



JOHN-PAUL HIMKA

RELIGION
AND NATIONALITY
IN WESTERN UKRAINE

The Greek Catholic Church
and the Ruthenian National Movement
in Galica, 1867-1900

Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine
The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement
in Galicia, 1867–1900

The Greek Catholic Church has been described as a hybrid of eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism that combines the heritage of Byzantine Christianity with submission to the Roman Papacy. The eastern and western elements of the church have often collided, but perhaps never so dramatically as in the province of Galicia in the late nineteenth century.

Using Soviet archival materials declassified in the 1980s, John-Paul Himka examines a period during which the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia was involved in a protracted, and at times bitter, struggle to maintain its distinctive, historically developed rites and customs. He focuses on the way differing concepts of Ruthenian nationality affected the perception and course of church affairs while showing the influence of local ecclesiastical matters on the development and acceptance of these divergent concepts of nationality.

The implications and complications of the Galician imbroglio are engagingly explained in this latest addition to Himka's work on nationality in late nineteenth-century Galicia. His analysis of the relationship between the church and the national movement is a valuable addition to the study of religion and national movements in East Europe and beyond.

JOHN-PAUL HIMKA is professor of history and classics, University of Alberta.

McGILL-QUEEN'S STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION

Volumes in the McGill-Queen's Studies in the History of Religion have been supported by the Jackman Foundation of Toronto.

SERIES ONE

G.A. Rawlyk, Editor

- 1 Small Differences
Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants, 1815–1922
An International Perspective
Donald Harman Akenson
- 2 Two Worlds
The Protestant Culture of Nineteenth-Century Ontario
William Westfall
- 3 An Evangelical Mind
Nathanael Burwash and the Methodist Tradition in Canada, 1839–1918
Marguerite Van Die
- 4 The Dévotes
Women and Church in Seventeenth-Century France
Elizabeth Rapley
- 5 The Evangelical Century
College and Creed in English Canada from the Great Revival to the Great Depression
Michael Gauvreau
- 6 The German Peasants' War and Anabaptist Community of Goods
James M. Stayer
- 7 A World Mission
Canadian Protestantism and the Quest for a New International Order, 1918–1939
Robert Wright
- 8 Serving the Present Age
Revivalism, Progressivism, and the Methodist Tradition in Canada
Phyllis D. Airhart
- 9 A Sensitive Independence
Canadian Methodist Women Missionaries in Canada and the Orient, 1881–1925
Rosemary R. Gagan
- 10 God's Peoples
Covenant and Land in South Africa, Israel, and Ulster
Donald Harman Akenson
- 11 Creed and Culture
The Place of English-Speaking Catholics in Canadian Society, 1750–1930
Terrence Murphy and Gerald Stortz, editors
- 12 Piety and Nationalism
Lay Voluntary Associations and the Creation of an Irish-Catholic Community in Toronto, 1850–1895
Brian P. Clarke

- 13 *Amazing Grace*
Studies in Evangelicalism in Australia, Britain, Canada, and the United States
George Rawlyk and Mark A. Noll, editors
- 14 *Children of Peace*
W. John McIntyre
- 15 *A Solitary Pillar*
Montreal's Anglican Church and the Quiet Revolution
Joan Marshall
- 16 *Padres in No Man's Land*
Canadian Chaplains and the Great War
Duff Crerar
- 17 *Christian Ethics and Political Economy in North America*
A Critical Analysis of U.S. and Canadian Approaches
P. Travis Kroeker
- 18 *Pilgrims in Lotus Land*
Conservative Protestantism in British Columbia, 1917–1981
Robert K. Burkinshaw
- 19 *Through Sunshine and Shadow*
The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Evangelicalism, and Reform in Ontario,
1874–1930
Sharon Cook
- 20 *Church, College, and Clergy*
A History of Theological Education at Knox College, Toronto, 1844–1994
Brian J. Fraser
- 21 *The Lord's Dominion*
The History of Canadian Methodism
Neil Semple
- 22 *A Full-Orbed Christianity*
The Protestant Churches and Social Welfare in Canada, 1900–1940
Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau
- 23 *Evangelism and Apostasy*
The Evolution and Impact of Evangelicals in Modern Mexico
Kurt Bowen
- 24 *The Chignecto Covenanters*
A Regional History of Reformed Presbyterianism in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia,
1827 to 1905
Eldon Hay
- 25 *Methodists and Women's Education in Ontario, 1836–1925*
Johanna M. Selles
- 26 *Puritanism and Historical Controversy*
William Lamont

SERIES TWO

In memory of George Rawlyk
Donald Harman Akenson, Editor

Marguerite Bourgeoys and Montreal, 1640-1665
Patricia Simpson

Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience
Edited by G.A. Rawlyk

Infinity, Faith, and Time
Christian Humanism and Renaissance Literature
John Spencer Hill

The Contribution of Presbyterianism to the Maritime Provinces of Canada
Charles H.H. Scobie and G.A. Rawlyk, editors

Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine
The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement in Galicia,
1867-1900
John-Paul Himka

Religion and Nationality
in Western Ukraine

*The Greek Catholic Church
and the Ruthenian National Movement
in Galicia, 1867–1900*

JOHN-PAUL HIMKA

McGill-Queen's University Press
Montreal & Kingston · London · Ithaca

© McGill-Queen's University Press 1999
ISBN 0-7735-1812-6

Legal deposit second quarter 1999
Bibliothèque nationale du Québec

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Humanities and Social Sciences Federation of Canada, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

McGill-Queen's University Press acknowledges the financial support of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program for its activities.

We also acknowledge the support of the Canada Council for the Arts for our publishing program.

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Himka, John-Paul, 1949–
Religion and nationality in Western Ukraine:
the Greek Catholic Church and Ruthenian
National Movement in Galicia, 1867–1900
(McGill-Queen's studies in the history
of religion)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7735-1812-6

1. Catholic Church – Byzantine rite, Ukrainian – Galicia (Poland and Ukraine) – History.
2. Nationalism – Galicia (Poland and Ukraine) – History – 19th century. 3. Nationalism – Galicia (Poland and Ukraine) – Religious aspects – Catholic Church.

I. Title. II. Series.

BX4711.622.H54 1999 281'.5 C98-901001-5

This book was typeset by Typo Litho
Composition Inc. in 10/12 Palatino.

*For my parents,
John and Cecilia Himka*

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations / xi

Acknowledgments / xv

List of Abbreviations / xix

Illustrations / xxi

INTRODUCTION

Thematic Perspectives / 3

The Greek Catholic Church / 5

The Ruthenians and Their National Movement / 8

Galicja / 12

The Chronological Limits: 1867–1900 / 13

Historiography / 14

Archival Sources / 19

Technical Matters / 20

PART I: 1866–1881

“A Glimpse into the Future” / 23

The Canonization of Iosafat Kuntsevych and
Its Reception in Galicja / 28

Mykhail Kuzemsky, Bishop of Chelm / 32

The Conflict in Przemyśl / 42

The Appointment of a New Metropolitan of Halych / 44

The Appointment of Ioann Stupnytsky
as Bishop of Przemyśl / 47

The <i>Sion</i> Circle / 49
The National Populists and the Church / 51
The St George Program of 1871 / 54
Improving the People, Serving the Nation / 56
The Conversion of Chelm Eparchy to Orthodoxy / 57
Three-Barred Crosses and Kolpaks / 64
The Resurrectionists / 67
PART II: 1882–1900
A: Crisis and Intervention / 73
Hnylychky and the Treason Trial / 73
The Reform of the Basilian Order / 79
The Resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych / 84
The Excommunication of Father Ioann Naumovych / 94
The Erection of Stanyslaviv Eparchy / 98
The Lviv Provincial Synod of 1891 / 101
Other Measures / 121
Bishops / 125
Andrei Sheptytsky as Bishop of Stanyslaviv / 130
B: Ruthenian National Politics and the Church / 135
The Politics of Sylvestr Sembratovych / 135
Russophilism and National Populism / 138
Radicalism / 149
Pastoral Activity and the National Movement / 158
CONCLUSIONS / 163
Appendix: Chronology, December 1881 to November 1882 / 169
Notes / 171
Bibliography / 217
Index / 231

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- 1 St George's Cathedral, Lviv. Postcard from the author's collection.
- 2 Metropolitan Spyrydon Lytvynovych. From Hryhor Luzhnyts'kyi, *Ukrains'ka tserkva mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom. Narys istorii ukrains'koi tserkvy* (Philadelphia: Nakladom Soiuzu ukraintsiv-katolykiv "Provydinnia," 1954), 518.
- 3 Iosafat Kuntsevych (from Jac. Susza, *Cursus vitae et certamen martyrii B. Josaphat*, 1665). From M.M. Solovii and A.H. Velykyi, *Sviatyi Iosafat Kuntsevych. Ioho zhyttia i doba*, *Ukrains'ka dukhovna biblioteka* (Toronto: Vydavnytstvo oo. Vasyliian, 1967), plate facing p. 416.
- 4 Bishop Mykhail Kuzemsky. From LNB, *Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).
- 5 The Greek Catholic cathedral in Chelm. From [N.I. Petrov,] *Kholm-skaia Rus'. Istoricheskiiia sud'by Russkago Zabuzh'ia* (St Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1887), 45.
- 6 Canon Hryhorii Shashkevych. From LNB, *Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).
- 7 Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky wearing a klobuk (1906). From Cyrille Charon (C.P. Karalevskiy), *Le quinzième Centenaire de S. Jean Chrysostome (407-1907) et ses conséquences pour l'action catholique dans l'Orient gréco-slave* (Rome: Collège pontifical grec, 1909), plate facing p. 306.
- 8 Canon Antonii Iuzychynsky. From LNB, *Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).
- 9 Canon Mykhail Malynovsky. From LNB, *Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).

- 10 Father Markell Popel, administrator of Chełm eparchy. From [N.I. Petrov,] *Kholmśkaia Rus'. Istoricheskiia sud'by Russkago Zabuzh'ia* (St Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1887), 209.
- 11 Three-barred cross on the grave of Markiiian Shashkevych, Lviv, erected in the 1890s. From Stanisław Śławomir Nicieja, *Cmentarz Łyczakowski we Lwowie w latach 1786–1986*, 2nd, rev. ed. (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1990), 27.
- 12 Father Ioann Naumovych wearing a kolpak (1863). From O.A. Monchalovskii, *Zhyt'e i diiatel'nost' Ivana Naumovycha*, Izdaniie polytychnoho Obshchestva "Russkaia rada" vo L'vovi (Lviv: Iz typohrafii Stavropyhiiskoho Instytutu, 1899), 38.
- 13 Father Stefan Kachala. From LNB, Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, *Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).
- 14 Protohegumen Klymentii Sarnytsky. From Hryhor Luzhnyts'kyi, *Ukrains'ka tserkva mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom. Narys istorii ukrains'koi tserkvy* (Philadelphia: Nakladom Soiuzu ukraintsiv-katolykiv "Provydinnia," 1954), 527.
- 15 Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych. From LNB, Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, *Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).
- 16 Father Ioann Naumovych. From LNB, Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, *Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).
- 17 Father Ioann Naumovych (1882). From O.A. Monchalovskii, *Zhyt'e i diiatel'nost' Ivana Naumovycha*, Izdaniie polytychnoho Obshchestva "Russkaia rada" vo L'vovi (Lviv: Iz typohrafii Stavropyhiiskoho Instytutu, 1899), 72.
- 18 Bishop Iuliiian Pelesh. From LNB, Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, *Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).
- 19 Isydor Sharanevych. From LNB, Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, *Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).
- 20 Metropolitan Sylvestr Sembratovych. From LNB, Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, *Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).

- 21 Metropolitan Iuliiian Sas-Kuilovsky. From LNB, *Viddil rukopysiv, Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, Materialy do biohrafich-noho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).
- 22 Andrei Sheptytsky, bishop of Stanyslaviv. From Gregor Prokoptschuk, *Metropolit Andreas Graf Scheptyckyj: Leben und Wirken des grossen Förderers der Kirchenunion*, 2nd ed. (Munich: Verlag Ukraine, 1967), 102.
- 23 Mykhailo Drahomanov. From Mykhailo Drahomanov, *Vybrani tvory. Zbirka politychnykh tvoriv z prymitkamy*, ed. Pavlo Bohats'kyi (Prague, New York: Nakladom Ukrain's'kykh postupovykh tovarystv v Amerytsi, 1937), 161.
- 24 Ivan Franko. From Mykhailo Drahomanov, *Vybrani tvory. Zbirka politychnykh tvoriv z prymitkamy*, ed. Pavlo Bohats'kyi (Prague, New York: Nakladom Ukrain's'kykh postupovykh tovarystv v Amerytsi, 1937), 113.
- 25 Mykhailo Pavlyk. From Mykhailo Drahomanov, *Vybrani tvory. Zbirka politychnykh tvoriv z prymitkamy*, ed. Pavlo Bohats'kyi (Prague, New York: Nakladom Ukrain's'kykh postupovykh tovarystv v Amerytsi, 1937), 113.
- 26 The Greek Catholic eparchies in Eastern Galicia and Bukovina (with the seats of deaneries), 1900. Adapted from John-Paul Himka, *Galicia and Bukovina: A Research Handbook about Western Ukraine, Late 19th and 20th Centuries*, Historic Sites Service, Occasional Paper, 20 ([Edmonton]: Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism, Historic Resources Division, 1990), 23.
- 27 The counties of Eastern Galicia, 1868. Adapted from John-Paul Himka, *Galicia and Bukovina: A Research Handbook about Western Ukraine, Late 19th and 20th Centuries*, Historic Sites Service, Occasional Paper, 20 ([Edmonton]: Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism, Historic Resources Division, 1990), 11.

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book has been long in the making, and I have accumulated a great many debts of gratitude along the way. In the first place I would like to thank the institutions that have made my research and writing possible. Above all, I am grateful to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for awarding me two generous grants that allowed me to consult the major archival and library collections in North America and Europe and to begin writing. Without SSHRC's sustained support (1984–87, 1991–93) this book could not have been written. I also have to single out for thanks the University of Alberta, which has fostered this work in many ways. Not only has the university provided me with study leave, course relief, and grants for travel and for the acquisition of photocopies of archival sources, but in 1994–95 it awarded me a McCalla Research Professorship, which freed me for one year from pedagogical and administrative duties and allowed me to focus on this book and bring it to completion.

I must also thank the National Endowment for the Humanities, which in 1990 gave me a travel grant to consult sources in Poland, and the International Research and Exchanges Board, which funded my last research trip to Ukraine in 1996. Several times the Harvard University Ukrainian Studies Fund and the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies paid for my travel to conferences abroad, where I was able also to do research for this study.

My first lessons in the themes of this book came from my teachers at St Basil's in Stamford, Connecticut, particularly Fathers Theodore Humanitzki, Lubomyr Husar, Leon Mosko, and Peter Skrincosky and Professor Wasył Lencyk. While working on the book at the University of Alberta, I benefited immensely from discussions with my colleagues at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, particularly Drs Serhy Plokhii and Frank Sysyn. My colleagues in the Department of History and Classics provided me with a supportive and intellectually stimulating atmosphere in which to work; I would particularly like to thank the chair of the department, Dr David Hall, for facilitating this project. While working on this book, I spent a year as a visiting professor in the history department at Harvard (1989–90); I was

able to make use of that university's excellent library and present some of my initial findings in the seminar at the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute; I am grateful to Dr Edward Keenan, then chair of the Department of History, and to Dr George G. Grabowicz, then director of the Ukrainian Research Institute. I am in debt, too, to the staffs of the many archives and libraries in which I worked, but I would like to make special mention of the cooperation I was given by the staff of the Central State Historical Archive in Lviv and by its director, Orest Masiuk.

I am privileged to number among my friends an outstanding historian of the Ukrainian and Belarusian churches, Sister Sophia Senyk. She helped me make the most of my research visits to Rome, discussed with me in person and by correspondence many points connected with Ukrainian church history and the Ukrainian religious heritage, commented on drafts, and encouraged my work. Her writings on church history have opened my eyes many times, and her confidence in my work was a continual source of fortification.

Many other individuals have helped me along the way, notably, but not exclusively, my graduate student Richard Bobier, who read and commented on the text; my cousin Vasyl Bubnii of Lviv, who patiently indexed microfilmed copies of newspapers; Father Roman Cholij, who read and commented on an earlier draft of the section on the Lviv synod of 1891; Lydia Dugbazah, graduate secretary in the Department of History and Classics at the University of Alberta, who skilfully prepared the final typescript; my niece Natalka Freeland, then a graduate student at Yale and now a professor at the University of Alberta, who made detailed summaries of some important documents; Dr Andrij Hornjatkevyč, of the University of Alberta, whose erudition and *dobrozychlyvist'* came in handy; Edward Kasinec, chief of the Slavic and Baltic Division of the New York Public Library, who provided invaluable research guidance; Dr Andrii Krawchuk, then of the Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies, who shared his sources and ideas on Galician church history with me; Taras Litkovets, who transcribed portions of Father Ioann Nehrebetsky's correspondence; Joe Parrottino of Bar Teca, whose coffee and conversation periodically revived me during the sleepy afternoons; Alan Rutkowski, Slavic acquisitions librarian at the University of Alberta, who not only ordered whatever I requested, but graciously listened to my frequent disquisitions on the themes of this book; Dr Franz Szabo, formerly of Carleton and now of the University of Alberta, to whom I owe much of what I know of Austria and Austrian sources; Oleh Turii, of the Institute of Historical Studies in Lviv, who provided me with some emergency photocopies in the

final phase of writing; and Dr Andrzej Zięba, of Jagiellonian University in Cracow, whose bibliographical suggestions were welcome. Two anonymous reviewers for McGill-Queen's University Press offered valuable advice on improving the work. Among those at the press who have been particularly helpful are the editor, D.H. Aken-son, and the coordinating editor, Joan McGilvray.

In this book, as in all my undertakings, I have been able to rely on the love, support, and comradeship of Chrystia Chomiak. She has lived through this book with me, listened to the accounts of my little discoveries late into the night, offered her own perceptive insights, and understood and adjusted to the changes in my perspective that the work precipitated. I have been very fortunate.

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABGK	Archiwum Biskupstwa grecko-katolickiego w Przemyślu
Adm. Registr.	Administrative Registratur
ANV	Archivio della Nunziatura di Vienna
APPrz	Archiwum Państwowe w Przemyślu
ASV	Archivio Segreto Vaticano
F.	Fach
f.	fond
Fasz.	Faszikel
GA	Gesandtschaftsarchiv
HHSA	Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv
K.	Karton
L	Liasse
LNB	L'vivs'ka Naukova Biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy
N.S.	New Style
NTsh	Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka
O.S.	Old Style
PA	Politisches Archiv
RV	Rom-Vatikan
spr.	sprava
TSDIAL	Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy u m. L'vovi

This page intentionally left blank



St George's Cathedral, Lviv



Metropolitan Spyrydon Lytvynovych

Iosafat Kuntsevych (from Jac. Susza,
Cursus vitae et certamen martyrii
B. Josaphat, 1665)





Bishop Mykhail Kuzemsky



The Greek Catholic cathedral in Chełm



Canon Hryhorii Shashkevych



Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky
wearing a klobuk (1906)



Canon Antonii Iuzhynsky



Canon Mykhail Malynovsky



Father Markell Popel,
administrator of
Chelm eparchy



Three-barred cross on the grave of Markkian Shashkevych, Lviv, erected in the 1890s



Father Ioann Naumovych wearing a kolpak (1863)



Father Stefan Kachala



Protohegumen Klymentii Sarnytsky



Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych



Father Ioann Naumovych



Father Ioann Naumovych (1882)



Bishop Iulian Pelesh



Isydor Sharanevych



Metropolitan Sylvestr Sembratovych



Metropolitan Iuliiian Sas-Kuilovsky



Andrei Sheptytsky, bishop of
Stanyslaviv

Mykhailo Drahomanov



Ivan Franko



Mykhailo Pavlyk

Note: Brezcz, Dukla, Kańczuga, Krosno, and Muszyna (the seats of deaneries in Przemyśl eparchy) were located in Western Galicia and therefore do not appear on this map



The Greek Catholic eparchies in Eastern Galicia and Bukovina (with the seats of deaneries), 1900



The counties of Eastern Galicia, 1868

*Religion and Nationality
in Western Ukraine*

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

Thematic Perspectives

On one level, this book is intended to provide material for understanding a theoretical question: What is the relation between religion and nationality? I have taken a particular case – that of a people who called themselves *rusyny*, who fell under the jurisdiction of the metropolis of Halych of the Greek Catholic church and lived in the Austrian province of Galicia in the late nineteenth century – and examined how the confessional structure influenced the construction of their nationality and the development of their national movement as well as how their nationality and national movement influenced their religious life. The case is set in a region where the intersection of religion and nationality has long been of unusual importance, namely East Central Europe, in a province so peculiar and among a people so individual that it may be regarded as typical for this complex and variegated part of the world. I undertook the book with this large puzzle of the interrelationship of religion and nationality in East Central Europe foremost in mind.

But as the book developed, another, much more “Rankean” level emerged. I realized that in addressing my more theoretically informed questions, I was telling a story that was virtually unknown. As I put together fragments from church archives in Rome, Lviv, and Przemyśl, from government archives in Vienna and Lviv, and from the Ruthenian and Polish press, I saw that a picture was coming into focus that perhaps no one had seen in all its complexity before. I had before me the Vatican documents that the archbishop of Lviv had never seen, the internal eparchial chancery documents that the political authorities had never been able to consult, the letters of ministers and dispatches of ambassadors and nuncios that were never shown to the people whose fate they decided, the articles in provincial newspapers that important decision makers could not be bothered about. I found the story of the Greek Catholic church in Galicia during the late nineteenth century to be of increasing intrinsic interest, not merely as

an instrument for exploring some other question. The other question – the interrelationship of nationality and religion – continued to inform the basic selection of material, but I interpreted this question generously, to allow plenty of space for construction of the Rankean level.

In conjunction with this, questions of civil and ecclesiastical *Hochpolitik* began to occupy more of the narrative than I had originally envisioned. This did not result in a distancing from the original set of problems I had set out to investigate. Instead, it provided a fuller framework for the exploration of the link between religion and nationality. The Austrian state and the papacy were very interested in the link between nationality and religion. For them the link was a practical, not a theoretical, concern, and hence the appraisals of the situation that one finds in ministerial and curial memoranda are often acute and revealing. Moreover, these two institutions intervened decisively in the religious-national nexus of Galicia, modifying it and reorienting it in accordance with their own interests. Therefore, to relegate the *Hochpolitik* to the background would have impoverished this study.

I kept a number of readers in mind when writing this book. I imagined, first of all, an ideal reader, one who might already have had some familiarity with my other experiments in the Galician laboratory and who was now willing to follow me into an exploration of the connection between religion and nationality. The more impatient of this category of reader might find the detail of this study daunting rather than enriching. I would recommend that they turn instead to some of my articles, where the points are made more sharply, with more of an eye to theoretical generalization.¹ For the reader who enjoys the savour of complexity and the nuances of historical situations and who is interested in the problem of religion and nationality's intersection, the present book should serve well enough.

I also wrote this book for those who have an interest in Greek Catholicism. I imagine that the clergy and educated faithful of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic church, in Europe and the Americas, may find this volume of considerable interest, since it concerns a formative turning point in that church's history and analyses problems that have by no means been resolved even at present, one hundred years later. Those who are interested in Eastern-rite Catholicism or Uniatism more generally may find that the issues treated here are the critical ones, even for churches that do not trace their origins to the metropolis of Halych. I hope that the book succeeds in charting out

some complicated terrain and that others will explore the same territory even more thoroughly.

The book is also meant to be a contribution to Ukrainian and East European studies. It is not a footnote to the history of the development of the Ukrainian national movement, but a substantial chapter, a chapter that has been neglected, both because it has been difficult to research and because it throws a spanner into the standard national conception.

For this book I have devised a structure different from the customary division into chapters. Following an introductory section, there are two major parts, divided on the basis of chronology, with the crisis of 1882 serving as the divide. Part I prepares the crisis, while Part II elaborates upon it and its repercussions. Part II is separated into two large thematic divisions, one treating the crisis and the interventions it provoked on the part of the Vatican and Austrian state, the other the impact of these interventions upon internal Ruthenian politics.

The Greek Catholic Church

Along most of the border zone where Western and Eastern Christianity meet, one encounters curious religious species. In Dalmatia the Roman-Slavonic (Glagolitic) liturgy has been preserved; Bosnia had its own Bogomil church before the mass conversions to Islam; and at one time or another since the end of the sixteenth century, from Križevci in Croatia through Transylvania, Transcarpathia, Galicia, Ukraine, and all the way to Vilnius and Polatsk, Uniatism has flourished. By Uniatism I mean particular churches or eparchies that retained the Greek or Eastern rite of Orthodoxy but entered into union with the Roman Catholic church.

The Greek Catholic church of Galicia was one of these. It kept its traditional Church Slavonic liturgical language, its Julian calendar, and its married parish clergy. The Greek Catholics were traditionally called Uniates or United Greeks until 1774, when the Austrian empress Maria Theresa decreed that the Uniates within her realm be called Greek Catholics to symbolize their equal status with Roman Catholics.² Although some today prefer to call the Greek Catholics of Galicia "Ukrainian Catholics," this book will refer to them by the traditional nomenclature of the Austrian period.

The Galician Greek Catholic church was descended from the Christian church established in Kyivan Rus' by Grand Prince Vladimir (Volodymyr) the Great in 988 and fostered by his son Iaroslav the Wise. The church accepted Byzantine Christianity in its Slavonic form. At the time of the Kyivan church's founding, there was as yet no formal schism between Eastern and Western Christianity, but this did occur in the year of Iaroslav the Wise's death in 1054 and the Rus' church eventually ended up on the Eastern Orthodox side of the divide. By the mid-twelfth century there were bishops in Halych, the capital of the principality of Galicia, and in Przemyśl.³ The eparchies of Halych (later transferred to Lviv) and Przemyśl remained Orthodox until the end of the seventeenth century. In 1439, by which time Galicia had passed under Polish rule, Isidore, the metropolitan of Kyiv, had accepted the Florentine union with the Roman church, but this did not take root, either in Galicia or in the other lands of Rus'. In 1595–96 the majority of Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian) Orthodox hierarchs in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth accepted union with the Roman Catholic church (the Union of Brest), creating the Ruthenian Uniate church. In Galicia, however, even though it too was in the commonwealth, the union was rejected. Only after the Cossack revolt of the mid-seventeenth century, when Poland strove to bring its Ukrainian territories under firmer control, was the church union implanted into Galicia: Przemyśl eparchy accepted it in 1692 and Lviv eparchy in 1700,⁴ although there were Orthodox holdouts in the territory of the latter eparchy (the Stauropegial Brotherhood in Lviv accepted the union in 1708; the Maniava Skete never accepted the union, but Emperor Joseph II dissolved it in 1786).

The Uniate church in Galicia was transformed after the first partition of Poland in 1772, when the territory of Galicia passed under Austrian rule. The enlightened absolutists Maria Theresa (1740–80) and her son Joseph II (co-ruler since 1765; sole ruler 1780–90) reformed the church thoroughly. Of their many reforms in this regard, two in particular stand out. First, they decreed that the Greek Catholic seminarians receive a formal higher education, and they set up institutions in Vienna and Lviv to achieve this goal. Hitherto, aspiring priests had learned most of what they knew from their fathers, who were generally priests themselves. The enlightened absolutists' educational reform had a profound secular consequence for the Ruthenian faithful of the Greek Catholic church, for within a generation an educated stratum suddenly appeared among the Ruthenian population. The educated priests became the first Ruthenian national awakeners in Galicia and the leaders of the Ruthenian political movement in 1848; their

children became the secular intelligentsia that comprised the leadership of the Ruthenian national movement throughout the Austrian constitutional era and even into the interwar period.

The second major reform of the enlightened absolutists was the upgrading of the hierarchical and administrative structure of the Greek Catholic church. The imperial authorities permitted the bishops of Lviv and Przemyśl to establish cathedral chapters (*krylosy* in Ukrainian) to aid in the administration of the eparchy.⁵ Further, in 1808 they erected (or restored) the metropolis of Halych; the metropolitan of Halych, who was also Greek Catholic archbishop of Lviv, headed the entire Greek Catholic church in Galicia.⁶ Until 1885 there were only the two eparchies in the metropolis, but in that year the southern, slightly larger half of Lviv archeparchy was separated off into a third eparchy, with its seat in Stanyslaviv. According to the ecclesiastical schematisms of 1900, Lviv archeparchy covered a territory of roughly 22,000 square kilometres; Przemyśl eparchy, which extended far into the west, where a majority of the population consisted of Polish Roman Catholics, had a territory of close to 40,000 square kilometres; and Stanyslaviv eparchy, which extended outside Galicia into the neighbouring province of Bukovina, had a territory of about 24,000 square kilometres. Although the smallest territorially, Lviv archeparchy had the largest number of faithful (1,081,727), followed closely by Przemyśl eparchy (1,039,430). Stanyslaviv eparchy had 867,010 faithful, of whom 15,673 lived in Bukovina. Altogether there were 2,972,494 Greek Catholics in Galicia in 1900.⁷ Each of the eparchies was divided administratively into twenty to thirty deaneries (*dekanaty*) with about twenty parishes each.

This administrative set-up lasted in its essentials until 1946, when the Soviet authorities forced the Greek Catholic church in Galicia to merge with the Russian Orthodox church at the synod of Lviv.⁸ The Greek Catholic church survived thereafter in an extremely weakened form as a persecuted, underground church. In 1989 the church was again allowed to function openly. It is presently the largest church in Ukrainian Galicia, but it no longer enjoys the allegiance of virtually all Galician Ukrainians, for it has found a serious competitor on its traditional terrain in the form of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox church. The metropolis of Halych continues to exist, but the composition of its constituent eparchies has been modified.

As a result of two large waves of emigration from Galicia, from the end of the nineteenth century to the First World War and then again in the aftermath of the Second World War, the Greek Catholic church in its Galician redaction has spread around the world. Today

Galician-Ukrainian Greek Catholics can be found in Canada, the United States, Brazil, Argentina, Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria, and Australia, to mention only some of the larger centres. The so-called Byzantine Catholics of the United States are also descended from the Greek Catholic church, but that of Transcarpathia, not Galicia.

The Ruthenians and Their National Movement

In this work, I have fairly consistently made conservative linguistic choices. I refer to "Greek Catholics" instead of to "Ukrainian Catholics," I give the names of Greek Catholic clergy in their Ruthenianized Church Slavonic form rather than in the modern standard Ukrainian form, I check the *Oxford English Dictionary* and therefore write "metropolis" to mean "the seat or see of a metropolitan bishop" instead of employing Slavisms or neologisms such as "metropolia" or "metropolitanate," and so on. Of the terminological choices I have had to make for this book, none has proved so difficult as the choice of the name for the people under investigation.

Today the East Slavic, Greek Catholic (and Orthodox) inhabitants of Galicia have a strong sense of their national identity as Ukrainians; in fact, they have probably the strongest such sense in all of Ukraine. Yet I very rarely use the term "Ukrainian" in this book; I do so generally in reference to a conscious Ukrainian orientation in Galicia or to Ukrainians from Dnieper Ukraine, then in the Russian empire. Instead, I use the old-fashioned term "Ruthenian." Partially, this is for stylistic consistency, to match the other linguistically conservative decisions I have made. Partially, this is because the contemporary sources I rely on never use the word "Ukrainian" to refer to the Galician Ruthenians; instead they refer to them (or to themselves) as *ruteni* (Italian), *Ruthenen* (German), *rusini* (Polish), and *rusyny* (Ruthenian-Ukrainian).⁹ The main reason, however, for retaining the old nomenclature is that it is neutral with regard to the two competing paradigms of national identity that divided the Ruthenians in the late nineteenth century, the all-Russian and the Ukrainian. Since the division between Russophiles and Ukrainophiles is a central factor in the narrative that follows, I selected a designation that would allow me to make a distinction between the ethnic group as such and the alternative constructions of its nationality. I also considered using the term "Rusyn," which is finding increasing application in English-

language scholarship as an appellation for the East Slavic, Eastern Christian inhabitants of the Carpathian region. In the end, I decided to retain the term "Ruthenian," which I have used in my previous books and articles, mainly because "Rusyn" is developing into a term for a particular national construction, that is, for the idea of a fourth East Slavic nationality comprising the Ruthenians of Transcarpathia and the Lemko region, and is thus losing the virtue of neutrality still present in "Ruthenian."

