



## The President and Fellows of Harvard College

---

The Kachkovs'kyi Society and the National Revival in Nineteenth-Century East Galicia

Author(s): PAUL ROBERT MAGOCSI

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 1/2 (June 1991), pp. 48-87

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036409>

Accessed: 30/09/2014 09:12

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## The Kachkovs'kyi Society and the National Revival in Nineteenth-Century East Galicia\*

PAUL ROBERT MAGOCSI

Most Slavic peoples, including Ukrainians, experienced a national revival in the nineteenth century. At the time, the vast majority of Ukrainians (approximately 85 percent) lived in the tsarist Russian Empire, with the remainder living within the neighboring Austro-Hungarian Empire. Although numerically smaller than their brethren in the Russian Empire, Ukrainians in politically more liberal Austria-Hungary had much greater opportunities to develop a national revival. This began seriously during the revolutionary years of 1848–1849, blossomed during the 1880s and 1890s, and finally culminated in the first decade and a half of the twentieth century. Of the Ukrainian-inhabited lands in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, it was most especially in the largest region—roughly the eastern half of the Austrian province of Galicia—that the national revival was played out in full force.<sup>1</sup>

In the course of the national revival, cultural organizations played a crucial role in transmitting cultural and national awareness from the educated elite—the intelligentsia—to the peasant masses, who made up nearly ninety

\* The period of national revival in late nineteenth-century East Galicia is marked by potential confusion about the terminology used by local writers in describing the East Slavic population. The terms *russskyi*, *rus'kyi*, *rusyn*, *ukrains'kyi* are among those most frequently encountered, some or all of which may be synonyms, depending on the ideological convictions of the author. In an attempt at consistency and the avoidance of undue confusion, I have decided to render *russskyi*, *rus'kyi*, and *rusyn* as Rus'; *ukrains'kyi* as Ukrainian; and the less frequent *rosiis'kyi* as Russian. Also, in an attempt to cut down on lengthy repetitions in the footnote references, the organizational name, *Obshchestvo im. Mykhaila Kachkovs'koho*, will be rendered by the initials OMK.

For transliteration, a modified Library of Congress system is used. Personal names of Galician Rus' activists are rendered in modern Ukrainian. Titles of works by Old Ruthenians (written in the "historic" Galician Rus' language) follow the Library of Congress transliteration, with the following additions:  $\delta = \delta$ ;  $\text{ѣ} = \text{ie}$ ; and  $\text{ы} = \text{y}$ .

<sup>1</sup> For a useful introduction to the Ukrainian national revival in East Galicia during the second half of the nineteenth century, see Ivan L. Rudnytsky, "The Ukrainians in Galicia Under Austrian Rule," in Andrei S. Markovits and Frank E. Sysyn, eds., *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), pp. 23–67. For further literature on the subject, see the bibliographical essay by Paul R. Magocsi, in *ibid.*, pp. 255–320, and the more extensive discussion in *idem*, *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographic Guide*, 2nd ed. (Toronto, 1985), esp. pp. 116–73.

percent of Galicia's Ukrainian population. The first modern Ukrainian cultural organizations came into being in 1848, when the Galician-Rus' Matytsia and a Chair of Rus' Language and Literature at the University of Lviv were established. That same year also witnessed the establishment of the first Ukrainian newspaper, *Zoria halyts'ka* (1848–57), and the beginnings of a fund-raising drive to create a National Center (Narodnyi Dim), which was opened in 1849. During the next half century, several other Ukrainian cultural organizations came into being, including university chairs, a wide variety of publications in all fields, and an unofficial academy of sciences known as the Shevchenko Scientific Society.

Yet among all these cultural organizations, the most influential for the national revival were those that reached directly into the villages, where they had an impact on the daily lives of peasants. In Ukrainian-inhabited Galicia there were two such popular-education societies, the Prosvita Society (Tovarystvo "Prosvita") established in 1868 and the Kachkovskiy Society (Obshchestvo Kachkovskoho) established in 1874. Each lasted until the outbreak of World War I and even beyond, so that both were active throughout the whole era of the Galician-Ukrainian national revival.

Despite the importance of both the Prosvita Society and the Kachkovskiy Society for the development of a national consciousness in Ukrainian Galicia, only Prosvita has been analyzed with any seriousness.<sup>2</sup> In an effort to correct that imbalance, this essay provides at least the broad outlines of the history of the Kachkovskiy Society from its establishment in 1874 until the outbreak of war in 1914, that is, during the period which coincides with the height of the Ukrainian national revival in East Galicia. Following a review of existing literature on the subject, the focus of attention rests on the establishment and structure of the Kachkovskiy Society, its activity, and its historical evolution and ideology.

#### LITERATURE AND SOURCES ON THE KACHKOVSKYI SOCIETY

The scant secondary literature on the Kachkovskiy Society is limited primarily to works published before 1910. Of this material, the most extensive includes a memorial book published on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the society's activity (1899) and a rare and virtually inaccessible history by P.O. Goptsus published in the Russian Empire at the outset of the twentieth century.<sup>3</sup> Besides these early works, all that remains are a few short articles

<sup>2</sup> Magocsi, *Galicia*, pp. 37 and 144.

<sup>3</sup> O. A. Monchalovskii, *Pamiatnaia knyzhka v 25-litnii iuvylei Obshchestva ymeny Mykhaylo Kachkovskoho, 1874–1899*, Izdanie OMK, no. 285 (Lviv, 1899); P.O. Goptsus, *Zarubezhnaia Rus' v bor'be za svoiu natsional'no-kul'turnuiu samobytnost': Narodnoprosvetitel'naia*

and encyclopedic entries on Mykhail Kachkovs'kyi in which the society named after him is mentioned,<sup>4</sup> some comments on the society in more general studies that deal with the so-called Russophile movement in Galicia,<sup>5</sup> and passing references to the society in general histories<sup>6</sup> and in memoirs or essays by contemporaries, whether by visitors from the Russian Empire like Mykhailo Drahomanov and Elizaveta de Vitte<sup>7</sup> or by local Galician activists like Mykhailo Pavlyk, Ivan Franko, and Kost' Levyts'kyi.<sup>8</sup>

There are several reasons for the dearth of literature on the Kachkovs'kyi Society. While individual histories of other Old Ruthenian and Russophile cultural organizations in Galicia have been published,<sup>9</sup> the Kachkovs'kyi Society, with its more populist and less "scholarly" concerns, seemed less important. For other reasons, the society has been of little concern to both Soviet and non-Soviet Ukrainian historians writing in the period since World War II. They simply have disregarded the earlier assessment of Franko—that the Kachkovs'kyi Society "published a series

---

*deiatel'nost' Obshchestva imeni Mikhailo Kachkovskogo v Galitskoi Rusi, osnovannogo prosvetitelem ee o. Ioannom Naumovichem* (Poltava, 1909).

<sup>4</sup> Afanasii Vasil'ev, "Mikhail Alekseevich Kachkovskii i obshchestvo ego imeni na Galitskoi Rusi," *Izvestiia Sankt-Peterburgskogo slavianskogo blagotvoritel'nogo obshchestva*, vol. 5 (1888), reprinted in his *Zarubezhnaia Rus'* (Petrograd, 1905), pp. 1–6, and in *Russkaia beseda* 1, no. 8 (1895): 99–108; J. Hejret, "Spolek Michaila Kačkovského," *Česka osvěta*, no. 10 (Prague, 1909); and the most recent, Jarosław Moklak, "Mychajlo Kaczkowski i czytelnie jego imienia na Łemkowszczyźnie," in *Magury '87* (Warsaw, 1987), pp. 52–64.

The longest encyclopedic entry on Kachkovs'kyi with a description of the society is in the tsarist Russian *Éntsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, vol. 14a (St. Petersburg, 1895), pp. 814–15. It is interesting to note that the most important pre-World War I Polish encyclopedia, Samuel Orgelbrand's *Encyklopedja powszechna* (Warsaw, 1898–1912), did not carry any entry on Kachkovs'kyi, but that the analogous Czech encyclopedia did include a brief entry on him by the Prague specialist on Ukrainian affairs, František Řehoř, *Ottův slovník naučný*, vol. 13 (Prague, 1898), p. 729.

<sup>5</sup> Mykola Andrusiak, *Narysy z istorii halyts'koho moskvofil'stva* (Prague, 1935), pp. 42–45; Stefan A. Fentsik, "Galitsiia," *Karpatskii svet* (Uzhhorod), 1, no. 10 (1928): 380–82.

<sup>6</sup> Omelian Ohonovskii, *Ystoriia lyteratury ruskoy*, vol. 2 (Lviv, 1889), pp. 89–90; Filipp I. Svistun, *Prikarpatskaia Rus' pod vladeniem Avstrii* (1896), 2nd rev. ed. (Trumbull, Conn., 1970), pp. 417–18.

<sup>7</sup> Mykhailo Drahomanov, "Avstro-rus'ki spomyny" (1889–92), in his *Literaturno-publitsystychni pratsi*, vol. 2 (Kiev, 1970), esp. pp. 254–57; Elizaveta de Vitte, *Puteviia vpechatleniia s istoricheskimi ocherkami: Leto 1903 g., Bukovina i Galichina* (1904), 2nd ed. (Bridgeport, Conn., 1977), esp. pp. 226–44.

<sup>8</sup> Mykhailo Pavlyk, "Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni" (1887), in his *Tvory* (Kiev, 1985), pp. 233–35; Ivan Franko, "Narys istorii ukrains'ko-rus'koi literatury do 1890 r." (1910), in his *Zibrannia tvoriv*, vol. 41 (Kiev, 1984), pp. 331 and 420; Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky halyts'kykh ukrainsiv 1848–1914*, pt. 1 (Lviv, 1926), pp. 146–47.

<sup>9</sup> For instance, the Stauropegial Institute has an extensive literature, while the Galician Rus' Matytsia and National Home are each the subject of at least one major study. See Magocsi, *Galicia*, pp. 35–36.

of books that were important for the practical life of the peasantry"<sup>10</sup>—and the conclusion of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi regarding the national orientation that the Kachkovskyyi Society epitomized: "The so-called 'provincial Muscovites' . . . are in no way Muscovites or Russians despite what their Lviv critics may say; they are simply Old Ruthenians—that is, Ukrainians also, even if they have old-fashioned and strange views. . . . They are a very useful force whether in economic or political work, and without them one cannot carry on any work in the countryside, because they are the real power among the local intelligentsia."<sup>11</sup> Instead, most Soviet and non-Soviet Ukrainian historians seem intent on dismissing the Kachkovskyyi Society outright, or at best in criticizing it for its supposed Russophile, conservative, clerical, tsarist, and, worst of all, "anti-revolutionary" tendencies.<sup>12</sup> It is only in the past few years that two Canadian specialists on Ukrainians in Galicia have called for a reassessment of the Kachkovskyyi Society and for a dispassionate analysis of its historic role.<sup>13</sup>

Unpublished sources on the Kachkovskyyi Society are held in the Central State Historical Archive in Lviv. Colleagues who have recently reviewed the archival fond devoted to the organization report that it only contains minutes and reports similar to those available in published sources.<sup>14</sup> This study is based on materials in the contemporary press from the time of the establishment of the Kachkovskyyi Society in 1874 until its first demise following the outbreak of World War I in 1914.

Although the society never had its own newspaper or journal, several periodicals provided systematic coverage of its activity. In this regard, the most important were the newspapers *Slovo* (Lviv, 1861–87), *Chervonnaia*

<sup>10</sup> Franko, "Narys istorii," p. 420. See also the positive assessment of Andrusiak, *Narys z istorii*, pp. 42–45.

<sup>11</sup> Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, "Konets' rutenstva," *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk*, 40 (Kiev and Lviv, 1907), p. 139.

<sup>12</sup> The Kachkovskyyi Society is given a negative assessment in a brief entry in the non-Soviet Ukrainian *Entsyklopediia ukrainoznavstva*, vol. 5 (Paris and New York, 1966), p. 1807, while neither it nor Kachkovskyyi himself have any entry at all in either the first or second editions of the *Ukrains'ka radians'ka entsyklopedia* (Kiev, 1959–65 and 1977–85) or the *Radians'ka entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy* (Kiev, 1969–72).

<sup>13</sup> John-Paul Himka, *Socialism in Galicia: The Emergence of Polish Social Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism (1860–1890)* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), p. 42, mentions the "progressive qualities" of Russophilism. Stella M. Hryniuk, in her "A Peasant Society in Transition: Ukrainian Peasants in Five East Galician Countries, 1880–1900" (Ph.D. diss., University of Manitoba, 1984), esp. pp. 175–79, after discussing in some detail the Kachkovskyyi Society's activity at the local level, suggests that "it is possible that its contribution to Ukrainian enlightenment in East Galicia has been underestimated."

