

Nationalizing a Multiethnic Space: The Case(s) of Ivan Franko and Galicia

Yaroslav Hrytsak

No, this story is neither about the Spanish Caudillo Francisco Franco nor about the Spanish Galicia. This is a story about the Ukrainian writer Ivan Franko from the Habsburg Galicia. What makes the Ukrainian Franko and the Spaniard Franco similar is that they both shared the same family name and – allegedly – Jewish origins.¹ Their family name derived from the first name Franciscus that became popular in the Catholic world along with the cult of St. Franciscus. The area of the name's usage extended to the South Eastern and Eastern borderlands of Western Christianity in the Balkans and Eastern Europe.² Franko the writer was born in the Habsburg's easternmost province that had two large Christian denominations, the Roman and Greek Catholics (or Uniates, being a Church of the Byzantine rite (hence the "Greek"), but subordinated to the See of Rome). The religious distinction largely coincided with ethnic differences and geographical location: the Catholics were Poles who lived in the Western half of the province, the Greek Catholics made up the majority in Eastern Galicia and were Ukrainians. The terms "Poles" and "Ukrainians" sound here somewhat out of place: until the collapse of the Habsburg monarchy, they were largely unknown beyond the local educated classes. The Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic peasants – who, combined, made up the majority of the local population – called themselves, respectively, Mazury (Mazovians) and Rusyny (Ruthenians). The name Franciszek/Franek was rather popular among the Mazury, and the "Mazovian colonization of Ruthenia", brought it into the Eastern (Ruthenian) part of Galicia. Some of them assimilated into the Ruthenian peasant milieu preserving, however, their original rite. Therefore even though they spoke Ruthenian, they kept their old names of Franek, Wojciech, and Kazimierz etc.³

Franko saw himself as a product of German, not Polish colonization. He believed that his ancestor was a German colonizer who came to Galicia right after the Habsburg annexation of Galicia in 1772 [19, c. 193].⁴ Recent studies of his genealogy

1 See on the alleged Jewish origins of Francisco Franco: P. Preston, *Francisco. A Biography*, New York 1994, p. 1.

2 Z. Kozłowska-Budkowa, *Franko, biskup polski*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*. T. VII. Firlej Jan – Girdovojć Kazimierz, Kraków 1948–1958), p. 82; A. Birkenmajer, *Franko z Polski*, in: *idem*, p. 93; Z. Turina Křevan, *Liber roda Turinskog i Franko od nastanjivanja u primorskom kraju, te of 1673–1969*, Rijeka 1971, pp. 85–88.

3 I. Naumovych, *Nazad k narodu!*, in: *Slovo* 79 (25 iyulya (6 avhusta) 1881) p. 2.

4 Hereafter the first number in the bracket indicates a volume in the collection of Ivan Franko's

deny this⁵ – which does not exclude probability of his German origins. The name “Galicia” evoked memories of the medieval Ruthenian Galician principality, which in 1340 was incorporated into the Polish kingdom, later known as *Rzeczpospolita* or Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Both the Galician principality and the *Rzeczpospolita* had a strong presence of German burgers and artisans. So Franko’s ancestors might have come here much earlier, during the previous waves of the German *Drang nach Osten*.

Franko was born in 1856, in a Carpathian village in the Southeastern part of Galicia. His father was a rich blacksmith. On his mother’s side, he belonged to a petty nobility family of Kulczycki/Kulchytsky.⁶ The different spellings of the family name render a mixed “Polish-Ukrainian” identity of the family. Most of the old Ruthenian nobility has been Catholicized and, respectively, Polonized under the *Rzeczpospolita*. Numerous local petty nobles had retained, however, some elements of their Ruthenian culture. In Franko’s mother’s village, they spoke the Ruthenian language and belonged to the Greek Catholic rite, but cherished the memory of the partitioned *Rzeczpospolita*. One of Franko’s uncles on the mother side died as a volunteer in the 1863 Polish uprising in the Russian empire, and another became a Greek Catholic priest.⁷

As if to complicate things further, some Greek Catholic priests preached that they and their parishioners were, in fact, not Ruthenians, but Russians (*russkiye*, not *rusyny*). But their Russian identification had not that much to do with the contemporary Russian empire per se. Their imagined motherland was closer to pre-Petrine Russia – the Holy Rus, the world of Eastern Christianity not corrupted by Western influences. In the times of Franko’s youth (1860–1870s) this Russophile trend seemed to dominate the cultural and political life of the Galician Ruthenians – which, among other things, was reflected in intensive borrowings of Russian words in local Ruthenian publications. The dramatic confusion of identities was summarized in a question that a young Ruthenian intellectual addressed with his father, a reputed Ruthenian poet: “Tell me, father, who are we really? We speak Polish, think in German and how do we write? – we write in Russian!”⁸

work (Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv*: in 50 vols. Kyiv 1976–1986, the second number gives a number of the page quoted).

5 R. Horak, “Ia ie muhyk, proloh, ne epiloh”. *Povist-dokument*, in: Kyiv 9 (1989) pp. 49–59.

6 The two most famous members of the clan were the Ukrainian Cossack hetman Petro Sahaydachnyi (1570–1622) and the hero of the 1683 Battle of Vienna George/Jerzy/Yurij Kolschitzky/Kulczycki/Kulchytsky (1620–1694) who also happened to be the owner of the first Viennese coffeehouse – see: I. Volchko Kulchytsky, *Istoriya sela Kulchyts i rodu Draho-Sasiv (700-littya sela i 1000-littya rodu)*, Drohobych 1995; *Polska Encyklopedia Szlachecka T. VII*, Warszawa 1937, p. 217–218.

7 *Ibid.*

8 K. Ustyianovych, M. Θ. Raievsky i rossiisky panslavizm. *Spomyvky z perezhytoho i peredumanoho*, Lviv 1884, p. 11; A. V. Wendland, *Die Russophilen in Galizien. Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Rußland 1848–1915*, Wien 2001, pp. 180–181.

The Ruthenian case was hardly unique. The educated Galician Jews were confused about their identity, too. They had to decide, first, whether the Galician Jewry – who made up ca. 10 per cent of the local population – were a religious group or a nation – and, if the latter was the case, what kind of a nation they should be: German, Polish, or Jewish? The Galician Yiddish showed numerous borrowings from Slavic languages, while the educated Jews mixed it with Western languages. One could hear among them a dialogue as follows:

“Wi gejc Fraian Berta?

Ach, że swi malaad, że la melankolik”.⁹

Galicia was linguistically a veritable Tower of Babel. German was an absolute must for the educated classes. A command of French or English was considered a *bon ton*. French was used by the Poles as a shield against Germanization, and English was spoken among the Polish aristocrats when they wanted to emphasize their high social status. Apart from the four main languages – German and the three local (Polish, Ruthenian and Yiddish) – the list of words that were used on an everyday basis included borrowings from Romanian, Hungarian, Latin, Armenian, French, Czech, Church-Slavonic, Russian, Italian, English, Turkish and the Arabic languages.¹⁰

This linguistic diversity affected both the educated and the uneducated classes. Galicia was a land where many persons would fit the East European definition: “(s)he does not speak three languages” – which meant that (s)he could converse, at least lamely, in three languages. Franko not only spoke, but also wrote fluently in three languages. He became a trilingual (Ukrainian-Polish-German) writer. This seems to be an unique case even under the extremely multicultural conditions of the Habsburg monarchy: there were many bilingual authors, but a written command of three languages was a rare occurrence.¹¹

Franko learned German and Polish in the Galician town of Drohobych/Drogobicz where he attended school and gymnasium (1864–1875). He also knew Yiddish due to his many and intense encounters with the local Jewish community: The Jews made up a majority (50,4%) in the town, many of Franko’s classmates were Jewish, and he earned his living by tutoring the children of Jewish families. Since then, the traditional Jewish culture always attracted him – in his own words, he was “driven by the Orient”.¹² His later Judeophilism – as well as his dis-

9 T. Burdiewicz, *Sprawy narodościowy w utworach Jana Lama*, in: K. Karolczak i H. W. Zaliński (eds.), *Galicyjskie Dylematy. Zbiór rozpraw*, Krakow 1994, p. 83.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 78–79.

