial’nist’ Oleksandra Konys’koho (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.253) (L’viv, 1901). M. Zahirnia, Abraham Linkol’n (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.250) (L’viv, 1901). The American War of Independence also figured in these publications – M. Zahirnia, Borot’ba anhliskykh kolonii amerykan’skykh za voliu (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.299-300) (L’viv, 1905).

⁴⁶⁵ [Syl’vestr Lepkyi] Marko Murava, Horyt’ (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.254) (L’viv, 1901), M. V. Beren, Iak cholovik boret’sia z pryrodoiu (pereklad z rosiis’koi), (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.255-256) (L’viv, 1901).

⁴⁶⁶ Kost’ Hurkevych, Pro luchbu gruntiv abo komasatsyiu (z dvoma kartynamy) (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.266-267) (L’viv, 1902).

⁴⁶⁷ Hryts’ko Kovalenko, Yid choho vmerla Melasia? Opovidanie pro zadavku (dyfteryiu) (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.269) (L’viv, 1902).

⁴⁶⁸ M. Zahirnia, Pid mors’kymy khvyliamy (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.257) (L’viv, 1901). I. Potapenko, Hromdas’kyi sud. Opovidanie z ukrains’koho zhyttia (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.258) (L’viv, 1901).

⁴⁶⁹ Volodymyr Hnatiuk, Starokhrystyians’ki liegydy. Iz knyhy “Narodovishchaniie” (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.259), (L’viv, 1901), with “Foreword” by Ivan Franko.

translation from Russian.⁴⁷⁰ Among the novels and novellas on Ukrainian history the majority concentrated on Cossack times, especially on the times of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi.⁴⁷¹ And we have already seen that a book on Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi himself was eventually published and enjoyed success among the peasants in Mshanets'. This book caused great controversy, and because of its anti-Polish character the Galician Diet stopped its subventions for *Prosvita*.

At the beginning of the twentieth century poetry was included in these popular publications. It was said that "our peasants and less educated people in general, although they understand the importance of literature, usually do not understand the importance of the part of literature called poetry." Usually peasants paid attention to newspapers, stories, religious tales and legal regulations, but neglected poems. To correct this attitude a collection of poems for recitation was published. Most popular among peasants were poets like Shevchenko, Rudan'skyi, Fed'kovych, who were represented by one poem each because there were separate books of their poetry already published. Other poems represented here were Kornilo Ustyianovych's "Easter" (very anti-Polish), Ivan Franko's "Eternal Life," Volodymyr Aleksandrov's "Christ's Parable of the Sowers," Borys Hrinchenko's "Breadmaker," Musii Kononenko's "Testament of Iaroslav the Wise" (patriotic, historical), Amvrosii Metlyns'kyi's "Jug" (more of a fable), Mykhailo Staryts'kyi's "To the Youth" (with a metaphor on "the dark brother"), Vasyl' Lymans'kyi's "Cossack Skeleton," Vasyl' Kusych's "Guest Mower," Anton Mohyl'nyts'kyi's "The Ruthenian – a Soldier," Stefan Petrushevych's "Ancient Drunkards," and Ivan Franko's "Easter in 1848."⁴⁷²

The publication of the poetry went hand in hand with the appearance of other works, such as those of the modernist writer Bohdan Lepkyi. Although the story published in the popular series was not exactly modernist, the author explained that he "did not try to write it popularly but tried to write it well. Our peasants have an artistic feeling that is already developed. I know from my own experience and from what others tell me that our peasant prefers well-done, artistic works

⁴⁷⁰ M. Blahovieshchens'kyi (z ros. pereklav M. K.), *Istoriia Moskovshchyny do Petra Velykoho* (Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.264-265) (L'viv, 1902).

⁴⁷¹ V. Shch., *Bohdaniv synok* (na osnovi rosyis. romanu O. Rohovoi) (Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.271) (L'viv, 1902). Other like this were M. N. na osnovi povisti Rohovoi, *Het'mans'ki svaty* (Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.281-2) (L'viv, 1903); N. M. na osnovi povisty Rohovoi, *Smert' Tymosha* (Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.286) (L'viv, 1904); Za Mykoloiu Kostomarovym, *Dvi oblohy L'vova. Pereiaslavs'ka uhoda* (Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.304-305) (L'viv, 1905); N. Tykhyi. na osnovi povisty E. Hrebinky, *Oleksii Popovych. Oповідання z kozats'kykh chasiv* (Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.291-291) (L'viv, 1904).

⁴⁷² Ivan Franko, (ed.), *Vybir deklamatsii dlia rus'kykh selian i mishchan. Zladyv i peredmovu dodav Ivan Franko*. (Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.262 i 263) (L'viv, 1902). Later on a survey of Ukrainian poetry was published – Filaret Kolessa, *Ohliad ukrains'ko-ruskoi narodnoi poezyi* (Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.302-303) (L'viv, 1905).

over popular publications.” He was also trying to write a story from contemporary life that would be of interest to the peasants and something that could educate peasant taste, because “it was common knowledge that a peasant prefers a story from the life of the intelligentsia to one from his own, he prefers something from the historical past rather than from the present. He does not like descriptions of nature or studies of the human soul, and this causes great problems for our literature.”⁴⁷³ Many felt like that and were against lowering the style of their texts, believing that the peasants would be able to appreciate it as it is. The disappearance of the particular “enlightening” style dominating these publications since the 1860s went hand in hand with the shift in them to a more modern self-help and entertainment style. More representations of exotic places, more pictures, more concern with the political and ethnic mosaic of the world. New publications were targeting not so much peasant justice- and truth-seekers as curious and pleasure-seeking readers, those dreaming about other places and others peoples.

In 1911 the *Prosvita* executive said that village members of the society were quite often asking about society’s publications and requested it to publish more titles. The society excused itself on the grounds of limited funds and said that although they were publishing less in comparison with the turn of the century, they were publishing texts with better content and more illustrations. But their point also was that at this moment a reading club and the peasants could not stay satisfied with free publications for *Prosvita* members. There were other cheap books published by *Prosvita* and other publishers as well. To make these books accessible to the villagers the reading clubs were advised to take particular care of their libraries, which quite often were declining soon after their establishment and losing their collections.⁴⁷⁴

Just as in the case of other patriot priests, Zubryts’kyi’s sons were active in the national movement, paying particular attention to the military-like societies disciplining spirit and body. In 1914, arrested by the Austrian authorities, Rev. Zubryts’kyi spent some time in Thalerhof, the notorious internment camp for Russophiles; released from there he spent some time in Slovenia waiting till Austrian army took back Galicia, returned, left Mshanets’ after the war ended for a parish in Lisko district, Uhertsi Zaplatyns’ki, and died there as the army of the newborn Polish state was defeating the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic and its Ukrainian Galician Army. The stories Rev. Zubryts’kyi told, despite all their peculiarities and author’s stamp, also bore numerous affinities with the stories

⁴⁷³ Bohdan Lepkyi, *V hlukhim kuti* (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.278) (L’viv, 1903). Another example of just “literature” and not a popular work published in the popular series would be Osyp Makovei, *Oferma. Opovidanie z zhyttia voiskovoho* (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.279) (L’viv, 1903).

⁴⁷⁴ “Vid vydavnytstva”, in V. Lunkevych, z rosyiskoi movy na ukrains’ku pereklav Ivan Halushchyns’kyi, *Vidky vzialy sia nashi domashni zviriata i rostyny* (Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.360) (L’viv, 1911).

and parts of stories we encountered in the case of Ivan Mykhas and other people from the area. These affinities were grounded in something this thesis defines as the Ukrainian project.

Conclusions

To conclude, this thesis has made several major departures from the outline of nineteenth century Galician history one can find in the existing historiography. These are the following:

- The impact of the Austrian enlightened absolutism on Galician countryside has been underestimated in historiography. It not only intervened into the relationships between landowners and their serfs, alleviating the condition of the latter and restraining powers of the former, but created the framework (legal, institutional and political) that conditioned multiple manifestations of social and political life in Galicia in the first half of the nineteenth century and actions ranging from the social protest to the undertakings of the first national projects.

Despite the usual emphasis on the reaction and rollback from the social reforms of enlightened absolutism in the *Vormärz* period, this thesis has shown the lasting impact of these reforms', traces of which could be found even at the end of the long nineteenth century. Basic structure of landholding, the institution of village community, elementary schooling in the villages, ways to govern the countryside – major elements of all of these can be traced back to the end of the eighteenth century. Not only structures and institutions but also languages, especially the way peasants as social group were talked about, their duties and rights conceptualized, their education and knowledge imagined by the state, left its imprint on both peasants and movements that appeared in Galicia in the last decades of the absolutist rule.

These developments, and not just the persistence of feudal relationships between the peasants and landlords, were of crucial importance for the rural Galicia in the first half of the nineteenth century. The ideology of absolutism and its reformist projects did go down to the villages and villagers and scattered evidence of this can be found. In 1837 in the lost in the god-forsaken mountainous village of Isaï peasant son Iosyf Andrushkevych, ten years old, was writing during his exam the following dictation: "Peasants offend religion with superstitions. Their fear of God is that of a slave, fear of punishment. True fear of God derives from the son's feeling and should be based on the love of God."¹ Many distinctive features of Galician peasants' world-view, ideas about monarchy, state, history, their own place in the world, also can be traced back to the end of the eighteenth century.

¹ APP, ABGK, sygn.8734.

Besides these long-lasting influences of the absolutism, this thesis dealt with some concrete historic situation of the first half of the nineteenth century, when the absolutist mode of power in general and its concrete policies in respect of certain questions and social groups, its interaction with the feudal and community modes of power, conditioned the events of 1846 and 1848, and profile of the first Polish and Ruthenian projects. Case studies of 1846 and 1848 in this thesis, besides dealing with the events of these years, also interpret discursive regime created by the Austrian absolutism, in which some very modern elements coexisted, were negotiated and conflicted with those of the old regime.

- This thesis has shown that events of 1846 were of crucial importance not only for Polish national project but also for construction of the Ruthenian identity in Habsburg Galicia. The pioneering character of the planned Polish revolution of 1846 must be stressed. 1846 was not only about primacy of class conflict, which allegedly informed peasant action and made them to slaughter their landlords despite all the ardent speeches these landlords made and noble plans they cherished. It was about discourses and regimes of power, about engagement with the idea of collective agency, about possibility of social and political change, about new identities and new opportunities brought by them.

1846 was not only about armed confrontation, but confrontation of discourses, languages and images. Peasants' response to the events was far from unanimous, and the peasantry itself, even inside of the separate communities, was far from homogenous. The same was true of Polish conspirators: some of whom indeed thought far-reaching social reform and creation of the modern national state, engaging into the first one of many smart games modern projects tried to play with the region's peasants.

1846 also had long-lasting effects on the Polish and Ruthenian discourses in Galicia. Polish "fear of peasants," of social reform, particular codification of everything plebeian and populist and transposition of these codes onto the Ruthenian movement can be traced back to 1846. 1846 had also disclosed a glaring discrepancy between Polish nationalist project connected to new discursive regime and the bourgeois mode of power, and the constellation of power modes and discourses already at work in the Galician countryside. This discrepancy had determined the failure of Polish conspiracy in 1846 and permutation of the Polish national project.

But 1846 also influenced peasants, their perceptions of the state, social order, and politics. It introduced ideas about possibility of change, and national identity. It was reflected in a particular pattern of rumors, combining "Poles," "Russians," "Emperor," and "Landlords" appeared at that time and lasted till the 1880s. 1846 was also the first serious crack in the absolutist regime in Galicia and thus was connected to the regime's failure in 1848 and its dismantling in the 1860s.

- Events of 1848 in Galicia were occurring in the context created by the policies of the Absolutist government and by the memory of 1846. Ruthenian movement in 1848 did not have some original solution to peasant question and did not seek for the ways to mobilize peasants. Having no original solution to peasant question at the beginning of revolution together with Austrian liberals it hoped that emancipated peasants would turn into good citizens of the liberal state, rural counterpart of bourgeoisie. Together with Austrian liberals Ruthenian movement shared in the disappointment with the peasantry, especially after the parliamentary elections.

In the case of the Ruthenian movement this disappointment was especially bitter because the peasants were the main prospective constituency of the Ruthenian national community. While nationalist world-view in Ruthenian discourse of 1848 appears as well-developed and elaborated in its work it had to resort to the practices of mobilization and institutionalization based on the practices and structures employed by the absolutist government.

On one hand, this allowed for the fast creation of the organizational network and gave ready-made ways of appealing to peasant communities (Church structure, and priest-s position vis-à-vis village community), on the other hand, it obstructed its advance inside of the communities, to the individual peasants, and imposed limitations on the ability to manipulate them.

On the side of the peasants, interaction with national movement seems to be quite accidental and largely tactical. The peasants largely abstained from active involvement into political struggle and were concerned with the local situation, observing developments on the political scene attentively.

1848 had a lasting impact on the Ruthenian movement in the 1850s and 1870s in terms of personage and politics. Many local Ruthenian leaders appeared in 1848 and received prominent position in the church and school system because of their loyalty to the throne. These would provide the leadership for the Ruthenian movement up to around 1880. In terms of the policies the outcome of 1848 revolution only strengthened Ruthenian liberals' reliance on the state, belief in the state's emancipatory and civilizing mission, and wariness of the peasants.

- In the 1860s the situation was changing dramatically and faced Ruthenian movement with a number of challenges. The ascendancy of Polish landowning nobility to political domination in Galician politics was accompanied by large-scale liberal reforms in state as well as in the province. Landowning nobility instead of resisting reforms actually accepted liberal language and liberal political framework to secure its own domination and interests. Accusing Vienna and absolutism in tyranny and bureaucratization it assumed a role of the vanguard of liberal reforms.

Taking over liberal language disarmed Ruthenian activists, who did not know any other political language besides that one. Ruthenians relying on Vienna and

believing into the betterment of the world by the means provided by liberal reform saw Vienna's withdrawal from the province's politics and impoverishment of the majority of the Ruthenian nation as the most probably outcome of the intervention of liberal reforms into rural setting.

The only those resisting the politics and employing language other than that of the Polish nobility were peasants, who, however, were represented as unfit for the liberal state and liberal politics, immature and irresponsible. This kind of peasant resistance had not chances to succeed and did not represent any viable alternative to the new regime. Only the communities trying to master the new language could negotiate and advocate their interests, the protests and actions of the rest could not have any success in the new context.

The abolition of servitudes was the logical consequence of emancipation and advance of capitalism into Galician countryside. They were integral part of the great reforms of the 1860s leading to commodification of land. Neither the communities nor their servitude cases were uniform. Depending on the kind of servitude, type of a landlord, size, composition and location of the community, attitude of its leadership, village communities had uneven chances to succeed. Inside of the communities as well some peasants were more interested in the servitudes and some – less.

Passivity of the Ruthenian movement and its inability to mobilize peasants were based on the fact that the movement shared the liberal agenda under the auspices of which the abolition of servitudes was conducted. The movement believed that peasants were wronged during this abolition but it happened because of the peasants' underdeveloped civic consciousness and lack of knowledge.

That is why the first popular teachings that appeared in the 1860s and 1870s aimed at upgrading peasants' consciousness and knowledge necessary in the new framework. This populism was not simply moralistic but directed towards reform of an individual and formation of a conscious citizen.

- The 1860s were the time of the Polish uprising in Russian Empire and its aftermath, which faced Ruthenians with the opportunity and, sometimes, necessity to define their attitude towards Poland and Russia. The 1860s were also the time of great constitutional reforms and reform of the administrative apparatus employed to govern the countryside, time of secularization.