Like their church, the Ruthenians developed out of Kyivan Rus', which gave them their Eastern Christian religion and writing in the Cyrillic alphabet. The Ruthenians of Galicia had their own medieval principality within the Rus' commonwealth, but they passed under Polish rule after the native dynasty expired (1340–86). Long before the nineteenth century, the old Rus' boyar class had been assimilated into the Polish nobility. The Ruthenians also lacked much of a presence in the towns of Galicia, which by the nineteenth century were largely Polish and Jewish. The Ruthenians were overwhelmingly peasants, with a rich folk culture, but were relatively untouched by what scholars have variously called "modernization" or "industrial culture" until the late nineteenth century. The only exception was the clergy, which, as has been mentioned, underwent a centralized, modernizing educational process beginning in the late eighteenth century.

About 1815–30 a Ruthenian national awakening began, similar in most respects to the other national awakenings of East Central Europe around the same time. The history of Galician Rus' was rediscovered, the folklore gathered, and the language codified in grammars and developed through translation and original composition. The main centres of this revival were in Galicia's capital, Lviv, in the seat of the only other Greek Catholic eparchy at that time, Przemyśl, and in the imperial capital, Vienna. A distinct nuance of the Ruthenian awakening was the prominence of the clergy, who constituted the overwhelming majority of the awakeners. They also introduced into the Ruthenian awakening a more explicitly ecclesiastical dimension than was generally found in East Central European awakenings: along with the assertion of the native language and culture came an assertion of the prerogatives of the distinct Ruthenian rite.

The high point of the national awakening is generally considered to have been the activities of the Ruthenian Triad in the 1830s and 1840s. The triad was made up of three Lviv seminarians – Iakiv Holovatsky, Markiiian Shashkevych, and Ivan Vahylevych – in association with a somewhat larger group of no more than a few dozen seminarians. They were able to publish a few almanacs, brochures, and articles, but they had problems with the censor and did not have the

wherewithal to publish a regular periodical. In fact, there was no Ruthenian periodical in Galicia at all until the outbreak of the all-European revolution of 1848-49.

The revolution fundamentally transformed Galician Rus'. Ruthenian society took a great step forward with the abolition of serfdom, making possible, within a few decades, the diffusion of the national movement to the broad masses of the Galician Ruthenian population (a story I have told elsewhere).¹⁰ The revolution also propelled the development of Ruthenian culture: not only did the first newspapers and periodicals make their appearance, but so did the first cultural association and the first scholarly conference. It also signalled the overt politicization of the Ruthenian movement.

The Ruthenians' chief organization in the revolution was the Supreme Ruthenian Council. The main lines of its policy were loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty, support for basic civil liberties and representative government, the defence of the interests of the peasantry, the protection and promotion of Ruthenian culture and the Greek Catholic church, and the division of Galicia into separate western and eastern provinces, with Poles dominant in the former and Ruthenians in the latter. The leadership of the Supreme Ruthenian Council was almost identical with the leadership of the Greek Catholic church. The metropolitan at that time, Mykhail Levytsky, a man in his mid-seventies, was too conservative and feeble to take an active part in the revolutionary events, but his suffragan, the newly appointed bishop of Przemyśl, Hryhorii Iakhymovych, was president of the council. Much of the day-to-day business of the council was conducted by Fathers Mykhail Kuzemsky and Mykhail Malynovsky, both of the Lviv cathedral chapter, who served, respectively, in the council's vice-presidency and secretariat. The council had its main seat in Lviv, but its affiliates elsewhere in Galicia were organized along the boundaries of the Greek Catholic deaneries. Priests made up the most influential and numerous social stratum in the council, so much so that Polish propagandists accused it of trying to establish a theocracy in Galicia.

After the suppression of the revolution, a decade of conservative reaction stifled public political life throughout the empire, including Ruthenian Galicia. By the end of the 1850s, even the Ruthenian-language press in the province completely petered out. Yet the decade was anything but politically fallow for the Ruthenians, because it was then that the intelligentsia, still largely composed of priests, underwent, to use a phrase from Russian history, a change of signposts. In the early 1850s the all-Russian national orientation, or Russophilism, rose to prominence among educated Ruthenians. Essentially, this

orientation held that the Galician Ruthenians, with the Russians constituted one political and cultural nation and that they looked to the Russian empire for moral, material, and political support against the Poles. It did not deny the specificities of the Ruthenians of Galicia, nor did it deny that the Ruthenians were most closely related to the Little Russians (Ukrainians) of Dnieper Ukraine within the boundaries of Russia, but it rejected the notion that the Ruthenian or Little Russian peculiarities had or should have political or high-cultural significance. Those with this view opposed the formation of a distinct Ukrainian-language literature and instead developed a literary language that might be described as a compromise between a continuation of the old Ruthenian Church Slavonic literary language and literary Russian. This was a sharp departure from the stance of the Ruthenian Triad in the 1830s and 1840s, which was deeply steeped in the literature of the Dnieper Ukrainian cultural revival and published its own works in a vernacular heavily influenced by the steppe dialect of Ukrainian. But the dynamism of the Russophile movement was so powerful in the wake of the revolution's defeat that even one of the members of the original triad, Iakiv Holovatsky, embraced its positions and, in fact, became one of its most important spokesmen and leaders.¹¹ The Ukrainophile position was to revive in the 1860s, and the Ruthenian national movement was to remain bifurcated for decades thereafter, particularly in the decades covered by this study. Indeed, would it not have appeared too idiosyncratic, I would have subtitled this work "The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movements in Galicia, 1867–1900."

Only one Ruthenian political issue surfaced in the public sphere in the decade of reaction, and that at the very end, in 1859. At the initiative of Count Agenor Gołuchowski, a conservative Polish aristocrat and former governor of Galicia who was about to become Austrian minister of the interior, the central government tried to have the Ruthenians change their alphabet from the Cyrillic to the Latin in order to create a barrier against Russophile tendencies. The majority of educated Ruthenians, of all persuasions, objected to this, and in the end the government and Gołuchowski lost what has come to be known in the historiography as "the alphabet war." The point that is important for this study is that much of the leadership of the fight against the introduction of the Latin alphabet was, as was the leadership in 1848–49, virtually identical with the leadership of the Greek Catholic church at the time: the bishops – and not much later metropolitans – Hryhorii Iakhymovych and Spyrydon Lytvynovych, and the canons of the Lviv cathedral chapter, Fathers Kuzemsky and Malynovsky.

Basically this same leadership represented the Ruthenians during the early years of constitutional reform in Austria, that is, 1860–67. For example, the four aforementioned churchmen all sat in the first session of the Galician diet in 1861. Based in Lviv's Greek Catholic Cathedral of St George, this particular Ruthenian leadership was generally known as the "St George party" (*sviatoiurtsi*). The 1860s brought political catastrophe for the Ruthenians in general and for the St George party in particular, but that story already belongs to the main text of this study.

Galicia

The place where all this happened, the Austrian crownland of Galicia, was located northeast of the Carpathian Mountains. It derived its name from the town of Halych, pronounced Galich in the days when it was the capital of a Rus' principality. The capital was transferred to Lviv in the mid-thirteenth century, but the name Galicia stuck until the principality, by this time a kingdom, was dissolved a century later. From then until the Austrians took it in 1772, the territory was under Polish rule and generally known as Red Rus' rather than Galicia. The Austrians revived the medieval name in an attempt to lend the appearance of legitimacy to their participation in the partition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Because of a medieval claim to Galicia by the kings of Hungary, their legitimate heirs, the Habsburgs, had the words "king of Galicia" in their title. Although the Habsburgs claimed Galicia in their capacity as kings of Hungary, they did not attach the region to the Hungarian kingdom, but included it administratively with the non-Hungarian provinces such as Styria and Bohemia. When the Habsburg monarchy became Austria-Hungary in 1867, Galicia was firmly in the Austrian or Cisleithanian portion.

The boundaries of Galicia between 1772 and 1815 fluctuated, but the Congress of Vienna established the basic configuration that was to last, with one territorially trivial but politically important change, until the end of the empire in 1918. The change was the incorporation of Cracow into Galicia in 1846.

The Austrian crownland of Galicia, as it existed from 1846 to 1918, differed territorially from the medieval kingdom of Galicia. Although by and large the old kingdom was incorporated into the new crownland, the crownland was larger (78,497 square kilometres), almost the

size of modern Austria, and extended westward into ethnically Polish territories. West of the Sian River the majority of Galicia's inhabitants were Poles, east of the Sian Ruthenians. According to the census of 1880, 3,059,222 Galicians were Polish speakers and 2,551,594 were Ruthenian speakers. Included among the Polish-speakers were most of the crownland's 686,596 Jews.¹²

During the period studied in this book, Galicia was experiencing social and cultural transformation. Railroads were extended into the crownland, bringing factory-made shoes and fresh newspapers from Vienna. Money was rapidly penetrating the countryside, simultaneously raising the standard of living and destroying former economic securities. The population increased and land seemed to shrink under the peasants' feet. Many of the common people – Poles, Ukrainians, Jews – decided to abandon Galicia and take boats across the ocean. Public opinion became a factor of increasing importance, while consensus was impossible to achieve owing to the differences between Pole and Ukrainian, gentile and Jew, landlord and peasant. The fragmentation of public opinion worked in favour of the maintenance of the lopsided autonomy that Galicia enjoyed within Austria after 1867, an autonomy that favoured the Polish gentry over any other nationality or class. In spite of the conservative political climate, this was also a period when new political movements arose to challenge the status quo: socialism, peasant populism, and radical nationalism. In general, not just in the church, it was a time of ferment.

Galicia was administratively divided, from 1867 until the collapse of the empire, into counties (or districts – in Ukrainian *povity*, in German *Bezirke*). In 1867 there were seventy-four counties, in 1914 eighty-two. Each county was headed by a captain (*starosta*, *Bezirkshauptmann*). From 1848 until 1867 there was a formal administrative division between largely Ruthenian Eastern Galicia and largely Polish Western Galicia; even after the formal division was liquidated, the distinction remained as both a popular conception and administrative convenience.¹³

The Chronological Limits: 1867–1900

The period encompassed by this study is the last third of the nineteenth century. I have chosen a political moment as the starting point: the year of the *Ausgleich* that formed Austria-Hungary and of the introduction of the basic constitutional structures that lasted in Austria,

with some important modifications (and suspension during the First World War), until the end of the monarchy. For the terminal point, on the other hand, I have chosen a moment of ecclesiastical significance: the appointment to the metropolitan see of Halych of Bishop Andrei Sheptytsky, a saintly man of extraordinary vision and energy who left a deep personal imprint on the Greek Catholic church.

Originally, I had intended this book to be about the entire period of Austrian rule in Galicia, that is, from 1772 until 1918, and indeed the research was carried out for the large plan. When I began to write, however, I saw that to do justice to the topic demanded much more space than I had mentally allotted to it. I eventually decided to focus just on the period 1867–1900, at least for the primary monograph that would emanate from my research.¹⁴ Several factors swayed the decision to choose these dates. The weightiest was that these years struck me as containing the crux of the whole matter. It was then that the fruit born from enlightened absolutism, the national awakening and the revolution of 1848–49, ripened. These were years of crisis and transformation as well, since the fruit was not one that Rome and Vienna were prepared to digest. The confrontations of these years were more clearly defined than all those preceding, and all those that succeeded were but variations on the themes established then.

Another reason that the dates 1867–1900 appealed to me has to do with a project larger than this particular book. Although this work is meant to stand on its own, it is nonetheless also intended as the final instalment of a trilogy on Galicia in the late nineteenth century. The first two books, on the socialist movements and on the Ukrainian national movement in the countryside, also concentrated on roughly the same time frame. Taken together, the books give a multidimensional portrait of an East European society in transition.

There was also the historiographical factor. These crucial years have been underinvestigated in the historical writing on the Greek Catholic church, while the periods from 1772 to 1867 and from 1900 to 1914 have a relatively well-developed literature, as will emerge from the historiographical discussion immediately following.

Historiography

The earlier history of the Greek Catholic church has been extensively treated in three nineteenth-century surveys. Two of these appeared in the early 1860s, in conjunction with the debate over the restructuring

of Austria, and were meant to provide scholarly weight to the Ruthenians' arguments against their Polish political opponents. Both were the work, in whole or in part, of Canon Mykhail Malynovsky, one of the most prominent leaders of the St George party. In spite of their polemical edge, they were solid, documentary works in the best tradition of late-nineteenth-century scholarship.

The work that was only partly Malynovsky's was *Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenae*. The basis of the book was a Latin text composed by Father Mykhail Harasevych (Michael Harasiewicz), an outstanding figure in the early history of the metropolis of Halych, a canon of the Lviv cathedral chapter who died in 1836. Although Harasevych alone figures as author on the title page of the *Annales*, there is quite a bit of Malynovsky in the work. Malynovsky expanded the text, in particular continuing the narrative from 1826, which is as far as Harasevych had gotten, until 1862, the year the book appeared. Moreover, Malynovsky added many documentary appendices to the Harasevych text, bringing the whole work to over 1,200 pages. It retains its value to the present.

At around the same time, Malynovsky published another history, this time his completely original composition, in German: *Die Kirchen- und Staats-Satzungen bezüglich des griechisch-katholischen Ritus der Ruthenen in Galizien*. Although the title page states that the book was published in 1861, the text cites newspapers from 1863. This was, like the reworking of the Harasevych text, another scholarly brick: it had 890 pages. The work was organized less as a chronological history than as a historically grounded defence of the rights and prerogatives of the Ruthenian church. It, too, included documentary publications and retains its usefulness even today.¹⁵

The third of the monumental nineteenth-century surveys was Iulian Pelesh's (Pelesz) two-volume *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom von den aeltesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. Like Malynovsky's works, this was written at a significant juncture: the aftermath of the eradication of the last Uniate eparchy in the Russian empire (the eparchy of Chełm). Its intent was both to convince non-Ruthenian readers of the essential Catholicism of the Ruthenian Greek Catholic church and to shore up the Catholic spirit among Ruthenian readers, which, as we shall see in the main text of this monograph, was sorely in need of such shoring up at this juncture. The second volume, published in 1881, contains what is probably still the best survey of the history of the Galician church during the first century of Austrian rule.¹⁶

These nineteenth-century works laid the foundations for subsequent, more detailed studies of the Galician Ruthenian church in the

pre-1867 period, many of which were published by the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv and by the Basilian Fathers in Zhovkva and later in Rome. These works are listed in the detailed bibliographies prepared by Father Isydor Patrylo, OSBM. Worthy of special mention are two works that contain detailed studies of church affairs in the early 1860s: Luigi Glinka's biography of Metropolitan Hryhorii Iakhymovych, which makes good use of Vatican archival material, and Iaroslav Hordyns'kyi's book on the cultural and political life of Galicia in the 1860s, which has separate sections devoted to the ritual controversy of 1861–63 and to Galician involvement in the affairs of the Chełm diocese in the mid-1860s.

Recently, an important addition to the historiography of the Ruthenian church has come from independent Ukraine: Oleh Turii's dissertation on "the Greek Catholic church in the social-political life of Galicia, 1848–1867." The existence of this study, which is based on a thorough examination of the Galician press and of the relevant documentation in the Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv, contributed to my decision to begin my own monograph in 1867 and not earlier.

The period after 1900 has attracted scholarship because of the charismatic figure who stood at the head of the Greek Catholic church in the first half of the twentieth century (1900–1944): Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky. Although much still remains to be done, there is a voluminous literature on Sheptytsky, in many languages. Two of the best works are in English: the biography by Father Cyril Korolevsky (translated from the French original), which discusses Sheptytsky within a wide historical and theological context, and the collection of papers edited by Paul Robert Magocsi (*Morality and Reality*). There are also good biographies in German (Gregor Prokoptschuk) and Ukrainian (Stepan Baran), a valuable collection of papers in Polish (*Metropolita Andrzej Szeptycki*, edited by Andrzej A. Zięba), and an excellent interpretive essay in French (Sophia Senyk). The Galician parish clergy in the period 1900–1939 is treated in the doctoral dissertation of Andrew Sorokowski.

There are a number of works that briefly survey the period 1867–1900 in the history of the Greek Catholic church in Galicia. The short section on 1867–1900 in the early (1902) Ukrainian-language survey by Father Ioan Rudovych can still serve as a useful introduction to the period. In the interwar years only one work covering our third of the century appeared: the German-language monograph by Anton Korczok. Korczok's work covers the whole Austrian period and is organized using a combination of thematic and chronological criteria. It is a balanced, scrupulously scholarly work, richly researched in

published sources. Eduard Winter's German-language study of "Byzantium and Rome in struggle over Ukraine," which appeared during the Second World War, contains a survey of the Galician church's history in 1867–1900; this portion of Winter's book is not without its insights, but it is neither thorough nor as reliable as Korczok's. Winter did, however, make use of some of the documentation of the Vienna nunciature in the Vatican archives.

Surveys of our period also appeared in two postwar general histories of the Ukrainian church "between East and West": one in Ukrainian by Hryhor Luzhnyts'kyi and one in German by Johannes Madey. Both are serviceable and informative. Two fuller, quite useful works appeared in Ukrainian, published by the Basilian Fathers: Irynei Nazarko's collection of biographical sketches of the metropolitans and volume 8 of Atanasii Velykyi's history of "Christian Ukraine." Both of these works have a rather defensively Catholic perspective, but contain a great deal of information on the Galician church. The work by Father Velykyi was originally composed as a series of lectures he read over Radio Vatican. It is compilatory and popular rather than scholarly and devotes much space to the general history of the Catholic church, but it also seems to have been informed in parts by some acquaintance with archival documents. Father Velykyi (Welykyj) also edited a valuable collection of papal documents concerning the Ukrainian church, quite a few of which are important for the period studied in this monograph (*Documenta Pontificium Romanorum*).

Although all the above-mentioned works have served to fill the 1867–1900 gap in the history of the Greek Catholic church in Galicia, none of them has been based on a close study of the relevant archival documentation in Rome, Vienna, and Lviv and of the contemporary Ruthenian press. For the most part, this failure is to be ascribed to long-standing problems of access for historians in the West and to ideological constraints for historians in Ukraine under Soviet rule.

Aside from these, on the whole, objective accounts, there are a number of treatments of the history of the Greek Catholic church, referring also to our period, that are seriously distorted by their one-sided approach. In the Soviet Union numerous anti-Uniate polemical pieces were published, of which S.T. Danilenko's *Uniaty* is a classic. I have found these publications almost useless. Only slightly less useless were the tendentious collections of anti-Uniate documents, namely *Pravda pro uniuu* and *Dokumenty rozpovidaiut'*. A recent overview written from opposite – pro-Uniate and Ukrainian nationalist – positions in independent Ukraine by Vasyl' Ivanyshyn also completely distorts the history of the Greek Catholic church and offers nothing new in the way of facts. One work that is extremely tendentious – that by Vasyl'

Kudryk, which was written from an anti-Uniate, pro-Orthodox perspective – at least has the virtue of containing a great deal of specific information in its account of “little known material from the history of the Greek Catholic church.”

Aside from surveys of the Greek Catholic church, there are many good surveys and studies of Galicia in the late nineteenth century that establish the political context and refer explicitly as well to church history. Most of these are listed in Paul Robert Magocsi’s excellent bibliographic guide to Galicia, and there is no need to review them here. Still, it is worth singling out two of the best works: Ivan L. Rudnytsky’s overview of “the Ukrainians in Galicia under Austrian rule”¹⁷ and Kost’ Levyts’kyi’s fact-filled compilation on “the history of the political thought of the Galician Ukrainians.”

The memoirs of several priests are concerned in whole or in part with the Galician church in the last third of the nineteenth century. Particularly illuminating are those of Fathers Severyn Matkovs’kyi, Oleksa Prystai, and Fylymon Tarnavs’kyi.

Certain discrete problems in the history of the Greek Catholic church in the period 1867–1900 have benefited from monographic study. The conversion of the Chełm diocese to Russian Orthodoxy, an affair in which many Galicians took part and which coloured the history of the Galician church for decades thereafter, is one such problem. There is a fairly substantial, if polemical and old-fashioned, literature in Polish, of which the relevant section in Edward Likowski’s “history of the Uniate church” is certainly one of the best and most balanced accounts. A more judicious, more scholarly study is Luigi Glinka’s book in Italian on the “Ukrainian Catholic diocese of Chełm”; Glinka published many documents in the appendices.

The reform of the Basilian order in 1882 has also been studied. In the 1930s M. Karovets’ put together several volumes of narrative and documents on the reform. The work seems to have been assembled in a very loose or idiosyncratic order and the author is quite partisan in his defence of the reform, but the volumes nonetheless constitute a rich source of raw materials for the history of the Greek Catholic church in the early 1880s. Much more focused are the documentary publications on the reform published by Porfirio Pidručnyj in the *Analecta* of the Basilians.

The Lviv provincial synod of 1891 has been the subject of some rather polemical studies and documentary publications in the inter-war years (Aleksandr Stefanovych, V.R. Vavryk, Pliaton Martyniuk), when the issue of clerical celibacy was being heatedly debated in Galicia. A very fine study of the synod, based on an analysis of the documents of the Oriental Congregation in Rome, was undertaken

after the Second World War by Myron Stasiv; unfortunately, his doctoral dissertation on the subject has never been published.

The Galician Greek Catholic church figures in Edith Saurer's study of "the political aspects of Austrian episcopal nominations, 1867–1903"; although not entirely trustworthy in its details, Saurer's work contains a fairly full treatment of both the appointment and resignation of Iosyf Sembratovych as metropolitan of Halych. Aspects of Galician church history also figure prominently in Eduard Winter's study of Vatican *Ostpolitik* in 1878–93.

Archival Sources

The archival research for this study was conducted in four cities: Rome, Vienna, Lviv, and Przemysł.

In Rome I worked in the Vatican archive (Archivio Segreto Vaticano), primarily with the documentary legacy of the Viennese nunciature (Archivio della Nunziatura di Vienna), which is the richest collection of materials relating to our theme in that archive.¹⁸ I also made use of the collection of the "consistorial processes" (Processus Consistoriales), which contains information on candidates for the episcopacy, but the rather formulaic documents therein were not very helpful. The richest repository of relevant materials in Rome is the archive of the Oriental Congregation (Archivum S. Congregationis Orientalis), but, with few exceptions, it has been and is closed to scholars. Although I applied for entrance to the Oriental Congregation's archive, I was not successful. (I was, however, permitted to obtain some specific photocopies.)

In Vienna I worked in branches of the Austrian State Archives, namely in the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv and in the Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv. The latter only contained a few items of relevance, in the collection of the former Austrian ministry of religion and education (Neue Kultusakten). Documentation on Galician Greek Catholic episcopal nominations was formerly preserved in this collection, but it was transferred to Poland after 1918;¹⁹ I have not located and used it for this study. The greatest concentration of relevant documentation in Vienna is in the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv.²⁰ The records of the foreign ministry (Die Akten des k.u.k. Ministeriums des Äussern 1848–1918), kept here, are of primary importance. The efforts of the Austrian state authorities and the Vatican to intervene in Greek Catholic ecclesiastical life in Galicia, which form a major theme of this

monograph, were all coordinated through the foreign ministry and find frank and full reflection in its documentation, particularly in the correspondence preserved in the ministry's "administrative registry" (Administrative Registratur).²¹ I also consulted the records of the Austrian embassy to the Holy See (Gesandtschaftsarchiv, Rom-Vatikan) as well as the "political archive" (Politisches Archiv).

In Lviv I worked in the Central State Historical Archive (Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy u m. L'vovi), which is the main repository of Galician documentation from the Austrian period. For the government side of the documentation, I concentrated on the collection of the Galician Lieutenancy (Halyts'ke namisnytstvo); for the ecclesiastical side, I found the records of the metropolitan consistory (Mytropolycha hreko-katolyts'ka konsystoriia) to be the most useful, but I also consulted the materials of the ordinariate (Hreko-katolyts'kyi mytropolychy ordynariat) and the Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky collection (Sheptyts'kyi Andrii). A very useful source was the collection of unpublished materials gathered by Ivan Omelianovych Levytsky for a biographical dictionary of Galician Rus' (Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka [I.O. Levyts'koho]);²² these are housed in the manuscript division of the Stefanyk Library (L'vivs'ka Naukova Biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy, Viddil rukopysiv).

In Przemyśl I worked, more briefly than I would have liked, in the state archive (Archiwum Państwowe w Przemyślu), where I consulted the archival legacy of the Greek Catholic eparchy of Przemyśl (Archiwum Biskupstwa grecko-katolickiego w Przemyślu). I did not, however, conduct research in the state archive of Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, which has preserved the materials of the Greek Catholic eparchy of Stanyslaviv (now the city of Ivano-Frankivsk).

Technical Matters

To transliterate from Ruthenian/Ukrainian to English, I have used a modified form of the Library of Congress system. For proper names in the text I have eliminated soft signs and rendered adjectival last names ending in *-yi* or *-ii* as *-y*. The soft signs and full adjectival endings are preserved in the footnotes, bibliography, and in the section entitled "Historiography" in this introduction. The orthographies of the variants of the Ruthenian literary language employed in the late nineteenth century often differed substantially from that of modern

standard Ukrainian; I have mentally transliterated the old orthographies into modern Ukrainian orthography before transliterating them into English. The detailed system of transliteration from variants of Ruthenian devised by Paul Robert Magocsi is far more exact, but technically cumbersome.

Dates are given according to the Gregorian calendar, that is, according to the New Style. Ruthenian newspapers in this period generally bore two dates, one in the Old Style (Julian calendar), one in the New. In my footnote references to these periodicals, I also provide the two dates; the earlier date is according to the Julian calendar, the later date to the Gregorian.

This page intentionally left blank

PART I: 1866–1881

“A Glimpse into the Future”

The summer of 1866 was one of the most difficult that the Habsburg monarchy ever experienced. Tensions with Prussia had been mounting since the previous year, and in June 1866 war erupted. In July Austria was defeated at the battle of Sadowa; in August it was forced to sign the Treaty of Prague with Prussia. The political implications of this chain of events were tremendous, both for the future of Germany and for the future of the conglomeration of peoples who lived under the Habsburg sceptre. Besides Bismarck and Prussia, the major winners from this contestation were Italy, which acquired Venetia from Austria, and the Magyar gentry, who used the Habsburgs' humiliation to extract a very far-reaching concession: the transformation of Austria into the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary (1867). Another party that gained from the situation was the Polish gentry of Galicia. Like their Magyar counterparts, Polish politicians agitated for extensive territorial autonomy from Vienna. Although all their demands were not met and the arrangement was not as formalized as they would have liked, the Poles in the years 1867–71 did succeed in achieving a *de facto* autonomy for Galicia, which left the local administration and the educational system securely in their hands. The major losers of 1866 and its aftermath, aside from the old unified monarchy, were the non-Magyar nationalities of the Hungarian part of Austria-Hungary and the Ruthenians of Galicia.

Within Ruthenian political circles, the major loser of the summer of 1866 was the St George party, that is, the Greek Catholic hierarchs and consistorial officials who had led the Ruthenian movement during the revolution of 1848–49 and during the first years of the constitutional era. Their policy had been one of absolute loyalty to the dynasty, in the expectation that such loyalty would ultimately be rewarded with political concessions. Already in the immediate aftermath of Sadowa, as word of Vienna's negotiations with the Poles leaked out, this policy was revealed to be completely bankrupt. Its foremost proponent, Metropolitan Spyrydon Lytvynovych, who until

recently – with his excellent manners and high-circle hobnobbing – had seemed to many Ruthenians to be the consummate politician, now looked like a dupe. The St George party, like the old Austria, never recovered from the defeat at Sadowa. Political leadership passed into other hands, those of the Russophiles, who must be considered among the winners of 1866.

This sudden reconfiguration of the Ruthenian political constellation found expression in a trenchant and quite frank article that appeared on the front page of the major Ruthenian newspaper, *Slovo*, on 8 August 1866, under the title “A Glimpse into the Future.”¹ It was signed by “One in the Name of Many,” but its author was Father Ioann Naumovych,² a Greek Catholic priest of strong Russophile convictions. Naumovych had acquired considerable fame, or notoriety, earlier in the 1860s as one of the three most prominent spokesmen (along with Fathers Vladymyr Terletsky [Hipolit Terlecki] and Markell Popel) of the movement to purge the Greek Catholic rite of latinizations and to bring it into conformity with Russian Orthodox liturgical practice. He propagated his liturgical conceptions in a series of articles that appeared in *Slovo* in 1861–63, running somewhat afoul of the ecclesiastical authorities in the process.³ Probably only insiders knew in 1866 that Father Naumovych was the author of “A Glimpse into the Future,” but it did not really matter in any case: it was the article itself and its political logic, not the author, that were important.

Naumovych took his cue from reports that a Polish deputation, headed by the highest-level politicians that the Galician Poles could muster, had left for Vienna to press the monarch to establish a separate chancery for Galicia, with the former interior minister Count Agenor Gołuchowski as chancellor. Naumovych contrasted the political behaviour of the Poles with that of the Ruthenians. The latter were too “goodhearted” to attempt to benefit from Austria’s misfortunes. They were too attached to their emperor to turn the occasion of his grief to their own advantage. Instead of demands and deputations, the Ruthenians offered the emperor a declaration of loyalty, “hoping thus to ease the pain and sickness of His heart.” The unfortunate thing, though, Naumovych pointed out, was that “our kindheartedness and tact” were proving less effective than “the agitation of our enemies.” Polish politicians spoke of the separate Galician chancery as if it were a certainty. The politics of alliance with the central Austrian government had not only brought the Ruthenians no gain, but had ultimately hurt them badly. “We played and still play with the so-called *Opportunitätspolitik*, and now we have to taste its bitter fruits.” What did the future hold for the Ruthenians? To Naumovych, it looked as if positions at all levels of administration and

self-government would soon be occupied exclusively by Poles and as if Polish would become the single legal language of administration in Galicia. The day seemed to be coming when a Ruthenian father would have to turn to his children and say: "Children, I sired you, and, in conditions that were tolerant of Rus', I raised you as Ruthenians, but now they're talking about a Polish chancery; it's going to be hard to remain Ruthenians, because they will polonize you, they won't let you live in our fatherland unless you deny your own Ruthenian mother and become Poles!"

Although the future that Naumovych envisioned in the summer of 1866 did not come to pass exactly as he had predicted, he was not far off the mark: as the consequences of the defeat at Sadowa clarified over the next several years, all, whether they had read his article or not, understood that the St George party's policy of orientation on Vienna had failed miserably. In his article, Naumovych also made a point of contrasting the effective and independent-minded leadership of the Serbs and Romanians in the monarchy with the leadership of the Galician Ruthenians, who let many an opportunity slip by in the 1860s to speak out more forcefully in the Galician diet. No Serbs or Romanians would be telling *their* children: "You will no longer be, as I am, Serb or Romanian; but you will become Magyars."

This part of Naumovych's argument, it is fair to say, was unassailable. The St George party had bet all it had on the wrong horse. Although, of course, it was in the nature of things that the hierarchy and the canons of St George's cathedral resisted this view, the majority of the secular intelligentsia and the rank-and-file clergy came to hold it, even those who did not follow Naumovych a step further in his argumentation.

That next step was to link the failed policy of the St George party with national irresolution, with the conception of a separate Ruthenian nationality limited to Austria-Hungary; in its place, Naumovych proposed a decisive, unambiguous declaration that the inhabitants of Galician Rus' were not any sort of "Ruthenians" at all, but Russians (*My ne Ruteny z 1848 roku, my nastoiashchii russkii*). As part of their policy of kowtowing to Vienna, Ruthenian political leaders had disavowed any relation to the Russian nationality, letting it be understood that they were a people who conveniently lived within the boundaries of the Habsburg monarchy. Now it was time to drop this facade. There was no sense pretending any more that there could be a glorious future for a separate Galician-Ruthenian literature. The Poles who denounced the Ruthenian movement were, in fact, absolutely correct: the Galician Ruthenian movement *was* striving for literary, linguistic, and ritual unity with the Russians. The Ruthenian literary

language should be standard Russian. Shmid's Russian dictionary was as good for Lviv as it was for St Petersburg. "Galician, Hungarian, Kyivan, Muscovite, Tobolskian, etc. Rus', in respect to ethnography, history, lexicon, literature and ritual, are one and the same Rus'." "The time has come, in our opinion, to cross our Rubicon and say openly so that everyone can hear it: We cannot be separated by a Chinese wall from our brothers and cannot stand apart from the linguistic, literary, ecclesiastical, and national connection with the entire Russian world!" Naumovych's "Glimpse into the Future" is rightly regarded as the most important manifesto of Galician Russophilism.