11 G. Wytrzens, *Zum literarischen Schaffen Frankos in Deutscher Sprache*, in: I.I. Lukinov et. al. (eds.), *Ivan Franko i svitova kultura. Materialy Mizhnarodnoho Symposiumu UNESCO (Lviv, 11–15 veresnia 1986 r.)*, Kyiv 1990, p. 51.

12 For a general overview of the subject: P. Kudryavtsev, *Ievreistvo, ievrei ta ievreiska sprava v tvorakh Ivana Franka*, in: A. I. Krymsky (ed.), *Zbirnyk prats ievreiskoi istorychno-arkheohrafychnoi komisii. T. 2.*, Kyiv 1929, p. 1. Franko’s Judeophilism did not stop him, how-

tinctly red hair and rumors that he was born out of wedlock – raised a suspicion that he himself was a half-Jew. It was reportedly “common knowledge” among his friends and colleagues in the capital Galician city of Lviv (Lwów/Lemberg).¹³

Franko moved there from Drohobycz in 1875, to enter the local University, and lived there until his death in 1916. In Lviv, he rose to prominence through the work of his pen. He wrote poetry, prose fiction, literary criticism, and essays in history and folklore studies, political journalism and economics. As a typical East European intellectual he combined his literary occupations with an active participation in political life. Franko was a co-founder and a leading ideologue of the first socialist organization. Apart from his socialist views, Franko was also an atheist and a propagator of free love – which in the very traditionalist and deeply religious Galicia was considered an outrageous intellectual provocation. It cost him several trials, imprisonments and social ostracism – but otherwise made him popular among the “progressive” intellectuals in the Austrian-Hungarian and Russian empires. Franko had contacts and exchanged ideas with Victor Adler, Theodor Herzl, Thomas Masaryk, as well as awakened the curiosity of Georgij Plekhanov and Maksim Gorky – to name only the most prominent figures.

From his many identities and loyalties, Franko is remembered and venerated today as an Ukrainian national poet – as a matter of fact, as the greatest Ukrainian national poet, second only to Taras Shevchenko (1814–1861) from the Russian Ukraine. By the end of his life Franko was considered to be an unparalleled leader of the development of a modern Ukrainian identity as far as the Ruthenians made a shift from a largely illiterate, agrarian, and self-sufficient peasant community to a largely literate, mobilized, and integrated society – in short, to a modern nation.

This had far-reaching international effects. Galicia was a typical borderland, where identities were blurred and open to contestation. Borderlands, as we all now know, play an important role in the articulation of identities in the centers.¹⁴ Galicia was “privileged” in a special way: the ways the local identity crisis would be resolved could have a direct impact on the future of Eastern Europe. Had the Galician Ruthenians chosen to become Russians, they would have ignited Russian irredentism in the Habsburg monarchy; their decision to become Ukrainians challenged the integrity of the ruling “Greater Russian nation” in the Russian empire. No wonder that since the end of the XIX century, Galicia was increasingly becoming a *causa*

ever, from some anti-Semitic remarks that he did in 1880s-1890s – see my: *Między filosemityzmem i antysemityzmem – Iwan Franko i kwestia żydowska*, in: K. Jasiewicz (ed.), *Świat Niepożegnany. A World We Bade No Farewell. Żydzi na dawnych ziemiach wschodnich Rzeczypospolitej w XVIII–XX wieku. Jews in the Eastern Territories of the Polish Republic from 18th to 20th century*, Warsaw, London 2005, pp. 451–480.

13 L. Krzywicki, *Wspomnienia*. T. 1. 1859–1885, Warszawa 1947, p. 265.

14 P. M., “Discovering the Galician Borderlands: The Case of the Eastern Carpathians”, in: *Slavic Review* 64 No. 2 (2005) p. 380; P. Sahlins, *Boundaries. The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1989, p. 271.

belli between the Austrian-Hungarian and Russian empires, second to the Balkans only.¹⁵

Franko became a role model for many educated Ruthenians of his and the next generation. By this token, his personal choice of the Ukrainian identity had large social consequences. What follows is an interpretative essay of his transformation into a Ukrainian national poet. The main claim is that this transformation could only adequately be understood in a wider international context: Franko rose to the status of a national poet not in spite of, but due to the multiethnic and multicultural factors in his biography.

1. International setting

To a large extent, Galicia as a concept was a creation of Vienna. It came into existence as a result of the Habsburg civilization experiment along the lines of Enlightened Absolutism.¹⁶

In the imagination of Habsburg bureaucracy, the newly annexed province was “Sarmatia” – a semi-Asian land, a symbol of cultural barbarism, political anarchy and economic poverty. They charged the local Polish nobility with responsibility for the province’s backwardness and saw it as their mission “to reeducate these Sarmatian beasts [=Polish nobles] into normal human beings”.¹⁷ This “reeducation” was to be achieved through Germanization. Habsburgs did not strive for the transformation of local ethnic groups into Germans – at least, not all at once – but into “civilized Galicians”.¹⁸ Accordingly, the success of Germanization was measured by the quality of the new and paved roads, the cleanliness of the streets, the efficiency of the bureaucratic machine – and, last but not least, by the elegance of the local coffeehouses that reportedly were not any worse than the coffeehouses of Dresden, Nuremberg and other German cities.¹⁹

15 See K. Bachmann, *Ein Herd der Feindschaft gegen Rußland. Galizien als Krisenherd in den Beziehungen der Donaumonarchie mit Rußland (1907–1914)*, Wien, München 2001; A. V. Prusin, *Nationalizing a Borderland. War, Ethnicity, and anti-Jewish Violence in East Galicia, 1914–1920*, Tsucaloosa 2005.

16 L. Wolff, *Inventing Galicia: Messianic Josephinism and the Recasting of Partitioned Poland*, in: *Slavic Review* 63 No. 4 (2004), pp. 818–840.

17 Quoted after: V. Adadurov, *Lviv u napoleonivsku epokhu*, in: M. Mudryi (ed.), *Lviv: Mistospilstvo-kultura. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Vol. 3*, Lviv, 1999, p. 212.

18 Prince Klemens von Metternich wrote in a letter to Franz I (1814) that the long-term goal of the Habsburg policy should be to encourage Polish nobles to become Germans. He was against, however, an accelerated implementation of that policy: “The tendency must be primarily go not towards making Poles into Germans all at once, but above all first making them true Galicians – thereby halting them from perceiving themselves as Poles” – see: A. Haas, *Metternich, reorganization and nationality*, Wiesbaden 1863, pp. 167–169, quoted after: H. Lane, *The Galician nobility and the border with the Congress Kingdom before during and after the November Uprising*, in: Chr. Augustinowicz, A. Kappeler (Hrsg.), *Die galizische Grenze 1772–1867: Kommunikation oder Isolation?*, Wien, Berlin 2007, p. 159.

19 J.G. Kohl, *Austria, Vienna, Prague, Hungary, Bohemia, and the Danube; Galicia, Styria, Moravia, Bukovina and the Military Frontier*, London 1844, pp. 433, 451, 455–456.