On the level of general Ruthenian politics the 1860s meant rise and decline of the St. George's party, which tried to build Ruthenian organization on the basis of Church structures just as it happened in 1848. On the level of separate village communities it was the time of the appearance of village self-government poorly supervised by the district authorities, of the communities' relative autonomy, of the uncertainty and confusion for parish priests, whose authority had been undermined.

Responses to these developments were the appearance of Ukrainophilism and Russophilism among Ruthenian intellectuals, and invention of paternalist populism by Ruthenian village pastors. Both responses were converging in the founding of Ruthenian enlightening societies – *Prosvita* and the Kachkovskii society.

This thesis has argued that in the situation of the 1860s -1870s these society were not yet able to organize a network of village voluntary association, and did not have such a task on their agenda. The peasantry was still thought of as immature; it had to be enlightened, armed with an adequate knowledge and moral codes, which would allow peasants to take active part in public and political life and to defend effectively their interests. That is why populism of the 1860s-1870s concentrated on publishing of popular books and brochures, while still relying on the paternalist patronage of village communities by patriotic priests. Nonetheless, the discourse of national projects was finding its ways among villagers and produced great popular response in form of the sobriety movement.

The 1860s-1870s also showed that there were some important differences between Ukrainian and Russophile projects in Galicia. Ukrainian discourse seems to be more fit for the conditions of modernity that a Russophile one. Ukrainian discourse was representing its project as that of the underdog in the world advancing and competing nations, and claimed to provide remedies to correct this situation. Ukrainian discourse emphasized progress, knowledge, civic consciousness, while a Russophile one suffered from the consequences of its “Eastward” orientation – it was vague in defining national community, more didactic, tradition and religion-oriented, concerned with moral betterment, civilizational distinctiveness and monarchism.

Securing of the political hegemony of Polish landowning nobility in province’s politics meant ability to control and manipulate elections through the control of district administration. But the establishment of this hegemony also meant abstaining from the involvement into the affairs of separate communities and distancing from the intra-community politics. This created space for the activities of Ruthenian patriots and appearance of peasant activists.

- The 1880s were the time crucial for the crystallization of the Ukrainian project in Galicia. These were the years when it obtained ideology, forms and features that would only strengthen in the decades to follow and last at least till the collapse of Habsburg Empire. The changes that occurred in the 1880s can be traced both on the level of discourse and on the level of concrete Ruthenian patriots.

In the 1880s the network of the Ruthenian activists of the 1848 generation is replaced by one including those who went through the student group of people-lovers in the 1860s and 1870s, and those whose world-view was shaped in the 1870s-1880s under the influence of socialism and positivism. Among this

new Ruthenian intelligentsia we encounter many peasant sons, who had used the opportunity that opened for them in the 1860s. Some of these peasant sons came back to the villages after graduation, largely as either priests or teachers.

Moreover, in the 1880s we encounter first peasant activists, who maintained contacts and interacted with the national activists and institutions of the movement based in the cities, openly proclaimed that their national identity was Ruthenian, swore political loyalty to the Ruthenian movement, and became this movement's local agents. The link between movement and these peasant activists was sustained with the help of the newspaper Bat'kivshchyna founded in 1879. Through this newspaper Ukrainian movement was able to enter village communities, to make public and discuss intra-community struggles and developments, to produce knowledge about village communities and patriotic activities there. It also gave an opportunity to peasant activists to bypass their local, and sometimes too paternalistic patrons and to communicate with the movement directly, to participate in the national politics. While in the 1860s and 1870s peasant activists were expected to read in the 1880s they were expected to write.

Looking closely at the articles written by Ivan Mykhas we could see how he was mastering the language of the movement and how he tried to articulate particular peasant interests in the public space provided to him by the national movement. The national movement was learning from the texts written by peasant activists, was imposing on them particular mode of discussion and integrated these texts with those of the movement's more educated agents, working among the peasants. The relationships of these agents to the peasants were the relationships of power. It was not accidental that Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, one of the more successful agents of the national-populists, was also a priest, an ethnographer and a correspondent to Ukrainian newspapers.

On the discursive level the split of the Ruthenian movement into Ukrainians and Russophile was clearly seen and some conceptual differences between the two camps were obvious. Ukrainian discourse as more modern one, was eager to use social and positive sciences, to translate its own problems and activities into the languages of these sciences, to find causes of poverty and discrimination grounded in the economic and social relationships. The Russophile discourse remained pragmatic, tactical individual-centered, hoping into the state-based solutions for social and national question. Russophile and Ukrainians were not two impenetrable camps and the above mentioned differences could be somewhat extenuated and mitigated in some individual cases, but by and large they coincided with national identity-orientation and quite often determined its choice by individuals.

Ukrainian project in the 1880s with its emphasis on social arrived at the idea of building-up the network of village voluntary associations centered around reading clubs and started implementing this idea. These networks of association

went hand-in-hand with thinking in the terms of social collectives, of the collectives that were much like organisms; they could be animated with correct instruments, struggled and suffered.

- Ivan Mykhas' adventures and texts have given us many important clues as to what was going on in Ukrainian politics of the 1890s and 1900s. This is the first in historiography attempt to narrate the stories about one of Ukrainian "peasant activists." These stories gave us some idea about local Ukrainian and Russophile politics in the Sambir area, about nature of peasant activism, anti-clericalism, growing political differentiation advancing inside of the Ukrainian movement. For the first time such landmark events as Ukrainian-Polish agreement of 1890, "bloody elections" of 1897, first general elections to the parliament in 1907 were approached in their local dimension and through the prism of the local peasant activist. Moreover, we got some picture of how national-populist (and later – national-democratic), radical, clerical-conservative, and Russophile camps worked in the districts and organized their own networks.

All these things can hardly be summarized, but some of the important findings were the following. The 1890s were the time of mass mobilization. It does not mean that the majority of villages became nationally conscious and participated in the politics to fulfill their civic duty. Active participation in the politics, subscription to the national newspaper and participation in the organizations, was the business of the minority. It rather means that the Ukrainian movement made a bet on democratization of franchise and political system in general and tried to work through political rallies, meetings, and councils. While in the 1880s the first of these gatherings were organized in L'viv, in the 1890s they spread down to the districts and groups of villages. In the 1890s the Ukrainian movement firmly associated itself with peasant masses and posed as democratic movement.

Political life in the districts was revolving around regular parliamentary and Diet elections. These were moments when district administration and local landlords paid increasing attention to the village communities, tried to manipulate pre-elections, but failing in many cases to do so, employed hooligans to terrorize electors in the towns on the day of elections. These politics only strengthened Ukrainian identity of peasants. The year of "bloody" elections, 1897, was the year in which *Prosvita* received 1,333 new members. This number exceeded in more than twice the average increase of membership for the years 1892-1895, and was surpassed only in 1904 and 1907 (1,359 and 1,379 respectively), during the struggle for the democratization of franchise. For Ivan Mykhas himself the elections of 1897 meant his first arrest and led to his radicalization, disappointment with the political and legal system, and loss of the belief into good will of local state administration.

Besides this democratic associations, Ukrainian politics in the districts were also showing direct continuity with the liberal and paternalist framework of the

1860s and 1870s. This was this continuity that allowed many conservatives and clericals to participate easily in the structures of national-populist, and despite the crystallization of separate Ukrainian conservative political group, starting with 1895-1896, to still influence the politics of Ukrainian national-democracy. Even inside of the national-democratic camp there are clearly visible attempt on behalf of priests and urban intelligentsia to maintain patronage and control over local village activists.

This situation in general and peculiarities of the developments in the Sambir area led to the break by Ivan Mykhas with the local Ukrainian establishment. In his case it becomes especially clear that the involvement of peasant activists in the 1880s into radicals' and socialists' plans and actions did not mean that these peasants became socialists themselves. Ivan Mykhas has been cooperating quite successfully in 1890-1891 with future Christian Socialists and conservatives, corresponding to semi-official newspaper. He broke with his patrons after their patronage became too binding and threatened his own power and influence in the community.

He joins Radical party, which became an outlet for many peasant activists engaged into the conflicts with local pastors or urban leaders of the Ukrainian movement. But the situation inside of the party appeared to be pregnant with potential splits and conflicts as well, and the relationships between urban-based leaders and peasant activists of the party remained tense as well.

As peasant activist Ivan Mykhas had particular relationships with other villagers, and, apparently, did not consider himself to be one of them, albeit often represented himself as a peasant in Ukrainian newspapers. He as well as some other peasant activist was not poor. He obviously belonged to the village strongmen, and to the richer peasants of the whole district. His anti-clericalism was grounded in the distrust of and competition with parish priests for power over the community. But it does not mean that his political moves can be explained only through this local context. Mykhas read Polish and Ruthenian newspapers, and not only those reserved for the peasants. His texts show his engagement with the contemporary debate and indicate that his choice of "radicalism" was a decision based on the convictions he obtained.

Having been defeated by the parish priest and after his moving to Berehy Mykhas softened his position towards national-democracy, and although he never made a peace with national-democrats, something like an armistice can be discerned there. Perhaps, this armistice was part of the hegemony national-democracy established in the Ukrainian camp at the beginning of the twentieth century and some aspects of which were discussed in the last chapter of this thesis.

- Ukrainian society as it functioned in Habsburg Empire in the 1890s and 1900s was sustained by discursive and organizational means. Among organizational means the most important were reading clubs. In line with the principles

accepted in the 1880s Ukrainian movement, starting with 1892 developed a network of the reading clubs around which other voluntary associations were formed and village communities remolded.

Village reading clubs constituted a space, inside of which proper ways of conducting public affairs, proper culture, and proper entertainment were practiced and introduced in the village life. Village reading clubs functioning as voluntary associations at the same time were making claims to the political power in the communities, to the control of the community government and the reordering of the village life.

Village reading clubs were not simply gates for the diffusion of the national culture in the villages. Reading clubs' practices disciplined their members, encountered resistance and counter-action. Their existence and lasting influence was not the consequence of their usefulness for the villagers but of sustained action of the national movement, *Prosvita* branched in particular. Struggles around founding of these clubs, around the processes taking place there, around influence in them were part of the daily routine of the district leaders of the Ukrainian movement. These knew better than anyone else that nation was not thing-like, that it was not once and forever, that it was not the consequence of the individual choice, but project to be constructed, enforced and sustained.

Besides, the network of the reading clubs as it developed in the Sambir area the last chapter of this thesis has also dealt with one important aspect of the Ukrainian discourse. It has argued that by concentrating attention on the national movement we do not see that another process took place, namely, class formation. Just as in the case with Ukrainians, peasants were not just there in 1800; they were created, and this process of class formation was not less complicated, and not less imagined, than the process of nation formation. The absence of the "purely peasant action" or organization should not discourage us, because the language of the peasant class was integrated in the discourse of and about Ukrainians which had both social and national sides. Conceptions of the Ukrainian nation manifested preoccupation with peasantry as the class crucial for the projected nation-state even after the First World War.²

Back then – in the 1890s and 1900s conceptions of the peasant class became the basis around which certain consensus of all the major Ukrainian political forces was formed, and on the basis of which certain version of Ukrainian identity established its hegemony. Images of the oppressed peasants as well as their defenders, Cossacks and haidamakas, became part of being Ukrainian. Ghosts invoked by Polish revolutionaries in the 1840s and projected onto

² For the importance of the peasant class to the twentieth century Ukrainian right-wing ideologies see Alexander J. Motyl, *The Turn to The Right: The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism, 1919-1929* (New York: Eastern European Monographs Series, No. LXV, 1980).

Ruthenians in the aftermath of 1846 came to life of their own and changed those on whom they were projected.

In the middle of the Second World War Lewis Namier has remarked that “when an East European peasant sits to a photographer, he places his hands symmetrically on his knees, like the statues of the Pharaohs: obviously a primeval instinct.”³ The truth is that already in the 1920s and 1930s the majority of Ukrainian peasants in former Galicia did not pose in this way. This can be seen in many places – pictures can be found in the books written on Galician peasants by foreign observers, in the regional historical collections published in North America by emigrants, in family archives.

Posing for the photograph in a particular way in this case often went hand in hand with the “national” or “bourgeois” wear. Those photographed had certain ideas about themselves as representatives of something larger than just them, about what is appropriate, what is valued and what is “nice.” Those photographed knew what control of the body meant and how it had to be shown; they wanted to show and to see themselves in certain way. Among other things this was the consequence of the identity at work. The formation of this identity had been discussed in this thesis, and in the light of this discussion it became clear why Ukrainian peasants in Galicia were no longer fitting Namier image of the East European peasant, as well as many other more scholarly concepts that were applied to East European peasants and peasants everywhere else.

This thesis has proved that “national identity” or “national consciousness” and its “spread” among masses is not about identification or awareness of belonging only. This identity implies complex social mechanisms of interaction with already existing political and social institutions, and formation of the new ones, diverse and sometimes conflicting ideologies, governmental and disciplining practices, which are negotiated in and form particular “national projects.”

As was shown on the example of Ruthenian, and later Ukrainian, national projects, these projects are never fixed although constantly try to stabilize themselves and indeed can be stabilized in a particular constellation of social and political forces. The case with Ruthenian national project, its mutations, and eventual transformation into a Ukrainian ones, reminds us that the story of the “national movement” is not so much the story of development as of discontinuities and alterations, of unacknowledged influences and hidden connections.

At the same time it seems that the category of “national project” is a useful to be employed in this kind of analysis. On one hand it reminds us of the unstable and process-like character of the national identity. On the other hand it

³ Lewis B. Namier, *Conflicts. Studies in Contemporary History* (London: Macmillan and Co. LTD, 1942), 69.

connotes purposeful action and agency, as well as their context and limitations imposed by it. “National project” may imply conflict, and struggle against certain political and social conditions as well as aspirations to power, “projected hegemony,”⁴ and already exercised hegemony among those encompassed by the proposed national identity.

While discussing textual production of the “national project” the word “discourse” seemed to work well, especially with the connotations it received from its use by Foucault. National discourse is not only about themes, images and tropes produced by the national project in its texts but also about rules and strategies according to which only certain texts were produced. Discontinuities of the “national project” were also breaks between the different “discursive formations.” And these formations of the national discourse, in turn, were intimately connected to larger political, social, and cultural languages, in the context of which the agenda of the national project becomes more apprehensible.

These “discursive formations” also make possible to speak despite all the instability and mutations of the “national projects” about singular “national identity.” In every concrete formation, national identity had particular political and social connotations, particular standards for political action, social responsibility, morals and culture, and the loyalty overriding all others. This concrete national identification was compatible with some identifications and incompatible with others. It was exclusive as well as inclusive and the mechanism of this exclusion/inclusion were not only discursive but went through the very bodies of people claimed or cast aside by the nation.

Neither national public sphere, nor social policies developed inside of the national project were limited to the discussion and the world of the ideas. At least in the Ukrainian case, the so-called “national revival” of the “non-historical” nation, besides the construction of nation was also from its very beginning concerned with some larger “civilizing” task, which in the Western part of Europe was accomplished by the state. Close engagement with the texts and workings of the national movement shows that this “civilizing” aspect of the national movement was not only about catching up with the more developed nations, not only about “modernization” but about “modernity” itself. Even if “modernity” is not a period, or a process, but simply “one way of telling the story.”⁵

The most effective way to approach this “civilizing” process is by using the Foucauldian category of biopolitics, with its two poles of individualized and

⁴ For the description of this see Ranajit Guha, Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India (Cambridge, MA, London, En: Harvard University Press, 1997).