<sup>14</sup> The Lviv archival fond in question is 182: "Materialy ob organizatsionnoi i propagandistskoi diiatel'nosti Obshchestva im. M. Kachkovskogo" (1879–1909). I am grateful to Dr. Stella Hryniuk, who reviewed the fond at my request.

*Rus'* (Lviv, 1888–91), and *Halychanyn* (Lviv, 1893–1913), which carried once each year the full texts of the Kachkovs'kyi Society's annual reports (*otcheti*) as well as descriptions throughout the year of the activity of the society's affiliates. Four other periodicals—*Nauka* (1871–99, 1902–14), *Russkaia rada* (1871–1912), *Russkoe slovo* (1890–1914), and *Golos naroda* (1909–1915)—were less systematic in reproducing the annual reports, but they did provide detailed descriptions of the society's annual meetings and other activity throughout each year. Thus, the contemporary Galician press provides extensive data to trace the history and development of the Kachkovs'kyi Society.

#### THE ESTABLISHMENT AND STRUCTURE OF THE KACHKOV'S'KYI SOCIETY

The idea to establish the Kachkovs'kyi Society originated with the Reverend Ivan Naumovych (1826–1891), a Greek Catholic priest in the town of Skalat not far from the Russian border. Naumovych was already well known throughout Ukrainian-inhabited Galicia as the author of several widely read short stories and plays and as the founding editor of the popular journal for rural domestic affairs, *Nauka*. In short, Naumovych's influence and popularity were based on the fact that he knew how to reach the Galician Ukrainian peasantry, not only to speak their language but to respond to their needs. He was a classic populist, whose primary life goal was to raise the cultural level of the Galician Ukrainian masses by working with them and at their level, or in his words, by going to the people (*k narodam*).<sup>15</sup>

Indeed, two other cultural organizations were already in existence; the Galician Rus' Matytsia from 1848 and the more recent Prosvita Society from 1868. However, the Matytsia limited itself to publishing an irregular and rather esoteric scholarly journal, while Prosvita, which was established to correct the Matytsia's isolation, did not (at least initially) do much better. For instance, during its first eight years of existence, only 564 persons

<sup>15</sup> Naumovych's role was even recognized by his adversaries, such as the socialist and Ukrainophile activist Mykhailo Pavlyk. Otherwise opposed to the conservative, clerical, Orthodox, and pro-Russian views of Naumovych, Pavlyk could nonetheless write that Naumovych "rendered a great service in the enlightenment of the Rus' people of Galicia! . . . because despite himself he cleared the Galician ground for true Ukrainophilism, even more so than most certified populists, since he readied the masses of our people for Ukrainianism." M. Pavlyk, *Moskvofil' svo ta ukrainofil' svo sered avstro-rus' koho narodu* (Lviv, 1906), p. 45.

On Naumovych's career, see the two biographies by, respectively, his Old Ruthenian and Russophile ideological descendants: O. A. Monchalovskii, *Zhyt' e i diatel' nost Ivana Naumovycha* (Lviv, 1899) and Vasilii R. Vavrik, *Prosvititel' Galitskoi Rusi Ivan G. Naumovich* (Lviv and Prague, 1926).

joined Prosvita, whose high dues and cost of publications closed out the peasant masses, making it just another cultural society “for the intelligentsia.”<sup>16</sup>

It was in these circumstances that the newly elected deputy to the national parliament in Vienna (1873), Ivan Naumovych, decided to act. While his new position did not garner for his people any concrete advantages from the Austrian government, it did give him a chance to interact in Vienna with leaders of other Slavic national revivals.

Generally, it is thought that the Galician Ukrainian national revival looked to the Poles, the Serbs, and most especially the Czechs to point the way. While this is true in general, in the case of Naumovych he found encouragement in the Slovenes, numerically the smallest Slavic people in the Habsburg Empire, divided geographically and administratively between Carniola and five other Austrian provinces. From Slovene representatives in Vienna, Naumovych learned of their struggle for national survival in the face of Germanization, and he was particularly impressed with the popular Slovene cultural society known as the Society of St. Hermagoras (*Druzhba sv. Mohorja*). This was actually a publishing house whose members (23,000 in the mid-1870s) guaranteed through their annual dues the publication of books in Slovene that no commercial publisher would be willing financially to underwrite.<sup>17</sup> Thus, reasoned Naumovych, if the numerically small Slovenes could survive in the face of German influence, so, too, could the Rus’ people of Galicia stand up to the Poles.<sup>18</sup>

With the Slovene model in mind, Naumovych turned first to the Galician Rus’ *Matytsia* and *Prosvita* Society, recommending that they dissolve themselves, join forces, and create a single publishing house. When his proposal was rejected, he decided instead to form a new cultural organization. On 20 August 1874, he summoned a group of Galician-Rus’ patriots, not to the Polish-dominated provincial capital of Lviv, but to the small town of Kolomyia tucked in the Carpathian Mountain valleys of southeastern Galicia. About 300 people gathered in Kolomyia, half of whom were peasants from

<sup>16</sup> Mykhailo Lozyns’kyi, *Sorok lit diial' nosty 'Pros'vity'* (Lviv, 1908), p. 10.

<sup>17</sup> For an introduction to the Hermagoras Society in the context of similar organizations, see Stanley B. Kimball, *The Austro-Slav Revival: A Study of Nineteenth-Century Literary Foundations*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 63, pt. 4 (Philadelphia, 1973), p. 66.

<sup>18</sup> On the influence of the Slovenes on Naumovych, see his statements in “O obshchestvī Mykhayla Kachkovskoho,” *Russkaia rada* (Kolomyia), 5, no. 24 (1875): 190, and “Poslanie k vsīm nashym chlenam OMK y dobrŷm liudam, shchyrŷm Rusynam!,” *Kalendar OMK na hod prostŷyi 1885* (Lviv, [1884]), pp. 69–71; as well as O. A. Monchalovskii, “Rich, proiznesennaia v heneral'nom sobranii chlenov OMK, 17 (29) sentiabra v Ternopolŷ,” *Slovo*, 29 September and 2 October 1884, pp. 1–2 and 1–2.

the local countryside, to form what became known as the Mykhail Kachkovs'kyi Society (Obshchestvo im. Mykhaila Kachkovskoho).

But why was the new society named after Mykhail Kachkovs'kyi? Kachkovs'kyi (1802–1872) was an Austrian civil servant, who in 1848 began a rather uneventful career as a judge at the district court in Sambir, where he acquired a reputation for defending peasants whenever disputes with manorial landlords were brought before him regarding forest and pasture rights.<sup>19</sup> Unmarried and with no other family obligations, he attained a certain amount of wealth which he used to support a few important publications in the late 1850s. In 1861, he provided funds for the establishment of the newspaper *Slovo*, which for nearly two decades was to be the authoritative organ of the Old Ruthenian orientation in Galician Ukrainian society; then, in 1871, he provided funds to help Naumovych publish a popular journal (*Nauka*) and newspaper (*Ruskaia rada*) written in the vernacular. When Kachkovs'kyi died unexpectedly a few months after his retirement in 1872 while on a trip to the Russian Empire, he left in his estate the sum of 60,000 guildens to the National Center (Narodnyi Dim) in Lviv for the “publication of books for the spiritual welfare of the Rus' people.”<sup>20</sup> Two years later, Naumovych thought that by naming his new society after Kachkovs'kyi and by carrying out the publication goals of the deceased's will, the fledgling organization would surely be guaranteed the endowed funding. Even though the matter was contested in Austrian courts for over a decade, in fact the National Home never released the funds, so that the society named for him never received any income from the Kachkovs'kyi estate.<sup>21</sup>

With no funding from the Kachovs'kyi estate or, with a few exceptions very much later, any funding from the Austrian central or Galician provincial governments, the Kachkovs'kyi Society had to survive solely on support from its own members. Moreover, since the vast majority of those

<sup>19</sup> For further details on Kachkovs'kyi, see the only significant biography, Bohdan A. Dīdytskii, *Mykhail Kachkovskii y sovremennaia halytsko-ruskaia lyteratura: Ocherk biohrafycheskii y ystoryko-lyteraturnyi* (Lviv, 1876); on the background to forming the Kachkovs'kyi Society, see Pavlyk, “Pro. . . chytal'ni,” pp. 226–33.

<sup>20</sup> From a speech by Kachkovs'kyi in Sambir (13 November 1860), as recorded by B. A. Dīdytskii, “Vspomynka o M. Kachkovskom,” *Slovo*, 9 (21) November 1885, p. 1.

For the text of the will, see “Zavīshchanie Mykhayla Kachkovskoho, ehozhe slavnoe ymia nashe Obshchestvo nosyt,” in *Yliustrovannyi kalendar' OMK na hod prostyi 1886* (Lviv, [1885]), pp. 155–60.

<sup>21</sup> I. Naumovych, “O obshchestvi Mykhayla Kachkovskoho,” *Ruskaia rada* (Kolomyia), 5, no. 24 (1875): 190. Several sources still assume incorrectly that the Kachkovs'kyi Society was funded by the Kachkovs'kyi estate. Cf. the editorial note in Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv*, p. 624.

members consistently came from the peasantry, it could in fact be called a national society.

The basic goals of the Kachkovs'kyi Society were outlined in the first paragraph of its statutes issued at the founding meeting in Kolomyia: "to spread knowledge, morality, industriousness, thriftiness, sobriety, civic awareness, and all aspects of integrity among the Rus' people of Austria" (see appendix 1). These goals were frequently summed up in the slogan, "study, pray, work, and prosper" (*uchysia, molysia, pratsiui, statkui*; or *molys', uchys', trudys' i shchady*, depending on the language of the author), which appeared over and over again in the annual reports and speeches of society members. It seemed to Naumovych and to most of his successors that the best way to achieve those goals was through the "diffusion of inexpensive and useful booklets among our Rus' people living in the Austrian state."<sup>22</sup>

The structure of the Kachkovs'kyi Society was the following. Individual members paid only 1 gulden annually in return for which they received gratis a publication each month, including the society's annual almanac.<sup>23</sup> (It is interesting to note that for the first nine years of its existence, Kachkovs'kyi's older rival, the Prosvita Society, charged 2 guildens to become a member plus nearly 8 guildens annual dues; moreover, publications had to be purchased by Prosvita members.)<sup>24</sup>

According to a revision of the statutes made in 1875, Kachkovs'kyi Society members belonged to local affiliates, which could be formed whenever at least twenty members submitted a petition to the central branch in Lviv for approval. The affiliates were generally based in district centers and were responsible for the territory of the given district (*Bezirk/povit*). Of the fifty-five districts in Ukrainian-inhabited eastern Galicia, the Kachkovs'kyi Society had affiliates at some time or other in thirty-two districts, with a total of thirty-one affiliates in 1913 (see appendix 2). The affiliates carried on their own cultural activity and were entitled to 10 percent of the annual dues of members living within their jurisdiction, the remainder going to the central branch. The founding statutes already made provision for the establishment of reading rooms, which could be set up with a minimum of twelve members (see appendix 1, section 7).

<sup>22</sup> "Zahal'noe sobranie obshchestva Mykhayla Kachkovskoho otbudesia v Stryî dnia 22. lat. (10 rus) serpnia seho roku." *Russkaia rada* (Kolomyia), 6, no. 15 (1876): 110.

<sup>23</sup> "Otchet OMK. . . 1876–1877," *Slovo*, 27 September 1877, pp. 1–2.

<sup>24</sup> *Lozys'kyi, Sorok lit*, p. 10, actually states 4 crowns membership and 1.4 crowns monthly, which after conversion (1 gulden equaled 2 crowns before 1892) equal the figures given here.

The central branch itself was first located in Kolomyia (on Honchars'ka Street), but as a result of an extraordinary general meeting held in January 1876, it was decided to change its location to Lviv. For nearly the next three decades, the central branch had its offices in the National Center (Narodnyi Dim at 22 Teatral'na Street) in downtown Lviv, for which it paid rent, until it was finally able to purchase its own building in 1904 at no. 14 on nearby Valova Street.