There were, however, some moments in the Habsburg civilization project that could be read in national(izing) terms. Habsburg reforms necessarily led to linguistic assimilation of the educated urban classes. Up to the early 1870s, in Lviv, German dominated both in the state and public spheres, and even the street vendors attracted potential buyers in German.²⁰ Another aspect was the recurring references to the term *Polnische Wirtschaft* (Polish economy) as a symbol of economic destitution and political anarchy that was responsible for backwardness of the (former) Rzeczpospolita. This term actively functioned in the German language since the end of the XVIII century, and its functioning reflected a single national German public space long before the German nation-state came into existence.²¹

Whatever the Habsburgs' Germanization meant, the local Polish patriots saw it as a threat to their Polish identity. They derided Vienna's efforts to create "a nation of Galicians"²² and stood up to resist. In 1846 and in 1848, their resistance evolved into anti-Habsburg revolts. In more peaceful times, until the last third of the XIX century the educated Galician public was divided into two rival parties, namely the "party of Schiller" and the "party of Mickiewicz".²³ In this rivalry, there was no place for a party of a Ruthenian, or, for that matter, a Jewish poet. The Ruthenians were either taking sides in the German-Polish rivalry, or ignoring it. Only a tiny minority of Ruthenian revivalists in 1830s sought to establish their own national literature in the local "peasant language". They saw themselves as members of a single Ruthenian-Ukrainian nation made up of the Habsburg Ruthenians and the Romanov Little Russians (Malorosy). They called for the support of Vienna because, as they believed, "by favoring the Ruthenian literature [in Galicia], Austria could exercise influence on Little Russia". The Habsburg establishment viewed such a scenario with concern. The local police director reportedly said that "we already have enough trouble with one nationality [the Poles], and these madmen want to resurrect the dead and buried Ruthenian nationality".²⁴

The situation changed during the 1848 Revolution when Vienna sought to instrumentalize the Ruthenian issue as a counterbalance against the Polish separatism. The Ruthenian intelligentsia, made up mostly of Greek Catholic priests, was not quite prepared for such a turn: their intellectual worldview was parochial, their

20 B. Limanowski, *Pamiętniki*, T.1, Warszawa 1958, pp. 19–20.

21 H. Orłowski, *Z modernizacją w tle. Wokół rodowodu nowoczesnych niemieckich wyobrażeń o Polsce i o Polakach*, Poznań 2002.

22 Z. Fras, *Galicja*, Wrocław 2000, p. 58.

23 J. Holzer, "Von Orient die Fantasie, und in der Brust der Slawen Feuer..." *Jüdisches Leben und Akkulturation im Lemberg des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, in: P. Fäßler, Th. Held und D. Sawitzki (eds.), *Lemberg-Lwów-Lviv. Ein Stadt in Schnittpunkt europäischer Kulturen*, Köln-Weimar-Wien 1993, pp. 77–87, T. Namowicz, *Galizien nach 1772. Zur Entstehung einer literarischen Provinz*, in F. Rinner, K. Zerinschek (eds.), *Galizien als Gemeinsame Literaturlandschaft. Beiträge des 2. Innsbrucker Symposiums polnischer und österreichischer Literaturwissenschaftler*, Innsbruck 1988, p. 72.

24 Quoted after: I. L. Rudnytsky, *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*, Edmonton 1987, pp. 318–319.

cultural production was negligible, and they thought about their identity in religious, rather than national terms. Forced to make a choice, after a long discussion they chose the Ruthenian-Ukrainian option. 1848 ignited the Polish-Ruthenian antagonism. Initially, the Ruthenian leaders felt strong due to the Habsburgs' support. But in 1860s, when, as a result of the Habsburg-Polish compromise, the rule over the province was handed to Polish elites, they were left to their own devices. Most of them felt threatened and vulnerable. They had a long and bitter record of their conflicts with Polish elites long before the Habsburg rule. Besides, Polonization of the Ruthenian elites was taking a heavy toll even before 1860s. With the introduction of autonomy for Galicia – which was, in fact, Polish autonomy – the scale of Polonization could become disastrous.

To withstand this new challenge, the educated Ruthenian elites badly needed their own dynamic high culture. On a symbolic level, their concerns and yearnings were reflected in the oft-reiterated question: Where is our national poet? The Ruthenian public prayed for emergence of somebody who could be – at least remotely – compared to the Polish *wieszcz* (national poets) Mickiewicz, Slowacki and Krasiński.²⁵ The solution seemed to suggest itself spontaneously: in 1862, Mykhailo Dymet, a Ruthenian merchant from Lviv brought several books by Taras Shevchenko with him from Kyiv. The result was a splash: all the books were sold out in a very short time, and those who did not manage to get a printed copy, were copying them by hand. For a generation of educated Ruthenians born around 1848, the reading of Shevchenko in 1862 left an enormous imprint in their memory: they compared its effects with a religious conversion. Shevchenko impressed them with the brilliance of his language, his unfeigned patriotism and passionate imagination – that is with everything they could not find among the local Ruthenian poets. And above all, Shevchenko provided a boost to their national dignity. His heroes, the Ukrainian Cossacks, kept defeating the Polish nobility. Identification with the heroic Cossack past provided the young Ruthenian intellectuals with a hope that they could oppose Polish pressure in the future.²⁶

The initial admiration for Shevchenko did not last long. There was a growing sense of unease, connected with the feeling that his poetry did not fit the local circumstances: the rather plain local geographical landscapes lacked the enticing beauty of the Ukrainian steppe, and the Galician Ruthenian history seemed not to have anything worth of poetic eulogy. Besides, the strong religious dimension of the Ruthenian identity did not allow to accept Shevchenko wholeheartedly: after all, the Ukrainian Cossacks were Orthodox and as such they exterminated the Greek Catholic clergy with the same brutality as they did the Poles and the Jews. Many Galician

25 V. Stefanyk, *Poety i inteligentsiya*, in: *Literaturno-Naukovy Vistnyk* Vol. 2 No. 6 p. 23.

26 F.S. F. S[vystun], *Chym iest dlia nas Shevchenko? Khytychnoe rozsuzhdenie*, Lvov 1885, pp. 5–6.

Ruthenians who felt enthusiastic about Shevchenko in their early years, were growing more disillusioned with him as they grew older.²⁷

In the mid-1870s, when Franko was entering the local literary scene, the position of a “national poet” was still vacant. Poesomania became something akin to a sport: there was hardly an educated young man who never tried his talents in writing poetry. The important question was, however, the choice of language. Some followed the 1848 line and wrote in Ukrainian. Others could not stand the idea that their language was to be a vernacular spoken by uneducated “peasants and shepherds”. They suggested the use of a slightly modernized version of Church Slavonic. The fact that the overwhelming majority of educated Ruthenians were Greek Catholic clergy made the choice of Church Slavonic very attractive – by definition, this was their “professional” language. And still others took a more radical route: instead of inventing new national literature, they suggested to “borrow” the modern Russian one – which was especially enticing, because by that time the Russian literature was rising to the status of a great world literature.

2. The first transformation: 1876

At the time, when Franko was leaving Gymnasium, he could not quite make sense of the language discussions²⁸ He was wavering, like most educated Ruthenians. His early works were full of praises for Holy Rus. But what exactly he meant by it was not quite clear: Rus was a very ambivalent term and depending on the circumstances it could mean different things. There were, however, two things that he was sure about. First, even though he could write poetry in Polish²⁹, he decided not to be a Polish poet. Some of the poetry of his youth reveals anti-Polish resentment, and on several occasions he made very critical remarks about Mickiewicz. Secondly, as he admitted on several occasions, he had no intention to write for peasants and about peasants – his works were to be for intelligentsia only.³⁰ These words were a paraphrase of Goethe and revealed his admiration for German culture. German influences were further testified to by the fact that he corresponded with his fiancée exclusively in German. His ambition was to write a *salonfähig* Ruthenian literature that could contest the popularity of Polish-language adventure and romance books among the Ruthenian readers of Galicia.³¹ Franko built an appropriate *salonfähig*

27 Ibid, p. 14.

28 I. Franko, *Zibrannia tomiv*, Vol. 49, Kyiv 1986, p. 244.

29 As a matter of fact, his *Gymnasium* Polish teacher Juliusz Turczynski, himself a Polish poet, claimed that Franko wrote in Polish better than any Polish student in his class – see: K. Badrivsky, *Spohady pro Franka-shkoliara*, in: M. Hnatiuk (ed.), *Spohady pro Ivana Franka*, Lviv 1997, p. 52.