⁵ James Donald, Imagining the Modern City (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 24.

disciplined bodies and of the concern with the well-being of population (species) as a whole.⁶ Moreover, these two poles were intimately connected with each other and neither of these could exist separately. Successful individualization and control of the bodies was occurring in the context of larger social bodies, those of nation and class.

The vocabulary of both discourses, that of class and that of nation was thoroughly racial. While at the “center” of Western modernity it was successfully hidden through separation by classification, on the “periphery” (Galicia) such a separation had collapsed exposing in unfamiliar forms some of its key mechanisms. The discourses of nation and class, with conceptual apparatus separated on the theoretical level, were constantly blended in practice, exposing workings common to both of them.

“Race” in the question did not necessary have to be established on the basis of different skin pigmentation or skull’s shape (although these categories also figures in prominently in the attempts to delineate Ukrainian nation, ranging from the explanations of racial order in the popular publications of the 1870s to the ethnographers’ anthropometric endeavors in the 1900s); nevertheless it also functioned very much like “colored race.” Just as many others political communities projected Ukrainian one was being constituted in the racialized form where “patterns of conflict [were] connected to the consolidation of *culture lines* rather than color lines.”⁷ In this it prefigured “wider shift from biology to culture, from species to ethnos, from rigid, predictable hierarchy towards different perils represented by a cultural alterity that was as fascinating as it was contaminating...”⁸

To say all this does not mean to present national projects as smart manipulation of the “simple people” by national bourgeoisie, and the space created by this project as space of repression. The idea has been to show that the Ukrainian national project cannot be explained fully in the terms of unproblematic struggle for class or national liberation. But this does not deny that this project was creating space for the peasants, for their effective action, it was empowering and satisfying them. One of the arguments of this thesis was that the power of the Ukrainian project was coming from this empowerment of the peasants. It worked not through the repression but through attractiveness and pleasure, but there was also price to be paid, and the other side for this project as well.

⁶ Here and below I am drawing on Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and The Education of Desire: Foucauld’s History of Sexuality and The Colonial Order of Things* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).

⁷ Paul Gilroy, *Between Camps: Race, Identity and Nationalism at the End of the Colour Line* (Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 2000), 1.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 33.

The power was not stopping its working inside of the project. Paternalist techniques continued to be employed in the national “public sphere” and were seen as most effective to reach project’s goal. National “culture” was created neither by creative reworking of popular rituals and celebrations nor by negotiation, rather by conquest and “inner” colonization. “The national project” never achieved its ideal of harmonious national community. Everyday life and interaction with the institutes living by rules different from those of the “national project” were constantly undermining this project’s credibility, and thus, in turn, were contributing to the amplification of its efforts. The number of peasants involved into the orbit of national movement was growing steadily in the 1900s, but it seems that only in the interwar Polish state, which adhered to the national principle, worked and discriminated against on its basis, the opportunity to avoid the tenets of the national projects was closed.

Bibliography

Archival and Manuscripts' Collections:

Main Archive of the Old Documents (*Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych*), Warsaw.

- Archive of Potockis from Łańcut (*Archiwum Potockich z Łańcutu*).

State Archive in Przemyśl (*Archiwum Państwowe w Przemyślu*), Przemyśl.

- Archive of the Greek-Catholic Bishopric (*Archiwum Biskupstwa Grecko-Catolickiego*)

Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in L'viv (*Tsentral'nyi Derzhavnyi Istorychnyi Arkhiv Ukrainy u L'vovi*), L'viv

- fond 20 (Franziscan Cadastre, *Frantsyskans'ka metryka*), op.14
- fond 130 (Ruthenian National Institute "People's House" in L'viv, *Rus'kyi narodnyi instytut "Narodnyi Dim"*, m. L'viv)
- fond 146 (Galician Viceroy's Office, *Halyts'ke namisnytstvo*), op.4, op.6, op.7, op.8, op.25, op.64
- fond 148 (Scholarly and Literary Society *Halyts'ko-Rus'ka Matytsia, Naukovo-literaturne tovarystvo*

'Halyts'ko-rus'ka matytsia), op.1

- fond 152 (Province's Court in L'viv, *Kraiivyi sud*), op.2.
- fond 156 (Higher State Prosecutor's Office in L'viv, *Vysbcha derzhavna prokuratura*), op.1
- fond 165 (Province's Committee of the Galician Diet, *Kraiivyi komitet*), op.1
- fond 180 (Supreme Ruthenian Council, *Holovna Rus'ka Rada*), op.1.
- fond 182 (Kachkovskii Society, *Tovarystvo im. Mykhaila Kachkovs'koho*), op.1
- fond 186 (Province's Land Tax Commission, *Kraiiva zemel'no-podatкова komisiia*), op.1.
- fond 196 (Political Society "Ruthenian Council," *Politychne tovarystvo "Rus'ka rada"*), op.1.
- fond 201 (Greek Catholic Metropolitan Consistory in L'viv, *Hreko-katolyts'ke mytropolycha konsystoriia*), op.4a.
- fond 309 (Taras Shevchenko Scholarly Society, *Naukove tovarystvo imeni T. Shevchenka*), op.1.
- fond 348 (*Prosvita* society, *Tovarystvo "Prosvita"*), op.1.
- fond 663 (Mykhailo Pavlyk), op.1.
- fond 664 (Tyt Revakovykh)
- fond 682 (Tyt Voinarovs'kyi), op.1.

- fond 847 (Supreme Committee of the *Sich* Society, *Holovnyi sichovyi komitet himnastychnoho i pozbezhnoho tovarystva "Sich"*), op.1.

L'viv Oblast' State Archive
(*L'vivs'kyi Oblasnyi Derzhavnyi Arkhiv*)

- fond 116, op.1.
- fond 1245, op.1, 2,3.

Manuscript Division of The Vasyl' Stefanyk L'viv Scientific Library of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (*Viddil Rukopysiv L'vivs'koï Naukovoï Biblioteky Akademii Nauk Ukrainy imeni Vasylia Stefanyka*), L'viv.

- Oleksandr Barvins'kyi's collection (fond 11)
- Aleksander Czołowski's collection (fond 141)
- Osyp Markov's collection (fond 168)
- Vasyl' Shchurat's collection (fond 206)
- Ivan Levyts'kyi's collection (fond 167)
- Mykhailo Pavlyk's collection (fond 160)
- Teofil' Pavlykiv's collection (fond 75)
- Tyt Revakovich's collection (fond 93)
- Omelian Terlets'kyi's collection (fond 115)
- Collection of the library of the „National Home”

(*Narodnyi Dim* (ND)) (fond 2)

- Collection of the NTSh library (NTSh) (fond 1)
- Zakhlyns'kyis' collection (fond 42)
- Collection of separate acquisitions (*okremykh nadkhozhen'* (o/n)) (fond 9)

Manuscript Division of the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature (*Viddil Rukopysiv Instytutu Literatury imeni Shevchenka*), Kyiv.

- Ivan Franko collection (fond 3)

Manuscript Division of Jagelonian Library (*Oddział Rękopism Biblioteki Jagiellońskiej*), Kraków.

- sygn.5368 / II, t.3.
- sygn.8109 / III.
- sygn.9117 / II,
- sygn. 9847 / III.
- sygn.10038 / IV.

Newspapers:

Bat'kivshchyna, 1879, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1894, 1896.

Buduchnist', 1909.

Chervonaia Rus', 1889.

Chytal'nia, 1893, 1894, 1895.

Czas, 1886, 1907.

Dilo, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1903, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914.

Dom i shkola, 1863.
Dziennik Polski, 1908.
Ekonomichnyi Listok, 1907, 1910.
Ekonomist, 1904, 1908, 1909, 1911.
Galichanin, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898.
Gazeta Naddniestrzańska, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888.
Gazeta Narodowa, 1886, 1907.
Gazeta Samborska, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1906, 1907.
Głos, 1887.
Głos Narodu, 1912
Golos Naroda, 1911, 1912.
Golos Truda, 1910.
Hazeta Shkol'na, 1879.
Hospodar', 1901.
Hospodars'ka Chasopys', 1912, 1913.
Hromads'kyi Druh, 1878,
Hromads'kyi Holos, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1911, 1938.
Iskra, 1903.
Khliborob (L'viv), 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894.
Khliborob (Chernivtsi), 1911.
Khlopska Pravda, 1903, 1909.
Kurjer Drohobycki, 1889.
Misionar', 1899.
Monitor, 1899.
Naddnistrrians'ki visty. (Organ povitovykh Komisariiativ v Sambori, Starim Sambori i Turtsi,) 1919.
Narod, 1890.
Narodna Chasopys', 1892, 1895.
Narodne Slovo, 1909, 1911.
Nova Sich, 1906.
Novyi Hromads'kyi Holos, 1904.
Novyi Prolom, 1883, 1885.
Osnova, 1907, 1908, 1910.
Pravda, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1890.
Prawda, 1907.
Prolom, 1881.
Poslannyk, 1897, 1899.
Przyjacieli Ludu, 1889.
Pys'mo do Hromady, 1864, 1865.
Ruslan, 1897, 1898, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1907, 1908, 1912, 1913, 1914.
Ruskaia Rada, 1872, 1873, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1887, 1888, 1906.
Russkoe Slovo, 1894, 1896, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1911.
Samopomich, 1910.
Slovo, 1861, 1867, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1884, 1885, 1886.
Stanislavivs'kyi Visty, 1912.
Svoboda, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1906, 1907, 1908.
Tygodnik Samborsko-Drohobycki, 1900, 1901, 1902.
Ukrains'kyi Beskyd, 1939.
Vistnyk, 1858, 1859, 1861.

Vpered, 1912.
Wieniec, 1882.
Zemlia i Volia, 1911.
Zoria Halytska, 1848, 1849, 1851.

Books and Articles:

A. L. Pisn' radosty. Lwów: Drukiem Piotra Pillena, 1848.

Althoen, David M. That Noble Quest: From True Nobility to Enlightened Society in The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, 1550-1830. 2 vs. Ph. D thesis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Anderson, Benedict. Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London, New York: Verso, 1991.

Andrusiak, Mykola. Geneza i kharakter halyts'koho russofil'stva v XIX-XX st. Praha: Proboiem, 1941.

Antin Hrytsuniak. Ieho zhytie ta smert' i spadshchyna, iaka po nim lyshyla sia dlia nas. Peremyshl': druhe vydannia nakladom B. Kona, 1902, (first edition – 1900).

Antonevych, Nikolai Iv. Nashe nynishnie polozhennia. Ch.1 and 2. L'viv, 1907-1910.

Appadurai, Arjun. Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Badeni, Jan. Ruch ludowy w Galicyi. Kraków: druk W. L. Anczyca i Spółki, 1895.

Bass I. I. and Kaspruk A. A. Ivan Franko: zhyttievyyi i tvorchyyi shliakh. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1983.

Barvins'kyi, Ivan “Khoto my? Chy narod svitlyi, chy mozhe taky liude dyki.” Nyva. Chytanochka dlia selian i mishchan. L'viv, 1872.

Barvins'kyi, Ivan. “Ot vam takyi statok, shcho hroshi z zemli vykopaue.” Nyva. Chytanochka dlia selian i mishchan. L'viv, 1872.

Barvins'kyi, Oleksandr. Spomyny z moho zhyttia. Ch. I “(Obrazky z hromadians'koho i pys'menn'skoho rozvytku Rusyniv v 60-ykh rr. XIX st. z dodatkom perepysky St. Novakovycha, M. Lysenka i P. Kulisha).” L'viv: Nakladom Iakova Orenshtaina v Kolomyi, 1912.

[Barvins'kyi, Oleksandr] Pomich vlasna abo “roby nebozhe, to i boh pomozhe!” Knyha o poradnosty Samuila Smail'sa. ch.1

- Dlia potreby ruskoho narodu obrobiv Oleksandr Barvins'kyi. Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.68. L'viv, 1882.
- [Barvins'kyi, Volodymyr] Vasyl' B. "Deshcho pro pershykh liudei – ta pro vsiaki narody." in Volodymyr Shashkevych, (ed.) Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei. Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.5. L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1871.
- Barvins'kyi, Volodymyr. "Muzhyk i pan." Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei. Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.6. L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1872, pp.18-31.
- Barvins'kyi, Volodymyr. Veksel' i lykhva nasha bida! [Nauka pro te, iaknashi liude maiut' ratuvatsy' vid lykhvarskykh ruk i z vekselevykh dohviv i iak mozhan khoronyty nashi maietky vid zahlady]. Vydannia „Prosvity,” kn.35. L'viv, 1875.
- Barvins'kyi, Volodymyr. Tryitsiat' lit tverezosty. Opovidanie pro te, shcho treba robyty, shchob statysia tverezym cholovikom. Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.42. L'viv, 1876.
- Belei, Ivan. Dvadtsiat' i piat' lit istorii tovarystva "Prosvity." Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.166. L'viv, 1894.
- Beren, M. V. Iak cholovik boret'sia z pryrodoiu (pereklad z rosiis'koi). Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.255-256. L'viv, 1901.
- Bilets'ka, Mariia. "Kartyna z zhyttia Ivana Franka" in O. I. Dei and N. P. Korniienko (eds.) Ivan Franko u spohadakh suchasnykiv. L'viv: Knyzhkovo-zhurnal'ne vydavnytstvo, 1956, pp.153-4.
- Bilys'kyi, Iaroslav. "Vivcharss'ki shliakhy Pivnichno-zakhidnoi Boikivshchyny." Litopys Boikivshchyny. No.10, 1938, 45-49.
- Bhabha, Homi K. The Location of Culture. New York, London: Routledge, 1994.
- Blahovieshchens'kyi, M. (z ros. pereklav M. K.) Istoriia Moskovshchyny do Petra Velykoho. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.264-265. L'viv, 1902.
- Blum, Jerome. Noble Landowners and Agriculture in Austria, 1815-1848. A Study in The Origin of The Peasant Emancipation of 1848. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1948.
- Bloch, Marc. French Rural History: an Essay on its Basic Characteristics. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

- Borys, Włodzimierz. "Z dziejów walk o wyzwolenie narodowe i społeczne Galicji w pierwszej połowie XIX w." Przemyskie zapiski historyczne. R.IV-V, 1987, pp.223-230.
- Brattia Rusyny! L'viv, 1848.
- Brenner, Robert. "The Rise and Declines of Serfdom in Medieval and Early Modern Europe." in Michael L. Bush (ed.) Serfdom and Slavery. Studies in Legal Bondage. London and New York: Longman, 1996, pp. 247-276.
- Bogdański, Henryk. Pamiętnik, 1832-1848. Edited by Antoni Knot. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1971.
- [Borkowski-Dunin, Alexander] Pierwszy sejm słowiański we Lwowie 1865-1866 przez naocznego świadka Leszka Borkowskiego. Lwów, 1884.
- [Borkowski-Dunin, Alexander] Mowy Leszka Dunina-Borkowskiego (1867-1887). Z przedmową Stanisława Schnür-Peplowskiego. Lwów, 1897.
- Borys, Volodymyr. "Antyfeodal'na ahitatsiia v Skhidnii Halychyni v polovyni 30-kh na pochatku 40-kh rr. XIX st." Arkhivy Ukraïny, 1968, No. 3, pp.76-84.
- Borys, Włodzimierz (Borys Volodymyr). "Z dziejów walk o wyzwolenie narodowe i społeczne Galicji w pierwszej połowie XIX w." Przemyskie Zapiski Historyczne, R.IV-V, 1987.
- Breiter, Ernest T. Spoleczenstwo Galicyjskie. Szkice krytyczne i programowe. cz.I. Lwów, 1890.
- Brock, Peter. Polish Revolutionary Populism: A Study in Agrarian Socialist Thought from the 1830s to the 1850s. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- Budzynovs'kyi, Viacheslav. Khlops'kyi straik. Chernivtsi: nakladom redaktsyi narodnoi hazety "Pratsia," 1897.
- Budzynovskiyi, Viacheslav. Ruskyi straik v 1902 rotsi. L'viv: nakladom "Svobody," 1902.
- Budzynovs'kyi, Viacheslav. Khlopska zemlia. "Khlopska polityka," series 1, t.1. L'viv: z drukarni Narodovoï, 1902.
- Budzynovs'kyi, Viacheslav. Khlopskyi rai v Novii Zelandii. "Khlopska polityka," series 1, t.1. L'viv: z drukarni Narodovoï, 1902.
- Budzynovs'kyi, Viacheslav. Nashi prava. "Khlopska Polityka," series I, t. 2. L'viv, 1903.