The governing body of the central branch and the Kachkovs'kyi Society as a whole was its central committee (*tsestral'nyi vydil*), composed of twelve members, of which eight were full members and four were alternates. Among the eight full members there were four officers—a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, and treasurer. The central committee was elected at each annual meeting by dues-paying members in attendance, and it was responsible for all policy and financial aspects of the society's activity. Not surprisingly, the first chairman elected was the person who conceived the idea of the society, Ivan Naumovych, and in the period until World War I there were only four other chairmen (see appendix 3), those with the longest tenure being Bohdan Didyts'kyi (1884–1903) and Fylyp Svystun (1903–1914).<sup>25</sup> All work by the officers was done on a voluntary basis, Didyts'kyi gaining his livelihood, for instance, as curator of the National Center and Svystun as a *gymnasium* teacher.

The original statute (see appendix 1) suggested the Kachkovs'kyi Society was to represent the Rus' people throughout all of Austria, and at its founding and subsequent annual meetings much emphasis was given to the representation from neighboring Bukovina. It was also because of the Bukovinian presence that the religious issue arose. When at the second meeting held in historic Halych a local Galician Greek Catholic priest expressed concern that the Orthodox Bukovinian guest and his fellow Galician Rus' were of a different religion, the speaker was criticized "because our members did not meet here for religious speeches but for the purposes of raising the level of education and welfare of the people."<sup>26</sup>

Bukovinian participation at annual meetings was to continue and already by 1876 there were eight Kachkovs'kyi reading rooms in Bukovina. This was in sharp contrast to Subcarpathian Rus' in Hungary where, during a

<sup>25</sup> For biographies of the first four chairmen, see Monchalovskii, *Pamiatnaia knyzhka*, pp. 6–8, 113–20.

<sup>26</sup> "Zahal'noe sobranie OMK v Halychy," *Ruskaia rada* (Kolomyia), 5, no. 17 (1875): 132. It is interesting to note that it was also at this meeting that the suggestion of the university student and future radical politician, Mykhailo Pavlyk, to have the Gospel "translated into the popular speech," was turned down. "Otchet yz vtoroho heneral'noho sobrannia OMK," *Slovo*, 19 August 1875, p. 1.

period of increasing magyarization before World War I, there was no participation or seemingly even awareness of the Kachkovskyyi Society.<sup>27</sup> This was confirmed during a visit to the area by Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841–1895), who, during an interview with the well-known Subcarpathian writer and archimandrite of the Mukachevo Monastery, Anatolii Kralyts'kyi (1834–1894), later recalled: “I couldn’t believe my ears: the archimandrite of a Rus’ monastery, a contributor to *Slovo*, and he never saw a publication of the Kachkovskyyi Society until [I] a Ukrainophile from Russia brought them to him.”<sup>28</sup> On the other hand, the Kachkovskyyi Society did make its presence felt among immigrants to the New World (mostly from Subcarpathian Rus’ and the Lemko region), and beginning in the 1890s it frequently sent its publications to immigrant organizations in the United States, Canada, and Brazil. By 1903, there were 139 Kachkovskyyi Society members in the United States, most of whom were in branches located in Seymour, Connecticut, and in Olyphant and Shamokin, Pennsylvania.<sup>29</sup>

#### THE ACTIVITY OF THE KACHKOVSKYYI SOCIETY

We have seen how Naumovych’s idea for creating the Kachkovskyyi Society sprang from the success of a Slovene publishing house. While it is true that the Kachkovskyyi Society with its various affiliates became increasingly involved in other kinds of activity, the “main task of the central committee” remained throughout its history the publication program. Its importance was further underlined by the fact that the chairman of the central committee was simultaneously responsible for publications.

The object of the publication program was accessibility and frequency. This meant small booklets (generally between 75 and 125 pages) published each month and sent gratis to all members. In practice, members received a booklet on an average ten to eleven times a year (the summer months were often doubled-up); after 1885 this included the society’s annual farmer’s almanac (*kalendar*) that usually was large enough to cover the page

<sup>27</sup> One commentator suggested that in the 1880s the Subcarpathian Rusyns were still “with us,” but that “since that time they have no contacts with us as if they were not of Rus’ origin.” “O heneral’nom sobraniiu chlenov OMK v Kolomyi,” *Russkaia rada*, (Kolomyia), 34, no. 17 (1905): 134.

On the magyarization process in Subcarpathian Rus’ and decreasing contacts with Galicia, see Paul Robert Magocsi, *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus’, 1848–1948* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), pp. 55–75.

<sup>28</sup> Drahomanov, “Avstro-rus’ki spomyny,” p. 276.

<sup>29</sup> “OMK: Spravozdanoe... za lita 1894–95 y 1895–96,” *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 7, no. 35 (1896): 6; “OMK: Otchet o diiatel’nosti tsentr. v’ydila,” *Halychany*, 8 September 1897, pp. 1–2; *Halychany*, 30 September 1903, pp. 1–2.

allotment for two months. The monthly series was officially known as the *Izdaniia Obshchestva ymeny Mykhayla Kachkovskoho* (Publications of the Mykhail Kachkovs'kyi Society), and between 1875, when the first booklet appeared, to the outbreak of World War I over 460 numbers were issued in the series.

Considering the double numbers assigned to certain titles, there were at least over 400 booklets that appeared between 1875 and 1914.<sup>30</sup> The size of the printings remained stable for each number within a given year (with the almanac usually printed in an extra 1,500 copies), but that size was to change from decade to decade depending on the society's membership. The initial four numbers (1875) came out in printruns of 10,000, but thereafter dropped to 6,000 and then after 1879—the lowest point in membership—to 5,500 and 5,200. It was not until the 1890s that the printings were again increased, culminating during the first decade of the twentieth century in 8,500 (1900) and then 10,500 (1904).

Since the Kachkovs'kyi Society was so consistent in getting out its monthly publications, during the thirty-eight years to 1914, it printed perhaps over 2.5 million copies. The importance of the publication program was confirmed by the annual budgets, over half of which each year went for editorial and printing costs.<sup>31</sup> Just what were these publications? Did they fulfill the intended goal of the society's statute: "to spread knowledge, morality, industriousness, thriftiness, sobriety, and civic awareness"? First of all, with regard to form, they were all written in the so-called traditional Galician-Rus' book language, that is, basically Galician-Ukrainian vernacular with a significant number of archaic forms and Church Slavonic influences and a lesser number of Russian influences. This book language was used in church books and had been taught in elementary schools at least until the 1870s. Moreover, in a semi-literate, conservative, and rural environment sensitive to any changes away from traditional

<sup>30</sup> I am not aware of any complete list of all Kachkovs'kyi Society publications. The estimate given here is based on the annual reports (*otchety*), which indicated the numbers in the series published in a given year and often provided titles as well. The most comprehensive list available (before 1893) is found in Ivan Em. Levytskii, *Halysko-russkaia bybliohrafiia XIX-ho stolittia*, vol. 2: 1861–1886 (Lviv, 1895), and the supplements under the title *Materiialy do ukrains'koi bibliografii: Ukrains'ka bibliohrafiia Avstro-Uhorshchyny za roky 1887–1893*, 3 vols. (Lviv, 1909–11). See also the discussion of the society's publishing activity and lists of publications (to 1905) arranged according to subject matter in Goptsus, *Zarubezhnaia Rus'*, pp. 72–82.

<sup>31</sup> For instance, looking at a typical budget during an early and later period, printing, binding, and postage costs represented 51 percent of expenses during the fiscal year 1885–1886 and 50.5 percent in the 1900–1901 fiscal year. *Slovo*, 3 (15) September 1886, p. 3; *Halychanyn*, 13 September 1901, pp. 1–2.

forms, the etymological alphabet was used, with its *tery* [ѣ], *iat* [ѣ], and hard sign [ѣ]. Thus, the Kachkovskyyi Society publications had a familiar look and were perceived by the peasant masses to be “our” Galician Rus’ books.<sup>32</sup>

In terms of content, each booklet included a single title or, more often, several titles. The subjects were either of a practical nature, concerning farming and personal health care, or were devoted to moral (i.e., religious) and civic concerns (Austrian citizenship, Galician Rus’ history), or aimed at exposing the masses to culture, whether in “high” forms through works by renowned Russian authors like Gogol and Tolstoy, or in more popular forms through plays and short stories by local Galician authors like Ivan Naumovych, Ievhenii Zhars’kyi (1834–1892), Dmytro Vintskovskyyi (1846–1917), and Orest Avdykovskyyi (1843–1913). In fact, the titles from the first year set the tone that would be followed for the next four decades. Among these were: “What Does a Person Need to Know About Health?” by Dr. Kornyii Merunovych; “Notes on the Use of Plants for Human Consumption” by P. V.; “Domestic Flocks” by Ignatii Hal’ka; “Vodka—the Ruination of Man and How to Overcome It”; “On the Planting of All Kinds of Trees,” “Dwellings for Sheep,” and “What Our Houses Should Look Like,” all by Mykhail Klemertovych; “God Be With Us” by Ivan Naumovych; “Love for the Fatherland” by V. Ruzhyts’kyi; “On the Rights and Duties of Citizens at the Village, District, Province, and State Level” by Ignatii Hal’ka; “A Conversation Between an Illiterate Father and Learned Son” by I. Sh.; literary works by Orest Avdykovskyyi, Ievhenii Zhars’kyi, and Dmytro Tretiak, and several reports on the society itself.

Throughout the four decades of the Kachkovskyyi Society’s publication program, one title was singled out as the “crown of our educational work.”<sup>33</sup> This was the *Slaviano-russkii bukvar* (Slavono-Rus’ Primer) published in 1895 in an initial printing of 20,000. This was the largest print run of any Kachkovskyyi Society publication, and its seeming popularity led to a second printing—this time 30,000 copies—in 1905.<sup>34</sup> In essence, the primer was not only an elementary educational tool; it became an element in the society’s ideological struggle to preserve the traditional Galician-Rus’

<sup>32</sup> This was in sharp contrast to the populist Ukrainophiles who, beginning in the 1870s, gradually introduced the phonetic alphabet, whose “strangeness” often alienated unsophisticated readers. On the alphabet and related problems, see Paul R. Magocsi, “The Language Question as a Factor in the National Movement in Eastern Galicia,” in Markovits and Sysyn, *Nation-building*, pp. 220–38.

<sup>33</sup> Cited from chairman Bohdan Didyts’kyi’s opening speech at the twenty-second annual convention in Stanyslaviv, “Narodnyi prazdnyk,” *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 7, no. 35 (1896): 1.

<sup>34</sup> “OMK v 1905/6 hodu,” *Halychany*, 19 September 1906, pp. 1–3.

book language and etymological alphabet in the face of the phonetically based alphabet of the Ukrainian vernacular which had been officially recognized by the Austrian provincial school administration in 1893.

Besides the publication program, the other way in which the Kachkovs'kyi Society advertised itself and tried to gain new members was through its annual conventions. Although the founder Naumovych quipped that "we could not have made a greater mistake than to designate Kolomyia as the seat of our headquarters,"<sup>35</sup> his own preference for Lviv did not blind him to the necessity that the Kachkovs'kyi Society avoid the example of all other Galician-Rus' societies, which often closed themselves off in the "big city," far from the provincial environment of the smaller towns and countryside.<sup>36</sup> Thus, to avoid the pitfalls of isolation for an organization whose goals were precisely to work among the masses, the Kachkovs'kyi Society used its annual conventions as an instrument for "going to the people." Each year, the annual conventions were held in a different Galician town, with the thirty-eight conventions held between 1874 and 1912 alternating between Brody (2 times), Drohobych (3), Halych (1), Jarosław (1), Kalush (1), Kolomyia (4), Lviv (12), Peremyshl' (Przemyśl) (2), Sanok (2), Sambir (2), Stanyslaviv (2), Stryi (2), Ternopil' (3), and Zolochiv (1) (see appendix 4).

According to the founding statute, the annual conventions were to be held each August 20 (August 8, old style), the day of Mykhail Kachkovs'kyi's death. While the founding meeting and some of the early conventions were held on or near that day, the norm soon became the second to third week of September, when the bulk of the harvest was in, allowing more peasant agriculturalists to attend. In a sense, the annual conventions became national holidays, which usually drew a few thousand participants and in some cases as many as 5,000, making them among the largest Rus' manifestations in Galicia and lending some credence to the standard description, *narodnyi prazdnyk*, given them by the Old Ruthenian and Russophile press.

A typical national convention was the one held in Kolomyia in 1905.<sup>37</sup> The participants arrived the day before and already at 7:30 P.M. on the eve of the meeting there was a parade with choral music, torches, and lanterns that wound its way through the streets of Kolomyia, culminating at the local

<sup>35</sup> From the chairman's speech at the extraordinary third convention in Lviv, "Heneral'noe sobranie chlenov OMK," *Slovo*, 13 January 1876, p. 1.