30 M. Pavlyk (ed.), *Perepyska Mykhaila Drahomanova z Mykhailom Pavlykom (1876–1895)* Vol. 2–8, Chernivtsi 1910–1912, Vol. 2, pp. 57, 96.

31 Above all, this kind of literature was aiming at young Ruthenian ladies, daughters of Greek Catholic priests who, as future mothers, were thought to be “the rock, on which the [national] temple will be built” – but who otherwise read only Polish literature. *Ot redaktsiy “Druha”*,

self-image: he chose the pen-name *Dzhedzalyk* – which could be loosely translated as ‘romancer’ – and his images from those times showed him dressed in a tail-coat with a bow tie.

A major change came during his first years in Lviv. The city was experiencing spectacular growth then. With the introduction of Galician autonomy, the center of administrative power over province shifted here from Vienna. Through its status as a provincial capital, Lviv gathered large state investments. The reintroduction of the self-government in 1870 allowed the municipal power to channel those investments into the development of urban infrastructure. Judging by the criteria of maximum use of city infrastructure for the needs of everyday life and the support of urban culture, Lviv had become a modern city – probably, the only really modern city within the realms of the former *Rzeczpospolita*.³² Suffice it to say that in 1881 by the number of literary magazines published in the city, Lviv outnumbered Moscow, Odessa, Kyiv/Kiev and Krakow – and had it been perchance annexed at that time by the Russian empire, it would have been third after St. Petersburg and Warsaw.³³

The new urban development went hand in hand with Polonization of the city. The local university that since its creation in 1817 was seen as a stronghold of German culture, was a major target. In 1871, German as the language of instruction was replaced by Polish. The faculty was given a three years notice: all professors were supposed either to master the new language or to leave. Most of them chose the latter option, and that provoked protests in Vienna. Both in the Reichstag and in local publications, there were voices raised to the effect that with the exodus of German professors, scholarship had deserted the University, and therefore it had to close.³⁴ They were rejected by Ksawery Liske, the local professor of Polish history. Liske denied the “alleged decline” of the local university, claiming that the Polish scholars were no worse than the German ones – in fact, they were much better. In his opinion, no other nation in the world had as many academic publications in internationally recognized languages as Poland.³⁵

Druh 13 (1 (13) lypnia 1875) pp. 297–299 (the quotation comes from journal that was co-edited by Ivan Franko).

32 K. Pawłowski, *Miejsce Lwowa w rozwoju urbanistyki europejskiej przełomu XIX i XX wieku*, in: B. Cherkes, M. Kubelik and E. Hofer (eds.), *Arkhitektura Halychyny XIX – XX st. Vybrani materialy mizhnarodnoho sympoziumu 24–27 travnia 1994 r., prysviachenoho 150-richchiu zasnavannia Derzhavnoho universytetu “Lvivska politekhnika”*, Lviv 1996, pp. 125–130; idem, *Narodziny nowoczesnego miasta*, in: *Sztuka drugiej połowy XIX wieku*, Warszawa 1973, pp. 57–58, 61–68.

33 K. Heck, *Bibliografia Polska z r. 1881 w porównaniu z czeską, węgierską i rosyjską*, in: *Przewodnik naukowy i literacki. Dodatek miesięczny do “Gazety Lwowskiej”* 10 (1882) p. 1096.

34 A. Dumreicher, *Die Verwaltung der Universitaeten seit dem letzten politischen Systemwechsel in Österreich*, Wien 1873, p. 106.

35 X. Liske, *Der angebliche Niedergang der Universität Lemberg. Offenes Sendschreiben an das Reichsrathsmittelglied Herrn dr Eduard Suess prof. an der Universität Wien*, Lemberg 1876, pp. 5, 15.

Apart from his patriotic exaggerations, Liske was right at least in one aspect: de-Germanization did not bring about a significant decline in the level of teaching at the University – because it was already depressingly low. The local German faculty was divided in two groups. The majority did not care about academic standards and treated their work as a life-long sinecure. An ambitious minority worked hard to become prominent and to leave when first occasion arose for any “central” German university. True, Lemberg belonged to the German cultural space. But since it was the easternmost German city, it could not but present a very provincial, second-hand variation of German culture. The provincial status affected other ethnic groups, too. When in 1861 the Russian consul to Vienna Mikhail Rayevski asked Yakiv Holovatsky – the former 1830 Ruthenian revivalist who by that time was chair of Ruthenian literature at the University of Lemberg – to provide him with local news, the latter answered “Lviv is a provincial city and important events are few”.³⁶

Polonization of the local University radically changed its status in “center-periphery” relations: from a provincial German University it turned into a central Polish University. Up to the 1830s, this status was held by the University of Wilno in the Russian empire. After the 1831 Polish uprising it was, however, closed and its facilities were used as a base for a new University opened in Kiev (1834). The Kiev University, as well as later (1882) the University of Warsaw were meant to be, according to plans of the Russian imperial government, centers of de-Polonization and Russification of the Western Russian borderlands.³⁷ Under these circumstances, the Polonized Lwów University, under the auspices of the liberal Habsburg policies, was to become a hotbed of Polish culture.

Franko entered the University of Lviv in 1875, when its future was still debated. He found there mostly “old” professors who did not leave because they knew the local languages – but who embodied intellectual parochialism. He was appalled by their “pedantic, senseless lectures [...], their slavish adherence to printed examples and verbal formulae” [34: 371–372]. The situation changed, however, a few years later, in 1878–1879, when Franko started attending classes of Włodzimierz Ochorowicz (1850–1917). Ochorowicz was a rising star of Polish science. He moved to Lviv from Warsaw, where he was known as a leading ideologue of Polish positivism.³⁸ Franko profited from his courses enormously. It was Ochorowicz who brought him to positivism, which until his last days remained a cornerstone of his worldview [48: 213; 49: 246].

The largest influence on him during his student years was affected by Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841–1895), professor of the Kyiv University. Drahomanov was a

36 V. Matula, I. Chuhkyna (eds.), *Zarubezhnye slaviane i Rossiia. Dokumenty akhivna M.F. Raevskoho 40–80 hodov XIX veka*, Moskva 1975, p. 139.

37 M. F. Hamm, *Kiev. A Portrait, 1800–1917*, Princeton, NJ 1993, pp. 63–64, 101; B. Porter, *When Nationalism Began to Hate. Imagining Modern Politics in Nineteenth-Century Poland*, New York 2000, pp. 80–81.