- Budzynovs'kyi, Viacheslav. Khlopska Polityka, t.3, 4. L'viv. 1919. L'viv: Chervona kalyna, 1930.
- Bujak, Franciszek. Galicja. 2 vs. Lwów, 1908.
- Bujak, Franciszek. Rozwój gospodarczy Galicyi (1772-1914). Lwów, 1917.
- Bujak, Franciszek. Limanowa. Miasteczko powiatowe w zachodniej Galicyi. Stan społeczny i gospodarczy. Kraków: G. Gebeethner i spółka, drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1902.
- Buszko, Józef. Sejmowa reforma wyborcza w Galicji, 1880-1914. Warszawa: PWN, 1956.
- Buszko, Józef. Polacy w parlamencie wiedeńskim 1848-1918. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1996.
- Bylyna, Ivan. Moia spovid'. Ternopil': Buduchnist', 1928.
- Carter, Erica; Donald, James; Squires, Judith. "Introduction." in Carter, Erica; Donald, James; Squires, Judith (eds.) Space and Place. Theories of Identity and Location. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1993.
- Chaikovs'kyi, Andrii. Chorni riadky. Moi spomyny za chas vid 1 lystopada 1918 do 13 travnia 1919. L'viv: Chervona kalyna, 1930.
- Chaikovs'kyi, Andrii. Obraz honoru. Wydania Prosvity ch.180. L'viv, 1895.
- Chaikovs'kyi, Andrii. U chuzhomu hnizdi: povisti z XIX stolittia. L'viv: Chervona Kalyna, 1994.
- Chałasiński, Józef. Młode pokolenie chłopów: procesy i zagadnienia kształtowania się warstwy chłopskiej w Polsce. Warszawa: Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza "Pomoc Oświatowa," 1938.
- Chapel's'kyi, Volodymyr. Ia liubvy ikh usikh. Z mynuloho Drohobychchyny. Drohobych: Vydavnycha filii "Vidrodzhennia," 1997.
- Chatterjee, Partha. "More on Modes of Power and the Peasantry." In Guha, Ranajit and Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (eds.) Selected Subaltern Studies. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 351-90.
- Chłopecki, Jerzy and Madurowicz-Urbańska, Helena (eds.) Galicja i jej dziedzictwo. Tom 2. Spółczeństwo i gospodarka. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Rzeszowie, 1995.

- Chmielowski, Eugeniusz. Czarownicy, strzygi, mamony czyli wierzenia i zabobony ludu galicyjskiego zebrane przez Eugeniusza Chmielowskiego w pierwszej połowie listopada roku 1890. Nowy Sącz, 1987, pp.25-26.
- Chornovol, Ihor. Ukraïns'ko-pol's'ka uhoda 1890-1894 rr. L'viv: L'vivs'ka akademiia mystetstv, 2000.
- Chornovol, Ihor. Ukraïns'ka fraktsiia Halyts'koho kraiovoho seimu 1861-1901 rr. (Narys z istoriï ukraïns'koho parlamentaryzmu). L'viv, 2002.
- Cichocki, Władysław. Sambor przed półwiekiem. Ku upamiętnieniu 40-ej rocznicy matury zdawanej w samborskiem gimnazjum w czerwcu 1884 roku. Kraków, 1925.
- Czaplicki, Franciszek. Rzeź w Horożanie. Pamiętnik więźnia stanu. Dwa dzieła w jednym tomie. Kraków: nakładem Marcelego Lumilskiego, 1872.
- Daszyński, Ignacy. Pamiętniki. t.1. Kraków: Proletariat, 1925.
- Davis, Mike. Late Victorian Holocausts. El Niño Famines and the Making of the Third World. London, New York: Verso, 2001.
- Demel, Józef. Stosunki gospodarcze i społeczne Krakowa w latach 1846-1853. Kraków, 1951.
- Demel, Józef. Stosunki gospodarcze i społeczne Krakowa w latach 1853-1866. Kraków, 1958.
- Demel, Józef. Życie gospodarcze i społeczne ziemi krakowskiej (1848-1867). Kraków, 1967.
- Dem'ian, Hryhorii. "Malovidomi storinky zhyttia i naukovi pratsi Mykhaila Zubryts'koho." ZNTSh. t.222. "Pratsi sektsiï etnohrafii i fol'klorystyky." L'viv, 1992.
- Denkschrift der ruthenischen Nation in Galizien zur Aufklärung ihrer Verhältnisse. L'viv, 1848.
- "Deshcho pro knyzhky i hazety." in Shashkevych, Volodymyr (ed.) Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei. Wydannia "Prosvity", kn.5. L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1871.
- "Deshcho pro pysmenstvo." Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei. Wydannia "Prosvity", kn.1. L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1869.
- Directorium et Schematismus Universali Veneralibus Cleri Saecularis & Regularis Dioecesis

- Ritus Latini Premisliensis pro anno domini 1881. Jasło, 1880.
- Dirk, Nicholas B.; Eley, Geoff; Ortner, Sherry B. "Introduction." in Dirk, Nicholas B.; Eley, Geoff; Ortner, Sherry B. (eds.) Culture/Power/History: A Reader In Contemporary Social Theory. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Dol'nyts'kyi, Antin. Pro novyji protses tsyvil'nyi. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.210. L'viv, 1897.
- Do moich Bratej ludu Halyckohol (1848).
- Drahomanov, Mykhailo. "Halyts'ko-rus'ke pys'menstvo (Perednie slovo do 'Povistei' Osypa Fed'kovycha)." in Drahomanov, Mykhailo. Literaturno-publitsystychni pratsi. T.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1970.
- [Drahomanov, Mykhailo] Lyps'kyi, Pro khliborobstvo. Rozмова tretia. Iak de zemlia podilena i iak by treba ii derzhaty. 1877.
- Drahomanova-Kosach, Ol'ha and Drahomanov, Mykhailo. "Russkie literaturnye obshchestva v Galitsii (Korespondentsiia 'V[estnika] Evropy')." in Drahomanov, Mykhailo. Literaturno-publitsystychni pratsi. T.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1970.
- Dunin-Wąsowicz, Krzysztof. Czasopiśmiennictwo ludowe w Galicji. Wrocław, 1952.
- Dunin-Wąsowicz, Krzysztof. Dzieje stronnictwa ludowego w Galicji. Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1956.
- Dunin-Wasowicz, Krzysztof. "Zjednoczenie stronnictw ludowych (1900-1901)." Studia z dziejów ruchu ludowego ofiarowane Czesławowi Wycechowi w 70 rocznice urodzin. Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1969.
- Powell, John Duncan. "Electoral Behavior among Peasants." The Process of Rural Transformation. Eastern Europe, Latin America and Australia. New York: Pergamon Press, 1980.
- Eley, Geoff. "Liberalism, Europe, and the Bourgeoisie 1860-1914." in Blackbourn, David and Evans, Richard J. The German Bourgeoisie. Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century. London and New York: Routledge, 1993, pp. 299-300.
- Eley, Geoff and Suny, Ronald Grigor (eds.) Becoming National:

- A Reader. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Engels, Frederick. The Peasant War in Germany. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1956.
- Falkowski, Jan and Pasznyi, B. Na pograniczu Lemkowsko-Bojkowskiem. Lwów, 1935.
- Fed'kovych, Iurii. Farmazoni abo iak to trydtsiat' sribnarivs'kykh hospodariv zapysalosia chortovi i iak vony za sim lit, sim misiatsiv i visim nedil' duzhe zabahatily. Krasna i pravydva povist' dlia rozumnykh hospodariv. Chetverte vydannia, v soti rokovyny pershoho redaktora vydan' Prosvity. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.802(8). L'viv, 1934. (First edition 1873).
- Feldman, Wilhelm. Stronnictwa i programy polityczne w Galicji, 1848-1906, 2 vs. Kraków: Księzka, 1907.
- Finkel, Ludwik. "Memoryał Antoniego hr. Pergena, pierwszego gubernatora Galicyi o stanie kraju." Kwartalnik Historyczny. t.XIV, No.1, 1900.
- Foucault, Michel. The History of Sexuality. V.1: An Introduction. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- Foucault, Michel. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Foucault, Michel. "What is critique?" in Michel Foucault, The Politics of Truth. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Lysa Hochroth. New York: Semiotext(e), 1997.
- Franko, Ivan. "Borba o pobyrannia podatkov v hromadakh." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.44, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.281-282.
- Franko, Ivan. "Choho khoche halyts'ka robitnycha hromada?" Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.45. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.151-164.
- Franko, Ivan. "Chy vertatys' nam nazad do narodu?" Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.45. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.140-150.
- Franko, Ivan. "Dribnychky kraiovi." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.44, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.404-411.
- Franko, Ivan. "D-r Ostap Terlets'kyi. Spomyny i materially." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.33. Kyiv:

- Naukova Dumka, 1982, pp.304-370.
- Franko, Ivan. "Foreword" in Zal'tsman, Khrystyian G. (transl. by Teodor Bilen'kyi), Knyzhka prykazok pro te, iak ne nalezhyt' sia povodyty sia z dit'my. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.243-244. L'viv, 1900.
- Franko, Ivan. Halyts'ko-rus'ki narodni pryповidky. t.1-3. Etnohrafichnyi zbirnyk NTSh, vs. 10, 23,24, 27, 28. L'viv, 1901-1910.
- Franko, Ivan. "Halyts'ka indemnizatsiia." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.44, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.86-121.
- Franko, Ivan. "Halyts'ka statystyka vyborcha z rokiv 1876 i 1883." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.44, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.382-395.
- Franko, Ivan. "Halyts'ke ukraïnofil'stvo. Vidpovid' na 'Uvahy rusyna'." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.46, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1985, pp.442-447.
- Franko, Ivan. "Halyts'kyi selianyn." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T. 44, kn.2. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1984, pp.501-512.
- Franko, Ivan. "Hromada Dobrovliany. (Materialy do monohrafiï.)" Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T. 44, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1984, pp.496-504.
- Franko, Ivan. "Ideï i 'idealy' halyts'koï moskvofil's'koï molodezhi," Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh, T.45. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.410-422.
- Franko, Ivan. "Khoma z sertsem i khoma bez sertsia." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.22. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1979, pp.7-29.
- Franko, Ivan. "Kil'ka sliv o tim, iak uporiadkuvaty i provadyty nashi liudovi vydavnytstva," Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.45. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.187-203.
- Franko, Ivan. "Krest'ianskie stremleniia i mechtaniia; rasschety na voinu s Rossiei." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.46, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1985, pp.299-305.
- Franko, Ivan. "L'EXTORSION DES NÈDOIMKAS." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. t.44, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.286-292.

- Franko, Ivan. "Liudovi viruvannia na Pidhir'iu." Etnohrafichnyi Zbirnyk. T.4. 1898. tomakh. t.46, kn.1. Kyïv: Naukova dumka, 1985, pp.352-414.
- Franko, Ivan. "Materialy dlia izuchenïia obshchestvennykh idealov ukrainskogo naroda v Galitsii," Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.44, kn.1. Kyïv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.130-137.
- Franko, Ivan. "Nashe teperishnie polozhennia." in Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.46, kn.1. Kyïv: Naukova dumka, 1985, pp.306-322.
- Franko, Ivan. "Obdovzhennia halyts'koi hruntovoi posilosti," Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.44, kn.1. Kyïv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.359-361.
- Franko, Ivan. "Panshchyna ta ïi skasuvannia 1848 r. V Halychyni." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. t.47. Kyïv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.7-122.
- Franko, Ivan. "Pis'ma iz Galicyi." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. t. 44, kn.1. Kyïv: Naukova dumka, 1984, pp.122-129.
- Franko, Ivan. "Pol's'ke povstannia v Halychyni 1846 roku (Istorychna rozvidka)." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. t.46, kn.1. Kyïv: Naukova dumka, 1985, pp.352-414.
- Franko, Ivan "Popy i ekonomichne polozhennia ukrains'koho narodu v Halychyni," Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. t.44, kn.1. Kyïv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.155-62.
- Franko, Ivan "Prohrama halyts'kykh sotsialistiv," in Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.45. Kyïv, 1986, pp.448-464.
- Franko, Ivan. Pro zhyttia i diial'nist' Oleksandra Konys'koho. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.253. L'viv, 1901.
- Franko, Ivan. "Prychynky do istorii 1848 r." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.47. Kyïv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.364-391.
- Franko, Ivan. "Prychynok do halyts'ko-rus'koi bibliografii 1848-1849 r." ZNTSh. t.XXII, 1898.
- [Franko, Ivan] Radykal'na taktyka. ch.1. L'viv: nakladom "Hromads'koho Holosu," 1899.
- Franko, Ivan "Radykaly i relihiia," Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.45. Kyïv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.268-271.