Was Naumovych, then, urging his countrymen to break politically with Austria and to seek the protection instead of the tsar of all the Russias? Only by implication. It is clear from the subsequent history of the Russophile movement that at about this time it had made a psychological break with Austria and had come to the conclusion that Russian irredentism was the key to solving the Ruthenian question in Galicia. The Russophile movement was generally not forthright on this issue and protested its loyalty to the Austrian monarchy. However, this posture was dictated by political expediency: calling publicly for political separation from Austria would result in the closing of Russophile publications and the incarceration of the Russophile leadership. Appearing at a moment when press censorship was rather lax, the Naumovych article was, in fact, one of the frankest expressions of the Russophile position in favour of politically abandoning Austria for Russia.

The article overflowed with protestations of loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty, but simultaneously Naumovych indicated that he did not at all mean that they be taken seriously. For example, at one point Naumovych assured his readers (or the censors) that the national-cultural union of the Ruthenians and Russians had no territorial-political ramifications: "The fear that a national connection must inevitably lead to a political connection has been and always is groundless." The argument he used ostensibly to buttress this point, however, would have unsettled any reader who genuinely wanted to be convinced: in 1859, when the Italians summoned their co-nationals in Switzerland to join them in creating the new national state of Italy, the Swiss Italians declined, because they were "happy in Switzerland." In the very next sentence, Naumovych noted that the Galician Ruthenians, however, were "not necessarily happy" with their situation. Moreover, to any reader in the summer of 1866, the Italian example would immediately call to mind the fact that Austria was about to lose its major Italian province, Venetia, to Italy, just as it had lost Lombardy to Italy in 1859. Then, after registering the Ruthenians' discon-

tent with their status in Galicia, Naumovych wrote that even so they "have never yet considered separating from constitutional Austria." (Note the word "yet.") What linked them with Austria? Naumovych answered: "fate" (i.e., history) and "the *hope* of a better future."⁴

The Russophile program was not simply cultural and political, it was religious. Naumovych brought this aspect into sharp relief. He felt bitterness towards Galicia's would-be chancellor Gołuchowski for being "a one-sided tool of ultramontaniam" and for championing Roman Catholicism; he would have loved to see Rus' "liberate itself from the fetters of Jesuitism"; he lamented that the Greek Catholic "rite has declined under the oppression of latinism"; he admitted what the Poles charged, namely, that now this rite "aspires to Orthodoxy (specifically, to purification from latinism)." In short, Naumovych, and the Russophiles in general had constructed a dualist politico-religious universe in which the papacy, the Poles, Roman Catholicism in general and the Jesuits in particular constituted the forces of evil bent on the destruction of the good: the pure Greek rite, otherwise known as Orthodoxy. Naumovych had been heading in this direction in his articles in *Slovo* a few years earlier, and he would continue to write in this vein for the next decade and a half.

Was Naumovych, then, urging his co-religionists to break jurisdictionally with Rome and to seek communion instead with Russian Orthodoxy? Again, only by implication. Near the end of his article, he threw a broader hint. He noted that there were "pure-Orthodox" nations in Austria and that they were, in fact, the most loyal nations of the monarchy. It was immediately after this declaration of the compatibility of religious Orthodoxy and political Austrianism that Naumovych included the passage cited earlier about the need to cross the Rubicon and affirm "the linguistic, literary, ecclesiastical, and national connection with the entire Russian world."

The intent of the hints and implications of Naumovych's article was obvious, but he nonetheless refrained from a clear declaration that Galician Ruthenians should work towards annexation by Russia and should convert to Orthodoxy. This failure to spell things out was characteristic of Russophile rhetoric, which excelled at piling up arguments for obvious conclusions that were never, however, explicitly stated. It was in this space of implications that the Russophiles worked. There were probably several reasons for their rhetoric of things left unsaid. One was prudence.⁵ Open advocacy of separation from Austria would result in severe censorship and arrest. Open advocacy of conversion to Orthodoxy would mean deprivation of office for Greek Catholic priests. Aside from this, the Russophiles were to find this rhetoric a useful device for drawing to their organizations

and press individuals who would shy away if the unspoken conclusions were inscribed on the movement's masthead. Finally, this rhetoric stemmed in part from a certain psychological reluctance on the part of even the leading Russophile activists themselves, including Naumovych, to draw the conclusions clearly in their own minds and to act forthrightly upon them. Naumovych, for instance, had already threatened to pass to Orthodoxy in the early 1860s, when he was being disciplined by Metropolitan Iakhymovych for his agitation to purify the Greek Catholic ritual,⁶ but in the end he did not. As we will see below, he also wavered in the 1880s before finally crossing his personal Rubicon and embracing Russian Orthodoxy. This indecision, irresolution, and reticence on the part of the mid-nineteenth-century Russophiles would generate a split in the movement at the end of the century between the so-called *staro-* and *novokursnyky*, that is, between followers of the old and new course. The latter were younger and had no patience with Delphic formulations; they made no pretence of loyalty to either Catholicism or Austria.

The Canonization of Iosafat Kuntsevych and Its Reception in Galicia

Iosafat Kuntsevych, a Ukrainian born in Volhynia, was Uniate bishop of Polatsk in Belarus from 1617 until 1623. It was a difficult period to exercise episcopal office. The Belarusian and Ukrainian bishops had recently entered the Union of Brest, which was intended to unite the entire Ruthenian church of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth with Rome. Right from the start, however, there were some holdouts among the hierarchy, notably the Galician bishops, and resistance to the union found a resonance in certain religious confraternities and among monks and Cossacks. With the aid of the latter (and without state approval), an Orthodox hierarchy parallel to the Uniate hierarchy was restored in 1620. Polatsk now had two Ruthenian bishops: Iosafat Kuntsevych for the Uniates and Meletii Smotrytsky for the Orthodox. Each bishop and his followers were completely convinced of their own claims to legitimacy, and confrontations, sometimes violent, became the order of the day.

In one of the most ugly episodes of this era, some Orthodox citizens of Vitsebsk hacked Iosafat to death when he was making a visitation to the city in 1623, throwing his body, weighted down with

stones, into the River Dvina.⁷ The body was retrieved and solemnly laid out in the Uniate cathedral in Polatsk, and the circumstances of the bishop's death were investigated by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. On the basis of the latter investigation, Iosafat was beatified in 1643, and it was noted in the beatification documents that he could be canonized as a martyr at any time. In fact, though, the cult of Blessed Iosafat was largely neglected, except at a local level, over the succeeding two centuries. He was not formally canonized until 29 June 1867.

Iosafat's canonization had some impact on further developments, but it also interests us because of what it reveals about the mood in Ruthenian Galicia at that time. It would seem on the face of it that the Greek Catholic Ruthenians should have been elated to have one of their number solemnly declared a saint by Pope Pius IX. Yet the exact opposite was the case: Galician Ruthenian public opinion greeted the news of Iosafat's canonization with hostility.

While preparations were being made for the canonization in 1864 and 1865, the Russophile *Slovo* reported on it negatively, presenting it as an initiative in the interests of the Poles and categorically refusing to collect donations to defray its costs. Some of the reports in *Slovo* were given to the pope, who, enthusiastic about the impending canonization of the Uniate martyr, was understandably upset by what he read.⁸ In 1865 *Slovo* also published copious extracts from a letter sent to Iosafat in 1622 by the Great Chancellor of Lithuania, Lew Sapieha. The letter accused Iosafat of abandoning all tact and resorting too frequently to violence in his dealings with the Orthodox. *Slovo* was insinuating by publishing this letter that Iosafat met his demise not in holy martyrdom, but as the natural consequence of his own violent actions. Furthermore, Sapieha's letter twice explicitly stated that the Union of Brest was the main cause of all the calamities and contention that were wracking the Ruthenian lands of the commonwealth.⁹ A little later *Slovo* returned to the attack, this time printing an abridged article from the official Russian *Journal de St. Pétersbourg* that offered a most unflattering portrait of the martyr.¹⁰

In the actual year of the canonization, 1867, the Galician Ruthenian press almost completely boycotted it. The detailed Galician Ruthenian bibliography of Ivan Em. Levyts'kyi, which lists every substantive article in every periodical as well as all separate publications, registers only one item that has some connection to the canonization.¹¹ Not even the Greek Catholic church hierarchy marked the event with a publication. A careful examination of *Slovo* for the summer of 1867 only turned up the same single item that Levyts'kyi listed: an article entitled "a voice of the Viennese centralists on the

Roman canonizations."¹² Not only was the article a translated reprint from *Neue Freie Presse*, but it made no mention of Iosafat! All these circumstances indicate that the silence on the canonization in 1867 was not an accident, but intended as a deliberate statement that the canonization of Iosafat was not a matter that concerned Ruthenians. Even in its silence, *Slovo* managed to make a comment on Iosafat. The article from the liberal *Neue Freie Presse* was indignant that the pope had canonized (on the same day as Iosafat) a Spanish inquisitor, St Peter of Arbues, whom the paper characterized as "one of the most bloodthirsty, merciless persecutors of heretics." The readers of *Slovo*, of course, would not think so much of Peter's activities in Saragosa as of Iosafat's in Polatsk and Vitsebsk.

On the first anniversary of Iosafat's canonization, *Slovo* and its literary supplement, *Halychanyn*, broke the silence. *Slovo* published an overview of all the misfortunes that had befallen Galician Rus' in the year since Iosafat's canonization. It also commented on "our unfortunate union," in which the Ruthenians "are not equals among equals, but slaves among proud feudal lords."¹³ *Halychanyn* had more to say. Under the title "Persecutions of Orthodox Rus' in the Times of Iosafat Kuntsevych," it published a long compilation of documents that portrayed the Uniate saint as an intolerant, violent fanatic.¹⁴ The anonymous compiler was Bohdan Didytsky, the editor of both *Slovo* and *Halychanyn*. Didytsky was also serializing his "National History of Rus'" in *Halychanyn* at this time, and shortly after the first anniversary of Iosafat's canonization, the "National History" included a segment on the martyred bishop's outrages against the Orthodox. The segment concluded with this statement: "So this was the death that met the Uniate bishop Iosafat Kuntsevych, called the soul-snatcher (*dushekhvat*), for his excessive zeal for the papal faith and for the Union, from which the honest people of Orthodox Rus' suffered oh so much affliction."¹⁵

In 1873 two Russophile Galician priests working in the Chełm Uniate eparchy in the Russian empire – Nykolai Lyvchak and Markell Popel – went well beyond a verbal attack on St Iosafat. Together they were largely responsible for removing Iosafat's relics from the church in Biała Podlaska where they had rested and for hiding them in the church basement, where they were not rediscovered until the Austrians took Biała during the Great War.¹⁶

Iosafat's unpopularity as a saint was not limited to the Russophiles. Years later, Father Stefan Kachala, who was a prominent member of the rival national populist, Ukrainophile camp, had nothing good to say about Iosafat either. Iosafat "more than others was distinguished by religious intolerance," as proven by Lew Sapieha's letter. He was

murdered after he "went to Vitsebsk, where with the aid of an army he did all sorts of nasty things to the Orthodox Ruthenians."¹⁷

The hostility to the canonization of Iosafat Kuntsevych in Greek Catholic Galicia makes sense within the context of the Russophile hegemony in Ruthenian public opinion. Not only did the canonization run against the grain of the anti-Roman, pro-Orthodox mood in Ruthenian Galicia, but it was widely interpreted as a papal affront to Russia, on which, of course, educated Ruthenian society at this time placed their hopes.

The canonization, however, did not simply provide a point around which the existing mood could crystallize; it helped shape and reinforce that mood by lending additional weight to a key Russophile argument: that the Ruthenian church union with Rome was in the interests not of the Ruthenians, but of their arch-rivals, the Poles.

It was not a Pole who retrieved Iosafat from relative obscurity and brought his case to the attention of the higher church authorities, but Italians, monks of the Italo-Greek monastery of Grottaferrata near Rome. One of them was rummaging in the monastery's bullarium in 1860 and came across Iosafat's beatification documents, with the note that the martyr could be canonized at any time. A few years later, Pius IX expressed the desire to canonize some *beati*, and Iosafat's name was put forward. This was in 1863. Early the next year, the pope initiated the formalities, naming a relator and two postulators.¹⁸

These first steps towards the canonization of Iosafat Kuntsevych coincided in time with the Poles' January Insurrection against Russian rule. The canonization of the victim of Orthodox murderers was understood in many circles, including Polish, Russian, and Ruthenian circles, as a papal gesture of moral support for the insurgent Poles. The insurgents themselves made pilgrimages to the relics of Blessed Iosafat in Biała Podlaska, paid for a large painting of his martyrdom, and even proclaimed him their patron.¹⁹ According to the Russian press, Polish priests distributed thousands of portraits of Iosafat during the insurrection.²⁰ In 1864, after the insurrection's collapse, an impressive array of Polish princes, counts, and other aristocrats wrote to the pope applauding the impending canonization.²¹

One of the postulators, Father Mykhail Dombrovsky, was a Greek-rite Basilian from the Chełm eparchy in the Russian empire who had fled persecution by the tsarist authorities in the 1840s and settled in Rome. He was also, though, a man of very little tact²² and thoroughly polonized. He worked to raise funds to cover the cost of the canonization, but all his promotional material appeared in the Polish, not the Ruthenian press, and he presented the canonization as a matter of concern to Poles, not Ruthenians. In fact, he simply wrote off the

Galician Ruthenians as uninterested in or hostile to the canonization.²³ In the second half of 1865, probably in an attempt to undo some of the damage Dombrovsky had done, a third postulator was appointed: Iosyf Sembratovych, a Galician-Ruthenian prelate resident in Rome.²⁴ But it was too late. All that was achieved by the appointment of Sembratovych was that this hapless bishop acquired the stigma of being a latinizer, and he was soon to suffer for it when he returned to Galicia as apostolic administrator of Przemyśl eparchy. In sum, Rome did not handle the canonization as adroitly as it could have, by keeping in mind the sensitivities of the Greek Catholics of Galicia. But the timing was also unlucky, the preparations for the canonization coinciding with the Polish insurrection and the official solemnities following soon after the formalization of the Compromise between Austria and Hungary, which had left the Ruthenians of Galicia feeling abandoned and betrayed.

One more point. The Russian government took offense at the canonization of Iosafat Kuntsevych and responded by accelerating the Russification of the Chełm Uniate eparchy,²⁵ to whose fateful relations with the Galician Ruthenians we now turn.

Mykhail Kuzemsky, Bishop of Chełm

By the 1860s there was only one Uniate eparchy left in the entire Russian empire, that of Chełm, situated just north of Galicia. At the end of the sixteenth century, the church union had extended over most of Ukraine and Belarus, but the Cossack revolt of the mid-seventeenth century drove the union from the central and eastern Ukrainian lands into the western territories. As a result of the partitions of Poland, Russia came to control most of Ukrainian and Belarusian territory. Catherine II liquidated the union in much of the Right Bank in the 1790s, and the remaining Right Bank parishes and all the Belarusian Uniate parishes were merged into the Russian Orthodox church in 1839. Chełm was the only Uniate eparchy to escape suppression. The reason for its survival was twofold: it came under Russian control relatively late, in 1809, that is, after the major unification campaign of Catherine II, and it was part of the relatively autonomous Congress Kingdom of Poland and not, as were the Right Bank and Belarus, directly integrated into the Russian gubernial system.

As long as the Poles were given a free hand in the Congress Kingdom, the Uniates of Chełm were left undisturbed, or relatively undis-

turbed, by the Russian government. The peace began to break down, however, after the Polish insurrection of 1830–31. The Russian government looked for allies in Polish and formerly Polish territory and thought it had found them in the local Ukrainian and Belarusian population of the old Polish east. The authorities took measures to affirm the ancient Russian character of the Polish-influenced Right Bank, Belarus, and the Chełm region. In doing so, they also contributed considerably to the Ukrainian national revival, a by-product they had by no means intended. Otherwise, though, the depolonization of Ukraine and Belarus was successful.

The ecclesiastical integration of the Belarusians and Ukrainians into the Russian Orthodox church in 1839 was a fundamental part of this depolonization and russification process. An attempt by Tsar Nicholas I in 1840–41 to pressure the Uniate bishop of Chełm into following suit did not, however, succeed. Russian pressures on Chełm eparchy mounted in the 1860s, in connection with the Polish national agitation of 1861 and the insurrection of 1863–64. Over the decades, the Russian government had succeeded in creating a small pro-Russian and pro-Orthodox party among the Chełm Uniate clergy and had used every means available to it to promote the adherents of this party in the eparchial administration. But the party was too small and too unpopular among the rank-and-file clergy and the Uniate faithful to accomplish much, even with official backing. By this time the Russian government had also scaled down its immediate aims: instead of trying to convert Chełm to Orthodoxy at once, it decided to press for ritual conformity of the local Uniate church with Russian Orthodoxy and to awaken an anti-Polish, pro-Russian national spirit among the faithful. But this, too, did not proceed very successfully. The eparchial administration might issue a ban on organs, Polish hymns, and rosaries in Uniate churches, but the majority of the clergy and faithful considered maintaining these latinisms a point of honour and ignored contrary edicts.

It should be emphasized that the situation in Chełm was quite different from that in Galicia. In Chełm, antagonism between the Poles and the local Ruthenian clergy and populace was virtually unknown; in fact, the clergy were culturally polonized and tended to support Polish patriotic causes. Poles and Ruthenian Uniates here preferred to make common cause against what was perceived as a common enemy: the schismatic Russians and their government.

Chełm eparchy had at one time been rather closely associated with Galicia, since from 1795 until 1809 most of it was under Austrian rule, and for two decades after passing to Russia, Chełm remained formally under the jurisdiction of the restored metropolis of Halych.

But after 1809 there was little contact between the Uniates/Greek Catholics of Chełm and those of Galicia. Contact was restored, and with a vengeance, after 1863. From the Russians' point of view, Galician Ruthenians were just the type of people they needed in order to accomplish at least their immediate aims in Chełm eparchy: Galician Ruthenians hated Poles, they wanted to purge their rite of latinisms and bring it closer to the practices of Russian Orthodoxy, and they were favourably disposed to the Russian government. So Russia recruited dozens of them, perhaps a few hundred, to teach and preach in Chełm eparchy. The recruitment began in 1864 and was organized out of Vienna, but it accelerated in the next year when the base of operations was transferred to Lviv. In Vienna the recruitment was conducted by Father Mikhail Raevsky of the Russian embassy, and in Lviv by Iakiv Holovatsky at the university as well as by prominent Russians and Ukrainians who travelled specifically to Galicia for that purpose.²⁶

The Galicians who went to Chełm were generally young men in their twenties; not only were they the most mobile elements for emigration, but they were the most likely to have been influenced by the ritual purification movement of the early 1860s and to have fallen under the spell of the still relatively young Russophile ideology. There were also a few somewhat older, more established individuals who went into service in Chełm. These included Father Markell Popel of ritual movement fame, then in his early forties, who left Galicia for Chełm eparchy in the fall of 1866.²⁷

Aside from ideological motivations, economic considerations played a major role in the decision of these young Galicians to emigrate. Ruthenians seeking a teaching career in Galicia at a time when the educational system was being polonized were at a disadvantage, but what made things difficult for them at home was turned to positive advantage once they crossed the northern border. To encourage the Galician emigration to Chełm, the Russian government also paid the teachers more than they would have earned at home. For young priests and seminarians, the prospects in Chełm were even better. Normally, the first ten years after ordination were very lean for Greek Catholic priests in Galicia: they were transferred from parish to parish in the capacity of assistants or administrators, experiencing considerable hardship. Only once they became pastors of their own parishes did their situations really improve. But in Chełm eparchy, many parishes were vacant, and the Russian government was keen to promote its Galician partisans to more influential and economically more solid positions. For example, Father Ippolyt Krynytsky was thirty-five years of age and still only an administrator when he left

Galicia in 1865, but after only a short time in Chełm he was appointed rector of the eparchial seminary.²⁸

In this confluence of ideological and economic motivations, the latter became for some the dominant factor. This emerges clearly in the correspondence that Mykola Lisikevych, a gymnasium teacher in Vilnius in Lithuania, sent home to his Galician friends. When he visited Iakiv Holovatsky, who had also emigrated to Vilnius, he was impressed most of all by the money Holovatsky was making, the "roubles upon roubles." Another emigrant friend of his was marrying a rich landowner. He himself, he reported, was a member of the local club and spent his evenings playing cards and billiards.²⁹ The Galician emigrants found themselves in that morally slippery situation in which the relationship between principle and self-interest becomes too convenient, when one's views on religion and politics just happen to lead as well to the easy life.

The situation in Chełm eparchy at the time that the Galicians began to immigrate was particularly sticky. From 1863 until 1866 the see of Chełm was occupied by the bishop nominate Ioann Kalynsky (Jan Kaliński) – the Russian government never let him actually receive episcopal ordination. His three years in office were one long battle with the Russian authorities, a battle that ended with Kalynsky's arrest, deportation, and death in Viatka, in the Russian interior. To replace him, the government installed Father Iakov Voitsitsky as administrator. Voitsitsky, pro-Russian and leaning towards Orthodoxy, embarked on a campaign of ritual purification, backed up by punitive actions on the part of the Russian police and military, and appointed pro-Russian Galicians, such as Popel and Krynytsky, to responsible positions. The Vatican refused to acknowledge Voitsitsky's authority, as did many among the clergy and faithful of the eparchy. The Russian government decided to seek a resolution of the crisis in the Chełm region by appointing a bishop acceptable both to itself and to Rome.

Early in 1868 the Russian ambassador in Vienna approached the papal nuncio there with the suggestion that Markell Popel be appointed bishop of Chełm. This proposition was certain to be rejected by the Holy See, both because of Popel's Orthodox leanings and because he lived in open concubinage. It can be regarded as little more than an opening gambit in negotiations, the end result of which was the appointment of a Galician, Father Mykhail Kuzemsky, to the see of Chełm.

Kuzemsky was in his late fifties at the time. He had a very distinguished record as a Ruthenian political activist, having taken a prominent part in the revolution of 1848, in the campaign to preserve the

Cyrillic alphabet in 1859, and in the constitutional wrangling of the 1860s.³⁰ He was also one of the most influential clerics in the metropolitan consistory, responsible for managing many of the day-to-day affairs of Lviv archeparchy. He was an ambitious man, and the high regard in which he held himself was eventually to undermine his ability to assess his actions; this and a certain weakness of backbone were to contribute to his undoing.

As a candidate for the Chełm episcopate, he was suitable from the point of view of both parties making the decision, that is, the Russian government and the papacy. The Russians knew of him from the Galician Russophiles, with whom Kuzemsky had close personal relations.³¹ Although Kuzemsky himself represented the St George party, the Russophiles admired him for the hard work he performed in Ruthenian organizations and for his uncompromising, outspoken opposition to the Poles. Moreover, the Russophiles knew that Kuzemsky preferred a purer, more Eastern ritual, cleansed of importations from the Latin rite. He seemed to be just what the Russians needed at this point in Chełm. The Vatican approved of Kuzemsky for two quite different reasons: (1) whatever his political profile, Kuzemsky's Catholicism was not suspect – he could be counted upon to remain loyal to the Holy See; and (2) he had the administrative experience and talent necessary to restore order and solidify Catholicism in Chełm eparchy. Although both parties were satisfied with Kuzemsky, he was neither's first choice: the Russian authorities would have preferred one of their protégés, such as Popel or Krynytsky, while the Vatican would have been more comfortable with a Roman-trained, less political prelate. The Poles were, of course, quite upset by the choice of Kuzemsky and denounced him to the Holy See, but when the Vienna nuncio made inquiries, he came to the conclusion that the charges of anti-latinism and schismatic leanings were politically motivated and groundless.³²

In September 1868, accompanied by throngs of well-wishers, Kuzemsky left Galicia for Chełm. He was full of confidence that he would be able to work out a solution to the crisis in Chełm that would satisfy the Russian government, the Vatican, and the faithful of the eparchy entrusted to his care. Most probably, he felt that the troubles in Chełm all proceeded from Polish intrigue and that a conscientiously Ruthenian approach to the problem would automatically solve it. In his first report to the Vienna nuncio after arriving in Chełm, he announced his "program": "to adhere most firmly to the union with the Catholic church, but no less to preserve the Greek rite as approved by the Supreme Pontiffs."³³

Things were not to prove so simple. He may have been a hero to the Ruthenians of Galicia, but the Uniates of Chełm eparchy had their reservations about him, although about ten thousand turned out to greet him when he arrived in his see.³⁴ He had only been in Chełm a few weeks when he received a petition signed by "a Uniate" asking him to expel the "wolves, who are all the Galicians, who came to us not through the door, but through the window like thieves." The petition went on to affirm the Galicians' complicity with the Russian government in its bloody campaign against organs and Polish hymns.³⁵ Kuzemsky also found another letter waiting for him, one signed by "the clergy of the entire Greek Uniate Chełm eparchy." The authors formally expressed joy at his appointment to the see of Chełm, but then went on to say that they were disturbed by what they saw in the newspapers and by what they heard as rumours. In particular, they were upset by reports (which were, in fact, false) that Kuzemsky had arrived with a large number of Galician priests to replace "the so-called 'latinized priests not suitable for sacerdotal office and not well disposed to our Russian nationality'"; they believed that the Galicians, moreover, would either run away from the wolf attacking the flock or, even worse, join the wolf in the attack. The bishop should follow Jesus' example in the temple and drive out the Galicians who had turned the place into a den of thieves. They recognized nationality, the Chełm clergy affirmed, but they did not mix it with religion. Christ did not tell his disciples to go forth and preach the Jewish nationality by means of bayonets, sabres, and prisons.³⁶ In the two and a half years he spent in Chełm, Bishop Kuzemsky was never able to overcome this distrust on the part of the Uniate faithful.

He also did not long enjoy the favour of the Vatican. He did not know at the time, but he was to find out later, that the Holy See was displeased that he chose to obey the Russian government's instructions not to communicate with Rome about anything but doctrinal matters. Kuzemsky sent fairly regular reports on the situation in Chełm to Monsignor Mariano Falcinelli, the nuncio in Vienna; he thought this sufficed, but in fact it did not.³⁷ More substantively, Rome was upset by Kuzemsky's pastoral letter of 23 October 1868, and later ones in a similar spirit, confirming the validity of certain ritual purifications introduced by "the intruder Voitsitsky." Rome was wary of ritual purification *à la russe*, since just such a process had preceded the suppression of the church union in Belarus and the Right Bank in 1839. Moreover, in the peculiar circumstances of Chełm, Rome seemed to prefer that the Uniates adhere to certain visibly Catholic practices of Latin origin. Kuzemsky had been under the impression that the papal

nuncio and the Russian ambassador in Vienna had reached an agreement that, in return for allowing the appointment of a bishop approved by Rome, the Russians would see the ritual practices of Chełm eparchy cleansed of latinisms. The nuncio wrote to Kuzemsky specifically to deny that such an agreement had ever been made.³⁸

The Vatican would have been even more displeased with Kuzemsky had it seen then the full text of a report on the state of Chełm eparchy that the bishop submitted to the Russian government on 31 January 1870. Kuzemsky gave a copy to his friend and long-time associate at St George's, Canon Mykhail Malynovsky, to abridge, translate into Latin, and submit to the nuncio.³⁹ The abridgement was very selective, with an eye to the mood in Rome.⁴⁰ In a letter to the nuncio, Kuzemsky himself described his report as "somewhat of an apology for the union" in which he "dared" (the phrase *ausus sum Augustissimo Imperatori* appears twice) to speak frankly about the difficulties facing the Uniates of Chełm. The report would undoubtedly cause the author "great inconveniences and persecutions," but a good Catholic bishop "is ready to suffer everything for the Catholic faith."⁴¹ In fact, however, it was a shockingly servile piece, as was revealed when copious excerpts were published in *Pravitel'stvennyi vestnik* in 1874. In his abridgement of his friend's report, it turned out, Father Malynovsky had left out such lines as these: "The latest disturbance in the Kingdom of Poland [the 1863 insurrection] revealed the extreme danger threatening the Russian population there. The government, after investigating the wretched situation of the Russian population and of the Greek-Uniate confession itself, decided to support and protect the Russian nationality and confession with a firm hand, employing to this end appropriate and effective measures."⁴² The reason the official Russian organ, *Pravitel'stvennyi vestnik*, published the excerpts from Kuzemsky's report in 1874 was to justify the conduct of the state authorities after ten peasants were shot dead during protests against ritual purification.

In spite of numerous concessions, Kuzemsky's success in retaining the support of the Russian government was no better than his success with Rome or with the majority of the clergy and faithful of Chełm. The Russians did not like his first pastoral letter, which seemed to confirm existing Latin practices in the Uniate ritual. Kuzemsky's fellow Galicians among the clergy continuously denounced him to the Russian authorities as a Latin sympathizer; they themselves preferred to move much faster in the direction of conformity to Russian Orthodoxy. Right from the start, in September 1868, the Russians proposed that Kuzemsky appoint Markell Popel his auxiliary bishop, but he

refused. He continued to refuse, even as the pressure mounted over the years. The two, both ambitious men, could not stand each other. Kuzemsky tried repeatedly to remove Popel from positions of responsibility, but the government always reinstated him; for his part, Popel fed the government a steady stream of denunciations of the bishop. With strong official backing, Popel grew ever more powerful in the eparchy, while Kuzemsky became ever more ineffectual and marginalized.⁴³ It was not very long before the Russian government let it be understood that it would welcome Kuzemsky's removal from Chełm.

Kuzemsky was in an impossible position. He had thought that he could bring about a workable compromise in Chełm, but in reality the positions of Rome and the Chełm Uniates, on the one hand, and of St Petersburg and the Galician emigrants, on the other, were irreconcilable. Instead of bringing any of the parties closer together, he was personally alienating each of them and growing ever more isolated. His episcopacy became an oppressive burden. His thoughts turned to escape.

On 4 June 1869 Spyrydon Lytvynovych, metropolitan of Halych, passed away, and the Greek Catholic see of Lviv became vacant. Many Ruthenians in Galicia thought that Kuzemsky would make the perfect successor, returning in triumph from Chełm. As Kuzemsky himself put it in letters to the nuncio, "all Galicia is waiting for me to be recalled" and "everyone, unanimously, is telling me that it is the sincerest wish of all Ruthenians that I return to Lviv."⁴⁴ The Russian government also supported his candidacy for the position, hoping to install Popel in his place in Chełm. For his part, Kuzemsky informed the nuncio that he would be very happy to obey the Holy See if it should desire that he return to Galicia as archbishop of Lviv and metropolitan of Halych.⁴⁵ Rome was not in the least interested.

As Kuzemsky wrote later in a letter to Pope Pius IX justifying the next step he took, "In this my tribulation, the finger of God showed me a way out from these my sufferings."⁴⁶ The *digitus Dei* here was bad health. He frequently had to travel to Lviv from Chełm to consult doctors, and he was laid up in bed for extended periods. When his relations with the Russian government deteriorated to the point of crisis, he resigned as bishop of Chełm for reasons of health. His resignation was accepted by the Russian government on 28 [16 O.S.] March 1871, and less than two months later he quit Chełm eparchy and returned to Lviv.⁴⁷ Except for excursions to curative baths, he remained in Lviv, bedridden, until his death in 1879.

Kuzemsky had not cleared his resignation with Rome, and, as is evident from the letter he sent to the bishop, Pius IX was upset by it.⁴⁸

Kuzemsky had, in his opinion, abandoned his post and left the eparchy entrusted to him at the mercy of the Russian government and of the administrator it appointed, namely Popel. Several months later Kuzemsky wrote a pathetic letter of self-justification to the pope in which he tried to portray himself as a confessor of the faith.⁴⁹ It didn't wash. The pope still considered Kuzemsky bishop of Chełm and would not accept his resignation, even though Kuzemsky pleaded for release (not only to relieve his conscience, but also so that he could apply for some salaried position in Lviv archeparchy). Kuzemsky only ceased to be the bishop of the Uniate eparchy of Chełm four years after he submitted his resignation to the Russian government, when the eparchy itself ceased to exist as a Catholic eparchy and was integrated into the Russian Orthodox church. (The final suppression of the church union in Chełm eparchy and its repercussions in Galicia will be dealt with later in this monograph.)