38 See J. Khajewski, Ochorowicz, Julian, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny Vol.13/1*, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk 1978, pp. 499–505.

member of the Kyiv Ukrainian commune (Hromada) that presented a blend of international socialism with Ukrainian nationalism. Official reports characterized it as “a society of communists” who spread among people “pernicious ideas and thoughts” with “writings of Father Taras” [Shevchenko] in one pocket, and Marx’ “Kapital” in the other.³⁹ It was Drahomanov who coined the formula for combining nationalism and socialism: since Ukrainians were a “plebeian” nation, consisting mostly of peasants mostly, then, “according to Ukrainian circumstances, it is a bad Ukrainian who does not become a radical [=socialist], and it is a bad radical who does not become Ukrainian”.⁴⁰

In 1876, Drahomanov was fired from the staff of the Kyiv University for “socialist tendencies and Ukrainian separatism”. His dismissal was an event in a longer chain of government repression that led to a ban (1876) of Ukrainian language publications in the Russian empire. Expecting repressions, the Hromada sent Drahomanov abroad with a mission to found an uncensored Ukrainian language journal in the West.⁴¹ His first stop on the way West was Lviv. Drahomanov was struck by the poverty of local intellectual life. At the Lviv University, he attended a lecture of professor Omelian Ohonowsky, chair of Ruthenian literature. After the lecture Drahomanov told the students that “I’ve visited various places in Russia and Europe, but never heard such stupid lectures as here in Lviv”.⁴²

Drahomanov’s frustration was easily understood: he and his fellows in Kyiv were intending to make full use of the metropolitan status of Lviv for Ukrainian purposes. They sought to establish here a center of modern Ukrainian culture and counted on the local Ruthenians as potential writers and readers for their journal. Drahomanov elaborated a plan of how to make Galician Ruthenian students meet his expectations. The plan included dissemination of Russian “progressive” literature. Firstly, this measure was intended to prove that the local Ruthenian literature, both in its language and ideological content, was a far cry from what was produced in Moscow and St. Petersburg – contrary to the claims of some Ruthenian writers. Secondly, as Drahomanov believed, the reading of Herzen, Chernyshevski, Dobrolyubov would necessarily turn young Galician writers from away from the salon public to “the people”, and the populist orientation would inevitably lead them to Ukrainian identity.⁴³

39 Quoted after V. Korotky, V. Ulianovsky (eds.), *Syn Ukrainy. Volodymyr Bonifatiiovych Antonovych: 3 Vols.*, Kyiv 1997, Vol. 2, p. 39; S. Podolynsky, *Lysty ta dokumenty*, Kyiv 2002, p. 435.

40 M. Drahomanov, *Avtobiohrafycheskaia zametka*, in: M. Pavlyk (ed.), *Mykhailo Petrovych Drahomanov, 1841–1895. Ieho iubylei, smert, avtobiohrafia i spys ioho tvoriv*, Lviv 1896, p. 59.

41 I. Butych et al. (eds.), *Mykhailo Drahomanov. Dokumenty i Materialy. 1841–1994*, Lviv 2001, pp. 94–107.

42 Quoted after I. Franko, *Peredmova*, in: M. Drahomanov, *Lysty do Ivana Franka i ynshykh*. Vol.1. 1881–1886, Lviv 1896, pp. 5–6.

43 Drahomanov, *Avtobiohrafycheskaia zametka*, p. 55.

It was not quite clear whether Drahomanov included Franko when he was castigating young Ruthenian writers for their “backwardness”. But Franko took his words very personally: he was about to commit suicide, so deeply was he ashamed for his previous actions and writing. He did not, in the end, commit suicide. But he did away with his previous identity. The first signs of his conversion were seen in his correspondence with his fiancée: he switched from German to Ruthenian. He explained his decision to her in a following way:

“And you may ask, why I am writing now [to you] in Ruthenian, not in German? That is simple. The German discourse is for me a fashionable tailcoat that quite often is worn by a Stutzer * with empty pockets. And the Ruthenian language is the language of my beloved home dress in which everyone shows himself to others as he really is – the way I really am, and in the way I love you best. The Ruthenian language is the language of my heart!” [48, c.46].

A comparison of his images from 1875 and 1881 revealed that he was true to his words literally: gone were his tail-coat and bow tie of 1875, replaced instead by an unpretentious embroidered shirt, a symbol of a Ukrainian peasant identity.⁴⁴ He also took a new pen name, Myron that was to imply his peasant origins.⁴⁵ Since then, one could hardly find in his later works and memoirs a single reference to his noble status.

3. Franko and his reading community, 1876–1896

The transformation of the educated Ruthenian youth of Galicia into Ukrainians was the first part of the Drahomanov’s plans. The second part was making them socialists, “according to the Ukrainian circumstances” Both parts worked in the case of Ivan Franko. In the late 1870s–early 1880s, he became a leading ideologist of the emerging socialist movement in Galicia. In 1881, he contributed to the Program of Galician socialists that was a bold attempt to apply Marxism to Galicia, with the agrarian character of its economy and the multiethnic structure of its population. Concerning the latter, Franko wrote in the name of all Galician socialist that they did not share Marx’s and Engels’ distinction between “state” and “non-state”, “large” and “small” nations: “There are no larger or smaller nations: all of them are equal and have an equal right to free development.” In Galicia, where several nationalities lived together side by side, the socialists hoped to create a federative union organized along ethnic lines. The Polish and Ukrainian socialist were to pursue their ac-

* A dandy (German).

44 See I. P. Slupsky (ed.), Ivan Franko. Dokumentalni fotohrafii, Lviv 1971, p. 27.

45 See Y. Hrytsak, Ruslan, Bohdan and Myron: Three Constructed Identities among Galician Ruthenians/Ukrainians, 1830–1914, in: M. Siefert (ed.), *Extending the Borders of Russian History. Essays in Honor of Alfred J. Rieber*, Budapest, New York 2003, pp. 97–112.

tivities in their respective ethnic territories; in the ethnically mixed communities they were supposed to work together [45: 456, 461].

The program served as a blueprint for the Polish-Ruthenian-Jewish socialist committee founded in Lviv by socialists of all three nationalities. Franko was to represent Ukrainian socialists and workers – but since both were few, he worked mostly among the Polish proletariat. And since his Jewish socialist colleagues were assimilated into the modern Polish culture and lost any connections to the local Jewish community, he served as their link with the Jewish proletariat in Drohobych and the Galician oilfields in its vicinity. In the context of the socialist movement, the Galician socialist committee could be seen as an early precursor of Austromarxism. In the context of Ukrainian political thought, Franko and his mentor Drahomanov presented a federative trend that dominated until 1917 and that opposed resolutely the ideal of Ukrainian political independence – for fear that the Ukrainian independent state would inevitably be dominated by the nobility and bourgeoisie, which were both, by definition, not quite Ukrainian and not at all peasants.⁴⁶

Young Franko tried to combine nationalism and socialism. The social appeal of this combination could be measured upon the scale and reactions of his reading public. In discussing the local reading market, one general point should be noted: until the late XIX century, the East Christian world was marked by a relative paucity of printing production.⁴⁷ The Galician Ruthenians were no exception. According to the fullest bibliography of their publications, between 1801 and 1860, the local authors produced 1352 works. It was a very modest result, to put it mildly: on average, there were 22 titles published per year. There were not just single years, but several decades (between 1801 and 1840) when not a single novel, story or drama were published.⁴⁸ As Franko ironically put it, it would only take a few barrows to gather all the Ruthenian publications in one place. [41: 21] The fullest bibliography of Franko's works lists 4,500 entries.⁴⁹ Even though not everything he produced may be considered of great value –as he himself willingly admitted [1: 19] – but his pub-

46 H. Mommsen, *Die Sozialdemokratie und die Nationalitätenfrage im habsburgischen Vielvölkerstaat*. Vol. 1. Das Ringen um die supranationale Integration der zisleitanischen Arbeiterbewegung (1867–1907), Wien 1963, p. 241; Y. Hrytsak, Ivan Franko pro politychnu samostiinist Ukrainy, in: *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne* 103 (1993), pp. 45–53.