- [Franko, Ivan] Rozmowy v Dobrovil'skii chytal'ni. Rozmova pro hroshi i skarby. Z peredmovoju o zalozeniu dobrovil'skoi chytal'ni. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.74. L'viv: z drukarni NTSh, 1883.
- Franko, Ivan. Selected correspondence in Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh, T.48, 49, 50. (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986).
- Franko, Ivan. "Soichyne krylo. Iz zapysok vidliud'ka." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.22. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1979, pp.53-93.
- Franko, Ivan. "[Stanovyshche selian sela Nahuievychiv]" Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.44, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.79-81.
- Franko, Ivan. "Shcho take postup?" Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.45. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.300-348.
- Franko, Ivan. "Ustava proty bezsovisnosti." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.44, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.375-378.
- Franko, Ivan. "Velykyi shum." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.22. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1979, pp.208-317.
- Franko, Ivan. "Zapysky ruskoho selianyna z pochatku XIX v." ZNTSh. T.115. L'viv, 1913.
- Franko, Ivan. "Zemel'na vlasnist' v Halychyni." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.44, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1984, pp.546-576.
- Franko, Ivan. "Zhyttia Ivana Fedorovycha i ioho chasy." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.46, kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.7-298.
- Franko, Ivan "Znadoby do statystyky Ukrainy. I. Lisovi shkody i kary v s. Nahuievychi." Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. T.44 kn.1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986, pp.82-85.
- Franko, Ivan (ed.) Vybir deklamatsii dlia rus'kykh selian i mishchan. Zladyv i peredmovu dodav Ivan Franko. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.262 i 263. L'viv, 1902.
- Fras, Zbigniew. Florian Ziemiakowski: 1817-1900. Biografia polityczna. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, 1991.
- Fras, Zbigniew. Demokracy w zyciu politycznym Galicji w latach

- 1848-1873. Acta Universitatis Wratislavenensis No.1962, Historia CXXXII. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1997.
- Frierson, Cathy A. Peasant Icons: Representations of Rural People in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Fylypchak, Ivan. Bratnia liubov kripsha vid kamynnykh stin. Povist' z zhyttia zahonovoï shliakhty z pochatku XX viku. Sambir: nakladom filii tovarystva "Prosvita" v Sambori, 1937.
- Fylypchak, Ivan. Istoriia sela Berehiv Sambirs'koho povitu. Sambir: vydavnytstvo chytal'ni "Prosvity" v Berehakh ch.1, nakladom kul'turnykh ustanov sela: Chytal'ni "Prosvity," Kooperatyvy "Tednist", Kasy "Selians'ka pomich" i kruzhka "Sil's'koho hospodaria, 1935.
- Fylypchak, Ivan. Pamiati Danyla Stakhury. Z hromadians'koi diial'nosti d-ra Danyla Stakhury v Sambirshchyni. L'viv, 1939.
- Fylypchak, Ivan. Shkola v Hordyni. Narys z istorii shkil'nytstva. Pedahohichno-metodychna biblioteka, vyp. 7. L'viv: nakladom tovarystva "Vzaimna pomich ukrains'koho vchytel'stva", 1938.
- Ivan Fylypchak, Shkola v Strilbychakh. Narys z istorii shkil'nytstva (L'viv, 1936).
- Fylypchak, Ivan. "Z istorii shkil'nytstva na zakhidnii Boikivshchyni (1772-1930)," Litopys Boikivshchyny, 1931, No.1.
- Fylypchak, Ivan. "Z istorii sela Lishni Sianits'koho povita." ZNTSh. T.149. L'viv, 1928.
- Fylypchak, Ivan and Lukan', Roman. Ts. K. Okruzhna Holovna shkola v Lavrovi 1788/89-1910/11. Istorychna monohrafiia. Biblioteka „Zapysok ChSVV,” ch.15. L'viv: nakladom redaktsii „Zapysok ChSVV”, 1936.
- Galichina, Bukovina, Ugorskaia Rus', sostavleno sotrudnikami zhurnala "Ukrainskaia zhizn'." Moskva: Zadruga, 1915.
- Gemeindexikon von Galizien bearbeitet auf Grund der Ergebnisse der Volkszählung vom 31 Dezember 1900. Herausgegeben von der k. k. Statistischen Zentralkomision. Wien: Druck und Verlag der k. k. hof- und staatsdrucken, 1907.
- Gordon, Robert W. "Paradoxical Property." Brewer, John and Staves, Susan (eds.) Early

- Modern Conceptions of Property. London and New York: Routledge, 1995, pp.95-110.
- Grodziski, Stanisław. "Z badań nad czesko-austriackim prawem hipotecznym i jego znaczeniem dla Galicji." Malopolskie Studia Historyczne. R.VIII. Kraków, 1965, z.3/4.
- Grodziski, Stanisław. Sejm krajowy galicyjski: 1861-1914. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowy, 1993.
- Grossberg, Lawrence. "Globalization, Media and Agency." (manuscript, third version).
- Guha, Ranajit. Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Guthier, Steven Lan. The Roots of Popular Ukrainian Nationalism: a Demographic, Social and Political Study of the Ukrainian Nationality to 1917. Ph. D Dissertation: Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 1990.
- Hagen, William H. "Subject Farmers in Brandenburg-Prussia and Poland: Village Life and Fortunes under Manorialism in Early Modern Central Europe." Bush, Michael L. (ed.), Serfdom and Slavery. Studies in Legal Bondage. London and New York: Longman, 1996, pp. 296-310.
- Hal'ka, Ihnatiï. O pravakh i povynnostiakh v hromadi, poviti, kraiu i derzhavi. Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho v Kolomyi, ch.3. L'vov, 1875.
- Harding, Sandra. "Gender, Development and Post-Enlightenment Philosophies of Science." Nicholson, Linda J. (ed.) Feminism/Postmodernism. New York, 1990, pp.83-106.
- Harvey, David. The Condition of Postmodernity. An Enquiry into the Origin of Cultural Change. Cambridge, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1990.
- Hempel, Helena. Wspomnienia z życia s. p. ks. Stanisława Stojalowskiego. Kraków: Nakładem Związku Ludowo Narodowego, 1921.
- Herasymenko, Mykhailo. Ahrarni vidnosyny v Halychyni v period kryzy panshchynnoho gospodarstva. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Akademii Nauk URSR, 1959.
- Herbil's'kyi, Hryhorii. Rozvytok prohresyvnykh idei v Halychyni. L'viv: Vydavnytstvo L'vivs'koho Universytetu, 1964.

- Himka, John-Paul. "The Construction of Nationality in Galician Rus': Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions." Suny, Ronald Grigor and Kennedy, Michael D. (eds.) Intellectuals and Articulation of the Nation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999, pp.109-164.
- Himka, John-Paul. Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988.
- Himka, John-Paul. "German Culture and the National Awakening in Western Ukraine before the Revolution of 1848." Torke, Hans-Joachim and Himka, John-Paul (eds.) German-Ukrainian Relations in Historical Perspective. Edmonton, Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1994, pp.29-44.
- Himka, John-Paul. "Hope in the Tsar: Displaced Naive Monarchism Among the Ukrainian Peasants of the Habsburg Empire." Russian History, v.7, 1980, pp.125-38.
- Himka, John-Paul. "The National and the Social in the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1920: The Historiographical Agenda."
- Archiv für Sozialgeschichte, 1994, (34), pp.95-110.
- Himka, John-Paul. Polish and Ukrainian Socialism: Austria, 1867-1890, 2 vs. Manuscript of Ph.D dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1977.
- Himka, John-Paul. Socialism in Galicia. The Emergence of Polish Social Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism (1860-1890). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1983.
- Hirnychenko, Iarema. Mizh molotom i kovalom (Obraz z khlops'koï polityky). Iz zapyskiv organizatora Sambirshchyny Iv. Mykhasa. L'viv: Nakladom I. Mykhasa i M. A., 1908.
- Hladylovych, Iurii. "Spomyny rus'koho sviashchenyka pro rizniu 1846 roku." ZNTSh, T.12, kn.4, 1896.
- Hnatiuk, Volodymyr. Halyts'ko-Rus'ki Narodni Liegends. Etnohrafichni Zbirnyk. T.12. L'viv, 1902.
- Hnatiuk, Volodymyr. "Kil'ka dukhovnykh virshiv." ZNTSh. T.56, 1903.
- Hnatiuk, Volodymyr. Natsional'ne vidrodzhennia avstrouhors'kykh

- ukraintsiv, 1772-1880 rr. Viden':
Soiuz Vyzvolennia Ukraïny,
1916.
- Hnatiuk, Volodymyr.
"Peredmov." Halyts'ko-rus'ki
anekdoty. Etnohrafichnyi
Zbirnyk. T.6. L'viv, 1899.
- Hnatiuk, Volodymyr.
Starokhrystyians'ki liehdy. Iz
knyhy "Narodovishchaniie."
Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.259.
L'viv, 1901. (With "Foreword"
by Ivan Franko).
- Hnatiuk, Volodymyr. Znadoby do
ukraïns'koi demonolohii.
"Etnohrafichnyi zbirnyk." T.34.
L'viv, 1912.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. The Age of
Capital: 1848-1875. London:
Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. "Peasant and
Politics." The Journal of
Peasant Studies, v.1, No.1,
1973.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. Primitive
Rebels. Studies in Archaic
Forms of Social Movement in
the Nineteenth and Twentieth
Centuries. Manchester:
Manchester University Press,
1959.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. "Scottish
Reformers of The Eighteenth
Century and Capitalist
Agriculture." In Peasants in
History. Essays in Honour of
Daniel Thorner. Oxford
University Press, 1980.
- Hoff, Jadwiga. Spoleczność małego
miasta galicyjskiego w dobie
autonomii. Rzeszów:
Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły
Pedagogicznej w Rzeszowie,
1992.
- Holos khliboroba selianyna,
nakladom khliboroba Nykolaia P.
L'viv: z drukarni Shchasnoho
Bednarskoho.
- Homola, Irena and Łopuszański
Bolesław (eds.) Pamiętniki
urzędników galicyjskich. Kraków:
Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1978.
- Homola, Irena. "Kwiat
społeczeństwa..." (Struktura
społeczna i zarządy położenia
inteligencji Krakowskiej w latach
1860-1914). Kraków-Wrocław:
Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1984.
- Homonko, Illia. "Selo Korostenko."
Litopys Boikivshchyny. No.2/26
(37), 1977.
- Horak, Roman and Hnativ, Iaroslav.
Ivan Franko. Knyha persha. Rid
Iakova. L'viv: Misioner, 2000.
- Hordyns'kyi, Iaroslav. Do istorii
kul'turnoho i politychnoho
zhyttia v Halychyni u 60-tykh rr.
XIX v. "Zbirnyk filiolohichnoi
seksii NTSh." t.16. L'viv, 1917.

- Hramota bratstva vstremezlyvosty zalozhenoho roku 1874. L'vov, 1885.
- Hroch, Miroslav. Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of The Social Composition of Patriotic Groups Among The Smaller European Nations. New York-Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Hryniuk, Stella. "Peasant Agriculture in East Galicia in The Late Nineteenth Century." Slavic and Eastern European Review. v.63(2), 1985, 228-243.
- Hryniuk, Stella. Peasants with Promise: Ukrainians in Southeastern Galicia, 1880-1900. Edmonton: CIUS Press, 1991.
- Hrytsak, Evhen. "Topohrafichni nazvy s. Sushytsi Rykovoï u Starosambirshchyni." Litopys Boikivshchyny. No.9, 1937.
- Hrytsak, Iaroslav. "Molodi radykaly v suspil'no-politychnomu zhytti Halychyny." ZNTSh. t.222, 1991, pp.71-110.
- Hrytsak, Iaroslav. "Iakykh-to kniaziv byly stolytsi v Kyievi?..?: do konstruiuvannia istorichnoï pam'iaty halyts'kykh ukraïntsiv u 1830-1930-ti roky." Ukraina Moderna. Ch.6, 2001, pp.77-95.
- Antin Hrytsuniak. Ieho zhytie ta smert' i spadshchyna, iaka po nim lyshyla sia dlia nas. Peremyshl': druhe vydannia nakladom B. Kona, 1902. (first edition– 1900).
- Hupka, Jan. Gospodarka na gruntach wspólnie używanych w Galicyi. Wydawnictwa klubu konserwatywnego, zeszyt V. Kraków, 1897.
- Hurkevych, Kost'. Pro luchbu gruntiv abo komasatsyiu (z dvoma kartynamy). Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.266-267. L'viv, 1902.
- Hurkevych, Volodymyr. "Boiky za 100 lit u chyslakh." Litopys Boikivshchyny. No.1, 1931, pp.113-145.
- Iasenytskii, Pavel. Hde Prosveshchenie, tam schastie. Izdaniia obshchestva Kachkovskoho, (June-July 1883). L'vov.
- Iavorskii, Iulian. "Pamiatniki galitsko-russkoi narodnoi slovesnosti." Zapiski Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva po otdeelniiu etnografii. t.XXVII, vyp.1. Kiev, 1915.
- [Il'nyts'kyi, Vasyl'] Denys. Sviatyi spokoïu, harazd s toboïu. Vydannia Prosvity, kn.97. L'viv, 1887.

- [Il'kevych, Hryhorii (ed.)] Halytskii pryповidky i zahadky zibrani Hryhorym Il'kievychom. Viden': cherenky o. o. Mekhytarystiv, 1841.
- Inglot, Stefan (ed.) Mauryczego Kraińskiego regesty materiałów do historii zniesienia stosunku poddańczego w Galicji. Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Archiwum komisji historycznej, 2 t.IV. Kraków, 1948.
- Istoriia mist i sil Ukrains'koi RSR, L'vivs'ka oblast'. Kyiv, 1968.
- Iuvylei 30-litnoi diial'nosti Mykhaila Pavlyka (1874-1904). Z portretamy iuvyliata j icho Ridni. L'viv: z drukarni Narodnoi, 1905.
- Ivan Franko. Dokumenty i materialy Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1966.
- Ivan Franko u spohadakh suchasnykiv. Kn. 2. L'viv: Kameniar, 1972.
- Janos, Andrew C. The Politics of Backwardness in Hungary. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Janowski, Maciej. Inteligencja wobec wyzwań nowoczesności: dylematy ideowe polskiej demokracji liberalnej w Galicji w latach 1889-1914. Warszawa: Instytut historii PAN, 1996.
- Judson, Pieter M. Exclusive Revolutionaries. Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848-1914. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- [Kachala, Stepan] Shcho nas hubyt' a shcho nam pomochoy mozhe. Pys'mo dlia rus'kykh selian. No.7. L'vov, 1869.
- Kachkan, V. A. Mykhailo Pavlyk. Narys zhyttia i tvorchosti. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1986.
- Kalendar' Prosvity na rik perestupnyi 1890. L'viv, 1889.
- Kalynnyk z Hryhorova. "Zhadka za staroho diaka Trofyma." Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei. Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.6. L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1872.
- Kearney, Michael. Reconceptualizing The Peasantry: Anthropology In The Global Perspective. Boulder: Westview Press, 1996.
- Kel'siev, Vasili. Galichina i Moldaviia. Putevye pis'ma Vasiliia Kel'sieva. Sankt-Peterburg, 1868.
- Khlop Zapeka. Skazka narodna. L'vov: Typm Instytutu Stavropihiiskoho, 1857.