At this point it is necessary to ask a delicate question to which I can give no definite answer: Why did Bishop Mykhail Kuzemsky leave Chełm eparchy? Why did he not stand by his flock, even at the risk of becoming in reality the confessor or martyr that he tried to pass himself off as? Let us put the question in a context. His legitimate predecessor, Ioann Kalynsky, preferred to die in Viatka than give in to the pressures of the Russian government. Early in the First World War, when the Russians invaded Galicia, the man who was then metropolitan of Halych, Andrei Sheptytsky, did not flee, but stood by his people, spoke out in defence of the Greek Catholic church, and paid for his steadfastness with exile to the interior of Russia. In the middle of the twentieth century, when Western Ukraine came under Soviet rule, all of the bishops of the Greek Catholic churches of Galicia and Transcarpathia stayed put, until their arrest. Why did Kuzemsky not conduct himself in a manner more typical of a Greek Catholic bishop?

It is impossible to answer this question with any certainty, because the personal factor enters in. Kuzemsky may simply have lacked sufficient moral courage. His letters do, after all, suggest a certain weakness of character and personal ambition. But then one wonders, if this is the explanation for his resignation, why had he so fervently championed the Ruthenian cause in Galicia in 1848–68 and so profoundly alienated the Poles, without whose consent he could hardly hope to advance to episcopal office within the metropolis of Halych? Surely, a man with more ambition than courage would have followed a more cautious line. Also, if the matter just boils down to the question of an individual's character, then one wonders how it came to be that so many strong characters ended up in Greek Catholic episcopal office in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Were all these indi-

viduals just that much better men than Kuzemsky? Perhaps, but I, for one, have my doubts.

I do not bring this whole question up in order to judge the unfortunate Kuzemsky, but because I wonder whether an important determinant of Kuzemsky's behaviour lay outside the personal-moral sphere, in a more objective, socio-cultural framework that is indicative of the state of the Greek Catholic church in Galicia in the late 1860s and 1870s. What might have put backbone into Ioann Kalynsky, Andrei Sheptytsky, and the martyrs and confessors of the Soviet period? For one thing, all of them had a profound sense of national difference from the Russians, Kalynsky as a Uniate of the *gente Ruthenus, natione Polonus* variety, the others as convinced adherents of the Ukrainian national idea. This sense of difference was heightened by the animosity between the nationally conscious Ukrainians (and nationally conscious Poles) and the Russians. Kuzemsky, on the other hand – and in this he was like most of his contemporaries in Ruthenian Galicia – did not feel a deep alienation from the Russians. Furthermore, for Kalynsky, steeped in the environment of Polish patriotism, resisting the Russian government was a point of honour. The mid-twentieth-century martyrs and confessors also felt a deep-seated moral repugnance towards the Russian regime, which had in the meantime become identified with Bolshevik atheism. Kuzemsky, in his historical circumstances and in his environment, could not have felt quite the same way. And finally, Kalynsky, Sheptytsky, and the bishops of the middle of the twentieth century all shared the conviction that the Russian Orthodox church was but a tool of the Russian regime. For Kuzemsky and the Ruthenians of his epoch, this would have seemed like a gross oversimplification. In short, what I wonder is this: in the case of Kuzemsky's abandonment of Chełm eparchy, which played the greater role – insufficient courage of his convictions or convictions that were simply not as powerful as those of his confessor-martyr counterparts?

Whatever ambiguities remain about Kuzemsky's part in the demise of the Chełm Uniate eparchy, there are none with regard to the part played by the Galician emigrants. Evidence of their willing collaboration with the Russian authorities and of their pro-Orthodox proclivities is abundant. This is, for example, a point that Kuzemsky made repeatedly in his letter of justification to Pius IX.⁵⁰ We will see later how they conducted themselves after the eparchy was left without a Catholic bishop.

Already by 1871, however, the whole involvement of the Galicians, including Kuzemsky, in the affairs of the Chełm Uniate eparchy had left Rome with a very bad taste in its mouth.

The Conflict in Przemyśl

By the mid-1860s the Greek Catholic bishop of Przemyśl, Toma Poliansky, had reached such a state of physical and especially mental deterioration that he was unable to manage the affairs of his eparchy. As a result, in 1865 both the Austrian government and Metropolitan Lytvynovych urged the appointment of a coadjutor with the right of succession. The government and the metropolitan agreed that the man most suitable for the post was Canon Hryhorii Shashkevych of Przemyśl, who had made a very favourable impression when he served in the ministry of education in Vienna from 1848 until 1865. Franz Joseph even made an official decision to name Shashkevych to the post.

Rome, however, disapproved. The Vatican secretary of state, Cardinal Giacomo Antonelli, wrote to the Austrian ambassador to the Holy See and explained the Vatican's view. Although Bishop Poliansky was not capable of administering his eparchy, his refusal to accept a coadjutor made the assignment of one problematic; in this case, the assignment of an apostolic administrator, without the right of succession, would be a more appropriate measure. Also, the Vatican was acquainted with Shashkevych from his recent promotion in the Przemyśl cathedral chapter and had reservations. Furthermore, Shashkevych was not suitable, as he was not a monk, and in the Eastern churches bishops are normally recruited from the monastic clergy; in fact, Shashkevych was not only a secular priest, but a widower with a child. Since the Galician Ruthenians were surrounded by schismatics, they had to observe strictly the discipline of the Eastern church. (Antonelli was representing here a view quite popular in Roman circles at the time, that the Eastern Catholic churches should move towards instituting celibacy for the clergy and that one step in this direction would be the restoration of the old custom of recruiting bishops from the religious clergy alone.)⁵¹ Instead of making Canon Shashkevych coadjutor with the right of succession in Przemyśl, Antonelli recommended that an apostolic administrator be provided in the person of the archbishop of Nazianzus *in partibus infidelium*, Iosyf Sembratovych, who was then residing in Rome. Although the whole affair came to a temporary halt when Austria changed its ambassador to the Holy See, Antonelli's solution was adopted when the matter was renewed in 1867.⁵²

By this time, Rome had a weightier argument against Shashkevych, one that also convinced Metropolitan Lytvynovych to shift his support to Sembratovych. As background, it should be noted that Shash-

kevych was no Russophile: his attachment to Austria was genuine and he had served her loyally and well for many years. He was also a known opponent of the ritual movement: as rector of the Greek Catholic seminary in Vienna, he had dismissed a priest who was introducing purifications,⁵³ and he was also associated with the anti-ritualist periodical *Vistnyk* in Vienna.⁵⁴ What possessed this worldly Austrian to do what he did in the spring of 1866 I cannot say, since the sources are silent on the point. But what he did is well documented: ⁵⁵ he went to Vienna and bought there, at his own expense, a klobuk (monastic headgear of the Eastern church) for each member of the Przemyśl cathedral chapter; then, upon returning to Przemyśl, he personally conferred a klobuk on each canon. On Easter Sunday of 1866, the Greek Catholics of Przemyśl witnessed a novel sight: the entire cathedral chapter entered the church in their klobuks. In the context of the time, this was seen as a clear endorsement of the ritual purification movement and, by some, as a symptom of schismatic proclivities. Shashkevych was subsequently reprimanded and the klobuks removed. Although Antonelli had opposed his appointment as coadjutor before the klobuk incident, this clinched it, because, as Metropolitan Lytvynovych pointed out in a letter to the Galician lieutenant, Count Agenor Gołuchowski, one couldn't very well recommend for episcopal office a priest who had just recently fallen under ecclesiastical censure.⁵⁶ Thus, the Vatican candidate, Iosyf Sembratovych, was named to administer Przemyśl eparchy.

Sembratovych had been in Rome, serving as one of the postulators for the canonization of Iosafat Kuntsevych. He had to excuse himself from the solemn celebration of the canonization at Grottaferrata in October 1867 in order to take up his duties as apostolic administrator in Przemyśl.⁵⁷ As might have been expected under the circumstances, Sembratovych met with considerable resistance from the canons of Przemyśl cathedral. In the fall and winter of 1868–69, Pope Pius IX received a number of denunciations of Sembratovych's allegedly "arbitrary and violent character," which made some work for Nuncio Falcinelli, who was charged with getting to the bottom of the matter. After investigation, the nuncio decided that the problem lay in the state of Przemyśl eparchy, which had been without adequate episcopal supervision for some ten years, not with Sembratovych's character. Still, Antonelli asked the nuncio to write to Sembratovych and urge him to be more tactful. In this same period, Sembratovych himself received at least one anonymous letter of complaint.⁵⁸ I assume that these denunciations and the letter either came directly from the Przemyśl canons or were inspired by them. It is even more certain that they forged a letter from their incapacitated bishop, Poliansky, to the emperor. In it, "Bishop Poliansky" complained that "under the

cloak of false piety" Archbishop Sembratovych was an egoist, whose nepotism and greed had become a plague on the eparchy. "The archbishop," the letter continued, "makes no secret of it that he will be able to stay on the episcopal throne after my death only with the help of the Polish party."⁵⁹

The conflict in Przemyśl became sharper and more open immediately after the death of Bishop Poliansky on 11 November 1869. Sembratovych maintained that he was in charge of the eparchy, on the basis of the papal breve of 1 October 1867 that charged him with administration of the eparchy until such time as the Holy See disposed otherwise.⁶⁰ The cathedral chapter, however, under the leadership of Shashkevych, argued that once Bishop Poliansky was deceased, Sembratovych's authority as apostolic administrator lapsed and that it was incumbent upon the cathedral chapter, as authorized by its officially approved statutes, to assemble and elect a capitular vicar to administer the eparchy. On 13 November the chapter did so meet and elected Shashkevych as capitular vicar *in spiritualibus* and Canon Antonii Iuzychynsky as capitular vicar *in temporalibus*. The governor of Galicia had no idea who was rightfully in charge of Przemyśl eparchy and lamented that the chapter had not just elected Sembratovych as capitular vicar – then both claims could have been satisfied and there would only have been a single authority in the eparchy.⁶¹

Both sides lobbied the government to uphold their claims, and the conflict was closely followed in the Russophile newspaper *Slovo*, which clearly sided with the Przemyśl canons against "the archbishop sent from Rome" who was "so unconditionally devoted to the Roman curia."⁶² Although many in the Austrian government favoured their old colleague Shashkevych, by the end of November a telegram from Rome settled the matter, in favour of Sembratovych, of course. *Slovo* commented that Rome obviously thought it could treat Ruthenian Uniates any way it so wished, "but patience also has its limits."⁶³

The Appointment of a New Metropolitan of Halych

It has already been mentioned, in connection with Mykhail Kuzemsky's plans to escape Chełm, that Metropolitan Spyrydon Lytvynovych passed away on 4 June 1869. Almost a year of intensive and stressful negotiations between Rome and Vienna passed before his

successor was chosen. On 18 May 1870 the emperor named Iosyf Sembratovych Greek Catholic metropolitan of Halych and archbishop of Lviv. The nomination was complicated by many factors, not the least of which was the ill feeling between the liberal Austrian government and the papacy as a result of the First Vatican Council and its affirmation of the doctrine of papal infallibility. For our purposes, it is not necessary to recount the tangled story of the nomination in detail, especially since its main outlines have been presented in Edith Saurer's study of political aspects of Austrian episcopal nominations.⁶⁴ Here we will simply survey the main candidates and what the various interested parties saw in them.

The choice of a Ruthenian metropolitan was always weighty, but in the late 1860s, given the rise of Russophilism in Ruthenian society, the role being played by the Galician clergy in Chełm eparchy, and the highly pitched tension between Poles and Ruthenians in the wake of Sadowa and the *Ausgleich*, it was particularly so. Antonelli stipulated that the successor to Lytvynovych had to be "learned, pious, prudent, and zealous."⁶⁵ For his part, the lieutenant of Galicia, at that time Count Ludwik Possinger-Choborski, sought a successor who was a strict Catholic, loyal to Austria, acceptable and useful to the Poles, but also beloved by the Ruthenians – as Saurer has pointed out, a highly improbable combination for the late 1860s.⁶⁶

In the end, the choice fell upon Iosyf Sembratovych, who fitted Antonelli's more modest ideal⁶⁷ more closely than he did Possinger's, since he was not at all beloved by the Ruthenians at the time of his nomination. He was considered, and he was, the candidate promoted by the Poles, and he also had the mark of the Vatican upon him. He was a candidate to which the Austrian government agreed with reluctance, only after Rome had unequivocally excluded Austria's own candidates. From the government's point of view, the choice of Sembratovych was unfortunate for three reasons. First, the government wanted a politically astute, capable administrator, a man like the departed Metropolitan Lytvynovych. Sembratovych was nothing like that: he shied away from the mundane and had little administrative experience. His only stint as an administrator, in Przemyśl eparchy, did not fill the government with confidence in his abilities. Second, Sembratovych was the Vatican's man, not the government's, at a time when relations between Rome and the liberal government in Vienna were strained. The government did not want an ultramontane to enter the ranks of the Austrian episcopate. And third, the government understood that it was not politically prudent to appoint as Ruthenian metropolitan a man whom the Ruthenians did not like. But with the Vatican insistent on his nomination and influential Poles

supporting him, the government capitulated and recommended to the emperor the nomination of Sembratovych.

Why the Vatican supported Sembratovych is clear enough. It wanted a strict Catholic on the metropolitan throne of Halych and it had no doubts about Sembratovych's loyalty and his ability to see things from Rome's perspective. There were some doubts, however, about his practical abilities, and some figures on the Roman side, in particular Nuncio Falcinelli, preferred Iosyf's nephew, Sylvestr Sembratovych, who, however, was excluded on the grounds that he was under forty years of age and thus too young for such an exalted post.⁶⁸ The Ruthenians' antipathy towards and the Poles' support for Iosyf Sembratovych were closely related and fed each other. Both parties lost sight of the fact that Sembratovych had never displayed any particular affinity for either Polish culture or Polish politics. He was Rome's man, but an unadulterated Ruthenian nonetheless. For the Russophiles, of course, his association with Rome was enough to bring his Ruthenianism into question, but this was a one-sided view and served only to confuse the issue so that the Poles overrated and the Ruthenians underrated him.

The most serious candidate for the metropolitanate after Sembratovych was Canon Shashkevych of Przemyśl. He was the Austrian government's first choice: politically connected, a skilled administrator, respected by all sensible, non-Russophile Ruthenians.⁶⁹ By November 1869 the ministers had prepared a decree for the emperor to sign⁷⁰ naming Shashkevych metropolitan, and they even announced the decision. However, as several years previously in the matter of the appointment of a coadjutor for Przemyśl eparchy, the Vatican's backing of Sembratovych quashed Shashkevych's nomination to episcopal office.⁷¹ The old argument was trotted out: the Galician Greek Catholics had to observe strict Eastern discipline and could not have a widower with a child as bishop.⁷² The klobuks of Easter Sunday 1866 also were not forgotten.⁷³ The government gave way. In addition to the Vatican pressure, the Poles, who in post-1867 Austria were a force to be reckoned with, let it be understood by the minister of religion that Shashkevych, as far as they were concerned, was "persona ingratisima."⁷⁴ The Latin archbishop of Lviv told the nuncio that he believed that "Shashkevych is a schismatic in his heart."⁷⁵

Forced to give way on Shashkevych, the government was still not prepared to accept Sembratovych. It instead put forward another Przemyśl canon with political experience: Antonii luzychynsky (the same person who, during the cathedral chapter's conflict with Sembratovych, was elected capitular vicar *in temporalibus* after the death of Bishop Poliansky). I suspect that this nomination was intended pri-

marily to flout the Vatican, since Iuzychynsky was patently unworthy of such office. His ambition was much greater than his scruples, he was neglectful of church services, and he had a scandalous reputation for sexual transgressions.⁷⁶ As the government pointed out, however, he did refuse the gift of a klobuk from Shashkevych back in 1866. The Austrian government actually prepared a decree, which the emperor dutifully signed, naming him metropolitan (25 March 1870). Once again Antonelli managed to have the decree retracted and the negotiations reopened.

The popular choice in Ruthenia was, of course, Bishop Mykhail Kuzemsky of Chełm. Ruthenian clergymen and laymen sent petitions to the emperor on his behalf,⁷⁷ and Kuzemsky himself appeared in Lviv in late February–early March 1870, ostensibly to consult the doctors, but really, at least so many thought, to lobby for the metropolitan throne.⁷⁸ I have seen no documentation that suggests that any of the principals involved in the negotiations ever took this candidacy seriously. The agitation for Kuzemsky did, however, have the effect of impressing upon the government the need for a quick decision.⁷⁹ This is why Iuzychynsky was hastily, and abortively, named metropolitan on 25 March 1870 and also probably why the government shortly thereafter agreed to the appointment of Rome's candidate, Iosyf Sembratovych.

Pope Pius IX confirmed the nomination of Iosyf Sembratovych on 26 June 1870;⁸⁰ his solemn installation took place on 7 August 1870.⁸¹

The Appointment of Ioann Stupnytsky as Bishop of Przemyśl

The Greek Catholic see of Przemyśl remained vacant after Iosyf Sembratovych assumed the metropolitan throne, so Sembratovych continued on for some time as administrator of that eparchy. A bishop was finally named by the emperor on 26 May 1871: Canon Ioann Stupnytsky of Lviv. But he did not assume office until the fall of 1872, because for over a year Sembratovych, asserting his prerogatives as metropolitan, refused to confirm the appointment. The Austrian government pressed the Vatican to persuade Sembratovych to confirm Stupnytsky, and Sembratovych himself travelled to Rome in March 1872 to state his case against the canon before the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (Propaganda), Antonelli, and the Holy

Father himself. At the end of July 1872, the matter finally came to a conclusion when the Vatican convinced the metropolitan to confirm Stupnytsky.⁸²

What lay behind this struggle? The metropolitan based his refusal to confirm on unfavourable reports about the faith and morals of the canon, but as all contemporaries were aware, the primary grounds were political. Stupnytsky was a candidate put forward by the Poles. For that matter, so had been Sembratovych, but there were some important differences. Sembratovych's real backer for the post of metropolitan had been Rome, and the Poles went along; Stupnytsky's backers were the Poles, and Rome went along. Sembratovych was not culturally or politically polonized, but Stupnytsky was a known polonophile. During the vacancy in the metropolitanate, Polish newspapers had championed Stupnytsky for metropolitan in much the same way that *Slovo* had championed Kuzemsky. Stupnytsky owed his very appointment to the cathedral chapter to Galicia's most prominent Polish politician, Count Agenor Gołuchowski, who had pressured Metropolitan Lytvynovych to appoint him in 1868.⁸³

The Russophiles published vehement attacks on Stupnytsky in *Slovo* after his nomination as bishop of Przemyśl.⁸⁴ One such attack, which appeared on the front page as a lead article, was particularly noteworthy, since it threatened mass conversion to Orthodoxy if the Poles continued to exercise control over the Greek Catholic church: "What would Stupnytsky do if, completely embittered by this Polish management, our clergy, which enjoys sympathy among the people, were, in the context of today's freedom of religion, to declare itself in favour of Orthodoxy?" "We see a serious danger for the [church] union in the instalment of Stupnytsky, and if he is installed as bishop, then it is most likely that Providence wants Galician Rus' to return more quickly to the bosom of its ancestral church."⁸⁵

The predicted catastrophe for the union failed to materialize. In fact, when in the summer of 1872 *Slovo* was convinced that the matter of Stupnytsky's confirmation was settled, it changed its line, reconciling itself to the practical necessity of living with the new bishop. It quoted, and expressed agreement with, Metropolitan Sembratovych's assessment: "Canon Stupnytsky, as an intelligent man, will not want to make his position difficult and ruin his name in the history of the Ruthenian church ... accordingly, he will try to gain consideration, love, and trust among the clergy and people with whom his fate will be bound."⁸⁶

One more aspect of the appointment is of some interest. There were those who said that Mykhail Kuzemsky's resignation as bishop of Chełm was connected with the vacancy to be filled in Przemyśl, that

having lost out on his bid for the metropolitan throne, he wanted at least to obtain the see of Przemyśl and hence resigned from Chełm.⁸⁷ Although I find this story difficult to believe, the timing does fit perfectly (18 March 1871). Moreover, there is a letter from Kuzemsky to Falcinelli, dated 15 March 1872 (i.e., after Stupnytsky's nomination, but before Sembratovych's agreement to confirm him), which can be read as confirmation that Kuzemsky was, at that late date, aspiring to the see of Przemyśl. In it, he thanked the Holy Father for the money he had sent (Kuzemsky was destitute) and noted that the Polish newspaper *Gazeta Narodowa* was interpreting this benevolence on the part of the Holy Father as a great danger for the client whom the Poles were trying to place in the eparchy of Przemyśl, that is, Stupnytsky.⁸⁸

The *Sion* Circle

There were among the Greek Catholic clergy of Galicia those who were disturbed by the religious ramifications of the vigorous Russophilism that seemed to have achieved hegemony in Ruthenian society, and who wished to nurture instead the development of a firmly Catholic perspective. In 1871 this current crystallized around a journal, *Sion Ruskii* (*Ruskii Sion* in 1872–80, replaced by *Halytskii Sion* in 1880–82, then restored as *Ruskii Sion* in 1883–85).

The founder and *spiritus movens* of *Sion* was Sylvestr Sembratovych, a Roman-trained doctor of theology and professor of dogmatics at Lviv University; as was mentioned previously, he might have been made metropolitan instead of his uncle Iosyf had he been forty years of age at the time of the appointment. His close collaborators in this project were the Reverend Dr Iuliiian Pelesh and an old school chum, Father Aleksii Toronsky. Others associated with the journal included Fathers Aleksandr Bachynsky, Iosyf Kobyliansky, Dr Iosyf Milnytsky, the Basilian protohegumen Dr Klymentii Sarnytsky, Dr Teofil Sembratovych, Ioann Shykh, and Aleksandr Stefanovych. Although outnumbered by the Russophiles, this was an extremely talented group.

In particular, Iuliiian Pelesh stood out. He wrote a Ruthenian-language textbook of pastoral theology, which even earned praise in *Slovo*,⁸⁹ and a two-volume history of the Ruthenian Catholic church, which, as a scholarly refutation of pro-Orthodox propaganda, did not. When in 1873, under the pressure of the Galician Poles, the ministry

of religion considered closing down the Greek Catholic seminary in Vienna as a hotbed of Russophilism, it was decided instead to send Pelesh to reform the institution. Two days after becoming rector in 1874, he dissolved the main centre of Russophilism in the seminary and imposed a discipline that discouraged contact with agents at the Russian embassy (notably Father Mikhail Raevsky). As long as he was rector, he managed to keep Russophilism under control at the seminary.⁹⁰

The journal itself, *Sion*, did not quite live up to all its possibilities, especially in the first years, when it tended to be too theoretical and divorced from current debates and issues. Even then, however, it was understood to be a religiously anti-Russophile organ, and Russophile priests combed its pages looking for possible errors of doctrine to denounce in *Slovo*.⁹¹

The journal became much more interesting after 1875; the conversion of Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy in that year seems to have galvanized it into greater engagement. It began to confront the Russophile ritualists directly, defending the papacy's record with regard to the Eastern churches, identifying the political, pro-Russian underpinnings of the ritualists' movement to make Greek Catholic ritual more similar to the Orthodox, and arguing that certain supposed latinisms, such as going about clean-shaven and with much the same clothing as the rest of the Catholic clergy, had more to do with comfort and the march of civilization than with the abandonment of hallowed Eastern practices.⁹²

At one point, in 1880, when Father Aleksandr Bachynsky was editor, the journal became a bit too engaged for its own good. Father Nykolai Malyniak, who had been educated in Rome and then served as one of the prefects of studies at the Lviv Greek Catholic seminary, contributed a long, rambling series of comments on Galician church affairs under the title "Notes of a Roman."⁹³ The series was critical of conditions in the Lviv seminary and of conditions in Lviv archeparchy more generally. Malyniak lamented, for example, that there were not many clerics suitable for high office in the Ruthenian church, that it was hard to find appropriate persons to become canons, rectors, and bishops, let alone cardinals.⁹⁴ St George's apparently found the series extremely offensive, and the metropolitan took some drastic steps: he dismissed Malyniak from the seminary and Bachynsky from the post of editor as well as from the seminary (of which he was vice-rector). He also formally closed down *Ruskii Sion* (in the process exposing Bachynsky to financial ruin)⁹⁵ and replaced it with *Halytskii Sion*, appointing Father Iosyf Milnytsky as editor.⁹⁶ *Ruskii Sion* would be restored with Bachynsky as editor after 1882, for reasons that will become clear later in this study.

Although the *Sion* group did not explicitly formulate a position with regard to the national movement and the national identity of the Galician Ruthenians, its publications were in a Ukrainianized vernacular, not the near-Russian favoured by *Slovo* and other Russophile publications. The group's main concern was religious, but it stood on the Ukrainian side of the divide between the Russophiles and Ukrainophiles.

The National Populists and the Church

Although Russophilism was ascendant in Galician Ruthenia in the 1860s, that same decade also saw the regrouping of the adherents of the Ukrainian national orientation. They managed to publish some short-lived periodicals in the earlier 1860s, but only really consolidated at the end of the decade, with the appearance of the journal *Pravda* in 1867 and the establishment of the Prosvita (Enlightenment) Society in 1868. By this time they had already taken for themselves the name *narodovtsi*, which is generally translated as "national populists" to catch the double meaning of the Ukrainian word *narod*. Just as the *Sion* group challenged the Russophiles religiously, but with some national-political implications, the national populists challenged the Russophiles nationally and politically, but with some religious implications.

There was no uniform national populist position on Ruthenian church affairs in the late 1860s/early 1870s. However, it is possible to discern at least two distinct tendencies, linked to two distinct political tendencies existing within the national populist camp at that time. Those national populists who felt that it was important to come to a political understanding with the Poles held views on the Greek Catholic church that were diametrically opposed to those of the Russophiles and rather close to those of moderate Polish Catholics. Those who promoted a more independent, anti-Polish line accepted certain elements of the Russophile critique of Roman and, particularly, Polish influence on the Greek Catholic church and argued the need for more ecclesiastical independence.

The first view was represented by the periodicals *Rus'*, which was actually subsidized by the Polish-dominated Galician government,⁹⁷ and *Osnova*, which was founded by the leader of the "conciliationists," Iuliiian Lavrivsky. In 1872 *Osnova* came out in support of the nomination of Ioann Stupnytsky as bishop of Przemyśl,⁹⁸ and in 1867 *Rus'* published the only positive reference I have been able to find in

the Ruthenian press concerning the canonization of Iosafat Kuntsevych (“the Uniate heaven is embellished with a new saint”). In fact, *Rus’* used the occasion of the canonization to reflect on the Ruthenian church union in a wide context. The Ruthenians benefited immensely from the union with the Catholic church, it argued, because through it they were brought into contact with Western culture and enlightenment. If the union had some negative consequences at first, this was certainly not the case at present. The Greek Catholic Ruthenians of Galicia were much better off than their Orthodox co-nationals under Muscovite rule. “Today Rome is neither as frightening nor as powerful as it was once ... Catholic Poland was never so frightening for us as Orthodox Russia is today ... Distant Rome will never be so frightening as neighbouring Moscow is today.” Rome never imported priests into Galicia to serve Polish interests or latinize the ritual, *Rus’* commented; when this was done, it was done by Galician Ruthenians themselves. By contrast, Russia was now importing “muscovized Galician priests” into Chelm in order to russify the Uniates there. The Ruthenians had gained from their connection with the universal church, and the latter also stood to learn from the Ruthenians: the Roman Catholic church should follow the Ruthenian example in two respects – it should allow married clergy and stop celebrating the liturgy in a dead foreign language.⁹⁹ In another article, the lead editorial published a week later, *Rus’* squarely attacked the ritual-purification movement, accusing it of being politically, not religiously, inspired.¹⁰⁰

Rus’ was too Polonophile for the majority of the national populists. One of the most energetic of their young activists, the seminarian Danylo Taniachkevych, wrote and published (under a pseudonym) “a letter of the Ruthenian national populists to the editor of ... *Rus’* as a protest and memorandum.” Although most of Taniachkevych’s polemic concerned politics, it also touched upon the ecclesiastical situation, expressing views that seem to have been more representative of national populist thinking, even if more sharply and more concretely formulated than was generally the case.

Taniachkevych began by stating that Polish Catholicism had been in the past and remained in the present an instrument of polonization. Nonetheless, he went on, the national populists had no intention of breaking with the Catholic church, because synodal Russian Orthodoxy posed a much greater danger. This was not to say, though, that the Ruthenian national populists had any ill will towards the Dnieper Ukrainians because of their Orthodox religion: “This union of ours is not chained to Brest or to Rome or to the grave of Blessed Iosafat by such iron shackles that we would identify the faith of our

Orthodox fathers and of our brothers with devil-worship." Taniachkevych wrote that the Ruthenians had accepted the union "from unclean hands as a hellish political machination," but that the deeply religious, moral spirit of his people had been cleansing it and would cleanse it completely. In fact, the union has a marvellous future before it. It was in the interests of the union to purify the rite of latinisms. As to the future structure of the Ruthenian Greek Catholic church, it should be "a patriarchate for the Ruthenians-Uniates, that is, for the Austro-Ruthenian dioceses, with all the appurtenant rights and prerogatives, namely, with the right to convoke a national synod to elect the patriarch and the bishops."¹⁰¹ The ecclesiastical ideal of the independentist national populists was almost identical to their national-political ideal: they wanted a church/nation that ruled itself, free from Polish and Russian political and cultural influence.

The national populists enjoyed some valuable support among the Lviv seminarians: Taniachkevych played a crucial role in the general mobilization of university youth for the national populists, and he was not their only activist in the seminary.¹⁰² Their relations with the established clergy, however, were not very good. It is said that one of the superiors at the Vienna seminary boasted that he had developed an excellent method for dealing with any Ukrainophile under his jurisdiction: he would have the offender shave his head until all he had left was his Cossack forelock, then he would grab him by this forelock and behead him with a sabre.¹⁰³ The canons of St George's were also said to have terrorized village priests into keeping their distance from the Ukrainophile orientation.¹⁰⁴ Numerous factors probably contributed to the initial coolness with which the established clergy greeted national populism – the Russophile mood of the times, the aversion to the polonophilism of the Lavrivsky faction, the criticism of the seminary administration that the national populists let Taniachkevych publish in their press under pseudonyms, and, most substantively, the religious indifferentism that coloured national populism.

The latter issue was evident in the quarrelling over a writer, the Ukrainian national poet Taras Shevchenko. For the national populists, Shevchenko – in spite of his formal adherence to the Russian Orthodox church, his heterodoxy, and his anti-Catholicism – was simply the greatest figure in the national pantheon. The older generation of clergy had trouble digesting this view. The first misunderstanding surfaced as early as 1862, in connection with the first anniversary of Shevchenko's death. The young national populists wanted to have a service celebrated in memory of the poet, but the Lviv clergy refused on the grounds that Shevchenko had been a

schismatic. The disagreement smouldered on, and the national populists began to publish articles on religion that St George's interpreted as a provocation. In 1865 the Lviv consistory placed a ban on their organ, *Meta*.¹⁰⁵

Another controversy over Shevchenko occurred in 1877, when Father Nykolai Ohonovsky denounced Shevchenko's "anti-religious writings" in *Ruskii Sion* as the source of the current demoralization and religious apathy of Galician youth.¹⁰⁶ In its day, the article was quite a sensation and provoked several responses, most of which *Sion* declined to publish.¹⁰⁷ When *Sion* closed off debate, Sylvestr Sembratovych made the following pronouncement: "I do not endorse ... any blasphemies and errors against the holy Catholic faith, whether in Shevchenko or in any other author, and I am of the opinion that the reading and distribution of this sort of works should be prohibited."¹⁰⁸

In the last analysis, the *Sion* group and the national populists shared an opposition to Russophilism, but little else.

The St George Program of 1871

With the consolidation of national populism at the end of the 1860s, Ruthenian society became politically riven between the Russophile and Ukrainophile camps. This division, a deep one, was to remain characteristic of Galician Ruthenia at least through the rest of the century. Early on, however, there was an attempt to make peace between the camps and restore national unity. In 1870 the newly appointed metropolitan, Iosyf Sembratovych, invited representatives of both factions to meet with him and discuss possible principles of unity.¹⁰⁹ In the next year, Canon Mykhail Malynovsky of St George's cathedral drafted a statement of such principles, entitled "Thoughts for the Concordant Comportment of the Galician Ruthenians in Their National Affairs."¹¹⁰

The program established as its first two points the traditional St George postulates of complete loyalty to the Catholic church and to the Austrian dynasty ("so as not even to provide a pretext for someone to ascribe to us separatist tendencies").