47 B. Gudziak, *Kryza i reforma. Kyivska Mytropoliya, tsarhorodsky patriarkhat i heneza Beresteiskoi Unii*, Lviv 2000), pp. 32–33, 139; M. Osterrieder, *Von der Sakralgemeinschaft zur modernen Nation. Die Entstehung eines Nationalbewusstseins unter Russen, Ukrainern und Weissruthenen im Lichte der Thesen Benedict Andersons*, in: E. Schmidt-Hartmann (ed.), *Formen der nationalen Bewusstseins im Lichte zeitgenössischer Nationalismustheorien*, München 1994, p. 207; A. Renner, *Russischer Nationalismus und Öffentlichkeit im Zarenreich 1855–1875*, Köln, Weimer, Wien 2000, pp. 119–120.

48 I. E. Levytsky, *Halytsko-ruskaya bibliografiya XIX stolitii s uvzhyadnenniem russkykh izdaniy poyavyvshykh v Uhozhshchyni i Bukovyni (1801–1886)*, Vol. 1. *Khronolohycheskii spisok pablykatsii [1801–1860]*, Lvov 1888, pp. IX, XX–XXI.

49 M.O. Moroz (ed.), *Ivan Franko. Bibliografiya tvoriv. 1874–1964*, Kyiv 1966.

lications alone could be presented as proof of existence of a separate Ruthenian-Ukrainian literature. Franko became a dominant figure in the Ruthenian-Ukrainian cultural production in both empires: before 1886, he was already on the “top 20” list of the most productive authors; after 1895 and for the next decade he was second to none (see the table).

Both, the geography of his publications and the languages of his many works exceeded the Ruthenian-Ukrainian “imagined community”: a significant part of Franko’s production was published in Polish and outside the Ukrainian ethnic territory. Ironically, in the first ten years after his conversion to the Ukrainian identity, he was far more widely read among the Poles than Ruthenians.⁵⁰ In the imagination of his readers, Franko was a “Ruthenian-Polish poet”.⁵¹ Franko’s popularity among the Poles could be partially explained by wider circulation of the Polish periodicals he contributed to, in comparison to the Ruthenian-Ukrainian ones (in Galicia in the 1880–1890s, the ratio of distributed copies of Polish periodicals to Ruthenian-Ukrainian ones was 7–8 to 1). Another reason of Franko’s popularity was the fact that his works filled specific gaps in Polish literature, as far as popular works of a propagandist character were concerned.⁵² Franko’s literary production in the 1870–1880s resonated with beliefs of both Ukrainian and Polish socialists because it carried an universal socialist message. Felix Daszyński, a leading Polish socialist and Franko’s translator in Polish, wrote to him that “when I finished reading your *Boa* [constrictor – a novel about Galician oil workers – Y.H.], I started to shiver as though with fever. Show me a human being that loves people more than you – and I will tell you that you are the only one”.⁵³

Through the mediation of Polish newspapers and magazines Franko could reach a reading public that exceeded the realms of Polish ethnicity. Polish largely remained the lingua franca in the lands of “historic Poland” up to World War I. Educated Jews in both empires reacted to Franko’s Polish-language publications on the Jewish issue – while his much more controversial publications in Ukrainian periodicals passed for them unnoticed. Franko’s Polish publications had an unexpected effect on Ruthenian readers in Galicia: since many of them believed that the Polish magazines were of a superior quality, his regular presence there testified to his high standards, and thus turned their attention to his works in the Ruthenian-Ukrainian language.⁵⁴

By the 1880s and mid-1890s, “Franko’s imagined community” was *prima facie* not a nation of Ukrainians, but a multiethnic “nation of progressists”. A thick line

50 Postup, in: Kurjer Lwowski, 4, 325 (24.listopada 1886) p. 1.

51 Quoted after Z.T. Franko, M.H. Vasylenko (eds.), *Ivan Franko, Mozaika. Iz tvoriv, shcho ne vviishly do Zibrannia tvoriv u 50 tomakh*, Lviv 2001, p. 325.

52 See St. Makowski, T. Styszko, *Z nie opublikowanej korespondencji Iwana Franki z Adamem Wiślickim*, in: *Sławia Orientalis* 7 No.1 (1958), p. 126.

53 Instytut literatury imeni Tarasa Shevchenka NAN Ukrainy, *viddil rukopysiv*, f. 3, spr. 1603, p. 55.

54 V. Budzynovsky, *Ishly didy na muky. Vvedennia v istoriiu Ukrainy*, Lviv 1925, p. 29.

was dividing those who sympathized with his works, on the one hand, and those who disliked them because of their ideological message, on the other. A conservative critic of Franko wrote that

“[w]hat strikes every reader of his novels in the first place, are his vivid lies: we expect to see the real world, and we see the world of Franko; we expect to see real people, and we see the people of his imagination. The heroes in Franko’s novels – be they workers, lords, priests or peasants – are not people who came from real life, they are real in a name only; their whole psychological image and their worldview are invented by the fantasy of the writer, subjectively transformed”.⁵⁵

Some of Franko’s followers agreed with these words, too. But they considered his digression from reality to be not a flaw, but rather a positive value: since his heroes were not “deeply rooted” in the local reality, they attained a universal human dimension. “With a few exceptions, – wrote a sympathetic Ukrainian critic from the Russian Empire, – we are encountering not Galician Ruthenians, but simply human beings; any of Franko’s Ruthenian characters could be taken for a Ukrainian, for a Russian, for a Pole, for an Italian – whoever you wanted him to be!”⁵⁶ This thought was reiterated by the Polish positivist Stanisław Wasilewski: in his opinion, Franko’s heroes were not “Ruthenians, Poles, or Jews [...] – [...] just ignorant and suffering people”.⁵⁷

4. The second transformation (1896) and its long-terms impact

The congruency between Franko’s ideal community and his reading public is rather striking: both were multiethnic in their structure and progressive in their ideology. They looked like a later edition of the Habsburg Enlightenment project to create “civilized Galicians”, albeit placed in a socialist and positivist framework. This idyll did not, however, last long. The first cracks became visible by the early 1890s. While still working at the local left liberal Polish newspaper “Kurjer Lwowski”, Franko complained that it was becoming more nationalist and more attuned to the Polish nobility. The development of the socialist movement led to the emergence of not one, but two separate socialist parties – the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical (1890) and the Polish Social Democratic Party (1892). Franko was a leader of the former, and in this capacity he criticized leaders of the latter for their alleged snobbish attitude towards the Galician Ruthenian peasants. Until the mid-1890s, the mood of mutual solidarity prevailed, but mutual resentments were strong on both sides. The

55 Zorya 11 (1 (13) chervnya 1887) p. 194.

56 A. Khvanko [Ahatanhel Krymsky], [Review], V poti chola. Obrazky z zhytia robuchoho liudu. Napysav Ivan Franko. Lviv 1890, in: Zorya 12 (1891) p. 77.

57 Biblioteka Narodowa w Warszawie, Wydział zbiorów specjalnych, mikrofilmy. II, 67675, pp. 83–84, 90.

growing antagonism finally led Franko to the bitter conclusion that “as things stand, the Polish social democrats are our worst enemies”.⁵⁸

The fatal blow, however, came from Vienna. In the mid-1890s, Galicia became the focus of all-Habsburg political debate. This was caused by the appointment of former Galician governor Count Stefan Badeni to a position of President-minister of Austro-Hungary. To get a majority in the Reichstag, Badeni created an alliance of Polish and Czech parliamentary deputies. The prize was the introduction of Czech as an official language in Bohemia and Moravia. This move provoked strong resistance of German speaking bureaucrats in those two provinces and vociferous protest of German nationalists everywhere. On the other hand, Badeni’s conservative politics raised a wave of criticism from the Austrian Social Democrats who demanded his resignation. For a while, the Badeni case revived the discourse of Polish economy.⁵⁹

Around this time Franko was approached by *Die Zeit*, the leading Austrian liberal magazine, to become its Galician correspondent. His earlier attempts to contribute to Viennese magazines failed, and for a long time he remained unknown to German language readers. But by the mid-1890s the situation had changed: by then Franko had achieved a doctorate from the University of Vienna (1892–1893) and established numerous connections within the Viennese intellectual and political elite. Gradually he won a reputation of “best connoisseur of Galician relations” and “a master story teller”.⁶⁰ Both *Die Zeit* and Franko profited from their cooperation: *Die Zeit* received masterly written accounts of Polish politics in Galicia, and Franko made himself a solid reputation among the German reading public.