<sup>36</sup> For instance, the headquarters of the Prosvita Society was in Lviv and this, combined with other reasons, led to the popular view that Prosvita was *pans'ke*—for the upper echelons; while Kachkovs'kyi was *khlops'ke*—for the peasant masses. Andrusiak, *Narysy z istorii*, p. 43.

<sup>37</sup> Based on the description in *Russkoe slovo*, 11 August 1905, p. 1.

Kachkovskiy Society reading room, where a theatrical performance began at 9:00 P.M. On the day of the convention, the proceedings began at 8:00 A.M. with a liturgy and *panakhyda* (memorial service) for Mykhail Kachkovskiy and deceased members of the society in the local Greek Catholic church. This was followed at 10:00 A.M. by a parade from the church to the city park, where at 10:30 A.M. the meeting was formally opened by the singing of the hymn of the Slavic patron saints, Cyril and Methodius: "Slava Vam bratia."

After a break for luncheon, the proceedings resumed outside at noon with a welcome speech by the chairman of the society, Pylip Svystun. This was followed by the reading of congratulatory telegrams, the election of a board of comptrollers, a reading of the financial report for the previous fiscal year (1904–1905), a speech by a woman villager, a poetry reading, the report of the board of comptrollers, and election of the chairman and central committee for the following year. Each of these activities was, of course, accompanied with speeches by—to quote the words of one outside visitor—"Galician orators. . . who are incapable of speaking briefly, clearly, and to the point," so that "to survive a Galician meeting is a difficult task even for an educated person, let alone a simple one."<sup>38</sup> When all was finally said and done late in the afternoon, the meeting closed with the singing of "Khto za namy, Boh za nym."

With formal affairs out of the way, the evening was left to a public festival that included theatrical performances, a concert by a military band and the local Kolomyia choir, a firework display at 8:30 P.M., and finally a public ball from 10:00 P.M. until the wee hours of the morning. The following day was reserved for a trip to the Hutsul resort of Iaremche along the Prut River, after which the participants returned home on foot, if they were from nearby villages, or by train if they were part of the central branch's delegation from Lviv or from other branches.

The main object of the annual meetings was to bring Galician Ukrainians together and give them a sense of their national unity through social contact and relaxation at the same time as they were exposed to patriotic speeches and cultural performances. The effort must have been successful since, with only a few exceptions, the Kachkovskiy Society conventions continued to attract thousands of participants right down to the last meeting (1912) held before World War I. Moreover, the few proposals made in the

<sup>38</sup> This description, generally applicable to Galician Ukrainian society (as well as to immigrant descendants of that society in North America), actually pertained to the 1876 annual convention. Drahomanov, "Avstro-rus'ki spomyny," p. 255.

mid-1880s to hold meetings only once every three years were never adopted.<sup>39</sup>

The annual meetings also provided the motivation for another important aspect of Kachkovs'kyi Society activity—agricultural work. Already in 1875, just one year after the society was founded, it was agreed to emend the statute, “so that at the national conventions exhibits would be set up to display tools and agricultural products.”<sup>40</sup> The first of these exhibits accompanied the annual meetings in 1879 (Stanyslaviv) and in 1880 (Kolomyia). They were enormously popular, because they spoke the language known best by the population of the rural area; namely, the visual language of exhibits which included displays of the newest crops like American potatoes, “Mamut” beets, kohlrabi, soybeans, and free seed samples of these and other agricultural products. The peasants were also able to get concrete ideas from other parts of the exhibit, which displayed the newest tools, milk and meat products, handicrafts, and domestic animals—chickens, geese, etc.<sup>41</sup> Whereas agricultural exhibits were held at a few subsequent annual conventions (Sanok, 1900, and bee raising at Kolomyia, 1905), this activity was basically left to the affiliates, which mounted their own exhibits, usually in conjunction with their own general meetings.

The central branch was more active in sponsoring courses such as fruit-raising and orchard care (1906), local store managing (1906–07, 1911–12), buttermaking and milk products (1908–09, 1911–12), and animal care (1911–12), all of which were held in or near Lviv.<sup>42</sup> More ambitious was a scholarship program begun in 1906 for five young peasants to spend five and one-half months (April 1–September 15) as guests of the Economic Union (Hospodařský Svaz) in Chrudim, Bohemia. There they learned advanced agricultural techniques and cooperative ventures from Czech farmers. The Kachkovs'kyi Society's Bohemian scholarships lasted until 1912.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Actually, a resolution for meetings to take place on a three-year cycle was adopted at the thirteenth annual convention in Sanok (1885), but apparently it was never followed. “XIII hener. sobranie chlenov OMK v Sianokí,” *Slovo*, 31 August 1885, pp. 1–2.

<sup>40</sup> “Otchet yz vtoroho heneral'noho sobraniia OMK,” *Slovo*, 14 (26) August, 1875, p. 1.

<sup>41</sup> *Russkaia rada* (Kolomyia), 9, no. 17–18 (1879): 125–26, and 10, nos. 4 and 7 (1880): 32–33 and 60–61; *Slovo*, 14 February 1880, p. 1; 24 April 1880, p. 2; and 9 September 1880, p. 2.

<sup>42</sup> See the reports in *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 17, no. 37 (1906): 5, and in *Halychanyn*, 12 and 13 September 1907, pp. 1–2 and 2–3; 1 October 1909, p. 2; 30 September 1910, p. 1; and 20 September 1912, p. 2.

<sup>43</sup> See the report of a participant during the first year of the program in *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 17, no. 37 (1906): 1–2.

Perhaps the most successful of the central branch's agricultural activities was the establishment in 1909 of an agricultural office. The office became a distribution center for all kinds of agricultural products, the most popular of which were fertilizers and seeds for feed grains.<sup>44</sup> The demand for agricultural-related activity remained so great that finally, in 1907, the Kachkovskyyi Society started its own newspaper, a monthly *Ekonomychnyi lystok*, devoted almost exclusively and quite aptly to agricultural matters.<sup>45</sup>

Another rural concern was the need for fire companies. In 1904, the central committee decided to issue statutes for volunteer fire companies and to provide instruction to members on how to become effective firefighters at the village level. By 1909, the number of volunteer fire companies had risen to 119.<sup>46</sup>

There were also, of course, the reading rooms, whose existence was provided for in the society's founding statute, provided there was a request by at least twelve members in a given village. (See appendix 1, section 7.) The central committee issued charters to reading rooms and these were treated as individual members, thereby entitling them to receive the monthly publication series as well as duplicate copies of books sent out periodically by the central branch. It is interesting to note that Kachkovskyyi publications were sent to its own as well as to some Prosvita reading rooms, who were also paid members of the society.

The real growth of the reading rooms took place around the turn of the twentieth century, although because of great fluctuation at the village level (inactivity or permanent or temporary change of allegiance to the Prosvita Society) it is difficult to obtain any reliable figures. For instance, on the occasion of the Kachkovskyyi Society's twenty-fifth anniversary in 1899, the memorial volume listed 559 reading rooms. A decade later, the official annual report for 1911–1912 mentioned 1,225 reading rooms, but at the same time it admitted that many of these existed solely on paper and that the actual number was probably closer to 800.<sup>47</sup> Similarly, the number of affiliates increased from twenty-one in 1899 to thirty-one in 1913 (see appendix 2). Finally, there were student dormitories, of which the

<sup>44</sup> During its first year of operation, August 1909 to April 1910, the agricultural office distributed forty railroad boxcar loads of fertilizer. *Halychanyn*, 30 September 1910, p. 1. Cf. the report in *Halychanyn*, 20 September 1912, p. 2.

<sup>45</sup> *Ekonomychnyi lystok* appeared in 8 issues in 1907 and, under the title *Lystok*, in 11 issues in 1908 as a supplement to the monthly booklets.

<sup>46</sup> *Halychanyn*, 7 September 1905, pp. 1–2; and *ibid.*, 1 October 1909, p. 2.

<sup>47</sup> Monchalovskii, *Pamiatnaia knyzhka*, pp. 105–12; OMK annual report for 1911–1912 in *Halychanyn*, 21 September 1912, p. 2. During the same period (1910) the Prosvita Society claimed 2,376 reading rooms. Volodymyr Doroshenko, *'Prosvita': li zasnuvannia i pratsia* (Philadelphia, 1959), p. 24.

Kachkovs'kyi Society operated eight by 1910. In most cases, poor students in local *gymnasias* were given free or greatly reduced living accommodations and meals.<sup>48</sup>

Thus, by the first decade of the twentieth century, the Kachkovs'kyi Society had a seemingly large number of affiliates (31), reading rooms (1,225), fire companies (119), and student dormitories (8), but this tells us little about its actual assets. Only very few of the buildings used by Kachkovs'kyi-related entities actually belonged to the society. In fact, its largest asset was the building for its central branch in Lviv, bought in 1904 after a decade-long fund-raising campaign and valued in 1912 at 183,170 crowns. Besides this it also owned two homes in Brody, property in Sokal', and minor undeveloped land in a few villages, all of which was bequeathed to the society after the death of certain members.<sup>49</sup> But whether or not the Kachkovs'kyi Society actually owned the buildings and settings that carried its name, it was nonetheless able through its publication program, annual conventions, agricultural programs, volunteer fire departments, reading rooms, and student dormitories to fulfill in large measure its basic goal of raising the cultural level, self-esteem, and in part the economic capability of the Ukrainians in Galicia.

#### THE EVOLUTION AND IDEOLOGY OF THE KACHKOV'S KYI SOCIETY

One way to trace the evolution of a self-supporting organization like the Kachkovs'kyi Society is to look at the growth of its membership. To be sure, membership figures, like those recording the number of reading rooms, need to be treated with caution. Nonetheless, they provide at least some idea of the relative fluctuations in the society's fortunes.

The expectations of the society's founder, Naumovych, who used as his model the numerically strong Slovene St. Hermagoras Society, proved to be overly optimistic. The original plan in 1874 (confirmed by the large print-runs of the first four publications) was for the Kachkovs'kyi Society to have

<sup>48</sup> Student dormitories were operated by Kachkovs'kyi Society affiliates in Brody, Drohobych, Kaminka Strumylova, Rava Rus'ka, Sambir, Stanyslaviv, Zhovkva, and Zolochiv. See the OMK annual report for 1909–1910 in *Halychanyn*, 2 October 1910, p. 2.

<sup>49</sup> Figures on all property (valued at 212,234 crowns in 1912) are from the OMK annual report for 1911–1912 in *Halychanyn*, 24 September 1912, p. 2.

The three-story building with two facades at 14 Valova Street in the center of Lviv was purchased on 24 March 1904 for 166,000 crowns, of which 71,983 was collected during a building drive, the remainder being paid by two mortgages (20,000 and 94,016). See the OMK annual report for 1903–1904 in *Halychanyn*, 9 September 1904, pp. 1–2.

10,000 members after the first year.<sup>50</sup> However, after one year, only 1,439 members were registered. In fact, the 10,000 figure for active dues-paying members was not attained until thirty-six years later, when in 1910 the society reached its highest point, recording 10,700 members. (See appendix 5.) Nonetheless, the Kachkovskiy Society remained until the outset of the twentieth century the largest Galician-Ukrainian cultural society, having registered a total of 25,422 members between 1874 and 1912. Its closest rival, the six-year-older Prosvita Society, caught up in membership only in 1905–1906, after which it became the larger of the two organizations, both in current numbers and in the overall total of members ever registered.<sup>51</sup>

More interesting is the social composition of the Kachkovskiy Society members. The society's aim was to reach the rural masses of Galicia, and in this it was successful since the majority of its members at any one time was always peasants. Although we did not have access to membership rolls (which may or may not have indicated social status), we do have data from 1884–1885 and 1890–1891 on new members, according to social status.<sup>52</sup>

	Teachers/					
	Total	Priests	Civil Servants	Townsmen	Peasants	Organizations
1884–85	392	20	49	34	180	104
1890–91	858	40	46	—	749	38

It is clear that for each of these representative years peasants formed by far the largest number of new members. Moreover, the respective percentages of peasant membership—45.9 percent in 1884–1885 and 87.2 percent in

<sup>50</sup> *Slovo*, 10 (22) August 1874, p. 1.