The third point has to be quoted in full: "We hold faithfully to the state constitution, and on the basis of it we should develop our Galician-Ruthenian nationality in scholarly and economic aspects. We do not meddle in politics (*V polytyku ne zapuskaïmsia*)." In speak-

ing of "our Galician-Ruthenian nationality" (*nashu halytsku-rusku narodnist'*), Malynovsky was employing phraseology common enough at the time, but both his Russophile and Ukrainophile contemporaries took him to mean that he championed the formation of a separate Galician-Ruthenian nationality – "an independent nationality of Galician Rus'," in the words of *Slovo*,¹¹¹ and "a nation of three million," in the words of *Osnova*.¹¹² I do not think Malynovsky had this consciously in mind, although the St Georgists did have a tendency to think in narrowly Galician terms and it would have been convenient for them if they represented a nationality whose territory coincided exactly with the jurisdiction of the Greek Catholic metropolis of Halych. I think rather that Malynovsky was merely trying to paper over the differences between the all-Russian and the Ukrainian conceptions so that the two tendencies could work together on concrete Galician projects. But neither the Russophiles nor the national populists were content with this formulation, since they were engaged in conflict precisely over the question of larger allegiances. That Malynovsky thought he could use finesse on this question indicates that St George's was a bit out of touch with political reality. This is corroborated by the amazing sentence that ends this particular point in what was, after all, a political program: ¹¹³ "We do not meddle in politics."

Another attempt at papering over substantive differences was contained in point 5, which concerned the language issue. It began by affirming that "we should use our particular Galician-Ruthenian (Little Russian) language." And then it proceeded to advocate two contradictory principles for standardizing that language: the vernacular principle favoured by the national populists¹¹⁴ and the historical principle favoured by the Russophiles.¹¹⁵ Also, since the Russophiles spelled the word for Ruthenian with two *s*'s so as to suggest unity with the Russians (*ruskii*) and the national populists spelled it with one *s* and a soft sign in the Ukrainian manner (*rus'kii*), Malynovsky proposed that from now on, in order to eliminate this stumbling-block to cooperation, all Ruthenians should use the compromise form *ruskii*, that is, with one *s*, but no soft sign.

The St George program of 1871 was unceremoniously rejected by both parties. The Russophiles snidely remarked that Malynovsky deserved to become a bishop of Przemyśl or at least a bishop *in partibus infidelium* for his troubles, while the national populists said that the program "opened the gates to the recognition of the three million as a part of the Russian nation."¹¹⁶ The program of 1871 turned out to be the last, feeble manifestation of the traditional clerical leadership of the Ruthenians.

Improving the People, Serving the Nation

One of the deeds for which Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych was long remembered was his anti-alcohol crusade. He was not the first Ruthenian metropolitan to combat alcohol: his predecessor Mykhail Levytsky had initiated a sobriety campaign in 1844. Nor was Metropolitan Iosyf the first Ruthenian clergyman in his own era to revive the struggle: Father Stefan Kachala had published an influential brochure in 1869, distributed by the national populist Prosvita organization, that identified vodka as the chief enemy of the Ruthenian peasant,¹¹⁷ and Father Ioann Naumovych often denounced the tavern in his popular periodical *Nauka*, established in 1871. But Metropolitan Iosyf gave the sobriety drive tremendous impetus, transforming it into a mass movement that engulfed the Galician countryside in the mid-1870s.

The crucial instrument in this transformation was a pastoral letter of over eighty printed pages “on the high dignity of man” issued on 3 April 1874¹¹⁸ and drafted by Canon Mykhail Malynovsky.¹¹⁹ The letter offered a detailed examination of the spiritual, corporal, and economic harm wrought by drink and concluded with a summons to pastors to establish temperance societies in their parishes. The metropolitan recapitulated his main points in the conclusion as “piety, sobriety, industry, and thrift.”¹²⁰ The whole pastoral letter was to be read aloud in segments in place of the sermon in all churches on Sundays and feast days. Each pastor was to report to the deanery which days would be set aside for public readings of the letter.

The letter made a great impact, and the Ruthenian press of the mid-1870s was full of reports on the activities of brotherhoods of sobriety and on temperance missions. In the view of the Galician establishment, this enthusiasm in fact got out of hand: the lieutenancy complained to the metropolitan in June 1875 that some pastors were pressuring the village mayors into illegal actions, such as placing a guard around the tavern, forcing parishioners to sign oaths of abstinence, and conducting searches in private homes. The metropolitan had to issue instructions to the clergy to eschew methods such as these.¹²¹

In order to strengthen his campaign to lead the Ruthenians “from the sin of drunkenness to the virtue of sobriety, from the sin of godlessness to the virtue of piety, from the sin of idleness and laziness to the virtue of industry, from the sin of wastefulness to the virtue of thrift,” the metropolitan appealed to Pope Pius IX to endow member-

ship in the brotherhoods of sobriety with indulgences. The pope agreed, and as of the end of July 1874, participation in the brotherhoods was rewarded with an assortment of plenary and partial indulgences.¹²²

The sobriety campaign earned the metropolitan immense respect among the great majority of educated Ruthenians.¹²³ It was seen as an expansion of the work among the people that was then being undertaken by both branches of the Ruthenian national movement through their popular-educational organizations, the Russophile Kachkovsky Society and the national populist Prosvita Society. It was part of a vast program of popular improvement – more education, more prosperity, more voluntary associations – that the Ruthenian national leaders had discovered was crucial to their success. It was a combination of pastoral and national activity that was sanctioned not only by the metropolitan but also, through the latter's intercession, by the pope himself.

On the other hand, there were those in Galicia who did not stand to benefit from the temperance campaign unleashed by the metropolitan: the large landowners, mainly Polish, who held a monopoly over the distillation of alcoholic beverages and for whom this was an important source of income, and the tavern keepers, mainly Jewish, whose livelihood was threatened by mass pledges of abstinence.¹²⁴ It has become a commonplace of Ukrainian historiography that Metropolitan Iosyf's sobriety campaign so alienated the Polish landlords that they later used their influence to have him removed from the metropolitan throne.¹²⁵ Although this is a fairly plausible explanation for what did in fact transpire in 1882, it finds absolutely no confirmation in the Austrian or Vatican documentation I have examined.

The Conversion of Chełm Eparchy to Orthodoxy

It will be recalled that after Mykhail Kuzemsky submitted his resignation as bishop of Chełm to the Russian government in 1871, the government appointed the Galician emigrant Markell Popel to administer the eparchy.¹²⁶ Popel pursued the campaign to purify the Chełm rite of Latin borrowings, performing services in the cathedral strictly in accordance with Orthodox practice and distributing Orthodox liturgical books to the clergy.

Popel's most important administrative measure in this regard was a circular issued on 2 October 1873 (O.S.).¹²⁷ In it he cited at some

length papal pronouncements on the necessity of preserving intact the rites of the Eastern Catholics. He noted, however, that in spite of these explicit statements of the popes, individuals serving Polish political interests had introduced changes, deformities, and innovations into the ritual of Chełm eparchy. "In light of these circumstances, the eparchial authorities of Chełm, which have been put on guard over the inviolability of the entire legacy of our forefathers, have continually issued directives aimed at the purification of our divine worship and our rite of all the Latin-Polish admixtures inappropriate to it and of arbitrary deformities." Nonetheless, he continued, many priests had ignored these directives and continued to perform services in the Latin-Polish way and had not installed iconostases in their churches. It was time once and for all to rectify this situation. As of 1 January 1874 all services would have to be performed in strict conformity with the directives of the eparchial authorities, after the Eastern manner.

In order to assure compliance with Popel's circular, the state authorities demanded that individual priests sign a declaration stating that they would abide by it in the new year. About two dozen priests who refused were deprived of their parishes; most of these were arrested, others fled to Galicia. In spite of prophylactic measures, the implementation of the circular in 1874 proved difficult. In numerous parishes the parishioners refused to accept the purified ritual and made their refusal known by such acts as dragging the pastor out of the church, taking the church keys away from him, or packing all his belongings in a cart in front of the rectory. Police and Cossacks intervened to force the parishioners into submission, making them spend cold winter nights barefoot in the snow until they agreed to accept the purifications, beating them with cudgels and whips, shooting them. Unrest was particularly acute in the northern part of Chełm eparchy (Podlachia), where the strife over ritual was reminiscent of the days of the Russian Old Believer schism, including a tragic case of self-immolation.¹²⁸ The Uniate resisters in Chełm eparchy were encouraged in their struggle by Pius IX's encyclical "Omnem sollicitudinem" of 13 May 1874, which unequivocally condemned the purification process and branded Popel an intruder.¹²⁹

By the end of 1874, the government had essentially quelled the unrest; it also claimed that the mood of the people had undergone a change, that now the peasants wanted to become of the same faith as "the White Tsar." On 12 January 1875 (O.S.), forty-five parishes of Chełm eparchy solemnly proclaimed their union with the Orthodox church. Such proclamations continued through May, by which time almost all of Chełm eparchy had formally converted to Orthodoxy.

As part of the conversion process, a delegation headed by Popel travelled to St Petersburg, where it was received by the tsar and tsarina on the feast of the Annunciation. The eparchy was incorporated into the newly created eparchy of Chełm and Warsaw, with a suffragan bishop of Lublin resident in Chełm. Popel was named to the latter post. The last Uniate eparchy in Russia had disappeared.¹³⁰

As contemporaries from every camp recognized, the Galician emigrant clergy played a crucial role in the conversion of Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy. The most prominent figure was Popel, but other Galician emigrants, such as Father Nykolai Lyvchak, who as part of the Uniate delegation to St Petersburg delivered a major speech in St Isaac's cathedral, also assumed representative functions for the faithful of Chełm eparchy. After purges of steadfast Catholic clergy, the Galician priests constituted a plurality of the clergy of what was once the Chełm Uniate eparchy. As of 1 March 1881, there were 291 Orthodox priests in the former eparchy: 95 were local Chełm priests who had converted from Uniatism to Orthodoxy, 53 were priests who had been Orthodox all along (*drevlepravoslavnye*) and hence were imported from outside the eparchy, and 143 were of Galician origin, including those ordained after the "reunion" with Orthodoxy.¹³¹ The Galician emigrants were fully conscious of their responsibility for the conversion. As one of them wrote in a letter to *Slovo* in the fall of 1875, "We returned ourselves and our brothers in Chełm to the bosom of the Russian church and Russian nationality. We won a battle that had been undecided for centuries. We were able to attain victory over Polonism and ultramontanism, and even more surely we shall *consolidate* the Russian Orthodoxy that *we* introduced."¹³² And further: "Without the Galician missionaries, Russia, in spite of its power, would not yet have made significant progress for Orthodoxy in this eparchy."¹³³

As these quotations indicate, the Galician emigrants were motivated, at least in part, by ideological considerations. They were able in Chełm to act upon the implications of the Russophile ideology they had imbibed in Galicia and to unite with "the Russian church and Russian nationality." Contemporaries of all camps, however, noted that there were material considerations involved as well. A correspondent of *Slovo* who seemed to have some lingering qualms about the conversion thought that the material arguments in its favour were compelling. He explained that "a man is sometimes prepared to accept another Christian confession in order to save the material life of his wife and children ... We understand the Catholic conscience of the metropolitan [who was then prepared to travel to St Petersburg to intercede for the Chełm Uniates] and we assure him that we do not trifle with this conscience either, but ... we have

another conscience, too, and another feeling, which tells us to take care of our children and wife, who need bread against hunger and clothing against cold, and this too has its power and its logic."¹³⁴ In other words, the Galician emigrants could not be expected to give up their parishes just because there was a change of faith. The same point was made by Father Stefan Kachala, a national populist, in a speech in the Galician diet (1881): "But did all those who went to Chełm go there with the idea of replacing the union with Orthodoxy? No. The union was in existence there, and they all could hope that they would remain in union; and that they did not go with something else in mind is demonstrated by the case of Kuzemsky, who returned and did not accept Orthodoxy. Well, one can ask: Why didn't the others return? Kuzemsky could return, because he had an assured living. But could the others return to the place from which hunger and cold had driven them?"¹³⁵ And a similar point was made by Iuliiian Pelesh in *Ruskii Sion*, although the phraseology was different: "The faithless Galician priests who of their own volition settled there are playing the role of Judases, selling themselves and the faithful for pieces of silver."¹³⁶

As was noted earlier in connection with the emigration to Chełm, the Galician emigrants found that their convictions and their material interests coincided, and surely the latter must have reinforced the former. How pathetic, by contrast, were those clergymen – Chełm locals almost to a man – who did not enjoy concord between what they believed and what was good for them; they either violated their conscience and stayed on as Orthodox *batiushki* in Chełm or stood by their beliefs and fled or were expelled to Galicia (sixty-six such priests) or else were imprisoned or exiled in Russia (seventy-four) or else died as martyrs (seven).¹³⁷

The Galician emigrants could have had no doubt that their actions in purifying the ritual and converting to Orthodoxy went against the will of the local population and the local clergy. The emigrants admitted this in articles in *Slovo*,¹³⁸ although such admissions hardly need to be adduced to make this particular point. In the course of the resistance to the purification and conversion, about 600 of the faithful of Chełm eparchy were deported and 108 lost their lives.¹³⁹ (The strength of Catholic sentiment even after the formal conversion was impressive. For a whole generation thereafter, "persisters," that is, Uniates who refused to reconcile themselves to the loss of their church, proved to be a thorn in the side of the Russian authorities. As one of the regime's concessions to the Poles during the revolution of 1905, the formally Orthodox population of the Chełm region was permitted to return to Catholicism, but only in the Latin rite; 170,000 of 450,000 did so by 1908.)

How did the Galician emigrants reconcile themselves to all this? Some seem to have pretended that these things never happened. Father Nykolai Lyvchak, looking back at the events in Chełm eparchy in his speech in St Isaac's cathedral in St Petersburg, omitted the Cossacks and the police from his account of the conversion: "Whole centuries of noisy falsehood [i.e., 'the machinations of Polish missionaries'] gave way before a few years of humble and quiet preaching on the part of some twenty clergymen."¹⁴⁰ Others admitted that there were disturbances, but claimed that they did not occur where Galicians were pastors¹⁴¹ or that they only occurred in "Polish parishes."¹⁴² The disturbances were the result of "Polish-Jesuit intrigue from abroad"¹⁴³ or, more precisely, of "Polono-ultramontane agitators, [who,] seeing the Galician priests unshakable in their actions, incited against them the dark and fanatic people of Podlachia."¹⁴⁴ One Galician emigrant expressed a maverick view: "Meeting with antipathy on the part of the polonized Uniate population, they [the Galician emigrants] rarely began by stating why they acted in this way and by explaining the liturgical services, but most frequently they appealed to the police authorities for help, which only increased the distrust towards the Galicians."¹⁴⁵ A rebuttal came quickly from another Galician emigrant: "They went to the authorities only during disturbances," and then only to protect their persons, their families, and their property.¹⁴⁶

So much for the Galicians abroad. How did those who remained at home react to the conversion?

The Russophiles were pleased that the Russian government "permitted the descendants of Orthodox ancestors to return from the union back to Orthodoxy."¹⁴⁷ *Slovo's* first official announcement of the conversion ascribed responsibility for it to bad policy on the part of the Roman papacy and Polish politicians. It also warned that "the vitality of our union in Austrian Rus' depends on the Roman curia and the bishops," and pointed out that, "unfortunately, in recent times bishops have been appointed to the eparchies who, in their one-sided and ruthless zeal for Rome as well as in their servile obedience to their patrons and the enemies of the Ruthenian nationality, display too little tact and so do the union more harm than good."¹⁴⁸ Throughout 1874 and 1875, *Slovo* only printed one side of the story. There were frequent reprints from the Russian official and unofficial press and frequent reports from Galician emigrants in Chełm. Some of this material was quite misleading, such as a letter from a Galician emigrant not long after the first shootings began which claimed that there were "no disturbances whatsoever."¹⁴⁹ Other material was highly offensive to Catholic sensibilities, such as this statement reprinted from the Russian paper *Golos*: "Of all the unnatural political,

religious, and national associations that human ingenuity has devised, the [church] union is the most insidious and dangerous in all respects – religious, national, and political.”¹⁵⁰ Of course, although *Slovo* reprinted official statements by Popel in full, the paper never even so much as printed a summary of Pius IX’s “*Omnem sollicitudinem*” condemning the purification campaign.

Slovo and the Russophiles also waged a concerted campaign against those priests of Chełm eparchy who refused to purify their ritual or convert to Orthodoxy and ended up in Galicia. The Russophiles kept up steady pressure on the consistories not to accept Chełm emigrants for pastoral work. After all, the Chełm priests, “who have rejected their nationality and their ancestral rite and who have lost a basis in their own eparchy for their Polonophile tendencies, are settling here to spread the same in our unfortunate Galicia.” The emigrants from Chełm were a delight to the local polonophiles who “are wringing their hands in anticipation that by means of them they will be able to drive a fatal wedge into the sickly Ruthenian body.” The Russophiles feared that soon iconostases would disappear from the Galician churches, as would the Eastern matins and vespers; one could expect to find organs and rosaries in their place. Moreover, the refugees would take positions away from the already hard-pressed Galician clergy. “We are reminded here of what is said in the Gospel: it is not good to take bread away from your children and throw it to the dogs (however faithful).”¹⁵¹ Moreover, the acceptance of priests from abroad would violate both Austrian civil law and canon law.¹⁵² Russophile deputies to the parliament, backed by German liberals, submitted an interpellation to the ministry of religion against the acceptance of Chełm refugees in the Galician eparchies.¹⁵³ The Russophiles’ campaign was fairly successful: in the end, only thirteen refugees were given positions in Lviv or Przemyśl eparchy; as for the rest, some of the unmarried ones joined the Basilian monks, some became attached to Latin-rite parishes, others became elementary school teachers, and some ended up permanently unemployed.¹⁵⁴

Only a minority of Galician Ruthenians openly condemned what had occurred in Chełm. Protest was limited, as might be expected, to the Greek Catholic hierarchy and to the *Sion* group. Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych was deeply moved by the plight of the Uniates in Chełm. When Emperor Franz Joseph was planning to pay an official visit to St Petersburg at the end of 1873, the metropolitan asked permission to accompany him and intercede directly with the tsar on behalf of the Chełm Uniates. The Austrian government, which was then hostile to the Holy See and seeking to improve relations with Russia,

denied him permission.¹⁵⁵ The metropolitan also did what he could to reduce the influence of *Slovo*: in 1875 he attempted to have the paper's editor expelled from the Stauropegial Institute and he issued a currenda prohibiting reading and subscribing to the paper.¹⁵⁶ For its part, *Ruskii Sion* printed a few forceful articles directed against those in Russia who implemented the Chełm conversion and those in Galicia who supported it.¹⁵⁷

The national populists, who at this time had as their organ the fortnightly *Pravda*, had very little to say about the Chełm affair.¹⁵⁸ They could neither support the Russian government like the Russophiles nor take the side of the overly polonized Uniates of Chełm, and they did not feel so deeply attached to their Catholicism as to share the position of the *Sion* group. Three articles briefly discussing the Chełm events appeared in *Pravda* in the crucial years of 1874–75.

In one, which appeared in 1874, *Pravda* summarized and cited with considerable delight an article it had found in the conservative Russian periodical *Moskovskie vedomosti* edited by Mikhail Katkov. The Russian article had argued that the government should just leave the Chełm Uniates alone. What difference did it make what kind of rituals non-Orthodox used in their services? The government, according to the article, was being drawn into a bitter dispute over ritual that had been instigated by the former bishop, Mykhail Kuzemsky, and the current administrator of the eparchy, Markell Popel. From *Pravda's* commentary on the article, it is clear that the important thing for the national populists was not that the Uniates of Chełm be left in peace, but that the Russophiles be embarrassed by the publication in a periodical otherwise much admired by them of an article that took a radically different line than they did on the Chełm question.¹⁵⁹

In a second article in 1874, *Pravda* discussed the question of priests who had fled Chełm eparchy rather than purify the ritual. A number of them were being sent to teachers' seminaries so that they could be employed in the Galician elementary educational system. *Pravda* opposed this. It recognized the validity of the humanitarian argument that these priests deserved material security, but nonetheless it argued against allowing them to hold teaching positions in Galicia: they were linguistically and culturally too polonized.¹⁶⁰

The last article appeared after the first conversions to Orthodoxy (January 1875) were announced. *Pravda* noted that the Russian newspapers and *Slovo* were enthusiastic about the conversion of Chełm eparchy, the Polish papers were full of lamentation and incrimination, and the German papers, engaged at the time in anti-Catholic polemics, generally expressed satisfaction. As for *Pravda* itself: "We received the news calmly." *Pravda* had expected the conversion to

happen and considered it a matter of some indifference from the national point of view. What was disturbing about the Chełm events was that the Russian government imposed the conversion by force.¹⁶¹

Three-Barred Crosses and Kolpaks

As the events in Chełm were reaching their denouement and in the immediate aftermath of the conversion, the easternizers in the Galician church were put on the defensive, both by the Polish press, which systematically denounced schismatic tendencies in the Ruthenian church, and by the bishop of Przemyśl, Ioann Stupnytsky, who in 1874 issued a stern warning against the introduction of any ritual innovations.¹⁶²

An issue over which the clash of views became particularly pronounced was the form of the cross.¹⁶³ The Polish press, as well as Bishop Stupnytsky, it seems, became disturbed by what it considered the increasing prominence in Ruthenian churches of the three-barred cross commonly associated with Orthodoxy. The complaints against the three-barred cross were heard in Rome, and the pope charged Propaganda with rendering a decision on the matter. As Bishop Stupnytsky later said in his pastoral letter on the subject, this was necessary, "especially since not long ago in the neighbouring Chełm Ruthenian-Catholic eparchy the Holy Union was destroyed and the so-called 'Eastern Orthodoxy' was introduced by force." On 15 May 1877 Propaganda made known its verdict. It admitted that the three-barred cross had "a remote and ancient origin also among Catholics of the Ruthenian rite," but affirmed that it had been passing into desuetude. Therefore, "lest wonder be provoked among people of another rite and lest occasion be given to suspect the Ruthenians of any sort of proclivity towards schismatics," large three-barred crosses should no longer be erected in public places in the Ruthenian eparchies. As for smaller three-barred crosses, used in sacraments and liturgical services, the Ruthenian ordinaries should "when the occasion presents itself" and "cautiously and discreetly" induce the faithful to give up their usage.

Bishop Stupnytsky published Propaganda's decision in his pastoral letter of 30 July 1877 and added his own instructions about the implementation of the ruling in Przemyśl eparchy. Small three-barred crosses, generally carved of wood and with the lowest bar parallel to the others instead of on a slant as among the Orthodox, could be

retained for use inside the church. Only single-barred crosses, however, could be used on altars. The erection of new, large three-barred crosses in public places was “completely and categorically” prohibited. Those already standing could remain in place, but as they deteriorated over time, they were to be replaced by single-barred crosses.¹⁶⁴

Aside from these official measures against the three-barred crosses, there was at least one incident of vandalism: unknown persons removed and burned two of the bars from a wooden cross standing on the roadside in the village of Bila Piskova (Rava Ruska county, Przemyśl eparchy); when the villagers restored the bars on the cross, vandals chopped down the whole cross.¹⁶⁵

The issue of the three-barred crosses provoked considerable commentary in *Slovo*, even in verse:

Pol vika stoiu ia na strazhi selen'ia,
 Kak znamia stradanii, nadezhdy spasen'ia,
 I Russkii, i chuzhdyi menia pochytal,
 I v skorbi zhyteiskoi ko mni vozzyral.

No nyini *moskalem* menia uzh' nazvaly
 I budto oichyzny vraha obruhaly, –
 Ia vyzhu: podnosyt bezbozhnyk i vor
 Na moie ubiistvo tiazhelyi topor.¹⁶⁶

The three-barred cross was able to withstand the bishop of Przemyśl, Propaganda, and the assault from vandals, because it found an effective champion in the person of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych. In the spring of 1878, the metropolitan issued his own pastoral letter in which the decisions of Propaganda and Bishop Stupnytsky were treated as ignorant errors. The metropolitan repeated in the pastoral letter what he had told Propaganda when he went to Rome in 1877: that these crosses had been used for a long time in the Ruthenian church, that they had appeared in “Little Russia” before they ever appeared in Greece or Russia, and that, with their cross of St Andrew formed by the slanted bar at the base, they were meant to commemorate the tradition that the apostle visited the hills of Kyiv. Moreover, the metropolitan pointed out, it was precisely the three-barred cross that had been chosen as the official symbol of Lviv archeparchy’s temperance campaign, inspired by His Holiness Pius IX. Whenever a particular commune made a decision to abstain from hard liquor, it was to erect a three-barred cross in a public place. The metropolitan affirmed that only the three-barred cross was to be used for this purpose. More than that: after returning from Rome in 1877, he had

engaged the Lviv merchant Mykhailo Dymet to prepare plaques for such three-barred crosses with this text: "Monument of the brotherhood of sobriety introduced by Pope Pius IX, 1874."¹⁶⁷

The easternizers in the Ruthenian church took courage from the firm stand of their metropolitan and immediately began to raise another item on their agenda: the question of an Eastern-style headgear for Ruthenian priests, namely kolpaks (*kamelaukia*). The kolpak question was raised not only in *Slovo* in 1878, but also in *Ruskii Sion*.¹⁶⁸ The Ruthenian clergy felt a need for some appropriate head covering. Greek Catholic priests performed a number of services out of doors, and most churches were unheated. With nothing on their heads, their health was at risk. They were entitled to wear the so-called *papafii*, but there seems to have been a general consensus that these were completely inappropriate to the Eastern tradition and, moreover, silly looking. Kolpaks were Eastern and dignifying.

Metropolitan Iosyf took up the issue and interceded with Rome to allow the Ruthenian clergy to wear a suitable head covering, basing his case largely on the health argument and on a breve of 1875 granting the right to wear *pontificalia* to dignitaries of the Lviv cathedral chapter.¹⁶⁹ On 15 January 1881 Propaganda issued a decree permitting the Ruthenian clergy to adopt a new head covering. The decree stipulated that the head covering could not be similar to that of the schismatics.

Thus, in early 1881 priests of Lviv archeparchy began to wear kolpaks. Heartened by this success, the easternizers formulated additional desiderata, including the right to wear beards and Eastern-style cassocks (*riasy*) as well as the canonization by the Catholic church of certain saints venerated among the Orthodox.¹⁷⁰ Their optimism did not last long.

The lieutenant of Galicia was disturbed by the appearance of kolpaks in his province. He brought the issue to the attention of the minister of religion, sending him an example of the kolpaks now being worn in Lviv archeparchy and pointing out that they differed little from the kolpaks worn by the Orthodox of Bukovina. The Ruthenian folk were easily incited to schismatic demonstrations, the lieutenant noted, and these kolpaks were quite threatening to political stability. The minister of religion agreed wholeheartedly and charged von Seiller, the ambassador to the Holy See, with influencing Propaganda to rescind its decree. In early November the ambassador met with Serafino Cretoni, Propaganda's secretary, who also saw that the kolpaks of Lviv were essentially the same as Orthodox kolpaks. Cretoni stated that they did not at all conform to the January 1881 decree, which was intended to provide practical headgear to safeguard the

health of Galician priests and which specified that the new headgear had to differ from that of the schismatics. Cretoni also speculated that the metropolitan himself was not responsible for the kolpaks, but rather the influential Canon Mykhail Malynovsky. On 3 November 1881 Propaganda sent Metropolitan Iosyf a letter suspending execution of the breve of 1875 and the decree of 1881 until such time as a new model head covering was submitted to Rome for approval.¹⁷¹

The issue of kolpaks was laid to rest for the moment. In fact, it turned out to be quite a long moment, for very shortly after Propaganda rescinded its original decree, Lviv archeparchy entered a period of great turmoil, Propaganda had its hands full with matters more weighty than headgear, and the climate was decidedly not such as to allow the pursuit of the kolpak cause on the part of the easternizers. But that is a story that will be told in Part II of this monograph.

The Resurrectionists

The Resurrectionists were a Polish religious order founded in Rome in 1842 by political exiles from the 1831 insurrection who, only a few years prior to taking their vows, had returned to the practice of the Catholic faith. The "resurrection" in their title referred explicitly to the resurrection of Our Lord and implicitly to the resurrection of their partitioned fatherland. Later the order attracted other ex-revolutionaries, including the eminent historian Walerian Kalinka, a veteran of the 1846 insurrection. The Resurrectionists engaged in missionary work abroad, in Canada and the United States as well as in Bulgaria, where conflicts with the Patriarch of Constantinople had created a uniate movement in 1859–61.¹⁷² In connection with the Bulgarian mission, the pope permitted the order to have some priests celebrate in the Greek rite. In the autumn of 1879 the superior general of the order, Father Piotr Semenenko, was received by Emperor Franz Joseph, whom he petitioned for permission to establish a base for activities in Galicia. The members of the order longed to return to Poland, and of the three partitions, the Austrian one was politically the most hospitable place to start. Since they had priests of the Greek rite, they wanted to work among the Ruthenians, combat schismatic proclivities among them, and develop a spirit of cooperation and harmony between the rites. Concretely, the order hoped to settle in Galicia and establish a boarding school for Ruthenian youth, something on the order of a minor seminary.¹⁷³

The proposition interested the emperor and the minister of religion, so the Galician lieutenant, Count Alfred Potocki, solicited the opinions of the local hierarchy. The Latin-rite archbishop of Lviv, Franciszek Ksawery Wierzhleyski, endorsed the idea, pointing out that the Resurrectionists had an outstanding record in education: they ran the Polish Papal College in Rome and their Father Kalinka had some very impressive scholarly publications to his credit.¹⁷⁴

The Ruthenian bishops, however – even Bishop Stupnytsky – were aghast at the idea and made their opposition to the Resurrectionists' intentions absolutely clear. Bishop Stupnytsky replied that he considered the Resurrectionists' desire to foster cooperation and harmony between the Greek and Latin rite in Galicia a laudable goal, "but whether the Ruthenians require in this regard aid from outside and in such measure no less than without collaboration and assistance it could not achieve this desired goal – that is another question; to answer 'yes' to that question would be the equivalent of issuing a Certificate of Intellectual and Moral Poverty to the Greek Catholic clergy." The bishop knew from many years of experience that, as numerous official documents confirm, such misunderstandings and encroachments of rite upon rite as occurred in Galicia were in the overwhelming majority of cases the fault of the Latin-rite clergy. "The sicker one needs the doctor," wrote the bishop.¹⁷⁵

Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych replied that the order's intended activities in Galicia were completely superfluous. Rather disingenuously, he affirmed that "harmony and cooperation of both rites ... reigns completely in this province," so what was left for the Resurrectionists to do? Also, thanks to the Habsburgs, there were enough seminaries to train the Greek Catholic clergy, which was now as educated as its Latin-rite counterpart, and the Greek Catholic clergy worked tirelessly at the education of Ruthenian youth both in school and from the pulpit. The Resurrectionists were not only unnecessary, but could do considerable damage. The order was composed exclusively of Poles, Sembratovych noted; it was likely to produce more friction between the rites than harmony. In particular, Ruthenians would wonder why the Resurrectionists were sent to them much as missionaries to the schismatic Bulgarians.¹⁷⁶ Both the metropolitan and the bishop of Przemyśl made the point to the lieutenantancy that relations between the rites in Galicia were regulated by the Concordia of 1863 and that there was no place for any self-appointed regulating religious order.

It is a good indicator of how influential the Poles were in the monarchy in those years and how low the stock of the Ruthenians had fallen that, in spite of the strenuous objections of the Ruthenian

bishops, the emperor on 6 November 1880 permitted the Resurrectionists to settle in Galicia.

By the spring of 1881 the plans of the Resurrectionists were public knowledge, and they became a heated political issue when a motion came before the Galician diet to grant the congregation 10,000 gulden to aid in the establishment of their boarding school for Ruthenian youth. Needless to say, the Ruthenian press voiced strong objections.¹⁷⁷ The highlight of Ruthenian opposition to the Resurrectionists' boarding school was a brilliant speech delivered in the Galician diet on 21 October 1881 by Father Stefan Kachala.¹⁷⁸ Although Kachala was a national populist, his speech made a great impression on the Russophiles¹⁷⁹ and in particular on Father Ioann Naumovych.¹⁸⁰ The speech is one of those texts that belongs in an anthology, and I will summarize it extensively here, especially since it goes right to the heart of matters that are a central concern of this study.