One contribution put him in the center of a large international scandal that abruptly ended his Polish connections. It was an article “Ein Dichter des Verrathes” (A Poet of Treason) published in *Die Zeit* in May 1897.⁶¹ The article strove to explain the double standards of the Polish elite who, on the one hand, complained about the oppression of Poles, and, on the other, had no qualms about oppressing the Galician Ruthenians. Franko saw the origins of that hypocrisy in the spiritual impact of Adam Mickiewicz. In his interpretation, it was the Polish poet who raised hypocrisy to the status of heroism, if practiced in the name of national interests. Ever since works by Mickiewicz were introduced into Galician school curricula, the Polish youth had been exposed to moral corruption.

The article was written in the context of the recent Viennese events, as another attack on Badeni and Polish politics.⁶² Its effect superseded, however, the original

58 Tsentralnyi Derzhavnyi Istroychnyi Arkhiv u Lvovi, f. 663, op.1, spr. 179, ark. 1.

59 H. Orłowski, “Polnische Wirtschaft”. Nowoczesny niemiecki dyskurs o Polsce, Olsztyn 1998, p. 306.

60 Quoted after E. Winter and P. Kirchner (eds.), Ivan Franko, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur der Ukraine. Ausgewählte deutsche Schriften des revolutionären Demokraten, 1882–1915, Berlin 1963, pp. 458, 460.

61 I. Franko, Ein Dichter des Verrathes, in: *Die Zeit*, 11, 136 (8. Mai 1897), pp. 86–89.

62 Franko knew Badeni’s politics from first-hand experience: Badeni prohibited Franko to get a professor position and harassed him as a candidate at the local elections from the Ruthenian-

intention. It was the time when the Poles finally got authorization from the Russian authority to build a monument to Mickiewicz in Warsaw, and were raising funds for that purpose. The Russian and Polish translations of Franko's article were published in Warsaw.⁶³ Many patriotic Poles regarded the as a political denunciation that worked into the hands of the Russian government. In Lviv, Franko was attacked and harassed. A straw man with an inscription "This is the way Franko will perish" was hanged in the front of Franko's house. The article almost cost him his life when a young Polish student shot at him, but luckily missed.

This failed attempt on Franko's life was the first case of political terrorism in Galicia. It symbolized a shift to politics in "a sharper key", similar to the developments in Vienna. It led to escalation of ethnic violence, until it culminated into the Polish-Ukrainian war in Galicia in 1918–1919. The 1897 incident put an end to his, as Franko later called it, "Polish employment" (*najmy u susidiv*). He was fired from *Kurjer Lwowski*: on the next day after the publication of his "Dichter des Verrathes", all his Polish colleagues demonstratively left the office as Franko entered, and then one of them returned to announce to him that "you do not work here anymore". He ceased publishing in Polish – or, rather the Polish periodicals stopped publishing his works. Since then, in the eyes of the Polish public, Franko acquired a lasting reputation of a Ukrainian chauvinist and a Polonophobe.⁶⁴

The incident was but one event among many that led him to rethink his ideological tenets. Since the Polish-Ukrainian national conflict affected the milieu of Galician socialists, reconciliation between socialism and nationalism seemed no longer possible. One had to make a choice of one over the other. In 1899, he left the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical party, providing as an argument that he felt more Ukrainian, than socialist. Around that time, he rejected the federative ideal and came to accept the idea of Ukrainian political independence.⁶⁵ A strong impetus for this shift came from his reading of Theodor Herzl's *Judenstaat* (1896). Franko had met Herzl in Vienna, and they had several discussions on the parallels between Zionism and Ukrainian nationalism. Herzl supposedly served as a prototype for Franko when he was writing his poem "Moses" (1905).⁶⁶ This was his poetic magnum opus that glorified the future Ukrainian independence and was seen by many as his political testament.

Ukrainian Radical Party.

63 Poeta zdrady. (Ein Dichter des Verrathes). Na język polski przełożył i wydał Patryota polski. Z phzedmową wydawcy, Warszawa 1897; Poet izmeny. (Ein Dichter des Verrathes). Pervod s polskoho izdaniia, dopolnennoho predysloviem "Polskoho patryota", Varshava 1897.

64 In 1908, Franko published a text that he claimed was an unknown poem of Mickiewicz "Wielka Utrata". The text turned out to be a fake, and he was harshly criticized by Polish newspapers for – as they saw it – his clumsy attempt of reconciliation.

65 I. Franko, *Ukraina irredenta*, in: *Zhytie i slovo* 4,6 (1896) pp. 471–483; ejusd., *Państwo żydowskie*, in: *Tydzień* 10 (9. III, 1896) pp. 73–74.

66 A. Wilcher, *Ivan Franko and Theodor Herzl: To the Genesis of Franko's Mojsej*, in: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 6 (1982) pp. 233–243.

Franko's final transformation into a Ukrainian national poet was matched by a new composition of his reading public. From now on, it was mostly, if not exclusively, Ukrainian. It meant, however, that it was much smaller than before: by the most optimistic evaluation, by the end of the XIX century in the Habsburg monarchy, there were 3,000 regular readers of Franko for 30,000 families of educated Ruthenians. On average, a Ruthenian-Ukrainian book was printed in 500–1000 copies and it took no less than one to two years to sell it out. Such a lazy book market could not bring any serious profits either for a publisher, or for an author.⁶⁷ To survive, the latter had either to have additional sources of income or to write incessantly. Since the end of the XIX century and until 1930s, there existed a vicious circle in the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Galician community: the small reading market could not give birth to a professional writer, and the lack of professional writers could not stimulate any significant growth of the reading public. Franko was the only exception as a successful professional writer⁶⁸, but his success had its flip side: he had to write non-stop, without having too much opportunity for rethinking and rewriting. On a personal level, this kept exhausting his physical and psychological health, until he mentally collapsed in 1908 as a result of a long-neglected illness. It also affected his literary activity: Franko never managed to write a large novel, as he wished to. Occasional surveys confirmed that he enjoyed the status of the most popular Ukrainian writer in Galicia. But quite often he was read out of a sense of "[national] duty" rather than for pleasure. During his last days and long after his death the Galician Ruthenian-Ukrainian readers preferred foreign authors to local⁶⁹, as had been the case in Franko's days of youth.

Franko believed that his life could be different if he had free access to the reading markets of the Russian empire [48: 267]: after all, it was there, that 80–85% of the (potential) Ukrainian nation lived. The fact was, however, that the Ukrainian reading market in the Russian empire was even smaller than that of the Habsburg monarchy. First of all, the level of literacy in greater Ukrainian provinces was much lower than in Galicia; secondly, the Ukrainian language publications were banned there until 1905 and occasionally repressed until 1917.⁷⁰ And last but not least, the Russian acculturation and assimilation of Ukrainian reading public minimized the

67 Ukr.–ruska literaturna produktsyya i konsumtsyya, in: *Literaturno-Naukovy Vistnyk* 2, 6 (cherven 1899) p. 188.

68 I. Svietsitsky, *Deshcho pro nauku, literaturu i mystetstvo Halytskoi Ukrainy Za ostannikh 40 lit*, in: *Dilo* 10 (14 sichnia 1928) p. 15.