<sup>51</sup> Most of the literature that mentions in passing or deals specifically with the Prosvita Society claims that it had always been much larger (in terms of membership) than the Kachkovskiy Society. Such claims are invalid, since they are based on the practice of citing for any given year all members that had belonged to Prosvita (including deceased or former members) at any time since its establishment in 1868. For instance, *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia*, vol. 2, ed. Volodymyr Kubijovyč (Toronto, 1971), p. 337, claims 19,000 Prosvita members in 1905, when in fact there were only about half that figure, or 8,500. The important distinction between all-time totals and membership in a given year is made in the first important historical survey of the Prosvita Society, which for 1908 shows an all-time total of 23,164 members as well as the “real number of members” in that year—about half, or 12,000. That same year Prosvita claimed 2,043 reading rooms. *Lozynskiy, Sorok lit.*, pp. 36 and 47. The closest comparative figures for both organizations are from 1906:

	Kachkovskiy	Prosvita
Total members	19,710	20,085
Members in 1906	9,229	10,000
Reading rooms	1,261	1,693
Affiliates	26	39

<sup>52</sup> These statistics are drawn from the OMK annual reports for 1884–1885, in *Slovo*, 23 November 1885; and for 1890–1891, in *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 2, no. 34 (1891): 4.

1890–1891—should be considered the minimum, since most of the new members listed under “organizations” were reading rooms located in villages and made up almost exclusively of peasants.

Although we have no concrete data on women members, we do know that the Kachkovs’kyi Society included them. Already at the second annual convention in 1875 the question of women members was discussed as “a matter of great importance,” because “it is from the breast of the mother that the child begins to learn how to love its homeland and Rus’ mother tongue.”<sup>53</sup> Women were frequent speakers at the annual conventions and affiliate meetings, although it was not until 1910 that a woman (Maria Koliankivs’ka, the wife of a *gymnasium* director) became a member of the central committee in Lviv. We also know that during the 1909–1910 campaign to collect funds for the Kachkovs’kyi Society, thirty-three of the forty-four districts in Galicia included women donors, and that in several districts they formed a majority or plurality of those who gave.<sup>54</sup>

The role of priests and the attitude of the Kachkovs’kyi Society toward them was more problematic. Much of the literature on Galicia in the late nineteenth century describes the Kachkovs’kyi Society as one of many in which priests played a dominant role. In certain affiliates, priests were indeed prominent. However, members frequently spoke out against the upper classes and the priesthood, especially the hierarchy, who in contrast to “the good old days” did not participate in or support the Kachkovs’kyi Society.<sup>55</sup>

Beyond the realm of impressions, it should be noted that priests played a very small role in the leadership and operation of the organization. Of the five chairmen between 1874 and 1914 (see appendix 3), two were priests (the founder Ivan Naumovych and the Reverend Feofil Pavlykov), but they headed the organization for only seven of those forty years. Moreover, no priest ever held the influential posts of secretary or treasurer, and at any one time there were at most only two out of twelve members on the central

<sup>53</sup> Cited from a report on the second annual convention, “Zahal’noe sobranie OMK v Halychy,” *Russkaia rada* (Kolomyia), 5, no. 16 (1875): 132.

<sup>54</sup> A full list of the names of donors appears as a supplement to issue 207 of *Halychany*, 29 September 1910.

<sup>55</sup> Cited from the invitation to the eighteenth annual convention in Ternopil’, *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 1, no. 30 (1890): 2–3. The good old days referred primarily to 1848–1849, when the head of the Supreme Ruthenian Council was under the leadership of the Greek Catholic Metropolitan Hryhorii Iakhymovych and Canon Mykhailo Kuzems’kyi, whose concerns with the political and cultural needs of the population were contrasted to the ostensibly more passive church leadership and clerical rank-and-file of the 1870s and 1880s, which “takes such an indifferent attitude to the important matter of popular culture and education.” Cited from a letter from Drohobych in *Slovo*, 3 June 1880, p. 1.

committee who were priests. Thus, in terms of its membership and leadership, the Kachkovskyyi Society remained from its foundation in 1874 until World War I a peasant-based organization led by a secular intelligentsia who for the most part were journalists, teachers, and most especially lawyers or court officers.

A glance at the yearly membership statistics (appendix 5) shows that after getting off to a slow but steady growth pattern, the Kachkovskyyi Society began to decline in the late 1870s, reaching a low point in 1884. Thereafter, it began slowly to recover, until in the late 1890s it finally reached the level of membership it had had twenty years earlier. From then on there was a steady increase until 1910, after which a leveling-off and perhaps a new decline were setting in. The reason for these fluctuations had to do with the internal policy of the Kachkovskyyi Society as well as external events.

After the initial establishment and flush of enthusiasm had passed, members began to criticize the Kachkovskyyi Society for doing little other than publishing books—which was, of course, one of its main goals.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, in the late 1870s reports continually suggested that the dozen or so affiliates were, with few exceptions, doing little. True, successful agricultural exhibits were organized at the 1879 and 1880 annual conventions, but these, it was argued, had a limited effect on the vast majority of Galician Ukrainian peasants.

Then, in 1882, came the widely publicized trial in Lviv against eleven Austrian Rus' leaders suspected of conspiring with the Russian Empire to commit treason against Austria.<sup>57</sup> Among the accused were the founding chairman of the Kachkovskyyi Society, the Reverend Ivan Naumovych, and his successor as chairman, Viktor M. Ploshchans'kyi (1834–1902). Even though they and the other accused were acquitted, the two men soon emigrated to the Russian Empire. Despite their departure, back home in Galicia the damage was done. The Kachkovskyyi Society and its leaders—in particular, its founder Naumovych, always given unlimited praise—were

<sup>56</sup> The early criticism that “only books were being published,” *Ruskaia rada* (Kolomyia), 9, no. 1 (1879): 4, was still being reiterated two decades later: “The booklets, it is true, are with few exceptions quite good, but we simply consider this to be limited editorial work which any one talented person could accomplish without a central branch and without so many affiliates.” From the speech of a member at the twenty-third annual convention in Drohobych, cited in *Ruskaia rada* (Kolomyia), 26, no. 12 (1897): 89.

<sup>57</sup> Actually, the two main defendants were the Subcarpathian Rusyn political leader Adol'f Dobrians'kyi and his daughter Olga Grabar (mother of the distinguished twentieth-century Soviet art historian, Igor Grabar), who were living in Lviv because of the pressure against them for their political activity in Hungary. “Protse rusynov v sud'i karnom v Lvovi: akt obzhalo-vania,” *Ruskaia rada* (Kolomyia) 12, no. 12 (1882): 34–37.

suspected of being agents and part of a front organization for the anti-Austrian interests of the Russian Empire in Galicia. Loyal pro-Habsburg Ukrainian peasants stopped paying their dues, and the tenth annual convention held in Lviv after the close of the trial in 1882 attracted only 160 participants.<sup>58</sup>

In short, by the 1880s, the Kachkovs'kyi Society had few friends. The provincial diet and Polish-dominated administration, which had always been reluctant to relinquish any funds to Rus'-Ukrainian organizations, was certainly not about to do so for suspect ones. Analogously, the Austrian government in Vienna remained increasingly suspicious of any movement that would enhance the interests of its Russian imperial rival in the East, while the new metropolitan of the Greek Catholic Church, Syl'vester Cardinal Sembratovych (1836–1898, consecrated 1885), was not about to make the mistake of his predecessor and tolerate, let alone support, the activity of the “suspicious” Kachkovs'kyi Society.<sup>59</sup> Finally, local populist-Ukrainophile activists (*narodovtsi*), who had always been opposed to the Kachkovs'kyi Society on ideological grounds, began in the 1880s to step up their attacks.

In such circumstances, the Kachkovs'kyi Society had only a few members of the Galician Diet and Vienna Parliament of the Old Ruthenian political persuasion to speak up on its behalf. But there was never any real hope of government support. For instance, while the Prosvita Society received a subsidy each year from the Galician provincial government (2,000 crowns between 1870–1876 and 1884–1907, then progressively 6,000 and 8,000 crowns),<sup>60</sup> the Kachkovs'kyi Society's every request was refused until 1910, when it received its first grant of 9,000 crowns, followed by another in 1911 of 6,000 crowns specifically for economic-related activity. However, subsequent grants were dependent on the organization

<sup>58</sup> *Slovo*, 21 August 1882, p. 1; *Russkaia rada* (Kolomyia), 12, no. 16–17 (1882): 122. The negative impact of the 1882 trial on the Kachkovs'kyi Society was still being written about years later. N. Holovka, “O obshchestvi Kachkovskoho,” *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 1, no. 25 (1890): 4–5. For the contemporary Polish Catholic view, which considered the OMK and its publications dangerous and religiously “schismatic,” see “Towarzystwo ruskie imienia Kaczkowskiego,” *Przegląd Kościelny* (Poznań), 10, no. 2 (1888): 786–88.

<sup>59</sup> Actually Syl'vester Sembratovych's predecessor (and relative), Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, was forced out of office in 1882 because of the treason trial. For criticism of Metropolitan Syl'vester Sembratovych and the Polish viceroy of Galicia, Count Casimir Badeni, as being the cause of the sad fate of the Kachkovs'kyi Society by the end of the nineteenth century, see *Russkoe slovo*, 13 September 1901, p. 1.

<sup>60</sup> Lozyns'kyi, *Sorok lit.*, pp. 62–64.

proving its ideological loyalty to Austria.<sup>61</sup>

Friction between the governmental authorities and fellow populist-Ukrainians took several forms. During the so-called New Era of the early 1890s, when efforts were made to bring the Poles and Ukrainians closer together through political compromise, the Galician viceroy singled out in a speech to the Diet in 1892 the government's need to be vigilant toward the suspect Kachkovskyyi Society. The viceroy couched his suspicions by raising the specter of an Orthodox threat from the Russian east: "We cannot be indifferent when a society, in which we see Catholic priests, publishes books which on the first page include well-known figures who have left the faith for the great schism."<sup>62</sup> That same year, the society's annual almanac was confiscated, and two years later the 1894 almanac was threatened with the same fate because a spot was ostensibly found on the eye of the emperor in a portrait that appeared in the volume.<sup>63</sup> Then in 1911, the society was forbidden, in the interests of public order, from holding its thirty-seventh annual convention out-of-doors in Lviv, while two years later the planned thirty-ninth annual convention was banned entirely (just one week before delegates were to arrive) on the grounds that there was a cholera epidemic in the province.<sup>64</sup>

With the populist Ukrainians, interestingly enough, the Kachkovskyyi Society initially had normal and even friendly relations. The future socialist politician Mykhailo Pavlyk (1853–1915) attended the founding and second annual convention of the Kachkovskyyi Society, where he proposed that it publish the Bible in the Galician vernacular. Pavlyk's proposal was turned down, and in general he and other younger figures like Ivan Franko

<sup>61</sup> The grant figures are taken from the society's annual report for 1910–1911 in *Halychanyn*, 27 September 1911, p. 2. As for proving ideological loyalty, the Kachkovskyyi Society could only receive future 9,000-crown grants for publications if its booklets appeared in the local Galician Ukrainian language, and specifically not in Russian. From the society's 1912–1913 annual report in *Golos naroda*, 3 October 1913, pp. 4–5.

<sup>62</sup> The viceroy's reference was obviously to Naumovych and his conversion to Orthodoxy, to which the Kachkovskyyi Society's chairman and secretary issued an official statement praising their founder's cultural work but disavowing his "political activity" and Orthodox conversion. B. A. Didytskii and I. N. Pelekh, "Otvit na napast'," *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 3, no. 29 (1892): 1–2.

<sup>63</sup> The pedantic concern with the details of this incident on the part of the local Austrian authorities has all the makings of a ridiculous plot for a Viennese operetta. The incident was brought to the provincial criminal courts; only seventeen issues were found to have the "spot"; concern was still high for the seventeen peasants who had the "seditious" material; in the end, the court annulled the confiscation order. The details of the saga of the spotted almanacs are provided in "Sneseny konfiskaty kalendaria OMK," *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 5, no. 20 (1894): 1–2, and "(Otozva do chlenov OMK," *ibid.*, 5, no. 27 (1894): 3–4.

<sup>64</sup> "Narodnyi prazdnyk," *Russkoe slovo*, 5 October 1911, p. 1; "Obschchoho sobraniia chlenov OMK ne bude!," *Holos naroda*, 24 September 1913, p. 1.