As to the concrete issue of the boarding school and its 10,000-gulden subvention, Kachala raised a number of points, some of which had been anticipated in the Ruthenian bishops' reply to the lieutenancy over a year earlier. If the school was intended to improve relations between both rites in Galicia, then why was it being established only for Ruthenian children? Were only Ruthenians responsible for improving relations? And why did the Ruthenian clergy need reform? "Don't the Ruthenian bishops now have seminaries, which they didn't have under Polish rule? Does our clergy stand at a lower level of education and morality than the Latin-rite clergy? No." But did not the Ruthenians lack minor seminaries, such as existed among the Latins? True, but the Ruthenians were in a different situation than the Latins. Most of the Ruthenian candidates for the priesthood were the sons of priests and received their preparatory training at home from their fathers. And why, Kachala asked, was this diet, which had been so niggardly in supporting other Ruthenian educational initiatives, showing itself so generous to the Resurrectionists? If the crownland had long said it could not afford to establish a second Ruthenian public school in Lviv, then why did it suddenly have the money for this particular school? "Why, I ask, is a boarding school being forced on the Ruthenians, as if out of great affection, a boarding school that the Ruthenians did not ask for, that the Ruthenian consistories said they don't need, and that generally all Ruthenians oppose?"

Moreover, Kachala went on, it had been reported that Father Walerian Kalinka held a meeting in Cracow in which he outlined plans for the Ruthenian boarding school: it would induce the Ruthenians to introduce clerical celibacy and to abandon both the Julian calendar

and the Cyrillic alphabet. It appeared, then, that the Resurrectionist school was intended to polonize the Ruthenian clergy, just as in the past Jesuit schools polonized the Ruthenian gentry. In fact, the Resurrectionists were just “second-edition Jesuits.”

Kachala did not confine his comments to the concrete case, but laid out some broader perspectives on the Polish-Ruthenian/Latin-Greek conflict. The Ruthenians were suspected of disloyalty to the union with Rome – this was the deeper sentiment behind the Resurrectionists’ plans. Kachala considered this suspicion to be based on a failure to make necessary distinctions. Ruthenians did not have anything against the union as such – in fact, they saw the great advantages of union with the Roman Catholic church – but they had firm objections to the way the union was misused to encourage assimilation to Polish culture and to achieve Polish political ends. Ruthenians were suspected not only of disloyalty to Rome, but of disloyalty to the emperor. One should consider who was making these accusations. It was not the Ruthenians who had risen in rebellion against Austria in 1809 and 1846 and had come close to doing so again in 1848, but their accusers. “Today they depict the Ruthenians as dangerous, so that others might appear in a better light with respect to devotion to the Throne. Today emigrés, revolutionaries, are supposed to teach us fidelity to the Throne.”

The Ruthenians were supposed to be filled with hatred towards the Poles, Kachala said, but this was not true. “No one has ever seen that a Ruthenian hated a Mazur [i.e., an ethnically Polish peasant] just because he was a Mazur.” If this were a case of ethnic antagonism, then the hatred would be visible and the agitation concentrated along the extensive borders between Polish and Ukrainian ethnic settlement. This was not, however, the case; the two folks got along together quite well. “If there is enmity between Ruthenians and Poles, it is because the Ruthenians are demanding their rights and the Poles refuse to grant them. As long as there are not equal rights, there will be no mutual harmony. For harmony to become consolidated, it has to be based not on boarding schools, but on justice.”

Also, noted Kachala, the Ruthenians were called “retrogrades, opponents of autonomy.” But here, too, a fundamental distinction had been neglected. Ruthenians did not oppose autonomy as such, but the kind of Polish-dominated autonomy that had been instituted in the crownland of Galicia, “because this is not autonomy, but hegemony.”

Kachala appealed to the members of the diet. If they were sincere about wishing to eliminate antagonism, then the means to do so were straightforward: “(1) complete equalization of political rights; (2) don’t

let the Jesuits or Resurrectionists interfere in our rite." "I ask you: do you want a harmony that is vital, beneficial, or do you want a harmony that is rotten, mouldy? Equality of rights will give you the first, boarding schools the second. Make your choice!"

As might be expected, the diet, in which the Poles held an unchallengeable majority, approved the subvention anyway. In the first year of the boarding school's existence, ninety young men applied to it,¹⁸¹ but there was only room for fourteen of them. The *spiritus movens* of the whole project, Father Kalinka, passed away in 1886, and the boarding school soon thereafter almost completely lost its Ruthenian character.¹⁸² But the affair did not turn out to be a tempest in a teacup; as we shall now see, it was the beginning of a raging storm.

This page intentionally left blank

PART II: 1882–1900

A: Crisis and Intervention

Hnylychky and the Treason Trial

As the year 1881 closed and the new year began, an incident occurred that could well have been dismissed as trivial but that in fact precipitated a series of momentous changes in the Greek Catholic church in Galicia: 129 inhabitants of the village of Hnylychky¹ in Zbarazh county declared their intention to change their religion from Catholicism to Orthodoxy. As subsequent investigations made clear, at the root of the declaration was a purely local matter that had nothing to do with religious or political principles. The peasants of Hnylychky simply wanted their own separate parish; that is, they wanted to have the church in their village recognized as independent of the mother church in Hnylytsi Velyki, about four kilometres away. This was not even a matter of local pride, of the honour of Hnylychky, but a thoroughly practical concern. The peasants of Hnylychky did not want to contribute money for the construction of a new church building being erected in Hnylytsi Velyki, but as long as Hnylychky was incorporated into the parish of Hnylytsi Velyki, contributions would be levied upon them. They petitioned the Lviv consistory for separation, but it was unwilling to undertake the difficult and expensive process of establishing a separate parish. The peasants thus decided to change from the jurisdiction of the Greek Catholic church to that of the Orthodox church, expecting that this would end their costly subordination to the parish of Hnylytsi Velyki. Although the practical, local concerns of a community of peasants lay at its basis, it turned out that a prominent Russophile priest also had a hand in the Hnylychky affair. The incident quickly blew up into a major scandal, and before a year had passed, it resulted in a trial for high treason, the forced resignation of the Greek Catholic metropolitan and his closest advisors, and a series of decisive interventions on the part of Rome and Vienna in Greek Catholic ecclesiastical life.

The peasants of Hnylychky announced their intention to convert to Orthodoxy in declarations sent to the Orthodox consistory in

Chernivtsi,² the Greek Catholic consistory in Lviv,³ and the county captaincy in Zbarazh⁴ at the end of December 1881. Both the Greek Catholic ecclesiastical authorities and the Galician civil authorities were disturbed by the intentions of Hnylychky, but there was an ultimately fateful divergence in their response to and assessment of the affair.

The Greek Catholic consistory in Lviv received the declaration from Hnylychky on 26 December and five days later appointed a commission to look into the matter.⁵ The commission visited Hnylychky after the Ruthenian Christmas holidays, on 10–11 January 1882, and interviewed the peasants. They determined that the origin of the whole affair was, as described above, the desire of the community to form a separate parish. This was how a member of the commission, Father Stefan Kachala, described his findings in the press,⁶ and this was how the metropolitan himself explained the matter to the Galician lieutenant.⁷ The commission was able to convince the community to withdraw its petition for a change of religion,⁸ the metropolitan prohibited the Russophile publications *Prolom* and *Viche* on 29 December⁹ and issued a pastoral letter in defence of Catholicism on 31 January,¹⁰ and there the matter seemed to have ended.

The consistorial commission did not look very deeply into the question of outside instigators. It contented itself with the theory that the peasants had hit upon the idea of switching to Orthodoxy under the influence of the local landowner, Count Della Scala, whose mother was of the Orthodox faith and who owned land in predominantly Orthodox Bukovina.¹¹ Neither the commission nor the metropolitan mentioned Russophile agitation in connection with the Hnylychky affair, an omission that rankled the civil authorities. As Lieutenant Alfred Potocki later wrote to the Austrian minister of religion and education, the commission concluded its work without establishing “what motives genuinely induced the inhabitants of the said community to leave the union, by whom they were influenced in this matter, and who was the author of the respective petitions.”¹²

Indeed, the consistorial commission should have suspected that there was more to the Hnylychky affair than they had unearthed. The declaration that the consistory had received at the end of December, although sent by peasants, was certainly not written by peasants. It raised a whole series of historical arguments intended to demonstrate that Catholicism endangered the very existence of the Ruthenian nationality, and it presented the church union of 1596 as a consequence “of the deceit of the Jesuits, those perfidious Pharisees, who came to us in their sheeps’ clothing, while inside they were cunning

wolves." The signatories ascribed their current intention to return to the Orthodox faith of their forefathers to the appearance in Galicia of new Jesuits, namely the Resurrectionists.

Peasants would have put matters differently.¹³

By contrast, the Galician civil authorities immediately suspected that deliberate Russophile instigation lay behind the Hnylychky affair. The captain of Zbarazh county, after returning from a short holiday, read the Hnylychky petition on 29 December 1881. Three days later, after talking to some of the Hnylychky peasants, the captain was able to report to the lieutenant not only that the incident had been touched off by the community's desire to avoid paying for a new church in Hnylytsi Velyki, but also that two of the organizers of the petition were in contact with the well-known Russophile Father Ioann Naumovych (the same man who had published "A Glimpse into the Future" in 1866). Naumovych, the captain noted, enjoyed considerable popularity among the peasants in the eastern part of Zbarazh county, since he lent them money and treated them with homeopathic remedies. The captain was sure that Naumovych was implicated in the move to Orthodoxy. In fact, he wrote, "this agitation ... secretly comes from a certain part of the Ruthenian clergy, and the declaration of the peasants of the community of Hnylychky seems to be an experiment which might eventually be imitated in other communities."¹⁴ This was perhaps the earliest formulation of the view that soon became dominant in Galician and Viennese government circles, in the Polish press, and in the Vatican. As investigations were shortly to prove, the captain's suspicions regarding Naumovych were justified; although a Greek Catholic pastor, Naumovych himself was the author of Hnylychky's declaration to the Lviv consistory that it wanted to transfer to the Orthodox faith.¹⁵

The sensational news regarding Hnylychky was the focus of Galician public opinion in January of 1882. The incident provided the Polish press with an excellent opportunity to depict the Ruthenians, the Poles' chief rivals in Galicia, as dangerously disloyal to the highest authorities of church and state.¹⁶ A lead article in Lviv's *Dziennik Polski* said that Russophile agitation had now reached a point that called for "energetic counteraction"; the state interests of Austria had been "threatened to a certain extent by the action of the peasants of Hnylychky."¹⁷ The organ of the Cracow conservatives, *Czas*, characterized the incident at Hnylychky as "only a menacing symptom of the decay in the Uniate church in Galicia, [which] confirms all accusations and all reservations concerning the education and direction of the Uniate clergy in Rus'."¹⁸ The view put forward by the Polish press

was rejected not only by Ruthenian political leaders, but also by the leadership of the Greek Catholic church. In fact, Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych issued a currenda on 27 April 1882, stating that the periodicals *Gazeta Narodowa*, *Dziennik Polski*, *Przegląd Lwowski*, *Czas*, *Gazeta Krakowska*, *Przegląd Kościelny*, and *Kurier Poznański* were violating the 1863 concordia by slandering the Greek Catholic hierarchy and clergy and should not be given credence.¹⁹

The ecclesiastical authorities in Lviv may have felt that the Polish newspapers (as well as the local Galician government) were overreacting to the Hnylychky matter, but the Vatican administration thought otherwise. The papal nuncio in Vienna, Serafino Vannutelli, was deeply disturbed by a letter dated 6 January from the Galician provincial of the Jesuit order, Henryk Jackowski, "a person who is in every way worthy of confidence."²⁰ The letter depicted the Greek Catholic Ruthenians as almost completely "corroded by schism." There was a great danger that thousands upon thousands of souls would be lost to the Catholic church, and such a mass conversion to Orthodoxy would not be without political consequences. Morally responsible for the incident at Hnylychky were Greek Catholic priests themselves, especially Ioann Naumovych, but also the "Ultra-Ruthenian" Stefan Kachala²¹ and others. The consistorial commission entrusted with the investigation of the Hnylychky incident was composed of two priests "leaning towards schism";²² the third member had no independent will.²³ Since the majority of the Ruthenian leadership disapproved of the Hnylychky action, but only because it was "premature," the commission would probably try to hush the matter up as much as possible and even, for appearances' sake, convince the peasants of Hnylychky to withdraw their declaration of conversion to Orthodoxy. But the evil would persist. The whole easternmost part of Galicia, from Ternopil to the Russian border, was favourably disposed to schism. Something had to be done at the highest levels.²⁴

The nuncio sent a copy of Jackowski's letter to Count Gustav Kálnoky, the Austrian minister of foreign affairs. He informed the minister that he had also written to Metropolitan Sembratovych, imploring him to do everything in his power to stop the looming scandal. The nuncio expressed the hope that the metropolitan would have the complete support of the civil authorities in this matter.

Cardinal Giovanni Simeoni, the prefect of Propaganda, was also very upset. He could hardly believe the "audacity and impiety" of the Russophile clergy and in particular of Naumovych.²⁵

Meanwhile, since January, the Galician authorities had been conducting searches among prominent Russophiles, including Nau-

movych.²⁶ In February they began to make arrests.²⁷ In the course of these arrests and searches, which continued into March, the authorities found letters and manuscripts in which the Russophiles, especially Naumovych, discussed their views quite frankly, without great regard for the censor or consistory.

Found, for instance, were some letters of Father Emylian Levytsky to the editorial board of *Slovo* in which he gave expression to his religious convictions. Levytsky considered "the Uniate rite" to be a Polish innovation that went against the conscience of the Ruthenians. He himself adhered in spirit to "the Greek Catholic rite," by which he clearly meant Eastern Orthodoxy.²⁸ In another letter he wrote that "the Galician Rus' were always and will always remain Orthodox"; he thought very highly of "our Orthodox church in Russia" and urged *Slovo* to foster love for and a spirit of service to the Orthodox church.²⁹

The Galician authorities also found the manuscript of a brochure entitled "To the Slanderers of the Oriental Church."³⁰ It was written by Father Naumovych, although he had signed it "A Secular Uniate" and had tried to convince Orest Avdykovsky to sign his own name to it. The brochure was less a defence of Orthodoxy than a broadside against Roman Catholicism and seemed less inspired by the Eastern church than by Western Protestantism. In it, Naumovych portrayed the Roman church, and the papacy in particular, as violent and avaricious, corrupt and power seeking. He also attacked the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. Naumovych considered his brochure to be of great importance. He thought that it would draw the attention of Russia to the plight of the Galicians on the eve of "a conflict between Rome and the East." The brochure would lead to "something à la Hus."³¹ Naumovych had also written another piece, an article intended for *Slovo*, that he felt was "an arrow in the very heart of Rome and Poland" it would, however, delight Russia. *Slovo* declined to publish the article, and the manuscript was subsequently lost.³² Ioann Naumovych (or his son Nykolai) was also the author of a letter that praised the decision of the inhabitants of Hnylychky "to go over to the bosom of the Orthodox church of their forefathers" and that predicted that "sooner or later all of Rus' up to the Tatra must become Orthodox."³³

When the civil authorities had gathered what they thought was sufficient evidence, they laid charges, on 20 May, against eleven defendants, including Ioann Naumovych, other prominent Russophiles, and two peasants who had led the movement to Orthodoxy in Hnylychky.³⁴ The accused were said to have been involved in a pan-Slavist plot directed against the most vital interests of the Austrian

state. The charge brought against the Russophiles was nothing less than high treason. This was, of course, too drastic a charge, and it was hardly surprising that all the accused were acquitted of it. Nonetheless, the trial, which lasted from 12 June to 29 July 1882, compromised the Russophile movement considerably. It was the subject of heated discussion, not only in the Galician press, but in the all-Austrian, Polish, and Russian press. While the trial lasted, feelings ran very high in Galicia and in circles concerned with Galicia.³⁵

One of the themes of the act of indictment was that the pan-Slavist agitators were trying to pave the way for a mass conversion of the Ruthenian population to Orthodoxy. Their goal at the moment was to build popular sympathy for Orthodoxy through the systematic introduction of Orthodox rituals into Greek Catholic churches and also through propaganda. The main content of the latter was to be that the Ruthenians' ancestral faith was Orthodoxy and that the Poles introduced the union only in order to polonize them.³⁶

The prosecution was able to prove that at least some of the defendants, and certainly Naumovych, maintained decidedly pro-Orthodox sentiments, but it was unable to offer evidence of any plan to win the mass of Ruthenians over to Orthodoxy. From the evidence and testimony produced at the trial, it is even difficult to say how firmly Naumovych was attached to Orthodoxy. He explained his involvement in the Hnylychky affair as a mere demonstration intended to shock the Vatican into better behaviour vis-à-vis the Ruthenian Greek Catholics. He claimed to have been outraged by the plans of the Resurrectionists and to have wanted to show Rome that such measures endangered rather than strengthened the union. Thus, when his acquaintance Ivan Shpunder, a peasant from Hnylychky, had approached him with the idea of changing his community's ecclesiastical allegiance, Naumovych had encouraged him and even drafted the community's declaration.³⁷

Naumovych's version was upheld by the testimony of his co-defendant Iosyf Markov: "This was a movement for Orthodoxy, but not such as the act of indictment presents it; there was no program and there is none." Naumovych only wanted "to release 'torpedoes' to scare Rome, so it would not send us Jesuits."³⁸ That Naumovych did indeed believe in torpedoes is clear from a letter he wrote earlier to *Slovo*. Urging the editors to publish his article that was intended to be "an arrow in the very heart of Rome and Poland," Naumovych argued that "such galvanic currents are necessary from time to time to awaken our lazy Rus'."³⁹ In another letter, to Markov, he wrote that he was not yet seriously thinking of converting to Orthodoxy himself.⁴⁰

The Reform of the Basilian Order

At almost exactly the same time that the Hnylychky affair was unfolding, the Vatican, with the cooperation of the Austrian government, embarked on a far-reaching reform of Ruthenian monastic life in Galicia. There was a close connection between these two events, but to view the monastic reform as simply "a consequence of the Hnylychky matter"⁴¹ is to oversimplify. The general need for the reform had deeper roots, and the concrete method adopted – to have the Basilian order reformed by the Jesuits – was already under consideration before the ecclesiastical authorities became aware of Hnylychky's intention to convert to Orthodoxy. However, a "reorganization" of the order had been proposed as long ago as 1867 to strengthen the Greek Catholic church's resistance to Orthodox influence,⁴² and the fears inspired by the Hnylychky incident strongly coloured the Vatican's and Austrian government's thinking about the reform and stiffened their determination to impose it on the Ruthenians in spite of their vehement objections.

Even in Ruthenian society no one doubted that the Basilian monks, once the elite of the Ruthenian clergy, had entered upon a grievous decline since the end of the eighteenth century.⁴³ At the request of Propaganda, Metropolitan Sembratovych visited the fourteen Basilian monasteries in September and October 1881, and reported back that they were sorely in need of reform.⁴⁴ When Father Kachala spoke against the Polish Resurrectionists in October of 1881 he admitted that the Ruthenian Basilians were deteriorating.⁴⁵ The national populist Evhen Olesnytsky signed a petition protesting the Jesuit-directed reform of the Basilian order, but he was nonetheless well aware of the order's decay. In his memoirs he described an evening he spent in the Basilian monastery in Buchach in 1881: "They served supper in the refectory; all the monks were there together with Hegumen Ostroverkha, a sleek and fat man. After supper prayers were said, and then they immediately brought out tables for cards and with them entire batteries of wine bottles. We sat at these tables, amidst great libations, until we saw the light of dawn; all night long the hegumen entertained us with dirty jokes and ditties. Looking down from the refectory walls in astonishment at our drunken company were the portraits of ancient hegumens and other holy fathers."⁴⁶ In addition to problems of discipline,⁴⁷ the order suffered from an acute shortage of vocations.⁴⁸

By the winter of 1881–82, two main plans had crystallized for the reform of the Basilians. One, devised by Metropolitan Sembratovych,

envisioned a reform conducted under his own direction, with the Basilian order firmly subordinated to his jurisdiction.⁴⁹ The other was devised by the protohegumen of the order, Father Klymentii Sarnytsky, in consultation with Father Henryk Jackowski, the Jesuit provincial of Galicia.⁵⁰ On 25 December 1881 Father Sarnytsky sent a letter to Rome admitting to the decline of the order and requesting a reform. He said that things had gone too far for the order to reform itself by its own efforts and that the aid of another religious order was necessary. Because of historical ties with the Jesuits, who had helped reform the Basilians in the seventeenth century, he proposed that they again be enlisted to direct a novitiate that would form the nucleus of the reform. He also proposed that the Basilians be exempt from episcopal jurisdiction and subordinate directly to Rome.⁵¹ The protohegumen's letter arrived together with a letter from the Jesuit provincial endorsing the plan. In his letter, Father Jackowski did not conceal the fact that a reform of the Basilians by Jesuits would encounter strong opposition among Ruthenian Catholics. Therefore, if the Holy See were to go along with the idea, it had to act "vigorously, quickly, and secretly."⁵² At the same time, Father Jackowski also sent letters explaining the plan of the reform to Cardinal Mieczysław Ledóchowski⁵³ and to the general of the Jesuit order, Pierre-Jean Beckx. In the latter letter, Father Jackowski said that the moment for such a reform was very opportune, since both the Austrian government and the Polish gentry would regard it favourably.⁵⁴

By the time the Vatican began to consider the two proposals, the Hnylychky affair had already come to light and the mood was favourable towards a project for fundamental reform of the Greek Catholic church.⁵⁵ Given the circumstances, the proposal of Fathers Sarnytsky and Jackowski seemed more appropriate than that of the metropolitan. At Leo XIII's invitation, Father Jackowski travelled to Rome at the end of February to discuss the details of the reform. He drafted a lengthy memorandum that was examined by a special committee on 16–17 March. The committee recommended proceeding with the reform, and the pope endorsed its decision. These deliberations had been kept secret, as Jackowski advised. But towards the end of March, Cardinal Simeoni informed the Viennese nuncio of what had transpired to date and instructed him to contact the Austrian government, whose approval and cooperation were necessary for the implementation of the reform.⁵⁶ The Austrian authorities agreed to support the project.⁵⁷

It seems that the Ruthenian bishops were first informed of the nature of the impending reform at a meeting called by the lieutenant of Galicia on 29 April. Present at the meeting, aside from the lieutenant

and another representative of the presidium of the lieutenantcy, were the Basilian protohegumen Sarnytsky, the Greek Catholic metropolitan Sembratovych, the Greek Catholic bishop of Przemyśl Ioann Stupnytsky, and the Roman Catholic suffragan bishop of Lviv Seweryn Morawski. Although all participants at the conference agreed that the Basilian order needed to be reformed, there was some disagreement about the means. Bishop Stupnytsky argued that the Basilians should reform themselves, without the aid of any other order. His view was energetically opposed by Protohegumen Sarnytsky, who painted a dark portrait of the state of his order and elaborated the view that the Jesuits should be enlisted to direct a new reform novitiate at the monastery in Dobromyl. Both Metropolitan Sembratovych and Bishop Morawski endorsed this view, and Bishop Stupnytsky came to accept it as well, although he warned that it would cause unrest in Ruthenian circles. All agreed that the Greek rite must be preserved and respected in the Dobromyl monastery, but in this question, too, there was some difference of opinion. Metropolitan Sembratovych proposed that the Jesuits engaged to direct the reform both enter the Basilian order and adopt the Greek rite. The other churchmen felt that neither the Holy See nor the Jesuit order would agree to this and that it would suffice if the Jesuits in question embraced the Greek rite.⁵⁸ Although this was the consensus of the meeting, when Lieutenant Potocki reported on it to Vienna, he urged the ministry of religion and education not to accept the churchmen's proposal that the Jesuits adopt the Greek rite. If Jesuits were to perform services in that rite, certain Ruthenians would examine their every move to find latinizing innovations. A ritual controversy could well break out that would undermine the success of the reform.⁵⁹ In the end, the Galician lieutenant's view prevailed.

The plans for the reform were made public by Pope Leo XIII in his bull of 12 May 1882, "*Singulare praesidium*."⁶⁰ He announced that it was "the common will of the bishops and monks" that the Jesuits establish a novitiate for the Basilians at Dobromyl monastery. He said that he was very pleased by this development and that it relieved some of the grief that pained his soul whenever he thought of the Ruthenians and the dangers to which their Catholicism was exposed.⁶¹ Because of the difficulties in carrying out such a reform, the Basilian order was to be subordinated for its duration directly to the Holy See, that is, to the pope and Propaganda; the monks' self-government was to be for the time being curtailed. Dobromyl was to be completely in the charge of the Jesuits until such time as the Holy See decided that there were men within the Basilian order itself to whom it could entrust the monastery. The Jesuits were to preserve

inviolable the customs of the Greek rite and to educate the novices sedulously in the Ruthenian liturgy and ceremonies. The pope stipulated, however, that, as of old, Latin-rite youth could enter the Basilian order, provided that they first changed over to the Greek rite; he firmly prohibited any subsequent regression to the Latin rite. He also exempted the order from the authority of the local bishops, thus restoring the jurisdictional independence it had enjoyed until the end of the eighteenth century. The pope also mentioned the article of the Synod of Zamość of 1720 that stipulated that only Basilian monks could become bishops in the Ruthenian church. This stipulation, however, had been deliberately ignored since the end of the eighteenth century. The pope did not expressly restore the stipulation in his bull, but his mention of it seemed to open the possibility of its restoration.⁶²

The announcement of the reform generally met with a warm reception in the Polish press, which welcomed it as a blow directed against schismatic influences and the machinations of the canons of St George's.⁶³ There was, however, an interesting exception: the radical democrat and pro-Ukrainian Jan Gniewosz, who put out a popular periodical for Polish artisans and peasants.⁶⁴ Gniewosz, in fact, organized a petition drive to protest the reform.⁶⁵

As Jackowski had expected, the reform provoked strong protest among Ruthenians. In a front-page editorial on 20 May, the leading national populist organ *Dilo* condemned the reform as an instrument of polonization, as a "new plan for the conquest of Rus' by Jesuitism."⁶⁶ *Slovo* published an editorial in the same spirit.⁶⁷ On 23 May, forty Basilian monks, led by Iieron Ostroverkha, the "sleek and fat" hegumen of the Buchach monastery, submitted a protest to the lieutenantancy. They argued that Protohegumen Sarnytsky had acted without the consent of the majority of Basilian monks, and hence illegally, in turning over Basilian property to the Jesuits. They demanded that the authorities prevent the transfer of the Dobromyl monastery to Jesuit control until the monks had had their proper say in the matter.⁶⁸ In June the secular clergy of Przemyśl eparchy, taking advantage of Bishop Stupnytsky's temporary absence,⁶⁹ held a series of deanery conferences at which they collectively protested the Basilian reform.⁷⁰ The priests were particularly distressed that the reform was being conducted by the Jesuit fathers, who "are considered the enemies of the Galician-Ruthenian nation."⁷¹ The Stauropegial Institute in Lviv also sent a strong protest to the Vatican on 24 June; the Ruthenians, said the institute, want neither Resurrectionists nor Jesuits.⁷²

In spite of these protests, the ecclesiastical and civil authorities stood by the reform, and Dobromyl monastery was formally entrusted

to the Jesuits on 15 June.⁷³ But the protests had made an impact. First the emperor and then the pope requested that non-Polish Jesuits be found to conduct the noviciate at Dobromyl. For some time, however, Father Jackowski could not find Jesuits of another nationality who had the necessary moral and intellectual qualities as well as a knowledge of Polish or Ruthenian.⁷⁴

Both the Vatican and the Galician authorities blamed the Greek Catholic hierarchy, and especially Metropolitan Sembratovych, for tolerating such widespread protests. Indeed Sembratovych's attitude towards the protests and towards the reform itself would become an important element in the determination of Rome and Vienna to force his resignation. Father Jackowski, reporting to Rome on 15 September 1882, not long after Sembratovych's abdication, was pleased to report that "now, after the resignation of the Lviv metropolitan, almost all [protests] should die down."⁷⁵ This, however, was optimism. Although there were some small pockets of support for the reform in Ruthenian society, serious protests were to continue for several years and hard feelings for much longer.

Ruthenian support for the reform was limited to the circle that put out *Sion* and to the vestiges of the Polish-Ruthenian community, the *gente Rutheni, natione Poloni*. *Sion* considered the reform "a purely religious matter, purely an internal affair of the church," and objected to politically motivated interference by lay elements.⁷⁶ The Polish-Ruthenians published an appeal "to Galician Ruthenians faithful to their church and people" in June 1882.⁷⁷ The appeal was signed by a few Greek Catholic priests and educated laymen, but mainly by peasants from three villages,⁷⁸ undoubtedly at the urging of their pastors. The signatories condemned Russophile agitation as manifested in the Hnylychky affair and in protests against the Basilian reform. "Let us now have our say, we Ruthenians loyal to Rus', loyal to the emperor, loyal to the church! Let us take a firm stand and show the world that Ruthenians still live in Rus', that we do not want to be and will not be the servants of the German centralists or the Muscovites." Lviv's major Polish daily wished these "Ruthenian patriots" success in their cause.⁷⁹

Mainstream Ruthenia continued to protest the Basilian reform, which was the subject of numerous articles and brochures⁸⁰ and even the occasional speech in the Austrian parliament.⁸¹ Ruthenian public assemblies in Lviv in June 1883⁸² and May 1884,⁸³ in which both Russophiles and national populists participated, condemned the reform. The 1884 assembly sent a distinguished delegation, consisting of both national populists and Old Ruthenians/Russophiles,⁸⁴ to the emperor in the following year to present a memorandum⁸⁵ pleading for

the revocation of the reform.⁸⁶ In 1884 the transfer of the Basilian monastery in Lavriv to the Jesuits called forth another wave of strongly worded protest. *Dilo* called the Jesuits nothing less than “the most difficult historical enemy of the Ruthenians, responsible for rivers of blood and blazing fires.”⁸⁷ Even twenty years later, when the Jesuit supervision of the Basilian reform came to an end, a Greek Catholic pastor rejoiced to be rid of the “Egyptian plague” of the “*Jesuwider*.”⁸⁸

Although such feelings were to linger, some Ukrainian leaders were able to assess the Basilian reform more objectively in the early twentieth century. One of the national populists’ most astute politicians, Evhen Olesnytsky, eventually came to the conclusion that “nothing bad happened. Out of the reform came monks far better in every respect than they had been previously. The old indolence and gut-stuffing disappeared from the monasteries, replaced by spiritual and national work. Among the reformed monks were many conscientious and even ardent Ukrainians. They helped a great deal in the struggle with Russophilism, and in general they stood firmly by the nation and spread national consciousness, especially among the peasantry and working and service classes in the cities.”⁸⁹

However one is to judge the Basilians’ contribution to the development of Ukrainian national consciousness, there can be no doubt that they once again became an influential factor in the church in the aftermath of the reform. They did much to promote popular piety in Galicia, their printing press in Zhovkva published numerous religious brochures and a popular religious magazine, and, particularly in the twentieth century, they made admirable contributions to Ukrainian church scholarship. They combined an attachment to the Ukrainian nationality with an unswerving devotion to Rome.

The Resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych

It is not clear exactly when the Vatican began to consider the removal of Iosyf Sembratovych from the metropolitan throne of Halych. The idea may have first emerged in the wake of the Chelm affair,⁹⁰ but if so, it had acquired a new seriousness and urgency by the middle of February 1882.⁹¹ This suggests that the Hnylychky affair and the way the metropolitan consistory had handled it were important catalysts

in the decision to bring about Sembratovych's resignation, although later the metropolitan's attitude towards the Basilian reform would also play a role.