- Kieniewicz, Stefan. "Galicja w latach 1846-1848." Natalia Gąsiorowska (ed.) W stulecie Wiosny ludów, 1848-1948. T.1. "Wiosna ludów na ziemiach polskich." Warszawa, 1948, pp.267-346.
- Kieniewicz, Stefan. Konspiracje galicyjskie, 1831-1845. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1950.
- Kieniewicz, Stefan. Pomiędzy Stadionem a Goslarem. Sprawa włościańska a Galicji w 1848 r. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, 1980.
- Kieniewicz, Stefan. Ruch chłopski w Galicji w 1846 roku. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Zakładu narodowego imienia Ossolińskich, 1951.
- Kil'ka besid russykh posliv dumy derzhavnoi i soima kraievoho. L'viv: nakladom Ivana Nakonechnoho, 1878.
- Kingston-Mann, Esther. "Breaking the Silence: An Introduction." Kingston-Mann, Esther and Mixer, Timothy (eds.) Peasant Economy, Culture, and Politics of European Russia, 1800-1921. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991, pp.3-19.
- Kmit, Iuryi. "Z sil's'kykh vidnosyn u Halychyni v seredyni XIX v." ZNTSh. T.54, 1903.
- Knott, John William. "Land, Kinship and Identity: The Cultural Roots of Agrarian Agitation in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Ireland." The Journal of Peasant Studies. v.12, No.1, 1984, pp.93-108.
- Knyzhka do chytaniia dlia druhoi kliassy uchylshch sel'skykh v c. k. avstriiskykh Derzhavakh. Viden': Izdaniem ts. k. shkolnoho Knyhopravytel'stva u S. Anny v ulytsi Ivannovoi, 1848.
- Kolessa, Filaret. Ohliad ukrains'ko-ruskoi narodnoi poezyi. Vydannia Prosvity ch.302-303. L'viv, 1905.
- Kompaniiets', Ivan. Stanovyshche i borot'ba trudiashchyykh mas Halychyny, Bukovyny ta Zakarpattia na pochatku XX st. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo AN URSS, 1960.
- Kosachevskaia, Evdokiia. Vostochnaia Galitsiia nakanune i v period revoliutsii 1848 goda. L'viv: Izd-vo L'vovskogo Universiteta, 1965.
- Kostołowski, Erazm. Studia nad kwestią włościańską w latach 1846-1864. Ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem literatury politycznej. Badania z dziejów społecznych i gospodarczych po

- redakcją prof. Fr. Bujaka, Nr.33. Lwów, 1938.
- Za Mykoloiu Kostomarovym. Dvi oblohy L'vova. Pereiaslavs'ka uhoda. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.304-305. L'viv, 1905.
- Kovalenko, Hryts'ko. Vid choho vmerla Melasia? Opovidanie pro zadavku (dyfteryiu). Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.269. L'viv, 1902.
- Kozik, Jan. "Kwestia włościańska w Galicja Wschodniej w polityce Hołownej Rady Ruskiej 1848-1849." Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiełońskiego. Nr.364, Prace Historyczne. 1974, pp.64-92.
- Kozik, Jan. Miedzy reakcją a rewolucją: studija z dziejów ukraińskiego ruchu narodowego w Galicji w latach 1848-1849. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1975.
- Kozik, Jan. The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia: 1815-1849. Edited and with an Introduction by Lawrence D. Orton, translated by Andrew Gorski and Lawrence D. Orton. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986.
- Kozik, Jan. Ukraiński ruch narodowy w Galicji w latach 1830-1848. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1973.
- Kravets', Mykola. "Selians'kyi rukh v Skhidnii Halychyni v 50-80kh rokakh XIX st." Z istorii Ukraïns'koi RSR. Vyp. 7. Kyïv: Vydavnytstvo AN URSS, 1962.
- Kravets', Mykola. "Masovi selians'ki vystupy v Skhidnii Halychyni v 90-kh rokakh XIX st." Z istorii Ukraïns'koi RSR. Vyp. 8. Kyïv: Vydavnytstvo AN URSS, 1963.
- Kravets', Mykola. Selianstvo Skhidnoi Halychyny i Pivnichnoi Bukovyny u druhiï polovyni XIX st. L'viv: Vydavnytstvo L'vivs'koho universytetu, 1964.
- Kravets', Mykola. "Borot'ba selianstva skhidnoi Halychyny za 'lisy j pasovyska' v seredyni XIX st." Ukraïna: kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'. Iuvileinyi zbirnyk prats' na poshanu Feodosiia Stebliia. Vyp.9, 2001, pp.188-196.
- Kremin', Vasyl'; Tabachnyk, Dmytro; Tkachenko, Vasyl'. Ukraïna: al'ternatyvy postupu: krytyka istorychnoho dosvidu. Kyïv: Firma "Arc-Ukraine," 1996.
- Krevets'kyi, Ivan. "Tsutsylivs'ka trivoha v 1848 r.: prychnyky do istorii ostannikh dnev panshchyny v Halychyni." In Naukovyi zbirnyk prysviachenyi pro Mykhailovy Hrushevs'komu uchenykamy j prykhyl'nykamy z

- nahody Ioho desiatylitnoi naukovoï pratsi v Halychyni (1894-1904). L'viv, 1906, pp.446-482.
- Krevets'kyi, Ivan. "Do psykhologii 1848 roku. (Sprava St. Hoshovskoho)." ZNTSh. T.40, 1909, pp.137-157.
- Kruhlashov, Anatolii. Drama intelektualna: politychni idei Mykhaila Drahomanova. Chernivtsi: Prut, 2000.
- Krushel'nyts'kyi, Antin. Ivan Franko (poeziia). Kolomyia: Halyts'ka nakladnia Iakova Orenshtaina.
- Kuczera, Aleksander. Samborszczyzna: ilustrowana monografja miasta Sambora i ekonomiji Samborskiej. T.2. Sambor, Nakładem Księgarni nauczycielskiej, 1937.
- Andrzej Kudłaszyk. Katolicka myśl społeczno-polityczna w Galicji na przełomie XIX i XX wieku. Prace naukowe Instytutu Nauk Społecznych Politechniki Wrocławskiej. v.24. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Wrocławskiej, 1980.
- Kulyniak, Petro. "Polkovnyk Andrii Mel'nyk," Lutsiv, Luka (ed.) Drohobychchyna – zemlia Ivana Franka. Niu Iork-Paryzh-Sydnei-Toronto, 1973.
- Kulyniak, Petro. "Iakubova Volia," in Lutsiv, Luka (ed.) Drohobychchyna – zemlia Ivana Franka. Niu Iork-Paryzh-Sydnei-Toronto, 1973.
- Kuzelia, Zenon. "Halychyna i Bukovyna v svitli perepysy z 31 hrudnia 1910." Literaturno-Naukovyi Visnyk. 1914. T.65, kn.1, pp.101-116.
- L., Odpowiedź na artykuł o nieistnieniu Rusinów umieszczony w Numerze 2gim Dziennika Narodowego (1848).
- Lepkyi, Bohdan. V hlukhim kuti. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.278. L'viv, 1903.
- [Lepkyi, Syl'vestr] Marko Murava. Horyt'. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.254. L'viv, 1901.
- [Levytskyi, Iosyf] Besida hovorena dnia 22 Maia 1848 roku v Drohobychy pry osnovanii Komiteta Ruskoho. Peremysl': v Typohrafiï sobornoï hr. kat. Kapituly, 1848.
- Levyts'kyi, Kost'. Istoriia politychnoi dumky halyts'kykh ukrainsiv, 1848-1914. Na pidstavi vlasnykh spomyniv. L'viv: Nakladom vlasnym, 1926.
- Levyts'kyi, Kost'. Nash zakon hromadskii abo iaki my maiem prava i povynnosti v hromadi.

- Vydannia "Prosvity," kn. 112.
L'viv, 1889.
- Levyts'kyi, Kost'. Pro spys
liudnosti (konskryptsyiu). V
dodatku "Staroruski
opovidannia" ch.V i VI.
(Pererobiv Ivan Franko.)
Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.245.
L'viv, 1900.
- Levyts'kyi, Kost'. Shcho maie
robyty Prosvita na osnovi
novoho statutu. Vydannia
Prosvity, kn.140. L'viv, 1892.
- Lewicki, Witold. Materiały do
reformy gminnej w Galicyi
zestawione z polecenia Wys.
Wydziału krajowego z dnia 16
Sierpnia 1887 do LW. 41.981.
Lwów, 1888.
- Linde, M. Samuel Bogumił.
Słownik języka polskiego.
Wydanie drugie. T.1. Lwów: w
drukarni Zakładu Ossolińskich,
1854.
- Łopuszański, Bolesław.
Stowarzyszenie ludu polskiego
(1835-1841). Geneza i dzieje.
Kraków: Wydawnictwo
Literackie, 1975.
- Łoziński, Bronisław. "Z czasów i
akt dominikalnych. (Przyczynek
do historii administracji w
Galicyi)." Kwartalnik
Historyczny. t.XX., 1906,
pp.252-285.
- [Łoziński, Walery] Piśma pomniejsze
Walerego Łozińskiego (Z
życiorysem autora). Lwów:
Nakładem Karola Wilda, 1865.
- Lozyns'kyi, Iosyf.
"Avtobiohraficheskii zapysky."
(Materialy k istorii Galitsko-
russkoi slovesnosti B. A.
Didytskoho). Literaturnyi
sbornik. 1885, pp.112-115.
- Lozyns'kyi, Mykhailo. Halychyna v
zhyttiu Ukraïny. Viden': Soiuz
Vyzvolennia Ukraïny, 1916.
- [Lozyns'kyi, Petro] Slovo v chasi
torzhestvennoi Sluzhby Bozhoi
odpravlenoi z postanovleniia
Holovnoi Rady Ruskoi z
prychyny vstupleniia na tron
Tsisarstva Avstriiskoho Ieho
Velychestva Kesaria i Korolia
Frantsishka Iosyfa Iho v tserkvi
Lvovskoi mistskoi or. hr. kat. v
prytomnosti vsikh V. V. c. k.
Voiskovykh i Tsyvil'nykh
Ouriadiv i mnohochyslenno
sobrannoho liuda, izrechonnoie
Petrom Lozyns'kym Vikariem
toizhe tserkvy i chlenom
Holovnoi Ruskoi Rady dnia 10
Dekevria 1848.
- Lysiak-Rudnyts'kyi, Ivan. "The
Ukrainians in Galicia under
Austrian Rule." Essays in
Modern Ukrainian History.
Cambridge, MA: Distributed by
Harvard University Press for the
Harvard Ukrainian Research
Institute, 1987, pp.315-352.

- Lystuvannia I. Franka i M. Drahomanova. Materiialy dlia kul'turnoi i hromads'koi istorii Zakhidnoi Ukrainy. t.1. Kyiv: komisiia Zakhidnoi Ukrainy Vseukrains'koi Akademii Nauk. Kyiv, 1928.
- M. N. Het'mans'ki svaty. Na osnovi povisti Rohovoï. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.281-2. L'viv, 1903.
- Mach, Harold. "Phantasies of the Public Sphere: Rethinking the Habermas of Historians." The Journal of Modern History, 72, March 2000.
- McPhee, Peter "Popular Culture, Symbolism and Rural Radicalism in Nineteenth-century France," Journal of Peasant Studies. V.5, No.2, 1978.
- Madejczyk, Jan. Wspomnienia Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1965.
- Makovei, Osyp. Oferma. Opovidanie z zhyttia voiskovoho. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.279. L'viv, 1903.
- Maksymuk, Ivan. "Deiaki instytutsii zvychaievoho prava v Starosambirshchyni." Litopys Boikivshchyny, No.11, 1939, pp.5-69.
- Marks, Karl. "Deбаты Шестого Рейнского Ландтага (статья трет'я). Дебаты по поводу закона о краже леса." Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Sochineniia. T.1. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1955, 119-160.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert. "The Kachkovs'kyi Society and The National Revival In Nineteenth Century East Galicia." Harvard Ukrainian Studies. V.15, 1991, pp.48-87.
- Magryś, Franciszek. Żywot chłopadziałacza. Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1987.
- Mendzhets'kyi, Volodymyr (Mędrzecki, Włodzimierz), "Seliany u natsiotvorchkykh protsesakh," Ukraina Moderna. ch.6. L'viv, 2001, pp.59-76.
- Merunowicz, Teofil. Wyniki samorządu Galicji. Z powodu 50-letcia istnienia urzędzen autonomicznych w Galicji. Lwów, 1916.
- Milewski, Edward. Sklepy społeczne. Lwów, 1910.
- [Mokh, Rudol'f] Slovo do naroda halytsko-ruskoho, holosyv Rudol'f Mokh, sekretar Rady Ruskoï Ounevskoi, parokh z Lahodova v chasi Narodnoho Sobraniiia dnia 12 Oktovriia / 30

- septembria 1848. L'viv: koshtom Chestnoi Ruskoi Ounevskoi Rady, 1848.
- Molenda, Jan. Chłopi, naród, niepoległość. Kształtowanie się postaw narodowych i obywatelskich chłopów w Galicji i Królestwie Polskim w przededniu odrodzenia Polski. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo NERITON, Instytut Historii PAN, 1999.
- Molenda, Jan. "The Formation of the National Consciousness of the Polish Peasants and the Part They Played in the Regaining of Independence by Poland." Acta Poloniae Historica, (63-64), 1991, pp.121-148.
- Monchalovskii, Osip. Zhyt'ie i diiatel'nost' Ivana Naumovycha. L'vov: Izdanie politicheskoho obshchestva „Russkaia Rada,” 1899.
- Moroz, Myroslav. Ivan Franko. Bibliohrafiia tvoriv, 1874-1964. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1966.
- Motyl, Alexander J. The Turn to the Right: The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism, 1919-1929. Eastern European Monographs Series, No. LXX. New York, 1980.
- Mucha, Emil. Zarys dziejów kólek rolniczych w regionie Przemyskim, 1882-1982. Przemysł: Polskie towarzystwo historyczne. Oddział i stacja naukowa w Przemyslu, 1983.
- N. M. Smert' Tymosha. na osnovi povisty Rohovoï. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.286. L'viv, 1904.
- Namier, Lewis B. Conflicts. Studies in Contemporary History. London: Macmillan and Co. LTD, 1942.
- Naumovich, Ivan. S Bohom. Izdaniï Obshchestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho v Kolomyi chyslo 1. Kolomyia, 1875.
- Najdus, Walentyna. Szkice z historii Galicji. 2vs. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1958.
- Nazarko, Irenei ChSVV. "Chil'nyi sviashchenyk z Boikivshchyny." Litopys Boikivshchyny. No.2/24 (35), 1976, pp.38-42.
- Neeson, Janet. Commoners: Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700-1820. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [Novakovs'kyi, Mykhailo] Mykhailo N. Radykal'na taktyka. ch. III i IV. Moskvofily, narodovtsi i konsolidatsiia. Khlops'ka biblioteka XVI. L'viv: nakladom "Hromads'koho Holosu," 1898.

- Novakovs'kyi, Mykhailo. Spilky dlia oshchadnosti i pozychok (systemy Raifaizena). Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.240. L'viv, 1900.
- Nyva. L'vov: nakladom Obshchestva imeni Kachkovskoho, 1878.
- Nicieja, Stanisław Sławomir and Patelski, Mariusz. "Rok 1846 we Lwowie. Stracenie Kapuścińskiego i Wiśniowskiego i ich kult we Lwowie," Śliwa, Michał (ed.) Rok 1846 w Galicji. Ludzie, wydarzenia, tradycje. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe WSP, 1997.
- Ohonovs'kyi, Omelian. Zhytie Tarasa Shevchenka. Chytanka dlia selian i mishchan. L'viv, 1876.
- [Ohonovs'kyi, Omelian] "Besida d-ra Omeliana Ohonovs'koho pry vidkryttiu zahal'nykh zboriv chleniv Prosvity dnia 20 sichnia (1 liutoho) 1888." In Kyrylo Kakhnykevych. Iak robyty hroshi? abo nauka iak mozhna v korotkim chasi staty sia bohachem. Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.104. L'viv, 1888.
- Okhrymovych, Volodymyr "Znadoby do piznannia narodnykh zvychaiv ta pohliadiv pravnykh." Zhytie i Slovo. v.3, 1895.
- Olesnyts'kyi, Evhen. Storinky z moho zhyttia. ch.I and II. L'viv: Vydavnycha Spilka „Dilo,” 1935.
- Olesnyts'kyi, Evhen. Iaka maie buty nasha ril'ncha orhanizatsiia? Promova na Zahal'nykh Zborakh filiï Tovarystva hospodarskoho "Sil's'kyi Hospodar" v Stanyslavovi. "Biblioteka "Sil's'koho hospodaria" ch.5." L'viv: z drukani I. Aikhnbel'rgera, 1910.
- Olesnyts'kyi, Evhen. V oboroni khlopa-khliboroba. Promova vyholoshena 13 zhovtnia 1911 pry debati nad vnesenniam v spravi dorozhnechi. Biblioteka Sil's'koho hospodaria ch. 17. L'viv: nakladom "Sil's'koho hospodaria," 1911.
- Orts-Repertorium des Königreiches Galizien und Lodomerian mit dem Grossherzogthume Krakau. Auf Grundlage der Volkszählung vom Jahre 1869 bearbeitet. Wien, 1874.
- Oscendowski, Franciszek Antoni. Karpaty i Podkarpacie. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Polskie.
- P. Chlop i strach (1848).
- Pałosz, Jerzy. "Sprawy kościelno-polityczne na forum Galicyjskiego Sejmu krajowego w okresie "austriackiego kulturkampfu" (1861-1874)."