69 I. Hrytsak, *Vybrani ukrainoznavchi pratsi*, *Peremyshl* 2002, pp. 416–418.

70 Franko personally had a long and complicated record with the Russian censorship – see: *Tsarskaia tsenzura o proizvedeniiakh pisatel'ia I. Franka. Vvodnaya stat'ia Polianskoi*, in: *Krasnyi arkhiv* 1 (98) (1940) pp. 263–277; I. Kurylenko, *Zaborona tvoriv I. Franka tsarskoiu tsenzuroiu. Podav...*, in: *Radianske literaturoznavstvo* 1 (1959) pp. 137–141; H. Pavlenko, *Ivan Franko i tsarska tsenzura (90-i rr. XIX st.)*, in: *Ukrainske literaturoznavstvo. Respublikanskyi Mizhvidomchyi Zbirnyk. Ivan Franko. Statti i materialy* 26, Lviv 1976, pp. 23–30; Ivan Franko i tsarska tsenzura (1909–1914 rr.), in: *Carpathica-Karpatyka*. 6, Uzhhorod 1999, pp. 204–209.

attraction of Ukrainian literature compared to the Russian *belles lettres*.⁷¹ As a result, the Ukrainian reading market in the Russian empire served as an addendum to the Galician reading public, not vice versa.⁷²

The general balance changed dramatically after the revolution in the Russian empire, which brought about, among other things, the creation of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet republic in 1922. The first decade of Soviet power in Ukraine was marked by the politics of Ukrainization – and that meant extensive publication of classic Ukrainian literature. In the 1920–1930s, Franko's works were published in numbers of copies, ranging from 3,000 to 30,000; in several cases, the numbers reached 100,000–200,000. The modest scope of Galician publications could not stand any comparison. After the World War II, when Galicia was incorporated into the Soviet Ukraine, the maximum of copies increased to 350,000.⁷³ For sure, Franko's legacy was selected and censored for the purposes of Communist propaganda; some of his works, like *Der Dichter des Verrathes* or his appraisal for Theoder Herzl, were never published or even mentioned.

Both the Soviet ideologists and the Ukrainian diaspora in North America, each for their particular reasons, put special efforts into translating and publicizing Franko outside of Soviet Ukraine. There is, however, no evidence of any authentic interests among non-Ukrainians. Already in the 1920s, few years after his death and the collapse of the Habsburg monarchy, he was virtually unknown in the post-Habsburg states.⁷⁴

5. Conclusion

The idea that nation-making is heavily dependent on international context is not new.⁷⁵ So far the studies of East European nationalisms along these lines focused on

71 O. Andriewsky, *The Politics of National Identity: The Ukrainian Question in Russia, 1904–1912* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1991), p. 193; I. Malaniuk, *Knyha sposterezhen. Proza*, Toronto 1962, p. 12.

72 It made a contrast to the Polish case: even after the introduction of Galician autonomy, Warsaw retained the status of capital of Polish printing production = see fn. 31 above. The Galician Ruthenian Ukrainian patriots confessed in 1880s that they would be extremely happy if the whole Russian Ukraine published at least half of what Warsaw did ([O. Barvinsky], *Ohliad slovesnoi pratsi avstriiyskykh Rusyniv za rik 1881*, in: *Dilo 1* (January 2 (12) 1882) p. 4.

73 Moroz (ed.), *Ivan Franko. Bibliohrafiya tvoriv (1874–1964)*, passim.

74 Y. Hordynsky, *Suchasne Frankozanvstvo (1916–1932)*, *Zapysky NTSh*, 153 (1933), p. 85; M. Kosiécka, Zofia Zydanowicz, *Iwan Franko w Polsce do 1953*. Maszynopis. Biblioteka Narodowa. Zakład Informacji Naukowej, Warsaw n.d.; M. Mohoz (ed.), *Zarubizhne Frankoznavstvo. Bibliohrafichnyi pokazchychk*, Lviv 1997.

75 For a classic statement: L. Greenfeld, *Nationalism. Five Roads to Modernity*, Cambridge, MA, London, 1992. For the Ukrainian case: R. Szporluk, *Ukraine: From an Imperial Periphery to a Sovereign State* in *ejusd.*, *Russia, Ukraine and the Breakup of the Soviet Union*, Stanford, CA 2000, pp. 361–394. Indeed, as some recent studies suggested, the international factor might be decisive for an outcome of a rivalry between various antagonistic nation-building projects – see: M. von Hagen, *The Dilemmas of Ukrainian Independence and Statehood, 1917–1921* in: *The Harriman Institute Forum* (1994). Vol.7. no.5 pp. 7–9; J.-P. Himka, "The Construction of Na-

political factors and actors: Berlin/Vienna vs. St. Petersburg, central imperial governments vs. various peripheral nationalisms, nationalisms fighting each other over contested territories. The case of Ivan Franko reveals the importance of the cultural dimension: political divisions might be stronger than geographical borders, but emerging cultural spaces trump both.

The emphasis on culture allows to see the spaces that were largely ignored in politics-oriented studies. The first such space was the German cultural space. In the East European context, the XIX century might well have been “German” given the dominant international status of German culture. It was reflected, among other things, in high numbers of German-language journals and German-speaking professors in both the Habsburg and Romanov monarchies (see table). Local writers, scholars and artists willy-nilly sought to emulate German standards. By doing so, quite often they relegated their cultural production to a status of second-rate and provincial copies of what was being done in Berlin, Vienna and other centers of German culture. Within the German context, local nation-buildings could flourish or not – but because of its cosmopolitan character, the German culture did not create a space inspiring enough for the emergence of exclusive national identities.

The second space is that of Rus. Rus referred largely to the a-national, deeply traditional and vaguely defined world of Eastern Christianity. To use the Benedict Anderson’s terms, it was very much like a sacred society rather than a modern national imagined community. If normally, the making of one nation was the unmaking of other(s), the making of modern Belarusian, Russian and Ukrainian nations meant also the unmaking of Rus. A crucial factor of such unmaking was the emergence of a secularized modern culture that could challenge traditional and religious values. The emerging modern Ukrainian culture that combined radical ideologies of nationalism and socialism (Shevchenko cum Marx) presented exactly that sort of culture. In the words of a Galician Russophile and Franko’s opponent,

“Ukrainian identity [=Українізм] is a result of a new trend in the spiritual life of Europe which grew slowly, starting from the second half of the XVIII century, from West to East until it reached Russia and made a revolution in the worldviews of the educated classes of the Russian people. In the field of science, it gave birth to empiricism, in belles letters – to realism, and in political and social relations – to the idea of personal liberty and equality of all people”.⁷⁶

tionality in Galician Rus’: Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions”, in: R. G. Suny and M. D. Kennedy (eds.), *Intellectuals and Articulation of the Nation*, Ann Arbor 1999, pp. 109–164; ejsd., J.-P. Himka, *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine. The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement in Galicia, 1867–1900*, Montreal & Kingston, London, Ithaca 1999.

76 Svystun, *Op. cit.*, p. 24.

My claim is that before 1914, nowhere else the concept of Rus was radically unmade as in the Habsburg Galicia. This unmaking occurred as Galicia underwent a radical transformation from a provincial part of the largely cosmopolitan German space to a leading center of the national(izing) Polish space. As Franko's biography amply testified, Ukrainian nationalism was strongly affected by this transformation. It became more sophisticated and articulate on the one hand, and more exclusive, on the other. The price Franko paid for becoming a Ukrainian national poet was total oblivion of his former international status. Try googling "Franko+Galicia", and the search engine will immediately ask: "Did you mean: Franco+Galicia"?⁷⁷

⁷⁷ Last checked March 16, 2007. For a further comparison: the combination "*Franko+Galicia*" gives 19,100 entries, while "*Franco+Galicia*" opens up a stream of 1,240,000 entries.