(1856–1916), who called the Kachkovs'kyi Society the “most important organization for raising the material standards of the people,” became alienated because they were kept out of leadership roles and because of their own change to a populist Ukrainian national orientation under the impact of Drahomanov.<sup>65</sup> Nonetheless, the Kachkovs'kyi Society did welcome the creation of the Ukrainian Radical party in 1890, in which Pavlyk and Franko played leading roles.<sup>66</sup>

As for the Ukrainophile Prosvita Society, it was for the longest time not considered a rival but rather a partner in the common goal of educating the Galician Rus' people. Thus, at its founding in 1874, the influential populist-Ukrainian journal *Pravda* commented that the “newly established [Kachkovs'kyi] Society should attract support among every patriotic Rusyn,”<sup>67</sup> while as late as 1892, the Kachkovs'kyi Society welcomed the creation of Prosvita affiliates which might attract “new members from among those peasants, teachers, and civil servants who—only God knows why—might be afraid to belong to the Kachkovs'kyi Society.”<sup>68</sup>

By the first decade of the twentieth century, however, friction replaced mutual tolerance. In 1908, the influential Ukrainian daily newspaper, *Dilo*, accused the Kachkovs'kyi Society of being an “agent of Moscow,”<sup>69</sup> and from 1906 on, when all but two of its annual conventions were held in Lviv, Ukrainian students tried to disrupt what they called “Muscovite” meetings, either by heckling speakers and throwing stones or attacking the building of the Kachkovs'kyi central branch.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Ivan Franko, “Kil'ka sliv o tim, iak uporiadkuvaty i provadyty nashi liudovi vydavnytstva” (1882), in his *Tvory*, vol. 19 (Kiev, 1956), p. 24. On the rejection of the younger populists from the Kachkovs'kyi Society, see *Russkaia rada* (Kolomyia), 5, no. 17 (1875): 131–33; and *Pravda* (Lviv), 9, no. 16 (1876): 635–38.

<sup>66</sup> “Kol'ko slóv o t.z. 'radykalakh’,” *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 5, no. 50 (1894): 2–5.

<sup>67</sup> *Pravda* (Lviv), 7, no. 13 (1874): 568.

<sup>68</sup> *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 3, no. 27 (1892): 7.

<sup>69</sup> “Diial'nist' tovarystva im. Kachkovs'koho,” *Dilo*, 24 and 25 September 1908, p. 1 and p. 2. According to a Prosvita Society activist, the populist-Ukrainophile view was that the Kachkovs'kyi Society did positive work, especially in producing popular publications, until the 1890s, after which it began to publish in an artificial language that no one could understand. Cf. Ivan Bryk, “Korotkyi ohliad ukrains'koi populiarnoi literatury v Halychyni,” in Ivan Bryk and Mykhailo Kotsiuba, eds., *Pershyi ukrains'kyi pros'vitno-ekonomichnyi kongres uladzhenyi Tovarystvom 'Pros'vita' u L'vovi. . . 1909 roku: Protokoly i referaty* (Lviv, 1910), pp. 116–17.

<sup>70</sup> See the reports on the 1907, 1911, and 1912 annual conventions in *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 18, no. 36 (1907): 1–2; 22, no. 41 (1911): 1–3; and 23, no. 25 (1912): 2–3. The attack on the Kachkovs'kyi Society in Lviv occurred in November 1912 and caused damage estimated at 300 crowns. See the annual report for 1912–1913 in *Holos naroda*, 24 September 1913, pp. 5–6.

As a result of the prewar international tension between Russia and Austria, and the increasing intolerance of local Ukrainians toward what had become “Muscovite” enemies (Old Ruthenians as well as Russophiles) in their midst, the Kachkovskyyi Society began what seemed to be a period of new decline. It was reported that as many as five society-sponsored student dormitories (in Chortkiv, Kaminka Strumyl’ova, Rava Rus’ka, Zhovkva, and Zolochiv) were closed by the Austrian authorities, while “long-standing members were asking the central committee to remove their names, albeit temporarily, from the membership rolls and not to send them publications.”<sup>71</sup> Moreover, the talk of war and mobilization made it impossible to send agricultural students to Bohemia or to organize other courses in Galicia as had been done in the past. Thus, even before the outbreak of the war in August 1914, the future of the Kachkovskyyi Society seemed in doubt, prompting its central committee to issue a declaration in which it stated flatly that “our society is being threatened with closure.”<sup>72</sup>

But why was the society on the decline once again, and why was it the focus of attack on the part of the Austrian central government, the Polish-dominated provincial Galician administration, and local Ukrainophiles? In large part, the reasons have to do with the group’s national ideology.

In essence, the Kachkovskyyi Society was an ideological child of the so-called Old Ruthenian (*starorusyn*) movement in Galician-Ukrainian society, whose main characteristic could be described as wanting to maintain the status quo. Whereas such a position would seem ideal for the ruling Austrian authorities, it in effect proved to be dangerous in a Galician environment in which both Poles and populist Ukrainians were continually pushing for changes that would enhance their own political status in local affairs and perhaps someday even lead to political independence. The Old Ruthenians, most of whom were in leadership positions in the Kachkovskyyi Society (Bohdan Didyts’kyyi, Pylyp Svistun, Osyp A. Markov, Osyp Monchalovskyyi) were certainly united on one issue—opposition to what they considered Polish political and cultural infiltration and dominance over historically Rus’ (East) Galicia.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>71</sup> *Holos naroda*, 24 September 1913, pp. 5–6.

<sup>72</sup> “Pros’ba k chlenam OMK,” *Ruskaia rada* (Kolomyia), 41, no. 2 (1912): 1.

<sup>73</sup> For details on the Old Ruthenian movement, see Paul R. Magocsi, “Old Ruthenianism and Russophilism: A New Conceptual Framework for Analyzing National Ideologies in Late 19th-Century Eastern Galicia,” in Paul Debreczeny, ed., *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists*, vol. 2 (Columbus, Ohio, 1983), pp. 305–24.

In that regard, their only seeming ally was the Austrian Habsburg throne, which in the past (and ostensibly in the future) had protected them from the inroads of Polish aristocratic and bureaucratic rule and its corollary the Roman Catholic Church. Within such a constellation, it was not difficult to understand why at Kachkovs'kyi Society meetings speakers would frequently—and genuinely—refer to the eighteenth-century Empress Maria Theresa (during whose reign Galicia had become part of Austria) as a “second Moses,” who liberated the Galician Rus' people after 432 years of “Polish-Egyptian” slavery,<sup>74</sup> or that if ever they needed to “send a delegation to the monarch [Franz Joseph], he for certain would not reject our demands and presentations.”<sup>75</sup> Thus, pro-Austrian loyalty directed toward the Habsburg emperor, for which Galicia's Rus'-Ukrainians had become proverbially known as the “Tyrolians of the East,” was to remain a basic ingredient of Kachkovs'kyi Society political ideology.<sup>76</sup>

The other ingredient of Old Ruthenianism was cultural, although enemies of the Kachkovs'kyi Society would argue it was political in nature. This had to do with the idea of the unity of Rus'. Without going into details, the Old Ruthenian ideology of the Kachkovs'kyi Society believed that all the Rus' (*russkyi*) people—the Great Rus', White Rus', and Little Rus', or to use modern terminology, Russians, Belorussians, and Ukrainians—were equal descendants of the common heritage of medieval Kievan Rus'. Indeed, such a view coincided with the contemporary Russian understanding of Pan-Slavism and with the official policy of the tsarist government, providing the latter with ideological legitimacy for claims to Austro-Hungarian historic Rus' lands (eastern Galicia, northern Bukovina, and Subcarpathian Rus'). However, the Galician Old Ruthenians did not wish to be ruled by the tsarist Russian Empire. They considered their relationship to the so-called common Rus' East solely in cultural terms that were analogous to the situation of Austria's German speakers who were culturally and linguistically related to the Germanic world without being politically subordinate to the German Empire.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>74</sup> From a speech at a meeting of the Sokal' affiliate, cited in “Zahal'noe sobranie chlenōv filiyi OMK v Sokaly,” *Russkaia rada* (Kolomyia), 9, no. 12–13 (1879): 92.

<sup>75</sup> From a speech at the 1892 annual meeting, cited in “Sobranie chlenōv OMK,” *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 3, no. 35 (1892): 3.

<sup>76</sup> On the dominant monarchical tendencies in Galician Rus' society, see John-Paul Himka, “Hope in the Tsar: Displaced Naive Monarchism Among the Ukrainian Peasants of the Habsburg Empire,” *Russian History* 7, no. 1–2 (1980): 125–38; and Paul R. Magocsi, “Vienna in 1848 Through the Eyes of Ukrainians,” forthcoming.

<sup>77</sup> The best introduction to Old Ruthenian ideology is found in O. A. Monchalovskii, *Sviataia Rus'* (Lviv, 1903).

As for the Old Ruthenians, the living symbol of their cultural unity with “Holy Rus’” (*Sviataia Rus’*) was language—not, however, the vernacular of the peasant masses (which they would admit was differentiated into at least three distinct languages or “dialects”: Russian, Belorussian, and Ukrainian), but the traditional *russkyi* book language used since time immemorial in church books in Galicia and, of course, in the publications of the Kachkovskiy Society. Thus, as is typical of the early stages of many national movements, the medium or form of the language—in this case the etymological alphabet and high-sounding words drawn from Church Slavonic—became more important than the message, especially since the medium somehow conveyed a sense of unity with an eastern Rus’ culture that had the prestige of several centuries of history. In the words of one Kachkovskiy Society member: “Our people have the greatest respect for the book language in which our church books and Holy Liturgy are written. . . . That language, which our patriotic forefathers wrote and still write since time immemorial, is called ‘Muscovite’ by the Ukrainophile populists. However, our people know nothing and do not wish to know anything about such things, because for our people there is only one Rus’ language. . . . The realization of the unity of Rus’ has always lived and still lives in the hearts of our people.”<sup>78</sup> Indeed, prestige and dignity became in themselves prime commodities for an intelligentsia with an ingrained sense of inferiority, an intelligentsia that felt it had to stand up to the more “prestigious” Polish culture in the context of an Austrian provincial environment.

It was this sense of looking to the past, of depending upon it as a crutch for existing in the present, that was at the heart of the Kachkovskiy Society’s national ideology, summed up so well in 1891 by its long-time chairman, Bohdan Didyts’kyi (1827–1908):

We call ourselves Old Rus’, and that name comes from the fact that we fervently stand by those beginnings which our ancestors gave to us, in particular our own saint and equal to the apostles, Prince Vladimir, with whom our ancestors accepted holy Christianity and with Christianity our Slavonic-Rus’ rite and Rus’ alphabet as well. We are proud that they call us Old Rus’, because we stand by our olden beginnings and wish to remain in union with our church which has existed for a thousand years.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>78</sup> From a speech by Vasyl’ Kurdydyk at a meeting of the Ternopil’ affiliate of the Kachkovskiy Society, cited in *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 6, nos. 24 and 25 (1895): 3 and 2, respectively.

<sup>79</sup> From the speech of Chairman Didyts’kyi at the society’s 1891 annual convention, cited in *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 2, no. 35 (1891): 2.

In a late nineteenth-century environment in which new ideas and movements (nationalism, socialism, Zionism, Marxism) found fertile ground in Galicia, Old Ruthenian spokesmen like Didyts'kyi, whose own culture was still not fully respected, came to have an almost pathological fear of change. This was summed up poignantly in a speech on the meaning of the society by Osyp A. Markov (1849–1909), a long-time member of its central committee: “The Kachkovs'kyi Society wants that Rus' will always remain Rus', that our people will not lose one inch of its land, nor one letter from its alphabet, nor one prayer from its church.”<sup>80</sup>

A few of the rival Ukrainophile national leaders in Galicia, among them the president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Mykhailo S. Hrushevs'kyi (1866–1934), respected the Old Ruthenians' position and even called for greater cooperation with them.<sup>81</sup> However, this attitude was the exception: most Galician-Ukrainian leaders saw the Old Ruthenians and the Kachkovs'kyi Society as a Muscovite fifth column to be exorcised from their Galician midst.<sup>82</sup>

The final irony is that when at the outset of the twentieth century a few younger Galician politicians (Dmytro Markov, Volodymyr Dudykevych, Ivan Hrynevets'kyi) and newspapers (*Prikarpatskaia Rus'*, *Holos naroda*) began to take what could be considered a classic Russophile position that favored the incorporation of Galicia into the Russian Empire and the adoption of the standard literary Russian language for publications and education, the Kachkovs'kyi Society found it as difficult to deal with them as with the Ukrainian populists.<sup>83</sup> Therefore, it is not surprising that with the outbreak of World War I and the rapid advance of tsarist Russian forces into Galicia in August 1914, the Kachkovs'kyi Society, like the Prosvita Society and other Ukrainian organizations, ceased functioning. Indeed, the Kachkovs'kyi Society renewed its activity after the war in 1919, but in the completely changed political circumstances of Polish rule and with the ascendancy of the Ukrainian national ideology it was merely marking time

<sup>80</sup> O. Markov, “Chomu OMK mae dlia nas znachenie?,” *Russkoe slovo* (Lviv), 9, no. 44 (1898): 2.