- Studia Historyczne. R.28, No.3, pp.363-380.
- Pamiaty slavykh liudei. Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho v Kolomyi, ch. 49. L'viv, hruden' 1879.
- Partacz, Czesław. Od Badeniego do Potockiego: stosunki polsko-ukraińskie w Galicji w latach 1888-1908. Toruń: Wydawnictwo A. Marszałek, 1996.
- Pashaeva, N. M. "Otrazhenie natsional'nykh i sotsial'nykh protivorechii v vostochnoi Galichine v 1848 g. v listovkakh Russkogo Sobora." Slavianskoe vozrozhdenie. Sbornik statei i materialov. Moskva: Nauka, 1966, pp.48-82.
- Pashaeva, N. M. Ocherki istorii russkogo dvizheniia v Galichine XIX – XX vv. Moscow: Gosudarstvennaia Publichnaia Istoricheskaia Biblioteka Rossii, 2001.
- Pavlyk, Mykhailo. Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni. Naukova biblioteka, Ch.2-3. L'viv: nakladom Iv. Franka, z drukarni NTSh, 1887.
- Pavlyk, Mykhailo. Introduction to Dreper, Dzh. Istoriia borot'by viry z naukoiu. (Translated by Mykhailo Pavlyk). New York: nakladom ukrains'koi knyhnarni im. T. Shevchenka i spilky, 1919, (original publication – L'viv, 1904.)
- Pavlykovs'kyi, Iulian. Zemel'na sprava u Skhidnii Halychyni (Korotkyi istorychnyi i ekonomichnyi ohliad zemel'noho pytannia ta suchasnyi ioho stan). Reprint from Literaturno-Naukovoho Visnyka, t.LXXVI. L'viv: z drukarni NTSh, 1922.
- Pers'kyi, Stepan. Populiarna istoriia tovarystva "Prosvita." "Naukovo-populiarna biblioteka tovarystva "Prosvita" ch.4." Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," ch.780. L'viv, 1932),
- Piechota, Jan. Gawęda mojego dzieciństwa. Wspomnienia z lat 1900-1918. Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1987.
- Pilat, Tadeusz "Własność ziemi i stosunki posiadania," in Powszechna Wystawa krajowa i siły produkcyjne kraju. t.II, z.6. Lwów, 1898.
- [Ploshchanskyi, Venedykt], Halytskii Rusyn pered i po 1848 h. Obrazok nachertan cherez 1/3 000 000. L'vov: Izdatel'stvo Instituta Stavropihiiskoho, 1863.
- Ploshchanskii, Venedykt M. Otchet o diatel'nosty Komiteta politicheskoho Obshchestva "Russkaia Rada" za vremia ot 17(29) noiabria 1879 do 30

- oktiabria (11 noiabria) 1885.
L'vov, 1885.
- Podolyns'kyi, Serhii. "Lysty do V. Smirnova." Vybrani tvory. Edited by Roman Serbyn. Ukraïns'ke istorychne tovarystvo, 1990.
- Podolyns'kyi, Serhii. "Pro bahatstvo i bidnist'." Vybrani tvory. Edited by Roman Serbyn. Ukraïns'ke istorychne tovarystvo, 1990.
- Podolyns'kyi, Vasyl' "Slovo perestorohy." Volodymyr Pylypovych (ed.) Lirvak z-nad Sianu. Peremys'ki druky seredyny XIX st. Peremysl', 2001.
- Poida, Dmitrii. Krest'ianskoe dvizhenie na Pravoberezhnoi Ukraine v poreformennyi period: 1866-1900. Dnepropetrovsk, 1960.
- Potoczny, Jerzy. Oświata dorosłych i popularyzacja wiedzy w plebejskich środowiskach Galicji doby konstytucyjnej (1867-1918). "Galicja i jej dziedzictwo, t. 10." Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wysszej szkoły pedagogicznej, 1998.
- Provinzial handbuch der Königreiche Galizien und Lodomerien führ Jahr 1845. Lemberg, 1845.
- Provinzial handbuch der Königreiche Galizien und Lodomerien führ das Jahr 1866. Lemberg, 1866.
- Shch., V. Bohdaniv synok. Na osnovi rosyis. romanu O. Rohovoï. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.271. L'viv, 1902.
- Za O. F. Shchepkovychem. Borot'ba Drepera z viroiu. (Vydavnytstvo tovarystva Sv. Apostola Pavla, ch.9-10). ("Nyva," rr.1904, 1905, 1906). L'viv: Zahal'na drukarnia, 1908.
- [Simovych, Vasyl'] V. S. Introduction to Iurii Fed'kovych. Farmazoni abo iak to trydtsiat' sribnarivs'kykh hospodariv zapysalosia chortovi i iak vony za sim lit, sim misiatsiv i visim nedil' duzhe zabahatily. Krasna i pravydva povist' dlia rozumnykh hospodariv. Chetverte vydannia, v soti rokovyny pershoho redaktora vydan' Prosvity, Vydannia "Prosvity," Ch. 802(8). L'viv, 1934.
- Podolak z za Kordonu. Pisń o Wyszniowskim. Lwów: z drukarni Ossolińskich, 1848.
- [Popiel, Michał], Ogłoszenie Mychaila Popela do WSICH RUSYNIW wo Samborskoj radi na 25 (hreczysk. kal. 13) maja 1848 r. po Chr. Lviv: z drukarni M. Poremby, 1848.

- Potapenko, I. Hromdas'kyi sud. Opovidanie z ukrains'koho zhyttia. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.258. L'viv, 1901.
- Prakash, Gyan. "Subaltern Studies as Postcolonial Criticism." American Historical Review. v 99, 1994, pp.1475-1490.
- Prakash, Gyan. "Introduction." Douglas Haynes and Gyan Prakash (eds.) Contesting Power: Resistance and Everyday Social Relations in South Asia. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Providnyk po vystavi kraievii u L'vovi z osoblyvym ohliadom na viddil etnografichnyi i na pavilion ruskykh narodnykh tovarystv. L'viv: z drukarni NTSh, 1894.
- Prystai, Oleksa. Z Truskavtsia u svit khmaroderiv. Spomyny z mynuloho i suchasnoho. V.2. L'viv-Niu-Iork, 1935.
- P. S. i N. V. Iak iarmarkuvaly Taras z Motreiu? Knyzhochka dlia sil'skykh liudei. L'viv: nakladom t-va "Prosvita," 1871.
- Publikacja konstytucji chłopom Rusinom przez Komisarza Niemca w roku 1848. Lwów: Ossolineum, 1848.
- Putek, Jan. Pierwsze występy włościństwa polskiego, 1848-1861. Kraków: nakładem Domu Ludowego "Wisła" w Krakowie.
- Radikaly i radikalizm. Khlopska Biblioteka IV. L'viv, 1896.
- Rosdolsky, Roman (Roman Rozdoslki). Die Bauernabgeordneten im konstituierenden österreichischen Reichstag 1848-1849. Materialien zur Arbeiterbewegung Nr.5. Wien: Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung, 1976.
- Rosdolsky, Roman. Engels and the "Nonhistoric" Peoples: The National Question in the Revolution of 1848. [Glasgow]: Critique Books, 1986.
- Rosdolsky, Roman. "A Revolutionary Parable on the Equality of Men." Archiv für Sozialgeschichte, No.3, 1963, pp.291-293.
- Rozdolski, Roman. "Do historii 'Krwawego roku' 1846." Kwartalnik Historyczny, 65, no.2 (1958), pp.403-22.
- Rozdolski, Roman. Stosunki poddańcze w dawnej Galicji. 2 vs. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962.
- Rozdolski, Roman. Wspólnota gminna w b. Galicji wschodniej i jej zanik, Badania z dziejów społecznych i gospodarczych po

- redakcją prof. Fr. Bujaka, Nr.27. Lwów, 1936.
- Rozwój koła tow. szkoły ludowej w Samborze od założenia 2 czerwca 1894 i sprawozdanie za r.1911 przedłożone walnemu zgromadzeniu dnia 28 marca 1912 r. Sambor: nakładem koła T.S.L., 1912.
- Rudolph, Richard L. (ed.), European Peasant Family and Society: Historical Studies. Liverpool, 1995.
- Rudolf, Richard. "The East European Peasant Household and The Beginning of Industry: East Galicia, 1786-1914." Koropets'kyi, I. S., (ed.), Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretive Essays. Cambridge, MA: Distributed by Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute, 1991, pp.339-382.
- Russkii posly derzhavnoi dumy i tykh-zhe klevetnyky. Ot oseny roku 1873 do Maia roku 1879. L'vov, 1879.
- Rybarski, Roman. Kredyt i lichwa w ekonomii Samborskiej w XVIII wieku. Badania z dziejów społecznych i gospodarczych po redakcją prof. Fr. Bujaka, Nr.30. Lwów, 1936.
- Rychlikowa, Irena. "Galicyjski odłam narodu szlacheckiego w latach 1772-1815." Kwartalnik Historyczny. t.XCV, z.2, 1989, pp.83-119.
- Rychlikowa, Irena. "Losy fortun magnackich w Galicji 1772-1815." Kwartalnik Historyczny, t.XCV, z.3, 1989, pp.127-171.
- [Rydel, Andrzej], "Krwawa laznia w Galicyi w dniach 19, 20 i 21 Lutego 1846 r. odbyta." Kraków, 1848.
- Ryl'skii, Fadei. "K izucheniiu ukrainskogo narodnogo mirovozreniia." Ukraïntsi: narodni viruvannia, povir'ia, demonolohiia. Kyïv: Lybid', 1991, pp.25-51.
- Sahlins, Peter. Forest Rites: The War of Demoiselles in Nineteenth-Century France. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Sala, Moritz. Geschichte des polnischen Aufstandes vom Jahre 1846. Wien, 1867.
- Sanduliak, Ivan. Selo Karliv kolys' a teper'. Material podav Ivan Sanduliak. Uporiadkuvala i vydala redaksiia "Bat'kivshchyny." L'viv, 1890.
- Sarbei, Vitalii. Do vyroblennia kontseptsii bahatotomnoi "Istorii ukraïns'koho narodu": rozdumy i propozytsii. Kyïv: Instytut istorii Ukraïny AN Ukraïny, 1994.

- Sarti, Roland. Long Live The Strong: A History of The Rural Society in The Apennine Mountains. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985.
- Schematismus universi venerabilis cleri dioceseos graeco catholicae premislensis pro anno domini... (Other titles Shematyzm... Skhimatyzm... and so on. Various accessible years were used to establish biographic data)
- Schneider, Antoni. Encyklopedya do krajoznawstwa Galicyi po wzgledem historycznym, statystycznym, topograficznym, orograficznym, handlowym, przemyslowym, sfragistycznym, etc., etc. T.2, zeszyt 7. Lwów: z drukarni J. Dobrzańskiego, 1874.
- Scott, James C. Domination and the Arts of Resistance. London, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Schnür-Pepłowski, Stanisław. Z tajnego archiwum. (Karta z dziejów Galicji). Lwów, 1906.
- Seletskii K. [parokh v Kobylnytsi]. Knyha mudroty abo zhytiie chasnoho cholovika, iak ono pislia zakoniv Bozhykh i liudskykh buty povynno. L'viv, 1874.
- Sen'ko, Ivan. "Pisnia pro skasuvannia panshchyny," ZNTSh. T.223. Pratsi seksii etnohrafii ta fol'klorystyky. L'viv, 1992, pp.63-76.
- Sereda, Ostap. "Hromady rannikh narodovtsiv u skhidnii Halychyni (60-i roky XIX stolittia)." Ukraïna: kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'. Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu Feodosiia Stebliia. Vyp.9, 2001, pp. 378-392.
- Sereda, Ostap. "My tu ne pryshly na smikh': uchast' skhidno-halyts'kykh selian u seimovykh vyborakh ta zasidanniakh u L'vovi (60-ii roky XIX st.)." Lwów: spoleczeństwo, miasto, kultura. T.IV, Kraków, 2002. pp.165-186.
- Simons, Thomas W. Jr. "The Peasant Revolt of 1846 in Galicia: Recent Polish Historiography." Slavic Review. V.30, no.4 (December 1971), pp.795-817.
- Singer, Barrett. Village Notables in Nienteenth-Century France: Priests, Mayors, Schoolmasters. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983.
- Shanin, Teodor. "Peasantry in Political Action," Shanin, Teodor (ed.) Peasants and Peasant Societies. Selected Readings.

- Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Shapoval, Iurii. “Dilo” (1880-1939): postup ukrains’koi suspil’noi dumky. L’viv, 1999.
- [Shashkevych, Hryhorii] Besida podchas festynu narodovoho ruskoho, vidpravlenoho v Stanislavovi dnia 30 Maia 1848 hovorena Hryhoriiem Shashkevychem, Parokhom Ouhrynivskim. L’viv: Typom Stavropigiians’kym, 1848.
- Shtrobl’, F. A. Prosvishcheniie. Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Kachkovskoho, ch.2. Kolomyia, 1875.
- Śliwa, Michał (ed.) Rok 1846 w Galicji. Ludzie, wydarzenia, tradycje. Kraków: Wydawnictwo naukowe WSP, 1997.
- Śliwa, Michał “Rok 1846 w Galicji i późniejsza Rewolucja 1848,” Wic, Władysław (ed.), Rok 1848. Wiosna Ludów w Galicji. Zbiór studiów, Akademia Pedagogiczna im. Komisji Edukacji Narodowej w Krakowie, Prace Monograficzne, Nr.27. Kraków, 1999.
- Słomka, Jan. Pamiętniki włościanina. Od pańszczyzny do dni dzisiejszych. (Wyd. II.) Kraków.
- Ślotwiński, Leliw. Katechism poddanych galicyjskich o prawach i powinnościach ich względem Rządu, Dworu i samych siebie. Lwów, 1832.
- Ślusarek, Krzysztof. Drobna szlachta w Galicji, 1772-1848. Kraków, 1994.
- [Sozański,] Antoni. Rozmowa z dyplomata o Polsce. Sanok, 1870.
- [Sozański, Antoni] Niektóre pisma A. Sozańskiego. t.II. Kraków, 1891.
- [Sozański, Antoni] Bez polityki nie dorobimy się nowej Polski, a dawna Polska ciągle będzie na katafalku. Sambor, 1880.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorti. “Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography.” in Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorti Spivak (eds.) Selected Subaltern Studies. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Sprawozdania stenograficzne z posiedzeń Sejmu krajowego galicyjskiego we Lwowie, odbytych od dnia 15 do 26 kwietnia 1861 r. Lwów, 1861.
- Sprawozdanie z działalności towarzystwa Prosvita. L’viv, 1899.
- Stenograficzne sprawozdania galicyjskiego Sejmu krajowego w