The Vatican's appraisal of Sembratovych and the situation in the Greek Catholic church emerges clearly from a letter Cardinal Simeoni sent to nuncio Vannutelli on 19 May 1882. Simeoni wrote that the reports reaching Propaganda on the state of the union in Galicia were ever more alarming and that the Holy Father himself was preoccupied with the issue. The Hnylychky incident was a symptom of how grave the situation was. The restoration of the Basilian order was one of the measures the Holy See was employing "for the benefit of the Ruthenians," but its salutary effects would necessarily be delayed. Meanwhile, every day revealed the need for other – speedier and more efficacious – remedies. All who knew the Galician situation were convinced that any measure would remain fruitless if it did not strike at the root of the evil by purging the consistory and removing Metropolitan Sembratovych. This was not to say, wrote Simeoni, that Sembratovych himself – a good man when considered as a private individual – was the cause of all the problems that afflicted the Ruthenian church. "But his diffidence and his prejudices against the Latins, his excessive love for Ruthenism, his blindness and debility" made him "an instrument" in the hands of ill-intentioned or obstructive advisors. The Vatican was looking for a graceful way to remove him, to call him to a post in Rome that would appear to be a promotion.⁹²

Although Iosyf Sembratovych should have been aware that Rome was seriously considering his removal from the metropolitan throne,⁹³ he issued a pastoral letter on 2 June⁹⁴ that was to do him immense damage. In this in many ways admirable document, Sembratovych stood his ground. He began the pastoral letter by urging the priests of the archeparchy to be obedient to authority, but he was not about to take them to task. He said that he had no doubts about their loyalty to the Holy See and Austrian throne and praised their work for the spiritual and material improvement of the flock entrusted to them. Characteristically, he singled out for praise their efforts to spread "sobriety, industry [and] thrift." Their toil in the vineyard had been blessed with fruit: the people had made extraordinary progress. The cathedral chapter and consistory had been of immense help in administering such a large archeparchy. Sembratovych said that he was constantly thanking God for giving him such co-workers. He only hoped that his clergy could maintain their strength, especially in the face of recent slander that they were not loyal to the Catholic church and Austrian state. The isolated incident in Hnylychky, where the people were motivated not by a desire to

convert to Orthodoxy but by the desire to constitute their community as an independent parish with its own pastor, was being presented in such a way as to suggest that all Ruthenian communities were aspiring to apostasy. Sembratovych believed that the slander had been so effective that it had succeeded in paining the heart of the Holy Father, as shown by his constitution of 12 May "Singulare praesidium."⁹⁵ He urged his clergy to be patient, because the slander would eventually be exposed. In the meantime, he instructed the deans to organize collective expressions of loyalty to the pope and emperor as was done in the wake of the Chelm affair.

The pastoral letter was sharply criticized in the Polish press.⁹⁶ Lviv's *Dziennik Polski* said that the letter "has such a marked agitational tendency, contains so many words at variance with the truth, that one does not want to believe one's eyes reading the metropolitan's signature beneath the pastoral letter. With this pastoral letter the metropolitan has issued a testimonial of how he exercises the archepiscopal authority entrusted to him by the Apostolic See."⁹⁷

More importantly, the pastoral letter was considered a damning document by Lieutenant Potocki.⁹⁸ In his letter to Metropolitan Sembratovych of 10 June⁹⁹ and in his memorandums to the minister of religion and education of 13¹⁰⁰ and 29 June,¹⁰¹ Potocki asked how it was possible for the archbishop to praise his clergy so unreservedly when the investigation into the Hnylychky affair and indeed some of the metropolitan's own currendas¹⁰² had revealed how seriously some priests were infected with schismatic proclivities. Moreover, the suggestion that the deans should initiate the collection of signatures on addresses of loyalty was dangerous. This could easily become the focus of agitation.¹⁰³ Peasants would ask why they were being required to sign the addresses and would be given the same explanation that one found in the pastoral letter: because they were being slandered. "Who then," they would ask, "are our slanderers?" "The Poles, of course."¹⁰⁴

At about the same time as he was being criticized for his pastoral letter, Metropolitan Sembratovych also came under criticism for his equivocal attitude to the Basilian reform.¹⁰⁵ In late May the metropolitan had expressed objections to the nuncio in Vienna with respect to the reform as decreed in "Singulare praesidium." Since persons of the Latin rite, that is, Poles, could enter the Basilian novitiate and since the papal constitution also renewed the Basilians' monopoly on episcopal office, soon all the Greek Catholic bishoprics in Galicia would be occupied by Poles. This could lead, he maintained, to the destruction of the Ruthenian nation in Galicia.¹⁰⁶ Simeoni responded directly to the metropolitan on 6 June, in a letter with the tone of a stern reprimand.

mand. Bishops should correct the erroneous opinions of the people, not be influenced by them (*"docendus est enim populus, non sequendus"*).¹⁰⁷ As the organ of the Cracow conservatives rather snidely remarked, in his letter Simeoni brilliantly refuted all arguments against the reform, thus easing the archbishop's task of scrupulously defending it.¹⁰⁸

Coincidentally, on the same day that Simeoni wrote his letter to Sembratovych, Sembratovych himself wrote a reprimand with regard to the Basilian reform. This was his response to the protest-petition that forty Basilian monks had submitted to the lieutenancy on 23 May. The metropolitan strictly prohibited any further protest of the reform, promising severe punishment for offenders. But – and for this the metropolitan was to be brought to account – he also suggested that it would not be out of place to present "a humble petition to the Holy Father himself" expressing "the lack of their consent to the proposal of their protohegumen" and indicating "the more or less deleterious points" of the reform. And if this were to fail, they could always appeal to God himself "to avert from us all that is vexatious."¹⁰⁹

Thus, in the first half of June, Metropolitan Sembratovych took a clear stand against the views prevailing in the Vatican, the Galician lieutenancy, and the Polish press. While the latter three viewed the Greek Catholic church as riddled with crypto-schismatics and Russophiles, the metropolitan expressed his conviction that the church and its clergy were loyal, that they were the victims of unscrupulous, partisan calumny. While the latter concluded that the Jesuits had to be brought in to create an antibody for this diseased church in the form of a renovated Basilian order, Sembratovych declared his metropolis to be basically healthy.

The metropolitan's defiance provoked an energetic response from Lieutenant Potocki. On 13 June he submitted a long, barbed memorandum to the minister of religion and education, Sigmund Conrad von Eybesfeld. He said that the Basilian reform launched by the Vatican and approved by the Austrian state was a valuable initiative, but by itself was insufficient to ward off the dangers to church and state. To be effective, it had to become one link in an entire chain of reforms. Two other indispensable links that needed to be added were the removal of Iosyf Sembratovych from the post of metropolitan and the removal of Canons Mykhail Malynovsky and Ioann Zhukovsky from the metropolitan consistory and cathedral chapter.

Potocki offered a sketch of the history of the Russophile movement in the Greek Catholic church. The first dangerous symptoms had appeared in the 1860s, but at that time they were limited to the liturgical sphere. However, after a few years, the threat grew larger, culminating

in the emigration of Galicians to Chełm eparchy in Russia, where they entered Russian service and participated in the conversion of that eparchy to schism. The emigration to Chełm did not, however, remove all the dangerous elements from Galicia; in fact, the majority of Russophiles remained at home, where their efforts ultimately led to the Hnylychky scandal. Most recently, with the announcement of the Basilian reform and the indictment of prominent Russophiles on charges of high treason, the Russophiles had felt threatened. They had therefore arranged for the metropolitan to praise them in his pastoral letter of 2 June, to keep up the spirits of the wavering.

Potocki characterized Metropolitan Sembratovych personally as "a true son of the church and state." Even so, he had regrettably become "the abject tool of his conscienceless and perfidious environment." He failed to handle the investigation of the Hnylychky affair properly. He not only failed to contain protests against the Basilian reform, but he gave public expression to his own vacillations. Moreover, he gave encouragement to the Russophiles in his pastoral letter. All this was due, of course, to the metropolitan's "weakness, complete lack of any will, truly astounding ignorance" of the true state of affairs in his archeparchy. But regardless of the degree of Metropolitan Sembratovych's personal culpability, he had to be removed from office. A man of his character could not be left in such a responsible position at such a perilous moment.

The great villain in Potocki's exposition was the metropolitan's chief advisor, Canon Mykhail Malynovsky.¹¹⁰ From time to time, wrote Potocki, it seemed that the metropolitan would come to a better understanding and would make decisions that would benefit the archeparchy, but as soon as he came under the influence of the "intriguing Canon Malynovsky," things would take a different turn. Malynovsky "openly scorns the weakness of the metropolitan" and played with him as if with a ball. Moreover, Potocki continued, Malynovsky tyrannized the clergy of the archeparchy. He did not consider what was right and fair, but acted arbitrarily and out of personal conceit. Woe to the priest who displayed his Catholic fervour. He would be derided as Romish, as a renegade Ruthenian; "the hand of Malynovsky will reach him, and if not him, then his son, his kin." And the powerless metropolitan looked upon these doings placidly. Under such conditions the clergy of the archeparchy grew wild and neglected its sacerdotal duties. Liturgical innovators were tolerated and even favoured, and "the church becomes a showplace of national and political agitations."

Potocki concluded his memorandum with the promise that he would soon come to Vienna, with regard to these very matters, and that he would discuss them further with the minister.¹¹¹

The minister of religion found the memorandum convincing and passed a copy along to the minister of foreign affairs, Count Gustav Kálnoky, to make use of in his dealings with the Holy See.¹¹² While Kálnoky also found the memorandum convincing, he thought that under the influence of the treason trial being conducted at that time in Lviv, Potocki might have "let darker shadows fall upon his depiction than would be the case in a completely unprejudiced account of the matter." But even laying aside any perturbation on the part of Lieutenant Potocki, it was clear to Kálnoky that here was a serious personnel problem that demanded decisive action. He sent his copy of the memorandum to Count Ludwig Paar, the Austrian ambassador to the Vatican, and urged him to begin formal negotiations with the Holy See concerning the removal of the metropolitan and the two canons.¹¹³

As he had promised, Potocki travelled to Vienna near the end of June.¹¹⁴ He discussed the resignation of Metropolitan Sembratovych and the canons with Prime Minister Eduard Taaffe,¹¹⁵ Nuncio Vannutelli,¹¹⁶ and, presumably, Minister of Religion and Education Conrad, with whom in any case he left another long and even more vehemently argued memorandum,¹¹⁷ complete with twenty-one appendices.¹¹⁸

This second memorandum, dated 29 June, began with a discussion of liturgical borrowings from Russian Orthodoxy, a subject that obsessed Potocki, however profane his intelligence in this sphere seems to have been. He said that such liturgical borrowings had begun in 1861 when Metropolitan Iakhymovych was already old and Bishop Poliansky of Przemyśl sick. In 1862 the lieutenancy had banned liturgical innovations, but thousands of lieutenancy documents show that this ban as well as the unemphatic admonitions of the two Greek Catholic bishops were ineffective. Only during the reign of Metropolitan Lytvynovych was the innovationist movement interrupted. Lytvynovych vigorously suppressed innovations and punished those who introduced them not only in his own archeparchy but also in the eparchy of Przemyśl. Lytvynovych knew how to maintain order in the metropolis, but when Metropolitan Sembratovych succeeded to the throne and the clergy realized that they no longer had a firm hand over them, they renewed the innovations more intensely and systematically than ever in the past. They not only introduced non-Catholic liturgical practices, but also employed in rituals and erected in public places three-barred crosses and dressed up like schismatic priests. The lieutenancy authorities put pressure on the Lviv and Przemyśl ordinariates to control this movement, but the ordinariates displayed no determination and held back the punishing hand. The appetites of some were not satisfied by the schismatic ritual

innovations. They were attracted by schism itself and emigrated to Chełm eparchy in Russia. Potocki included among his twenty-one appendices a list of ninety-three Galician clergymen and forty-two seminarians who went without state permission to work in Chełm.

Potocki also cited, at great length, what he considered to be the “saddest illustrations” of the religious views of part of the Greek Catholic clergy: material discovered in connection with the investigation of the Hnylychky affair. He quoted amply from Naumovych’s letters and testimony to demonstrate his infatuation with Russian Orthodoxy. And yet, he lamented, Naumovych enjoyed great respect and influence among the Greek Catholic clergy; even his prosecution on charges of high treason had essentially done nothing to diminish his popularity.

Potocki also wrote pages on the alleged moral decay of the Greek Catholic clergy, citing criminal transgressions, sexual scandals, and instances of extortionate sacramental fees extracted from peasants, and on the lack of discipline in the seminary, citing interest in forbidden ideas (socialism) and late-night gambling sessions. Here Potocki was overstating his case (as Kálnoky would have put it, letting “darker shadows fall upon his depiction”), since the problems he cited not only were irrelevant to the issue at hand but were by no means restricted either to the late nineteenth century or to Greek Catholic Galicia. Yet all this, as well as the leanings towards schism, were charged to the responsibility of Metropolitan Sembratovych and his consistory.

Potocki once again brought up, and included among the appendices, the metropolitan’s pastoral letter of 2 June and his response to the protest of the forty Basilians of 6 June. Potocki closed his memorandum with these words: “From the above it is as clear as day that the state of the Greek Catholic church in Galicia is such that to tolerate it any longer would be irresponsible with regard to the interests of the state and the church, and that a sweeping reform in head and members has become an urgent necessity.”

This second memorandum was also circulated, but not just in Austrian government circles. The day after it was submitted, on 30 June, the ministry of foreign affairs passed the memorandum and twenty-one appendices to Nuncio Vannutelli,¹¹⁹ who promptly had all of it translated into Italian¹²⁰ so that it could be studied in Rome. Ambassador Ludwig Paar personally lent his copy to Cardinal Luigi Jacobi, the Vatican secretary of state.¹²¹

Already on 28 June, however, Propaganda had summoned Metropolitan Sembratovych to Rome.¹²² The Vatican was still envisioning at this time a relatively graceful removal of the metropolitan. He would

be offered a position, indeed a promotion, that would keep him in Rome, and thus his replacement would not cause great consternation among the Ruthenians. Perhaps this was a delusion from the beginning and nothing could have made Metropolitan Sembratovych resign his throne voluntarily. The whole process of Metropolitan Sembratovych's replacement was meant to have been conducted in secrecy, but in fact a great deal was leaked to newspapers, especially to Polish newspapers, which began to write about his impending resignation at the beginning of July.¹²³ Soon the atmosphere became clogged by the attention that the resignation affair received in the press. Now if the metropolitan were to resign it would seem to vindicate the accusations of the Polish press, which the metropolitan had consistently rejected as slander.

Metropolitan Sembratovych left Lviv on 9 July¹²⁴ and arrived in Rome six days later.¹²⁵ He stayed until late August. During these five weeks, both the Austrian embassy and Propaganda pressed him hard to resign. He had several audiences with Pope Leo XIII. During the first, which took place on 23¹²⁶ or 24 July,¹²⁷ the pope expressed his dissatisfaction with the state of Lviv archeparchy and told Metropolitan Sembratovych that he did not consider him equal to the position that he had entrusted to him, but he stopped short of a direct demand that he resign.¹²⁸ The pope received the metropolitan again shortly before he left Rome. This time he told him that he expected his resignation within a few months. The metropolitan answered that he would never be disobedient.¹²⁹

For most of these weeks in Rome, Sembratovych stood his ground. He admitted to no wrongdoing. He insisted that the accusations against his church were exaggerated, the fruit of friction between the nationalities. Both the Austrian government and the curia were ill informed about the situation in Galicia. They were too ready to give credence to Polish slander. The Ruthenians had no one in either Vienna or Rome to defend them. When the embassy councillor (*Legations-Rath*) Sigmund von Rosty countered that the evidence amassed for the treason trial proved the seriousness of the situation, Sembratovych predicted that the verdict in that trial would show just how exaggerated all talk of a conspiracy really was.¹³⁰ He made it clear that he regarded his return to Lviv a point of honour. Many of his subordinates were being unjustly accused and he had to stay at his post. If he resigned as metropolitan, even to accept a cardinal's hat, it would be interpreted as punishment and as proof of the slanderous claims of a partisan press. Ruthenians would view him as a victim of Polish intrigues. Thus, his resignation, far from solving anything, would only stoke the fire of national animosities. He would

not resign, he told them; he would have to be removed by a canonical process. This resolution on the part of a man supposedly weak-willed and vacillating surprised his interlocutors; however, rather than question the validity of their own assessment of and information on the metropolitan's character, they preferred to interpret this steadfast behaviour as testimony to the potency of Canon Malynovsky's influence.¹³¹

At the pope's insistence,¹³² Metropolitan Sembratovych did make a concession on the matter of the Basilian reform. On 16 August he issued a pastoral letter that unequivocally endorsed the constitution "*Singulare praesidium*" reforming the Basilian order. He said that the pope had instituted the reform solely out of a sincere love for the Ruthenian people. He called upon the clergy and faithful to lay aside their fears and trust in the pope's love.¹³³ The proponents of the reform hoped that this declaration would compensate for "the sinister effects" of his earlier statements.¹³⁴

His weeks in Rome were a great ordeal for the metropolitan. At one meeting with Cardinal Simeoni, in which the prefect told him that both the pope and the Austrian government had lost confidence in him and wanted his resignation, the metropolitan had tears in his eyes.¹³⁵ When the pope himself confronted him with his dissatisfaction, at the first audience in July, the metropolitan was "deeply stricken." Days afterward he was said to be "in a very depressed mood."¹³⁶

During these difficult weeks, the metropolitan maintained the hope that he would still be able to clear his reputation and that of his clergy. Like so many of his peasant faithful, Metropolitan Sembratovych was possessed of a great and naive trust in the emperor. He had already had an audience with the emperor on 13 February,¹³⁷ and it is not unlikely that he discussed on that occasion the Hnylychky affair, its interpretation in the Polish press, and the situation in his archeparchy. In July he informed von Rosty at the Austrian embassy that he would stop in Ischl on his way home to Lviv to clear matters up with the emperor himself.¹³⁸ The government's opinion on his case could be discounted, since Austria had a "party-government"; he wished to justify himself directly to the emperor.¹³⁹ He also told Cardinal Simeoni that he could resist the pressures to resign, because he enjoyed the emperor's benevolence and hoped to dispel all the accusations of the Poles in the various governmental spheres.¹⁴⁰ On the occasion of the emperor's birthday, the metropolitan appeared at the embassy to convey his greetings.¹⁴¹

Metropolitan Sembratovych left Rome for Vienna towards the end of August, having promised the pope a week earlier that he would

submit his resignation within the next few months. The day after his arrival, on 31 August, Emperor Franz Josef received him in a private audience. The emperor first made a point of praising Sembratovych's personal virtues, but then told him in no uncertain words that the good of church and state demanded his immediate resignation. As Vannutelli informed Simeoni, "it was a terrible blow for Monsignor Sembratovych."¹⁴² Not long thereafter, on 4 September, the metropolitan submitted his written promise of resignation to the emperor.¹⁴³ On the next day he submitted his formal resignation to the pope.¹⁴⁴ His personal drama concluded, he returned to Lviv.¹⁴⁵

Public reaction to the resignation was much as might be expected. The Polish press regarded it as a necessity. An editorial in *Czas* said that the metropolitan had been unable to rise to the demands of his office: "He was unable to take command either of the consistory or of the situation ... He did not have the requisite characteristics which under the given circumstances could guarantee the security and highest moral interests of the church and state."¹⁴⁶ The Ukrainian *Dilo* expressed shock and disappointment at the resignation, which it considered to be a result of the recent treason trial.¹⁴⁷ One editorial bitterly asked: "Does Rome think that by helping Polish chauvinists to build Poland it will bring Catholicism to the East?"¹⁴⁸ Whatever *Halytskii Sion* had to say about the matter was so strong that most of the article devoted to it was suppressed by the censors.¹⁴⁹

Now that Metropolitan Sembratovych had resigned, the authorities had to settle upon a successor, a choice that, in Simeoni's words, demanded the "utmost wariness." The problem of succession had been kept in mind from the very first, but as of September it was necessary to come to a decision. There was general agreement about the qualities expected of the successor. Simeoni summarized them well: the successor must have "fortitude and energy" to reorganize Lviv archeparchy, "a profound devotion and attachment to the Holy See," willingness to follow orders and instructions docilely, and a spirit superior to the miserable competitions of nationality.¹⁵⁰

Over the months many solutions to the succession problem had been advanced. In his memorandum of 13 June, Potocki argued that an Austrian German should be appointed administrator.¹⁵¹ Early on, Simeoni was considering a Roman Catholic canon, the vice-rector of the Roman Catholic seminary in Przemyśl, Jan Puzyna. Puzyna was "originally a Ruthenian, but now is of the Latin rite"; this appointment, however, would be resented by the Ruthenians.¹⁵² By the fall a consensus had emerged that a Latin could not be appointed, that this would alienate the Ruthenians too much. Potocki himself had come around to this point of view. "Such dangerous elements as do exist

among them must be eliminated," but care must be taken not to offend the religious or national sentiment of the Ruthenians as a whole. "They must be kept as that which they are: good Uniates and good Austrian patriots."¹⁵³ But a metropolitan could not as yet be appointed from among potential Ruthenian candidates. None had demonstrated the qualities that would be necessary in the present, most dangerous situation. Father Jackowski expressed the prevailing view when he said that, considering the almost desperate state of the Ruthenian church, a metropolitan who was not a full match for his difficult position might cause the ruin of the holy union even if he were a good Christian and devoted to the Holy See.¹⁵⁴

In the end, all concerned came to the conclusion that the best thing to do was to appoint the suffragan bishop Sylvestr Sembratovych, a nephew of the deposed metropolitan and one of the founders of *Sion*, as apostolic administrator of Lviv archeparchy. There were serious reservations about Sylvestr's character,¹⁵⁵ but a choice had to be made quickly¹⁵⁶ so as to resolve the situation in the Ruthenian church. On 14 October the emperor issued a decision to leave the Lviv throne vacant and appoint Sylvestr Sembratovych to administer the archeparchy,¹⁵⁷ and on 11 November the pope officially named him apostolic administrator.¹⁵⁸ In spite of some lingering doubts,¹⁵⁹ Sylvestr was to remain in charge of Lviv archeparchy. On 26 March 1885 he was named archbishop of Lviv and metropolitan of Halych,¹⁶⁰ a post he retained until his death in 1898. After Sylvestr's appointment, Iosyf Sembratovych went off to Rome, where he lived out his days on a handsome pension but in relative obscurity. Canons Malynovsky and Zhukovsky submitted their resignations on 21 October and were forced to vacate the cathedral complex.¹⁶¹

The Excommunication of Father Ioann Naumovych

A Russian traveller who visited Galicia in 1881 met Father Naumovych and marvelled at his appearance. Unlike the other Galician priests he had encountered, Naumovych wore a *riasa*, the long, wide-sleeved cassock characteristic of the clergy in the traveller's native Russia. And unlike the rest of the clean-shaven Galician priesthood, but in conformity with the traditions of the Oriental church, Naumovych dignified his visage with a beard. He looked exactly, according to the traveller, like an Orthodox priest.¹⁶²

The cultivation of this appearance was, of course, intended as a statement, the outward manifestation of Naumovych's ritual radicalism and sympathy for Russian Orthodoxy. Most of his colleagues considered his dressing up and his whole attitude of exaggerated Easternism to be emanations of Naumovych's eccentric personality, on a par with his mania for bee-keeping and practice of homeopathic medicine. Naumovych was an enthusiast, a man who could do nothing by half-measures, and if he took up the cause of ritual purity, it was only to be expected that he would overdo it. Colleagues tended to overlook this. They had liked the plump and jovial Naumovych since seminary days; in fact, he was an immensely popular, exceptionally likable fellow. He was also widely respected in Ruthenian society. Although some of his actions might provoke amusement or exasperation, no one could deny his great services to the Ruthenian nation, especially in the realm of popular education; after all, he was the founder of the Kachkovsky Society¹⁶³ and the author and publisher of many beneficial works for the common people, who also held him in high regard. Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych would have shared the generally positive evaluation of Naumovych's popular-educational activities, since Naumovych in his publications for the peasantry stressed the importance of hard work and thrift and the dangers of drunkenness and ignorance; these were exactly the same bees that buzzed in the metropolitan's bonnet. The metropolitan also may have found it difficult to take Naumovych's easternizing extremism quite as seriously as did the Vatican and Austrian authorities.

Yet it was largely because of Naumovych that the unfortunate metropolitan was forced to resign. When the police searched every nook and cranny of Russophile Galicia in 1882, they could produce very little evidence that the Greek Catholic clergy were seriously flirting with Russian Orthodoxy. Aside from a few passages in the correspondence of Father Emylian Levytsky, the only incriminating materials were the letters and manuscripts of Father Naumovych. The letters revealed that Naumovych was willing to go much further in his Russian Orthodox sympathies than any of his comrades in the Russophile movement. Naumovych also, of course, encouraged the peasants of Hnylychky to go over to Orthodoxy and even drafted their petition for them. It was to Naumovych that Cracow Jesuits, the Galician lieutenant, Roman prelates, Polish journalists, and Austrian officials could point when they hurled accusations at Metropolitan Sembratovych and his canons and conjured up the spectre of schism.

Naumovych's radical religious views, hitherto expressed fully only in conversations, letters, and unpublished manuscripts, and the extent of his responsibility in the Hnylychky affair were revealed to the public in the course of the treason trial. Although acquitted of the

charge of high treason, Naumovych was found guilty of disturbing public order. He was sentenced to an eight-month prison term,¹⁶⁴ which he served almost a year and a half after the trial ended, from 27 December 1883 to 27 August 1884.¹⁶⁵

Immediately after the conclusion of the treason trial, at the end of July 1882, the Lviv consistory suspended Naumovych *a sacris*.¹⁶⁶ A very interesting commentary on Naumovych's suspension appeared in *Halytskii Sion*, a journal with a consistent record of opposition to religious Russophilism and of loyalty to the Catholic church: "The eccentric initiatives of that pastor have now been condemned by the spiritual authorities; he is suspended from performing the sacraments. We hope that after his most recent trials he will enter the path of unabashed Catholicism and true, unhypocritical patriotism and that with his talent and popularity he will yet render the Galician-Ruthenian people important services."¹⁶⁷ What is interesting about the commentary is how completely a journal associated with influential figures in the Ruthenian church and permeated by an "unabashed" Catholic spirit could still misread the Naumovych situation at such a late date.

Soon thereafter things would clarify. Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych submitted his resignation in early September but remained in charge of his archeparchy until his nephew was appointed administrator on 11 November. In his last two months as metropolitan, Iosyf Sembratovych dealt decisively with Naumovych. He established a special tribunal to examine the errant pastor's case; it held its hearings on 19–21 September 1882. On 3 November the metropolitan issued a verdict: in light of Father Naumovych's anti-Catholic and pro-schismatic writings, especially his declarations on behalf of the parishioners of Hnylychky and his unpublished tract on the eucharist, he was suspended *ab officio et beneficio* and excommunicated. The metropolitan gave Naumovych the opportunity to recant and appeal for mercy from the Holy See.¹⁶⁸ On the same day, Father Emylian Levytsky was also suspended *ab officio et beneficio* and given the opportunity to recant and appeal to Rome for clemency.¹⁶⁹

Shortly thereafter, on 12 December, Father Levytsky issued a brief statement to the press, in Latin and Ruthenian, publicly admitting his guilt and retracting the pro-schismatic views that had been expressed in his letters to *Slovo*.¹⁷⁰ Naumovych took longer to reply to the decree of excommunication, not finishing his answer until late January or February 1883.¹⁷¹ His reply, moreover, was anything but brief. In fact, it was a long essay that was published (with some omissions) in a fifteen-part series in *Slovo*¹⁷² and (presumably, completely) as a separate brochure in the Russian empire.¹⁷³ And this "Appeal to Pope

Leo XIII" was anything but a confession of guilt and recantation. It was a manifesto of intransigence. It vehemently condemned the progressive latinization of the Greek rite under the union, which it depicted as part of a grand plan to polonize and ultimately eradicate the Ruthenian nation. The Latins had reduced the Ruthenian Uniates to the status of barely tolerated slaves, the Latins were not abiding by the terms of the Florentine union, and therefore upright Ruthenians had little moral choice but to leave the union and return to the faith of their forefathers. Naumovych did not repent of his actions, even in the Hnylychky affair, and indicated that he would go over to Orthodoxy if the pope did nothing to right the wrongs done to the Ruthenian Greek Catholic church. The appeal did, however, end with a formal plea that the pope withdraw the suspension and excommunication.

Naumovych had to wait two years before receiving a formal reply to his appeal. During that period he widened the distance between himself and Rome. In the spring of 1884, while serving his prison term for disturbing public order, Naumovych submitted letters to the prison and municipal authorities declaring his intent to convert to Orthodoxy; he asked that an Orthodox priest be sent to confess him and that he be allowed to attend Orthodox church services on Sunday. Shortly after submitting the declarations, he retracted them,¹⁷⁴ but he continued to write and publish articles directed against the union and Rome.¹⁷⁵

On 27 December 1884 Naumovych was summoned to the metropolitan consistory to clarify his position. Asked if he had "defected to schism" or not, Naumovych replied that he had not yet done so. He was giving the Roman church a chance to change its policy vis-à-vis the Ruthenian church; in particular, he hoped that abuses he ascribed to the Resurrectionists would be eliminated. He was also asked if he would travel to Rome to discuss his appeal before the Inquisition as he had been requested to. Naumovych replied that he would be willing to travel to Rome, but that being deprived of his parish, he did not have the means to do so.¹⁷⁶ Very soon the issue of Naumovych's trip to Rome became a matter of public concern, with his Russophile supporters urging him not to go, lest Jesuit fanatics do harm to his person. In the end, Naumovych bowed to their advice.¹⁷⁷

Naumovych finally received a formal answer to his appeal in the spring of 1885. A decision had been reached in Rome on 29 April, and Sylvestr Sembratovych communicated it to Naumovych on 23 May. Naumovych was given one month to renounce his errors and solemnly accept a special *confessio fidei* that emphasized obedience to the Roman pontiff and included a retraction of whatever he had written

against the union; otherwise the suspension and excommunication would be confirmed.¹⁷⁸ Naumovych put off responding to this ultimatum, pleading ill health.¹⁷⁹ The one-month deadline passed twice when, at the end of July 1885, the Lviv consistory issued a currenda (backdated to 5 July 1885) announcing that Naumovych remained under excommunication “on account of his inclination to schism and disobedience to the holy Apostolic Roman See.”¹⁸⁰ Only then did Naumovych pen a response to the *confessio fidei*,¹⁸¹ but the very first instalment printed in *Slovo* was confiscated and the paper decided that the response could not be published in Galicia.¹⁸²

Naumovych decided to convert to Orthodoxy.¹⁸³ He also decided to leave Austria for Russia. He had been travelling to Russia frequently since his release from prison late in the summer of 1884,¹⁸⁴ and he was finding it more and more difficult to remain in Austria, where he was being hounded by the police¹⁸⁵ and where he could not earn a livelihood as a clergyman. Early in 1886 he moved together with his family to Kyiv. Here the Russian government and Orthodox church gave him a generous pension.¹⁸⁶ He primarily devoted himself to writing, although he did take one short stab at pastoral work in a village outside of Kyiv. He died in mysterious circumstances in 1891; someone had given him poison.¹⁸⁷ There is a monument to Naumovych, erected in 1894 and still standing, at “Askold’s Burial Mound” in Kyiv.

The Erection of Stanyslaviv Eparchy

A further result of the crisis of 1882 was the establishment of a third Greek Catholic eparchy in Galicia, with its seat in the county capital of Stanyslaviv (now called Ivano-Frankivsk), about halfway between Lviv and Chernivtsi. The idea to establish a bishopric here was not new. Malynovsky had proposed it to the Vatican’s consultant on Eastern church affairs, Augustin Theiner, back in 1842.¹⁸⁸ In the aftermath of the revolution, in 1850, Bishop Iakhymovych had submitted a petition to the throne for the establishment of the eparchy. In recognition of the loyalty of the Ruthenians in 1848, the emperor had agreed in principle to the request. However, in spite of this imperial decision, nothing actually happened; no eparchy was established because of difficulties with funding. Galicia’s crownland statute of 26 February 1861 made provision for the Stanyslaviv bishop to have a seat in the diet, but no such bishop was appointed. Ruthenians petitioned for the establishment of the eparchy in the 1860s, but to no avail. In 1876

Father Aleksii Zaklynsky introduced an interpellation in parliament to the minister of religion and education, reminding the government of the decision of 1850. But Minister Karl von Stremayr replied that the government had no money to spare at that time for the establishment of a third Ruthenian bishopric.¹⁸⁹

Stanyslaviv eparchy remained a moribund issue until 1882, when, in connection with the Hnylychky affair and resignation of Iosyf Sembratovych, it was revived. Already in February 1882 the first rumours reached the press that the government was intending to establish the eparchy.¹⁹⁰ In autumn 1882 both the Vatican and Austrian authorities definitively made up their minds to do it.¹⁹¹ Financial and other technical complications continued to delay the execution of this decision,¹⁹² but on 25 March 1885 Leo XIII issued a bull erecting the eparchy¹⁹³ and on 9–10 January 1886 Iuliiian Pelesh was solemnly enthroned as the first Greek Catholic bishop of Stanyslaviv.¹⁹⁴

Why in 1882–86, after over thirty years of lassitude, did the will finally emerge to establish Stanyslaviv eparchy? As the timing suggests, this was connected with the Russophilism crisis in the Ruthenian church. The erection of the eparchy was intended both to mollify the Ruthenians in the wake of a series of unpalatable interventions in their ecclesiastical life and, at the same time, to deal another hard blow to the Russophiles.