<sup>81</sup> See above, fn. 11.

<sup>82</sup> A typical Ukrainophile view was that of Lon'gyn Tselhel's'kyi, who, while recognizing that the “old Muscovites [Old Ruthenians] led de facto a Ukrainian cultural life and expressed de facto the Ukrainian national position with regard to the Poles” (p. 402), nonetheless argued that the whole movement was a pathological phenomenon in Galician Ukrainian Society. See his “Halys'ke moskvofil'stvo v ostannii ioho fazi,” *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* (Lviv and Kiev), 50 (1910): 389–406.

<sup>83</sup> See the negative views toward the Russophiles by the chairman of the Kachkovs'kyi Society and prominent Old Ruthenian, Bohdan Didyts'kyi, “Svoezhyt'evi zapysky,” pt. 2, *Vistnyk 'Narodnoho Doma'* (Lviv), 26, no. 3 (1908): 50–54.

until its final demise with the entry of Soviet troops and administration into Galicia in September 1939.<sup>84</sup>

### CONCLUSION

The Kachkovs'kyi Society during its four decades of existence under Austrian rule did succeed in its basic goal: to serve as a publisher of popular books that raised the educational, moral, and civic culture of the Rus'-Ukrainian population in Galicia. It was also partially successful in the more practical tasks of publication and instruction in agricultural matters for the rural population.

As for its ideology of looking backward and promoting the idea of Rus' cultural unity, the Kachkovs'kyi Society was by the eve of World War I eclipsed by its rival Prosvita Society and the Ukrainian national movement. The reason for its failure was perhaps its inability to develop and promote elements of higher culture based on the local Galician environment. For instance, while Prosvita and other Ukrainian cultural societies were promoting critical and scholarly publications, theatrical life, and the works of writers like Ivan Franko, the Kachkovs'kyi Society sought its models of high culture in the works of Tolstoy, Pushkin, and other Russian writers that were culturally as well as linguistically removed from the local Galician Ukrainian environment.

The question of the degree to which higher forms of cultural endeavor can be divorced from the environment in which they are being promoted is one that had faced the Galician intelligentsia throughout the Ukrainian national revival in the six decades preceding the outbreak of World War I. In its effort to attain cultural prestige and self-confidence by associating with an undifferentiated, historic East Slavic East, it seems that the Kachkovs'kyi Society and the Old Ruthenian orientation it represented went too far, thereby eventually alienating itself from the very population it had hoped to serve.

*University of Toronto*

<sup>84</sup> If the literature of the Kachkovs'kyi Society in the pre-World War I years is limited, that on the interwar period is virtually non-existent.

Appendix 1  
 STATUTE OF THE MYKHAIL KACHKOV'S'KYI SOCIETY\*

**СТАТУТЪ**  
**ОБЩЕСТВА ИМЕНИ МИХАИЛА КАЧКОВСКОГО**  
**въ КОЛОМЫѢ.**

**I. Назва и цѣль общества, его мѣстопребываніе и печать.**

§. 1.

Общество имени „Михаила Качковского“ назначило собою задачу: распространеніе наукъ, обычаевъ, трудолюбія, тверезости и оцандности, гражданскаго сознанія и всякихъ честнотъ межн русскимъ народомъ въ Австріи.

Главнымъ мѣсто-пребываніемъ того общества и его выдѣла есть городъ Коломыя.

Общество тое употребляетъ печати съ надписію: Общество „Михаила Качковского“ въ Коломыѣ.

**II. Средства общества.**

§. 2.

Для достиженія задачи общества служатъ слѣдующіи средства :

- а) издаванье популярныхъ и поучительныхъ, а дешевыхъ книжокъ религіино-обычайнаго, науковаго, господарскаго и забавнаго содержанія;
- б) основаніе читальней;
- в) публичніи отчеты;
- г) основаніе обществъ тверезости;
- д) основаніе громадскихъ позычковыхъ-касъ и осыповъ зббжа;
- е) основаніе обществъ рукодѣльничѣвъ.

§. 3.

Выдатки общества покрываются: вносами членѣвъ, доброволь-

\* *Nauka*, vol. 4 (Kolomyia, 1875), pp. 54–62.

ными датками и жертвами, завѣщаніями и легатами якъ и приходами взыскуемыми изъ розпродажи книжокъ обществомъ издаваемыхъ.

#### §. 4.

Весь мастокъ общества выказуе инвентарь.

Маесткомъ орудуе оя такъ, щобы кромъ покрытыя текущихъ выдатковъ, основано фондъ коронный.

### III. Составъ общества.

#### §. 5.

Общество состоитъ изъ членовъ дѣйствительныхъ и почетныхъ.

#### §. 6.

Дѣйствительнымъ членомъ стаеся каждый австрійскій обыватель русскои народности, который обявитъ свою волю, причнпнаться въ пользу общества грошевымъ даткомъ или другимъ якимъ способомъ на пр. трудомъ литературнымъ, и выделомъ общества буде принятыи въ члены.

#### §. 7.

Почетными членами именуе общее собраніе общества лица, извѣстныи изъ чоловако- и народолюбія.

#### §. 8.

Особы допустившіи ся якого безчестного дела по карнымъ законамъ караемого, особенноже походящего изъ користолюбія, якъ и отдаючіиися неморальности или налогови півнства, не могутъ бути членами общества, а еслибы ними будучи попали въ подобный порокъ або противодѣйствовали цѣлямъ общества, рѣшенемъ выдела изъ общества выключаются.

На случай откаанья принятія въ члены общества или выключенья изъ того, служитъ оскорбленому право откляка до общего собранія общества, которое жалобу рѣшае окончательно.

#### §. 9.

Также перестаетъ бути членомъ каждый, кто съ уплатою даткою за два лѣта збстаетъ въ зяляглости и збставши до уплаты выделомъ унѣиненый, въ теченіи 14 дней всеи зяляглости не сложить.

## IV. Обязанности членовъ.

### §. 10.

Каждый членъ дѣйствительный общества принимаетъ слѣдующія обязанности :

1. каждого года платити 1 зр. до касы общества;
2. старатися о позысканьѣ новыхъ членовъ для общества;
3. словомъ и дѣломъ заохочовати каждого до школьной и всякой доброй и полезной науки, якъ и подавати помѣчь убогой школьной молодежи.
4. неупотребляти нечестныхъ и поганныхъ словъ и проклятовъ, и мерзкой звычай тотъ, где случится, искореняти.
5. словомъ и примѣромъ своимъ другихъ бѣтъ пиянства отводити и причинятися до основанія общества воздержности (тверезости);
6. бути для всехъ добрымъ примѣромъ трудолюбія, порядка, чистоты, господарности и оцадности;
7. возбуждати и крѣпити въ народѣ почитаніе права и послушаніе законамъ;
8. старатися всѣми силами объ основаніи громадскихъ читалней, позысковати для нихъ якъ наибѣльше членовъ, и по возможности держати въ нихъ или слухати отчитовъ о всякихъ полезныхъ рѣчахъ.
9. заложити у себе, если есть властителемъ грунту, школу садовины и роздавати или дешево продавати другимъ убогороднскую садовину — также старатися о обсаженъѣ садовиною или хоть дикою деревянною дорбѣгъ и пустыхъ мѣстцъ.
10. старатися о заведеніи лучшей расы худобъ, лучшихъ улиствъ и розпространяти науку о рациональномъ веденіи господарства, якъ о поднесенъѣ промысла — а тымъ самымъ, пособствовати добробытову народа.

## V. Права членовъ.

### §. 11.

Каждый членъ дѣйствительный общества має право :

1. при общихъ собраніяхъ забирати голось, ставляти внесенія, захвалювати къ именованію почетныхъ членовъ, голосовати при выборахъ предсѣдателя общаго собранія якъ и поодинокихъ секцій того собранія, дальше при выборѣ предсѣдателя и чле-

- новъ выдѣла, наконецъ при ухвалахъ общаго Собранія и взгля-  
дати въ все акта общаго собранію предложенія.
2. бути избраннымъ въ члены Предсѣдательства и выдѣла.
  3. являтися на засѣданія выдѣла съ голосомъ совѣтующимъ, если  
не есть членомъ выдѣла — або подавати до выдѣла внесенія  
на письмѣ.
  4. изъ всехъ книжокъ, обществомъ издаваемыхъ получить даромъ  
по одному экземпляру.

## §. 12.

Каждый членъ получаетъ отъ выдѣла грамоту принятія въ члены,  
котора его яко члена легитимую и управляетъ его до вступу на об-  
щее собраніе, на засѣданія выдѣла, якъ и на отчеты въ читальняхъ.

## §. 13.

Членъ почетный має право до вступу на общій собранія и за-  
сѣданія выдѣла, но не має права забирати тутъ голосъ. Ему слу-  
жить право посѣщати читальни и держати тутъ отчеты.

## §. 14.

Списокъ всехъ членовъ удержуе выдѣлъ въ точной зримости и  
оголошуе всякіи въ томже послѣдовавшіи змѣны въ спискѣ въ §. 30.  
означенный.

## §. 15.

Всеми дѣлами общества управляютъ: общее собраніе и выдѣлъ.

## А. Общее собраніе.

## §. 16.

Общее собраніе отбываетъ ся по правилу разъ въ годъ и то о  
сколько возможно, въ день 8 (20) августа, яко въ день смерти б.п.  
Михайла Качковского, а по обстоятельствамъ каждого року въ ин-  
номъ мѣсци.

Коли 50 членовъ того зажадаютъ или обстоятельства того тре-  
бовати будутъ, долженъ выдѣлъ скликати надпорядочное общее со-  
браніе.

## §. 17.

Скликанье общаго собранія должно дѣятися посредствомъ рус-  
скихъ красныхъ часописей или особными листами и то четыре (4)

недѣли напередъ, въ наглыхъ же случаяхъ можна той речинець скоротити до 14 дней.

#### §. 18.

Общое собраніе провъзглашае предсѣдатель выдѣла що есть отворене, скоро явилось на тоє 50 членѡвъ дѣйствительныхъ.

Онъ розпочинає дѣйствіе общого собранія короткою промовою и взыває, чтобы собравшіяся члены избрали предсѣдателя общого собранія, заступника председателя и двоихъ секретарѡвъ.

#### §. 19.

Выдѣль эдає справу зъ веденія дѣлъ общества и предкладає счеты и внесенія.

Къ розсмотренію дѣлъ избирає собраніе потребне число комисій.

#### §. 20.

Общое собраніе ухваляє змѣну статутѡвъ общества, рѣшає внесенія, отклики и жалобы, именує почетныхъ членѡвъ, избирає предсѣдателя выдѣла, тогоже членѡвъ и ихъ заступникѡвъ, заряжує шконтра касеѣ, склада книгъ и иныхъ засобѡвъ, удѣляє или отъказує абсолюторія выдѣлови, опредѣляє почетъ службы при выдѣлѣ якъ и платию или нагороду для поодинокихъ управненыхъ лицъ и вообще розпоряжує, якъ имѣниємъ общества орудоватися має.

#### §. 21.

Общое собраніе ухвалює важно абсолютнымъ бѣльшеньствомъ голосѡвъ приуотствующихъ членѡвъ дѣйствительныхъ.

Предсѣдатель голосує тѣлько при именованіи членѡвъ почетныхъ и при выборѣ выдѣла, въ прочемъ рѣшає при рѡвности голосѡвъ.

#### §. 22.

Якимъ способомъ голосоватися має, т. е. чи поименно, картами, галками, черѡъ аклямацію, поднесеніе рукъ, повстанье или черѡъ сидженье, заряжає предсѣдатель.

## Б. Выдѣль.

#### §. 23.

Выдѣль общества состоятъ изъ председателя, осьми (8) членѡвъ и ихъ четырехъ (4) заступникѡвъ, всѣхъ общимъ собраніємъ избранныхъ.

Выдѣль же самъ избираеть изъ посередь себе мѣстопредсѣдателя и одного секретаря.

§. 24.

Мѣстопредсѣдатель заступае предсѣдателя отсутствующого а заступникъ члена покликуеся, если который членъ есть перешкодженъ участвовати въ дѣлахъ выдѣла.

§. 25.

Выдѣль избираеся на оденъ годъ, онъ долженъ однакожь урядовати поти, поки новонизбранный выдѣль не отбере веденія дѣлъ общества.

Члены выдѣла могутъ быти поновно избранныи.

§. 26.