- drugim periodzie [1868]. Lwów, 1868.
- [Srokowski, Celestyn?] C...t..n
S...r...i. Na czest' bratej
powernuwszych z newoli.
2.09.1848.
- Stauter-Halsted, Keely. The Nation
in the Village: The Genesis of
Peasant National Identity in
Austrian Poland, 1848-1914.
Ithaca: Cornell University Press,
2001.
- [Stebel's'kyi, Volodymyr] Bohdan z
Podolia, Do ruskoho liudu.
Knyzhochky dlia sil'skoho i
miskoho naroda, kn.8. L'viv:
Komitet dlia vydavannia
knyzhochok dlia naroda,
vidpovidaie za komitet Kazymyr
Okaz, 1882.
- Steblii, Feodosii. Borot'ba selian
Skhidnoi Halychyny proty
feodal'noho hnitu. L'viv, 1961.
- Steblii, Feodosii. "Derzhavnyts'ki
aktsenty v diial'nosti 'Rus'koï
Triitsi'." Shashkevychiana. v.3-4.
L'viv-Winnipeg, 2000, pp.22-41.
- Steblii, Feodosii et al. (eds.)
Klasova borot'ba selianstva
Skhidnoi Halychyny: 1772-1849.
Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1974.
- Steblii, Feodosii. "Selians'kyi rukh
u Skhidniï Halychyni v 1846
rotsi." Z istoriï
zakhidnoukraïns'kykh zemel'.
Vyp. 5. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo
Akademii Nauk Ukraïns'koï RSR,
1960.
- Steblii, F. I.; Kupchyns'kyi, O. A.;
Hrytsak, Ia. I.; Parubii, V. I.;
Polians'kyi, O. A.; Humeniuk Ie.
M. (eds.) "Rusalka Dnistrova":
Dokumenty i materialy. Kyiv:
Naukova dumka, 1989.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. Race and The
Education of Desire: Foucauld's
History of Sexuality and The
Colonial Order of Things.
Durham: Duke University Press,
1995.
- Strzetelska Grynbergowa, Zofia.
Staromieskie: Ziemia i ludność.
Lwów: Nakładem Muzeum
imienia Dzieduszyckich z
drukarni E. Winiarza, 1899.
- Studyns'kyi, Kyrilo. "Pol's'ki
konspiratsiï sered rus'kykh
pytomtsiv i dukhoven'stva v
Halychyni v rokakh 1831-1846."
ZNTSh. T.80, 1907, pp.53-108;
t.82, 1908, pp.87-177.
- Stupnicki, Hipolit. Das Königreich
Galizien und Lodomerien, sammt
dem Grossherzothume Krakau
und denn Herzogthume
Bukovina, in geographisch-
historisch-statistischer
Beziehung. Lemberg, 1853.
- Styś, Wincenty. Rozdrobnienie
gruntów chłopskich w byłym
zaborze austriackim w latach

- 1787-1931. Lwów: Gebelthner i Wolf, 1934.
- Sukhyi, Oleksii. Halychyna: mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom: narysy istorii, XIX – poch. XX st. L'viv : L'vivs'kyi derzhavnyi universytet, In-t ukraïnoznavstva im. I. Kryp'iakevycha NAN, 1997.
- [Svientsits'kyi, Pavlo] Pavlo Svii. Baiky. L'viv: Nakladom t-va "Prosvita", 1874.
- Sviezhyns'kyi, Pavlo. Ahrarni vidnosyny na Zakhidnii Ukraini v kintsi XIX – na pochatku XX st. L'viv: Vydavnytsvo L'vivs'koho universytetu, 1966.
- Swieradski, Józef and Wycech, Czesław (eds.) Rok 1846 w Galicji. Materiały źródłowe. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1958.
- Świętek, Jan. Brzozowa i okolica Zakliczyna nad Dunajcem. Obraz etnograficzny – zbiór z lat 1897-1906. cz.III. Archiwum etnograficzne, t.36, ed. by Edward Pietraszko. Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, 1999; cz.IV (2000); cz.VI (2000).
- Szaflik, Janusz Albin and Józef, Ryszard (eds.) Listy Jana Stapińskiego z lat 1895-1928. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: Zakład imienia
- Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Państwowej Akademii Nauk, 1977.
- Szporluk, Roman. Communism and Nationalism. Karl Marx versus Friedrich List. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Szporluk, Roman. "Ukraine: From An Imperial Periphery to A Sovereign State." Daedalus. V.126 (3), 1997, pp.85-119.
- Szczucki, Baltazar. Widkie sia wzięła Slachta, Pany, Panszczyzna i piddani. Lwiw: 11.05.1848.
- [Szcucki, Baltasar?] Widozwa towarzystwa Bratej, do mylych bratej selaniu, aby swoi grunta nemarnowały. L'viv: Z drukarni Poremby, 30.09.1848.
- Taniachkevych, Danylo. Lakhy! Chytana mova, shcho trymav na vechernytsiakh, vypravlenykh vid Fylii towarzystva "Prosvita" v Zolochevi, na same seredopistie (7(19)03) 1879 r. L'viv, 1879.
- Terlets'kyi, Ostap. Moskvofily j narodovtsi v 70-ykh rr. Naukovo-literaturna biblioteka ch.37. L'viv: z drukarni NTSh, 1902.
- Thomas, William and Znaniacki, Florian. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, Monograph of An Immigrant

- Group. New York: The Knopf, 1927, (the second edition).
- Thompson, Edward Palmer. Customs in Common. London: Merlin Press, 1991.
- Tokarz, Waclaw. Galicja w początkach ery Józefińskiej w świetle ankiety urzędowej z roku 1783. Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1909.
- Trusevych, Semen. Suspil'no-politychnyi rukh v Skhidnii Halychyni v 50-70kh rokakh XIX st. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1978.
- Tryliovs'kyi, Kyrylo. Pro halytski sudy. Promova vyHoloshena v Radi Derzhavnii dnia 24 chervnia 1908. Kolomyia, 1909.
- Tryliovs'kyi, Petro (ed.) Hei tam na hori "Sich" ide!.. Propam'iatna knyha "Sichei." Winnipeg, 1965.
- Turii, Oleh. "Hreko-katolyts'ka tserkva i revoliutsiia 1848-1849 rr. u Halychyni," in Wic, Władysław (ed.) Rok 1848. Wiosna Ludów w Galicji. Zbiór studiów. "Akademia Pedagogiczna im. Komisji Edukacji Narodowej w Krakowie, Prace Monograficzne, Nr.27." Kraków, 1999.
- Turii, Oleh Hreko-katolyts'ka tserkva v suspil'no-politychnomu zhytti Halychyny, 1848-1867. Manuscript of kandydats'ka dissertation. L'viv: L'vivs'kyi derzhavnyi universytet imeni Ivana Franka, 1994.
- Tsehlyns'kyi, Hryhorii. Shliakhta khodachkova. Komedii v IV diiakh. "Literaturno-naukova biblioteka, ch.147." (Second edition (the first one – 1887)). L'viv, 1911.
- Tykhyi, N. Oleksii Popovych. Opovidanie z kozats'kykh chasiv. (Na osnovi povisty E. Hrebinky). Vydannia Prosvity ch.291-291. L'viv, 1904.
- Tyrovych, Viktor. Rodyna Morozovychiv. Vydannia Prosvity, kn.85. L'viv, 1885.
- Tyrowicz, Marian. Prawda i mit w biografii Juliana Macieja Goslara (1820-1852). Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1972.
- "Ukraïn'sko-ruski vydannia moskovs'kykh lubochnyktiv." Zoria. No.21, 1890, p.335.
- Uruski, hrabia Seweryn; Kościński, Adam Amilkar; Włodarski, Aleksandr (eds.) Rodzina. Herbarz szlachty Polskiej. T.1 Warszawa, 1904.
- Vakhnianyn, Anatol'. "Deshcho pro liudei." Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei. Vydannia

- “Prosvity,” kn.1. L’viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1869.
- Verkhrats'kyi, Ivan. “Z diakivs'koï literatury.” ZNTSh. T.113, 1913.
- Verstiuk, Vladyslav. “Conceptual Issues in Studying the History of the Ukrainian Revolution.” Journal of Ukrainian Studies, v. 24, 2000, pp.3-20.
- “Vid vydavnytstva.” in Lunkevych, V. (Z rosyiskoï movy na ukraïns’ku pereklav Ivan Halushchyns’kyi). Vidky vzialy sia nashi domashni zviriatia i rostyny. Vydannia “Prosvity,” ch.360. L’viv, 1911.
- Vinok. Chytanochka dlia selian i mishchan. Vydannia “Prosvity,” kn. 44. L’viv, 1877.
- Vinok. Chytanka dlia selian i mishchan. Izdaniia Obshestva imeni Kachkovskoho. L’vov, 1879.
- Vintskovskii, Dmytro. Poradnyk v spravakh voiskovykh. Izdaniia Obshestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho ch. 50-51. L’vov, 1880.
- Volchko-Kul’chyts’kyi, Ivan. Istoriia sela Kul’chyts’ i rodu Drago-Sasiv. Drohobych: Vidrozhennia, 1995.
- Vozniak, Mykhailo. Iak probudylosia ukraïns’ke zhyttia v Halychyni za Avstriï. L’viv: Dilo, 1924.
- Vozniak, Mykhailo. “Z zakhodiv kolo rushchyny v sambirs’kii himnazii v 1849 i 1850 rr.” Nasha shkola, 1913, No.4-5, pp.217-233.
- Vretsiona, Hryhorii. Narodno-ruskii katekhizm. Vydannia “Prosvity,” kn.175. L’viv, 1894.
- Vydannia „Prosvity” Halychyny: knyhy ta arkusheva produktsiia (1868-1938). Bibliohrafichnyi pokazhchyk. Kyiv: Abrys, 1996.
- Vypys z rukovodstva do vpravy dlia strazhy narodnoï. Dodatok do chysla 25 Zori Halytskoi, 1848.
- Vytanovych, Ivan. Ukraïns’ke selianstvo na shliakhu do pobidy. Samoosvita, Ch.79. L’viv, 1936.
- Watulewicz, Józef. Z pamietników proboszcza łac. w Felsztynie. Skrzęsłonych w latach wojny światowej 1914-1919. Przemyśl, 1920, (odbitka z rocznika III T. P. N. w Przemyślu).
- Weber, Eugene. My France. Politics, Culture, Myth. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Wendland, Anna Veronika. Die Russophilen in Galizien. Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und

- Rußland 1848-1915. Studien zur Geschichte der Osterreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie. Band XXVII. Wien: Verlag der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2001.
- Witos, Wincenty. Moje wspomnienia. t.1. Paryż: Instytut Literacki, 1964.
- Wolf, Eric R. Peasants. Englewood, 1967.
- Wolf, Eric R. Pathways of Power. Building and Anthropology of the Modern World. University of California Press, 2001.
- Worobec, Christine D. "Galicians into Ukrainians: Ukrainian Nationalism Penetrates Nineteenth-Century Rural Austrian Galicia." Peasant Studies. v.16, No.3, 1989.
- Wycech, Czesław. Powstanie chłopow w 1846 roku. Jakub Szela. Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1955.
- Wyka, Kazimierz. Teka Stańczyka na tle historii Galicji w latach 1848-1869. Instytut Badań Literackich. Studia historyczno-literackie, 4. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich, 1951.
- Zacharjasiewicz, Jan. Święty Jur. Powieść współczesna. t.1. Warszawa, 1886.
- Zahirnia, M. Abraham Linkol'n. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.250. L'viv, 1901.
- Zahirnia, M. Pid mors'kymy khvyliamy. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.257. L'viv, 1901.
- Zahirnia, M. Borot'ba anhliiskykh kolonii amerykan'skykh za voliu. Vydannia "Prosvity," ch.299-300. L'viv, 1905.
- Zaklyns'kyi, Roman. Heohrafyia Rusy. ch.1, Rus' halytska, bukovynska i uhorska. Z kartoiu Halychyny, Bukovyny i uhorskoj Rusy. Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.98. L'viv, 1887.
- [Zaleski, Stefan] Swiatłomir. Ciemnota Galicyi w swietle cyfr i faktów, 1772-1902. Czarna księga szkolnictwa galicyjskiego. Lwów, 1904.
- Zayarnyuk, Andriy. "Mapping *Halychyna*: Constructing the Ukrainian National Space in Habsburg Galicia." Susan Ingram, Markus Reisenleitner, Cornelia Szabó-Knotik (eds.) Identität·Kultur·Raum: Kulturelle Praktiken und die Ausbildung von Imagined Communities in Nordamerika und Zentraleuropa. Wien: Turia und Kant, 2001, pp.123-40.

- Zayarnyuk, Andriy. "Closing Modernity: Ukrainian Emigration and Images of America." in Susan Ingram, Markus Reisenleitner, Cornelia Szabó-Knotik (eds.) Reverberations. Representations of Modernity, Tradition and Cultural Value in-between Central Europe and North America. Frankfurt/M: Peter Lang, 2002, pp.175-98.
- Zayarnyuk, Andriy. "Selo i liudy." Krytyka, 2002, 3(53), pp.21-25.
- Zborucki, Zygmunt. Proces studentow samborskich. Lwów, 1927.
- [Zhelekhovskii, Iustyn] Iu.V.Zh. Vospomyaniia iz 1848 goda. Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Kachkovskoho, ch.269-270. L'vov, 1898.
- Zhuravel', Danylo. Iak zemlia nasha staie ne nasha, bezplatnyi dodatok do "Novoho Slova" ch.97. [L'viv, peredruk z "Dila"].
- Zhyvotko, Arkadii. Istoriia ukrains'koi presy. Miunkhen, 1989-90.
- Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei. Vydannia "Prosvity," kn.4. L'viv: z drukarni Stavropihiiskoho i-ta, 1870.
- Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. "Budyvky i maistry." Zhytie i Slovo. 1894, kn.3, pp.71-75.
- Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. "Do istorii halyts'ko-rus'koho selianstva: Pro panshchynu v seli kolo Staroho Mista." Zhytie i Slovo. 1894, kn.5, pp.271-3.
- Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. "Halyts'ki sviashchenyky v Kholmshchyni." ZNTSh, T.84, 1908.
- Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. "Maietkovyi stan selian u Mshantsy starosambirskoho povitu v 1910 r." Studii z polia suspil'nykh nauk. T.III, 1912 [separate offprint].
- Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. "Pachkarstvo bakunu (tiutiunu) v horakh u Halychyni v XIX st." Naukovyi zbirnyk prysviachenyi profesorovy Hrushevs'komu uchenykamy i prykhyl'nykamy z nahody Ioho desiatylytn'oi naukovoï pratsi v Halychyni (1894-1904). L'viv, 1906, pp.409-31.
- Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. "Parokhiiiany vidmovliaiut' pidpysiv na petytsiiu protyv vidobrannia tserkovnykh i parokhiial'nykh dibr v 1848 r.," ZNTSh. T.57, 1904, pp.6-8.
- Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. "Prychynky do istorii rus'koho dukhovenstva

v Halychyni vid 1820 do 1853
r.” ZNTSh. T.88, pp.118-150.

Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. “Dekanal'ni
i parokhiial'ni biblioteky
Peremys'koi eparkhii.” ZNTSh.
T.90, 1909.

Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. “Prychynky
do istorii rekruchchyny v
Halychyni pry kintsi XVIII i do
polovyny XIX stolittia.”
ZNTSh. t.42, 1901, pp.2-9.

Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. “Spomyanky
pro konfederativ.” Zhytie i
Slovo. Kn.1. L'viv, 1894.

Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. “Tisni
roky.” ZNTSh. T.26, 1898,
pp.1-16.

Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. “Lisy i
pasovys'ka' (Spomyny).”
Literaturno-Naukovyi Visnyk.
T.52, 1910.

Zubryts'kyi, Mykhailo. “Velyka
rodyna v seli Mshantsy
Starosambirskoho povitu.”
ZNTSh. T.73, 1906.