Кромъ всѣхъ администраційныхъ дѣлъ общества належать до выдѣла: прпнятіе и выключеніе членбвъ (§§. 6, 8.), оцѣнка рукописей до печатанья назначенныхъ, заключаніе уговора съ сочинителями взглядомъ вынагородъ, занятіея печатаньемъ и розсылкою книгъ общества, веденіе касы общества, дальше оголошенія въ §§. 14, 17, 30, 34, 35, 36, наведеныи, потбмъ надсмотръ читальней, также позамѣстцевыхъ, якъ и урядженъе публичныхъ отчптбвъ въ тыхже, также надсмотръ надъ обществами тверезости, громадскими позычковыми касами и ссынами зббжа якъ и надъ обществами рукодѣльникбвъ, наконецъ удѣлянье инструкцій всѣмъ отраслямъ общества.

§. 27.

Выдѣль ухвалюе важно, скоро кромъ предсѣдателя (мѣстопредсѣдателя) собралося шесть (6) членбвъ или по крайней мѣрѣ три члены и три заступники членбвъ.

Секретарь всегда вчисляеся въ тое число.

Ухвалы выдѣла западають абсолютною ббльшостію голосбвъ.

Предсѣдатель голосуе завсѣгды.

Голосованъе отбуваеся явно или тайно (§. 22.) пбдля выбору и варяженія предсѣдателя.

§. 28.

Секретарь списуе всѣ ухвалы въ книгу выдѣла.

Кождый протоколъ якъ и всѣ письма и грамоты отъ выдѣла выходящии, пбдписують предсѣдатели (мѣстопредсѣдатель) и секретарь.

Грамоты правніи должніи кромѣ того содержать ссылку на ухвалу выдѣла и бути снабжены вытисненіемъ печати общества.

§. 29.

Общество предсѣдательствуетъ на вѣхъ и заступае тосже передъ властями и судами предсѣдатель выдѣла -- а въ его отсутствіи или перешкодѣ мѣстопресѣдатель.

§. 30.

Состояніе кассы съ вѣхми сюда относящимися грамотами и квитками предкладае Выдѣль ежегодно общому собранію къ пересмотру и одобренію и оголошуетъ сумаричный выказъ кассы въ русскихъ часописяхъ якъ и въ первой книжочкѣ изданой Обществомъ по ѳтбытію кождократного общого собранія.

## VII Читальнѣ.

§. 31.

Въ каждой мѣстцовости, въ котрой вписалося по крайней мѣрѣ 12 членовъ до общества, служитъ имъ право основати у себе читальню.

Въ той цѣли могутъ они возвати выдѣль общества къ содѣйствованію, которому также служитъ надзоръ основаной читальнѣ.

§. 32.

Каждая такая читальня получае даромъ по одному экземпляру всѣхъ сочиненій обществомъ изданныхъ и на складѣ находящихся.

§. 33.

Члены общества мають свободный вступъ до читальнѣ.

Зарядъ читальнѣ ухвалитъ, чи лица до Общества неналежащии могутъ посѣщати читальню и подѣ якими условіями.

§. 34.

Выдѣль общества якъ и зарядъ читальнѣ могутъ уряжати публичныи ѳтчиты въ читальняхъ — и такъ одинъ якъ другій о состояніи тѣхже подавати извѣстія до публичной вѣдомости.

## VIII. Общества тверезости.

§. 35.

Такъ выдѣлови общества якъ и поодинокимъ членамъ служитъ

право поспішествовати основанію обществъ тверезости или воздержности.

Выдѣль провадить верховный надзоръ надъ ними и похвалы достойній событія подае до общої вѣдомости.

## IX. Громадскіи позичковыи касы и ссыпы збѣжа.

### §. 36.

За содѣйствіемъ выдѣла общества или членѣвъ основаныи позичковыи касы или ссыпы збѣжа въ поодинокіихъ громадахъ удержуе выдѣль въ зримости и старася о періодичнѣмъ обвѣщанію тыхже состоянія.

## X. Общества рукодѣльникѣвъ.

### §. 37.

Выдѣль якъ и чоодинокіи члени общества должніи улегчати сочленамъ-рукодѣльникамъ основаніе обществъ, маючихъ на цѣли спроваджуванье въ мѣщевости, залишенныи въ промышленности, майстрѣвъ и знатокѣвъ — старатися о точное выученье ремеселъ черезъ поодинокіихъ рукодѣльникѣвъ якъ и о закупно потребныхъ матеріалѣвъ гуртомъ.

## XI. Розвязанье общества.

### §. 38.

Тѣлько общому собранію, къ той цѣли выразно скликаному, служитъ право ухвалити розвязанье общества.

Такою ухвалу якъ и опредѣленье, на якую общеплезную цѣль масяа обернути все чистое имѣніе общества, становитъ общее собраніе важно, если по крайной мѣрѣ бѣольшая половина дѣйствительныхъ членѣвъ собранія и то три чвертины ( $\frac{3}{4}$ ) голосѣвъ присутствующихъ членѣвъ дотычную ухвалу повзяла.

Еслибы же до такой ухвалы не прійшло, припадае все чистое имѣніе въ пользу русско-народного Института „Народный Дѣмъ“ въ Львовѣ.

## XII. Споры.

### §. 39.

Всякого рода споры, изъ отношеній общества происходящии

рѣшае окѣнчательно и безъ всякаго отклика мировой судъ, въ составъ котораго избирае каждая сторона по одному судіи, а тіи оба судіи избирають сверхника своего.

### **XIII. Переходныи опредѣленія.**

#### **§. 40.**

Поки выдѣль общества не зѣстане по мысли §. 20. избранъ, комитеть учредительный веде дѣла Выдѣлови препорученыи.

По затверженіи статутѣвъ скличе комитеть учредительный безпироволочно первое общее собраніе.

---

Appendix 2  
KACHKOVSKYI SOCIETY AFFILIATES, 1913\*  
(Names followed by parentheses refer to districts;  
all others are district centers)

- |                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1. Brody                | 21. Sokal'                                  |
| 2. Buchach              | 22. Stanyslaviv                             |
| 3. Chortkiv             | 23. Staryi Sambir (Sambir)                  |
| 4. Drobomil'            | 24. Stryi                                   |
| 5. Drohobych            | 25. Ternopil'                               |
| 6. Halych (Stanyslaviv) | 26. Turka                                   |
| 7. Hrimno (Rudky)       | 27. Ustryky Dolishni (Lisko)                |
| 8. Kalush               | 28. Vysits'ko (Jaroslaw)                    |
| 9. Kaminka Strumyl'ova  | 29. Zboriv                                  |
| 10. Kolomyia            | 30. Zhovkva                                 |
| 11. Krynica (Nowy Sacz) | 31. Zolochiv                                |
| 12. Lisko               |   |
| 13. Lviv                |   |
| 14. Peremyshliany       | Other affiliates no longer existing in 1913 |
| 15. Peremyshl'          | 1. Berezhany                                |
| 16. Rava Rus'ka         | 2. Hlyniany (Peremyshliany)                 |
| 17. Rohatyn             | 3. Iavoriv                                  |
| 18. Sambir              | 4. Rudky                                    |
| 19. Sanok               | 5. Sniatyn                                  |
| 20. Skalat              | 6. Zhydachiv                                |

Appendix 3  
KACHKOVSKYI SOCIETY CHAIRMEN AND SECRETARIES

*Chairmen*

1874–1877	Reverend Ivan Naumovych
1877–1880	Vyktor M. Ploshchansk'kyi
1880–1884	Reverend Feofil Pavlykov
1884–1903	Bohdan Didyts'kyi
1903–1914	Pylyp Svystun

*Secretaries*

1874–1878	Ivan E. Levyts'kyi
1876–1880	Fedir Olipnyk
1878	Dmytro Vints'kovs'kyi
1879	F. Pleshkovich
1880–1882	Osyp A. Markov
1882–1884	Orest A. Avdykovs'kyi
1884–1886	Osyp A. Monchalovs'kyi
1886–1910	Ivan N. Pelekh
1910–1912	Semen Bendasiuk
1912–1914	Myron S. Zaiats'

\* *Russkaia nyva* (Lviv, 1913), p. 71

## Appendix 4

## KACHKOVSKYI SOCIETY ANNUAL CONVENTIONS

1.	Kolomyia		20 August 1874
2.	Halych		24 August 1875
3.	Lviv (extraordinary)		20 January 1876
4.	Stryi		22 August 1876
5.	Lviv		20 September 1877
6.	Peremyshl'		20 August 1878
7.	Stanyslaviv		11 September 1879
8.	Kolomyia		9 September 1880
9.	Zolochiv		29 September 1881
10.	Lviv		31 August 1882
11.	Drohobych		18 September 1883
12.	Ternopil'		29 September 1884
13.	Sanok		8 September 1885
14.	Brody		9 September 1886
15.	Kolomyia		8 September 1887
16.	Drohobych		6 September 1888
17.	Kalush		17 September 1889
18.	Ternopil'		9 September 1890
19.	Lviv		8 September 1891
20.	Stryi		8 September 1892
[21.	Stanyslaviv	cancelled due to cholera epidemic	12 September 1893]
21.	Lviv		18 September 1894
22.	Stanyslaviv		8 September 1896
23.	Drohobych		7 September 1897
24.	Sambir		8 September 1898
25.	Lviv		6 September 1899
26.	Sanok		18 September 1900
27.	Brody		12 September 1901
28.	Sambir		16 September 1902
29.	Peremyshl'		29 September 1903
30.	Lviv		8 September 1904
31.	Kolomyia		7 September 1905
32.	Lviv		18 September 1906
33.	Ternopil'		12 September 1907
34.	Jaroslav		19 September 1908
35.	Lviv		29 September 1909
36.	Lviv		29 September 1910
37.	Lviv		29 September 1911
38.	Lviv		24 September 1912
[39.	Lviv	cancelled due to cholera epidemic	29 September 1913]

Appendix 5  
KACHKOVSKYI SOCIETY MEMBERSHIP

<i>Members</i>	<i>Source and date</i>
1,439	<i>Russkaia rada</i> (Kolomyia), 5, no. 7 (1875): 50
2,600	<i>Slovo</i> , 14 August 1875, p. 1
3,000	<i>Russkaia rada</i> (Kolomyia), 5, no. 18 (1875): 141
3,700	<i>Russkaia rada</i> (Kolomyia), 5, no. 24 (1875): 190
3,562	<i>Russkaia rada</i> (Kolomyia), 6, no. 1 (1876): 11
6,000	<i>Russkaia rada</i> (Kolomyia), 7, no. 11 (1877): 94
over 5,000	<i>Slovo</i> , 3 June 1880, p. 1
4,100	<i>Slovo</i> , 24 September 1881, p. 1
3,500	<i>Slovo</i> , 6 October 1884, p. 1
3,637	<i>Slovo</i> , 23 November 1885, p. 2
5,000	<i>Russkaia rada</i> (Kolomyia), 18, no. 15 (1888): 120
4,136	<i>Russkaia rada</i> (Kolomyia), 20, no. 17 (1890): 110; <i>Russkoe slovo</i> (Lviv), 1, no. 37 (1890): 6
4,457	<i>Russkoe slovo</i> (Lviv), 2, no. 34 (1891): 4
5,476	<i>Russkoe slovo</i> (Lviv), 3, no. 33 (1892): 5
5,357	<i>Russkoe slovo</i> (Lviv), 5, no. 35 (1894): 7
5,173	<i>Russkoe slovo</i> (Lviv), 7, no. 35 (1896): 7
5,875	<i>Halychanyn</i> , 8 September 1897, p. 1
7,157	<i>Russkoe slovo</i> (Lviv), 11, no. 37 (1900): 1; <i>Halychanyn</i> , 19 September 1900, p. 2
7,444	<i>Halychanyn</i> , 13 September 1901, p. 2
8,130	<i>Russkoe slovo</i> (Lviv), 13 no. 36 (1902): 2
8,343	<i>Halychanyn</i> , 30 September 1903, p. 2
7,972	<i>Halychanyn</i> , 10 September 1904, p. 2
8,000	<i>Russkaia rada</i> (Kolomyia), 34, no. 16 (1905): 103
9,229/7,888	<i>Russkoe slovo</i> (Lviv), 17, no. 37 (1906): 5; <i>Halychanyn</i> , 19 September 1906, p. 2
9,872	<i>Dilo</i> , 24 September 1908, p. 1
10,011	<i>Halychanyn</i> , 1 October 1909, p. 2
10,700	<i>Halychanyn</i> , 2 October 1910, p. 2
10,395	<i>Halychanyn</i> , 21 September 1912, p. 2