Shortly after the resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych in September 1882, the Vatican secretary of state, Cardinal Luigi Jacobini, told a representative of the Austrian embassy that this was the right moment to erect Stanyslaviv eparchy. The Ruthenians would view it as the fulfilment of their long-standing desire, and perhaps it would serve to reduce the unfavourable impression created by the removal of their "incontestably popular archbishop."¹⁹⁵ In the wake of the Ruthenian assembly of June 1883, which protested the Basilian reform, Serafino Cretoni, the secretary of Propaganda, asked the Austrian embassy to see what it could do to expedite the erection of Stanyslaviv eparchy and thus relieve some of the tension in the Ruthenian church.¹⁹⁶ As the Austrian ambassador wrote to the minister of foreign affairs early in 1884: "One hopes that this measure will give the Ruthenians a clear picture of the concern shown for their ecclesiastical interests by the emperor and pope and that it will have the best consequences in the political and religious spheres."¹⁹⁷

The authorities were correct that the Ruthenians would welcome the erection of the diocese. Even though Ruthenian political leaders suspected that the Poles were interested in Stanyslaviv eparchy for reasons of their own, they nonetheless made it known that the erection of a third eparchy was "completely in harmony also with our

Ruthenian interest."¹⁹⁸ When the eparchy was at last established, addresses of gratitude were sent to the emperor and pope¹⁹⁹ and a delegation led by Bishop Pelesh thanked the emperor in person.²⁰⁰

Aside from placating the Ruthenians, the appointment of a bishop to Stanyslaviv was also meant to weaken the Russophiles. Cardinal Jacobini summed up the strategy as "divide et impera."²⁰¹ Stanyslaviv eparchy was to be carved out of Lviv archeparchy. The latter was one of the largest Catholic dioceses in Austria, with a territory extending over more than 46,000 square kilometres and with over 1.3 million faithful in 1848.²⁰² Because of its size, the archeparchy was difficult to administer, and this was one of the considerations that had led the Ruthenians to seek its partition. The Vatican also thought it too large. As Jacobini told the Austrian embassy in September 1882, the archeparchy of Lviv was too extensive for a single bishop to keep watch over, especially "in the present troubled time" with such "untrustworthy elements" there; the eparchy had to be split to make it more manageable.²⁰³ A source in Propaganda later made a similar case to the embassy: Lviv archeparchy extended over such a large territory (bordering, moreover, on Russia) that no bishop could hope to live long enough to visit every parish. Thus, canonical visitation – an important instrument against Russian agitation – could not be fully employed. If there were two eparchies on this territory, it would be possible to keep tighter reins on the clergy and thereby also protect the population from Russian national and Orthodox agitation.²⁰⁴

Although the documents do not say so explicitly, it is evident that the division of Lviv archeparchy would strengthen the Catholic spirit in the Ruthenian church and undermine Russophilism in another way as well. The influence of the Lviv chapter and consistory, which even after the purge of Malynovsky and Zhukovsky still consisted largely of the old guard,²⁰⁵ would be restricted to a much smaller territory. Moreover, the appointments to the new Stanyslaviv chapter and consistory would be made in an atmosphere in which clerics loyal to Rome would be favoured and Russophiles excluded.

There was, finally, one other important way in which the erection of Stanyslaviv eparchy could reform the Ruthenian church. With the establishment of a third bishopric, it would be possible to hold a provincial synod. Such a synod could introduce reforms that would cause consternation if simply imposed from above, and it could settle with authority many of the liturgical and other questions that caused dissension.

The man chosen to become the first bishop of Stanyslaviv was Iuliiian Pelesh. (The Roman Catholic Jan Puzyna had also been briefly considered for the position, although not, it appears, very seriously.)²⁰⁶

Pelesh had spent years in Vienna as rector of the Greek Catholic seminary there and had made a good impression on the Austrian minister of religion and education. He was also the author of an excellent two-volume history of the Uniate church, written in the German language and in a spirit of loyalty to Catholicism.²⁰⁷ After the forced resignations of Malynovsky and Zhukovsky, he was appointed to the Lviv chapter and there gained some experience in the administration of an eparchy. Pelesh struck the authorities as such an outstanding episcopal candidate that the only question was whether he should be appointed archbishop of Lviv and metropolitan of Halych instead. Sylvestr Sembratovych, who was too "pliant," could be honoured with some political and ecclesiastical distinction for his services to date and then shunted down to Stanyslaviv. He could do a serviceable job as the bishop of a smaller eparchy, especially if he were to rely on the local Jesuits for advice. However, there were problems with this plan. Passing over Sylvestr Sembratovych to appoint Pelesh as metropolitan might provide the "oppositional elements of the Ruthenian church" with a new pretext for agitation. Furthermore, there was some doubt that Pelesh had learned enough about administration in his few years in the Lviv chapter to be able to take on the responsibilities of metropolitan.²⁰⁸ Thus, in the end, in 1885, Sylvestr Sembratovych was made archbishop-metropolitan and Pelesh bishop of Stanyslaviv.

The Lviv Provincial Synod of 1891

The last Ruthenian Catholic provincial synod had taken place in 1720 in Zamość. Although the need to hold another had been felt for some time prior to the mid-1880s, it had been impossible to convoke one. A quorum of three bishops was necessary for a provincial synod, but from the time of the establishment of the metropolis of Halych in 1808 until the appointment of Iuliiian Pelesh as bishop of Stanyslaviv in 1885, there were only two Ruthenian bishops in the metropolitan province. For political reasons, the participation of Ruthenian Catholic bishops from outside Galicia – that is, from the Russian empire or even Habsburg Hungary (Ruthenian Subcarpathia) – was precluded.

As soon as the third bishop was in place, in 1885, plans for a synod began to take shape. The prefect of Propaganda, Simeoni, wrote to the Vienna nuncio, Vannutelli, and explained why the synod was necessary. Much had transpired since the Zamość synod had met back in

1720. In particular, recent events had exposed the incessant efforts of "apostles and agents of the so-called Orthodoxy" to win adherents from among Galicia's Greek Catholics. It was therefore necessary to give the clergy a solid education in a true ecclesiastical spirit; the Ruthenian seminaries left much to be desired in this regard and had to be reformed.²⁰⁹ A provincial synod would be a useful instrument for implementing the required changes. The prefect asked the nuncio what he thought about this.²¹⁰

The nuncio consulted with Father Henryk Jackowski, the architect of the Basilian reform. Jackowski told him that now would not be a good time to hold a synod, given the mood in Ruthenian society and the state of the Greek Catholic clergy. Vannutelli accordingly advised Propaganda in February 1886 to wait until "the better elements are more developed." When the reform of the Basilian order was further advanced, if not completed, and when the new bishop of Stanyslaviv had gained more influence, then a synod could be held that would benefit Catholic interests. At the present conjuncture, holding a synod might give rise to serious internal and external dissension.²¹¹

The nuncio's reply temporarily chilled plans for a synod, but they were revived in the spring of 1888. At that time the three Ruthenian bishops and a large group of clergy and faithful travelled to Rome to greet Pope Leo XIII on the occasion of the forty-fifth jubilee of his ordination to the priesthood. The Greek Catholic hierarchy used the occasion to lobby for a provincial synod. Metropolitan Sembratovych met several times with the prefect of Propaganda, who on 2 May 1888 presented him with written authorization to begin preparations.²¹²

The Vatican, however, had failed to consult the Austrian government about this decision. Vienna got wind of the plans for the synod from newspaper reports, and the minister of religion and education, Paul Gautsch von Frankenthurn, wrote to the Galician lieutenant Filip Zaleski on 21 July for information. Zaleski reported that a synod was indeed planned, tentatively for the fall of 1889, that it would exclude lay participation, and that it would be preceded by a series of deanery councils at which the agenda of the synod would be discussed.²¹³ Gautsch was disturbed. He contacted the minister of foreign affairs, Kálnoky, on 20 October to express his concerns and to request his mediation with the curia. What bothered him primarily was the prospect of the deanery councils turning into political forums that would revive the discord between the Polish Roman Catholics and the Ruthenian Greek Catholics in Galicia: "It is sufficiently known that the Greek Catholic church contains in the lower ranks of its hierarchy numerous elements standing on the borderline between schism and the Catholic faith." These elements could make use of the deanery

councils for dangerous agitation. Furthermore, Gautsch wrote, the clergy constituted the primary component of the Ruthenian intelligentsia and, being married, were connected in manifold ways with the rest of Ruthenian society. In light of this, the exclusion of lay participation in the synod would be a mere formality. The danger was that the synod and the preparatory conferences would broach a number of controversial religious and national questions that stood only to exacerbate the discord within the population of the eastern frontier of the monarchy. Gautsch therefore wanted to see the synod postponed to some indefinite date in the future and hoped that the foreign ministry would present his case in the Vatican.²¹⁴

From November 1888 to April 1889, negotiations were conducted among Propaganda, the Austrian ministries of foreign affairs and religion, and the Ruthenian hierarchy.²¹⁵ They reached a compromise, and the curia and the Austrian government agreed to cooperate in the preparation of the synod, but secretly, lest the Ruthenians suspect that the Poles were influencing the synod through the offices of the government.²¹⁶ Vienna understood the need for the synod when the Vatican explained that the Ruthenian seminaries urgently required reform and that a number of liturgical questions needed to be settled to introduce uniformity and reduce dissension; in particular, it was pointed out that a new set of liturgical books had to be printed, since otherwise liturgical books from Russia would continue to find their way into Galician churches.²¹⁷ These were effective arguments. The Galician lieutenant had already expressed the need for seminary reform during the crisis of 1882,²¹⁸ and the Austrian government had recently, in the fall of 1886, pressed the Vatican to accelerate work on revising Greek Catholic liturgical books so that a new set could be printed to stem the influx of Russian editions.²¹⁹

To allay the fears of the government, Rome and the Ruthenian hierarchy agreed to dispense with the preparatory councils of the deaneries and to have all the materials for the synod drawn up in the bishops' chanceries. Furthermore, it was agreed that the Vienna nuncio or a specially appointed papal delegate would preside over the synod. The latter point proved to be contentious. Metropolitan Sembratovych objected to it on three grounds: (1) the proceedings would be conducted in Ruthenian and the president of the synod would then not be able to understand them; (2) the metropolis was too poor to host a nuncio or apostolic delegate in the appropriate manner, especially since the former metropolitan, Iosyf Sembratovych, was receiving such a large pension; and (3) the synodal fathers might interpret the presence of a papal representative as a restriction on their freedom of speech. Propaganda countered these objections as follows: (1) the

president would make use of a translator, a practice followed at other synods in the Orient; (2) Propaganda would subsidize the papal representative; and (3) Propaganda could not take seriously the objection that somehow a papal representative would make the participants at a Catholic synod uncomfortable.²²⁰ What transpired later, at and immediately after the synod, shows that the metropolitan was closer to the mark than Propaganda.

Propaganda took a very active role in the preparations so that less debate, and possible controversy, about synodal matters would take place in Galicia. On 12 August the congregation sent instructions to the Ruthenian bishops that outlined the entire work of the synod. The primary tasks of the provincial synod would be to remove all anti-Catholic influence in liturgical books, to combat modernist heresies, and to reform the education of the clergy.²²¹ With regard to the latter task, the instructions called for the establishment of minor seminaries and for the encouragement of clerical celibacy.

Commissions within the Ruthenian consistories worked intensively from November 1889 into May 1890 to draft preparatory schemas for the synod on the basis of Propaganda's instructions. By the end of January 1891, they had essentially completed the Latin text, which was translated into Ruthenian by the middle of May 1891. The schemas were sent to Propaganda for approval. Propaganda returned the approved text on 4 July 1891, and final corrections were made on 6 July.²²²

Although the synod had originally been planned for the fall of 1889, it had to be postponed to the fall of 1891. This was partly the result of the slow pace of preparations, but it was also due to changes in the Ruthenian episcopate. In late December 1890, after some months of debilitating illness, Bishop Ioann Stupnytsky of Przemyśl passed away. Thus, there were once again only two Ruthenian bishops, and the synod could not be held until a new bishop was appointed. In May 1891 Bishop Iuliiian Pelesh was transferred from Stanyslaviv to the ancient and more important see of Przemyśl. His place in Stanyslaviv was taken by Bishop Iuliiian Sas-Kuilovsky, who had served as coadjutor for the ailing Bishop Stupnytsky in the previous year.²²³

When these matters were settled, the final arrangements were made for the synod. In July an apostolic delegate was selected to preside over the synod. This was Monsignor Agostino Ciasca, whom the Austrian ambassador to the Vatican described as "a man of both firm character and great erudition, who indeed by profession is also an excellent Orientalist."²²⁴ Ciasca's Oriental studies had not included Slavic languages, however, and it was necessary to provide him with

a translator. The Polish cardinals Mieczysław Ledóchowski and Albin Dunajewski suggested that a Polish Resurrectionist father would make a good choice, but Propaganda prudently ignored their advice and looked for a Roman-educated priest of Ruthenian nationality. The choice fell on Father Isydor Dolnytsky, spiritual director of the Lviv seminary, who had studied at Propaganda's college in Rome.²²⁵

In August Monsignor Ciasca paid a visit to the Austrian embassy to discuss the synod. He said, among other things, that the main source of the lack of discipline in the Ruthenian seminaries and clergy in general was the tradition of ordaining married men to the priesthood. While it would be impossible to completely abolish this privilege, the synod could at least put restrictions on it.²²⁶

This turned out to be the most controversial issue at the synod. Although the tradition of a married parish clergy had been long established in the Ruthenian church, there were those, like Monsignor Ciasca, who felt that the ideal of celibacy should be encouraged instead. It was the promotion of the latter's views at the Lviv synod that occasioned the discord that both Propaganda and the Austrian government had been hoping all along to avoid.

The Vatican had a general policy in the late nineteenth century of promoting celibacy in the Oriental Catholic churches. A special commission of the First Vatican Council in 1869–70 had studied the question. Although the commission concluded that the Eastern Catholic churches were not yet mature enough to embrace clerical celibacy completely, it called upon the council to praise celibacy and to commend those Eastern bishops who were working to propagate it among their clergy. The council was interrupted by the Franco-Prussian War, but the general thrust of the commission's recommendations was reflected in subsequent Vatican policy. The encouragement of celibacy at the Ruthenian synod of 1891 must be viewed within the larger context of a series of Eastern Catholic church synods at which celibacy was promoted. The Romanian synod of Alba-Julia and Fogaras in 1872 and a synod of Armenian bishops in 1890 emphasized that celibacy was a more perfect state. The Syrian synod of Sharfeh in 1888 and the Coptic synod of Cairo in 1898 went further; both accepted (with some exceptions) compulsory celibacy for the clergy of their churches.²²⁷

The Roman policy also found its adherents among a small minority of the Ruthenian clergy, as would be evident at the Lviv synod. However, even before the synod, in 1884, Father Iosyf Kobyljansky had published two articles – characteristically, in *Ruskii Sion* – in praise of clerical celibacy.²²⁸ His second article had ended with the

words of St Paul to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 7:32-3): "The unmarried man is solicitous about the things of the Lord, how to please the Lord; but the married man is solicitous about the things of the world, how to please his wife, and he is divided."²²⁹ This particular citation would figure prominently in the resolutions and debates of the Lviv provincial synod seven years later. Also, Father Dolnytsky, who would translate for Monsignor Ciasca at the synod, had written repeatedly to the Oriental Congregation in the late 1880s arguing vigorously for the introduction of a celibate clergy.²³⁰

In addition to the general Vatican policy and its individual adherents in the Greek Catholic church in Galicia, there was one more source for the promotion of celibacy in the Ruthenian church: Galician Polish circles, both lay and clerical. In 1884 rumours appeared in the Ruthenian press that the Polish Jesuits at Dobromyl were planning a campaign to introduce celibacy in the Greek Catholic church,²³¹ and similar rumours resurfaced five years later.²³² In 1885 the lieutenant of Galicia, Filip Zaleski, had written to the Oriental Congregation on the perceived deficiencies of the Ruthenian clergy and, in that context, mentioned that the introduction of celibacy in the Greek Catholic church would be very desirable.²³³ In 1890 Lieutenant Kazimierz Badeni sought advice on how to remedy problems in the Greek Catholic seminary in Vienna. He solicited the opinion of Rev. Jan Puzyna, then suffragan bishop of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Lviv and rector of its seminary. Puzyna said that the problem lay in the Ruthenian seminarians' exposure to "the spirit of unbelief" and "national and social hatred." Candidates for the Greek Catholic priesthood had to be protected from unhealthy influences and educated in such a way that they would refrain from marriage and cultivate the idea of celibacy. Without a devotion to the idea of celibacy, the Ruthenian clergy would always remain at the same low level.²³⁴ On the very eve of the synod, the nuncio in Vienna was dismayed that Poles published reports in the press and declared in public meetings that the apostolic delegate would impose clerical celibacy as well as the Gregorian calendar on the Greek Catholic church.²³⁵ This Polish interest in Greek Catholic clerical celibacy was bound to rankle the Ruthenian clergy and make them perceive the issue not as one of internal church discipline, but as one of national-political import.²³⁶

The celibacy issue was explicitly formulated in Propaganda's instructions to the Ruthenian bishops of 12 August 1889. The passage of the instructions that was intended to serve as the basis for a formal synodal resolution read: "Indeed it would be best if priests were not held back by the cares, affairs, and business of marriage and family.

For as the Apostle admonishes (1 Cor. 7): 'The unmarried man is solicitous about the things of the Lord, how to please the Lord; but the married man is solicitous about the things of the world, how to please his wife, and he is divided.'"²³⁷

The consistorial commission charged with preparing the preliminary schemas on seminary reform drafted the following resolution based on the instructions:

Although for grave reasons the Holy See permits the marriages of Ruthenian candidates for the priesthood, it is nonetheless incumbent upon seminary authorities to strive as opportunity permits to teach them to hold continence of life, or celibacy, as a higher value, and to dispose them to this state gently, but seriously; because it would be very desirable, both for the good of the church and of our rite, that as many unmarried men as possible would be available, who would be able and freer to fulfil certain duties, and not be bound by such a difficult bond as marriage. For as the holy Apostle admonishes: "The unmarried man is solicitous about the things of the Lord, how to please the Lord; but the married man is solicitous about the things of the world, how to please his wife, and he is divided." (1 Cor. 7:32-33)²³⁸

The synod commenced its activities on 24 September. The priests had no clear idea what would be proposed, since the preparatory documents had all been kept confidential,²³⁹ but they arrived in a quarrelsome mood, owing to the rumours in the press. The synodal fathers became acquainted with the actual text of the celibacy resolution on the second day of the synod, 25 September.²⁴⁰ The text clearly encouraged celibacy, but it did not explicitly impose it upon the Greek Catholic clergy.²⁴¹ According to the apostolic delegate, Monsignor Ciasca, the clergy at the synod at first seemed to be relieved when they discovered that the resolution stopped short of imposing and only counselled celibacy.²⁴² However, some synodal fathers, including Ioann Nehrebetsky, who had begun challenging procedures at the synod from the very first day²⁴³ and who, it is fair to say, wasted no opportunity to exacerbate the tensions at the synod, interpreted the text as *implicitly* introducing celibacy.²⁴⁴ In the atmosphere of distrust and apprehension that permeated the Lviv synod, this view very quickly became dominant among the participants.

That evening there was great agitation in the seminary as the fathers discussed the resolution. Some wanted to quit the synod in protest. Instead, Fathers Nehrebetsky, Vasylii Chernetsky, and Iosyf Krushynsky drafted a petition,²⁴⁵ which some eighty priests signed, asking that the resolution on celibacy be withdrawn entirely from the synod's agenda. According to the petition, the celibacy resolution

secretly contained "a blow aimed at destroying the Ruthenian Catholic church and Ruthenian nation." Although the fathers recognized the church's teaching on the superiority of the celibate state, they stood firmly by the right of their church to retain a married clergy. After all, the petition argued, "the married state of almost all the apostles was not the least hindrance in the fulfilment of their extensive universal mission"; how could it be such a burden for ordinary pastoral work? The fathers could not in conscience accept the resolution, especially its concluding words, which implied that the married clergy were deficient in ability and zeal. They did not want to see impressionable young seminarians pushed into making a wrong decision that would bind them for the rest of their lives. Pressuring young men into celibacy would eventually result in an atmosphere of hypocrisy detrimental to the morality of the clergy. At the same time, the morale of the clergy would deteriorate as the hierarchy favoured celibate priests over married priests. The right of a married clergy in the Ruthenian church had been guaranteed by numerous papal constitutions. To abandon this custom would undermine the Greek Catholics' ability to serve as a model for their Orthodox co-ritualists. In conclusion, the fathers solemnly affirmed that "at a synod, which has been awaited for 171 years, they do not dare to abdicate from the mission of their church in the East by any act that changes the character of the Ruthenian Catholic church."

A delegation of four priests²⁴⁶ took the petition to Metropolitan Sylvestr Sembratovych on Saturday, 27 September. Already on the previous day the metropolitan had learned that the priests were planning to protest the resolution on celibacy and even threatening to boycott the synod. The metropolitan was said to have reacted to the news with anger. However, his feelings seemed to have changed by the next day. The delegation reported that he gave them a warm reception and promised to withdraw the resolution on celibacy. The other fathers were relieved when they heard the report of the delegation, and they decided not to leave the synod.²⁴⁷

The celibacy resolution, however, was discussed formally at the synod first on Wednesday afternoon, 30 September, during a session of the First Commission. Bishop Pelesh presided over the lively and substantive discussion.²⁴⁸ Almost all the speakers opposed the resolution. Father Teofil Pavlykov, a widower, pastor of the Dormition Church in Lviv and past president of the Old Ruthenian/Russophile Kachkovsky Society, affirmed that "the union [with Rome] had been accepted under certain conditions" and that the primary of these was the preservation of the customs of the Greek church, including a mar-

ried clergy. Another widower, the honorary canon Dr Iosyf Levytsky of Lviv,²⁴⁹ stated that celibacy would harm not only the church, but the nation, since most of the Ruthenian intelligentsia derived from the clergy. Of the sixteen speakers in the commission, only two spoke in favour of the resolution: the Reverend Dr Iosyf Milnytsky of Lviv, vice-rector of the seminary and a celibate, and Bishop Pelesh. Milnytsky's defence of the resolution was not very spirited. He merely reminded those assembled that some men were in fact called to the celibate state; for their sake, the text could stand as it was. Even Bishop Pelesh's intervention was hardly staunch. He denied that the resolution contained any element of compulsion. He also denied that it was envisaged as a prelude to the introduction of celibacy. It was, he said, merely a practical response to a practical need, the need for more celibate priests to occupy certain positions in the church. Canons and doctors of theology were very poorly paid and could not support families. The bishop said that he was personally acquainted with many married priests who knew much, much more than some doctors of theology, but they could not be placed in teaching positions because of inadequate salaries. The statutes of cathedral chapters even specified that members must be celibate or widowed. Previous speakers, in his view, had been overly sensitive. This was the general line of the Ruthenian episcopate at the synod. But Bishop Pelesh went further and even provided arguments for the opposition by defending the Eastern churches' traditional practice. He quoted St Paul, who had said that it was better to marry than to burn.²⁵⁰ He also told the synodal fathers of an incident from the first council of Nicea. When the discussion at the council had turned to the issue of priestly celibacy, Paphnutius, a ninety-year-old Egyptian bishop, rose to defend the marriage of the clergy, saying that one could not impose such great burdens as celibacy on mere human beings.²⁵¹ After all had spoken their piece, the resolution was put to a vote. Although Bishop Pelesh had said in his intervention that it would be inappropriate to reject the entire paragraph concerning celibacy, that it could be amended, but not deleted altogether, he placed two choices before the members of the commission: (1) they could delete the entire resolution, or (2) they could modify it. The vast majority of the commission voted to delete the resolution altogether.²⁵² The session adjourned.

Although formally the issue should have been settled by the vote of the commission on 30 September, word filtered down to the lower clergy at the synod that their decision to delete the resolution altogether was not going to be accepted.

On Saturday morning, 3 October, the priests were conducting heated, informal discussions of the celibacy issue in the seminary corridors. Rumour had it that the resolution was going to be discussed later that very day at the general session of the synod. The priests held a meeting, chaired by Father Pavlykov, at which they chose speakers for the general debate.²⁵³ However, the celibacy issue was not raised at the general session on that day.

That afternoon, with feeling running high, a group of priests decided to appoint itself as a delegation and inform the papal representative Agostino Ciasca that the clergy were opposed to the celibacy resolution and ready to walk out of the synod in protest. They hoped that Monsignor Ciasca would mediate between the clergy and episcopate. The self-appointed delegation consisted of Fathers Vasylii Chernetsky, Iosyf Krushynsky, and Ioann Nehrebetsky; they took the metropolitan's nephew, Father Teofil Sembratovych, with them as a witness and translator.

The delegation received an appointment with Monsignor Ciasca at 5:00 p.m.²⁵⁴ The audience, meant to be for only five minutes, lasted an hour and a quarter. In the course of the interview, the apostolic delegate said that he had heard nothing in Rome about the subjects to be aired at the synod. It was only in Vienna, at the nuncio's office, that he had learned that the issue of celibacy was to be discussed, and he thought that the Greek Catholic clergy themselves had wanted it on the agenda, since in recent times other Eastern churches had accepted celibacy. He himself, he said, favoured it. The delegation responded that the Greek Catholic church had an obligation to retain its custom of married clergy in order to have an influence on the Orthodox East. Monsignor Ciasca said that not much was at stake, just acceptance of the words of St Paul: "The unmarried man," etc. This had to be accepted; after all, it was Holy Scripture. At this the delegates became indignant. They had come, they said, for the apostolic delegate's help in reaching an understanding with their bishops. Instead, they saw that he was trying to force his views on them. They had not come for a theology test; they knew the church's explicit teaching that those words of St Paul were meant as counsel, not as something binding. The apostolic delegate was trying to use the authority of the church to fetter the clergy. Monsignor Ciasca said that if they did not believe the words of St Paul, they were heretics. He threw his snuffbox on the floor in agitation. Father Nehrebetsky, in a spontaneous reflex, made as if to strike. Fathers Krushynsky and Chernetsky rose to leave. The delegation announced that it would send a telegram to the pope to let him know that the apostolic delegate was abusing his position, forc-

ing his views on the synodal fathers and impugning the orthodoxy of the Greek Catholic clergy after centuries of loyalty.

Monsignor Ciasca then tried to calm them down. He reassured them that the Holy Father had given him no instructions regarding celibacy. The fathers were free to adopt any resolution they wished so long as it contained the relevant words of St Paul to the Corinthians. The priests said, however, that they could not accept those words, because the entire clergy was against the inclusion of that particular text. Monsignor Ciasca flattered them that if they were to accept the text, the rest of the clergy would follow suit.²⁵⁵ The delegation objected that they were not just referring to the synodal fathers; the entire Ruthenian clergy – indeed the entire people – opposed the resolution. At this the papal delegate made a contemptuous gesture to indicate that what the people thought did not have any bearing on the matter. He then tried to convince each of the priests individually to accept the words of St Paul. The audience came to an end.

Although the audience had been tense, the delegates returned to the seminary quite proud of themselves and satisfied with what they had learned from Monsignor Ciasca. The apostolic delegate, they decided, was no diplomat; he had revealed much more than he really should have. They reported to their compatriots the facts as they believed they had established them to be on the basis of their meeting with the loquacious apostolic delegate: it was not Rome that had initiated the celibacy resolution, but the Ruthenian episcopate itself.²⁵⁶

The next morning, Sunday, 4 October, saw great agitation among the priests at the synod as rumours and accounts of the meeting with Monsignor Ciasca circulated. Two rumours in particular aroused their passions: that Metropolitan Sylvestr had promised the Polish ruling elite in Galicia that celibacy would be introduced, that this was the price of his mitre; and that since he could not convince the clergy to go along with him, he was going to have the disputed resolution proclaimed – without further discussion – from the pulpit at the solemn session of the synod in St George's that afternoon.²⁵⁷

After the liturgy, about noon, a light lunch for synod participants was served in the metropolitan's residence. The metropolitan came in angry; he had learned about the delegation to Monsignor Ciasca as well as the threat to boycott the synod. He berated those whom he considered the ringleaders of the opposition, namely the canons of Przemyśl eparchy and Father Nehrebetsky and his associates. He told the priests of his own archeparchy to stay clear of these "rebels." He vehemently denied that he was trying to introduce celibacy. When Father Iliia Mardarovych pointed out that the words of the

resolution seemed to imply otherwise, the metropolitan threatened to suspend him. Bishop Pelesh intervened to calm tempers, and then he and the metropolitan left. Bishop Pelesh returned shortly thereafter to assure the priests that the resolution would not be proclaimed from the pulpit as they feared. He also asked some of them to meet with him later to seek a solution to the growing conflict.²⁵⁸

On the same afternoon, the only layman at the synod, Isydor Sharanevych, senior of the Stauropegial Institute, paid a visit to the apostolic delegate, who was staying in the metropolitan's residence. Sharanevych read aloud and presented to the apostolic delegate a memorandum in Latin concerning the celibacy issue. The memorandum emphasized the importance of married clergy to the Ruthenian nation. A married clergy was the source of the intelligentsia; indeed, almost all the members of the Stauropegial Institute were themselves descended from sacerdotal families. Since the intelligentsia were raised in priests' homes, they developed a special, filial love for and knowledge of the clergy and the Catholic church. The institution of married clergy was, then, a necessity for the nation and a blessing for the church; the encouragement of celibacy, even in very gentle form, would be harmful. Monsignor Ciasca was unable to conceal his displeasure with Sharanevych's presentation.²⁵⁹

At about 5:30 that evening, after the formal session of the synod at the cathedral, Bishop Pelesh called together several members of the Przemyśl and Stanyslaviv cathedral chapters and asked them to consider a new version of the resolution. This new draft had been prepared by Father Iosyf Milnytsky, who had been the only one besides Bishop Pelesh to speak in defence of the original resolution in the commission on 30 September. This version read as follows:

The seminary authorities should as the opportunity presents itself teach Ruthenian seminarians that it is better and happier to remain in virginity or celibacy than to be bound by matrimony (Trid. sess. 24. can. 10), that it is very desirable for the good of our church that many be ordained as priests in a free state. But considering that the evangelical counsels are given for the entire Christian community and not for the perfection of each individual, and considering also that the Ruthenian Catholic church allows its seminarians to enter the married state prior to the reception of higher orders, prudence prescribes that each of them should reflect on all his circumstances, and if he decides that he is called to marriage or that celibacy would be dangerous or even harmful to him, then he should make use of the freedom granted to him by the Church and should, after completing theological studies, enter the married state.²⁶⁰

Bishop Pelesh asked the canons to consult with others at the synod and to report to him whether the new resolution was acceptable. The canons asked permission to invite the most outspoken opponents of the celibacy resolution to their conference; thus, Fathers Nehrebetsky and Chernetsky along with several others joined the deliberations. They approved Father Milnytsky's resolution, and later another group of about forty priests met and also endorsed it.²⁶¹

At the urging of Bishop Pelesh the priests sent a second delegation to Monsignor Ciasca. The delegation consisted of Fathers Chernetsky, Nehrebetsky, and Mykhail Matkovsky, pastor of Horozhanna in Przemysł eparchy. It was about 10–10:30 in the evening when the delegation knocked on Monsignor Ciasca's door. The purpose of the second interview with the apostolic delegate was to reach a compromise on the basis of Father Milnytsky's new resolution, but in fact the meeting only made matters worse. Monsignor Ciasca refused to accept any resolution that did not contain the pertinent words of St Paul to the Corinthians. The delegation objected that they would not accept a resolution that implied that they served, not God, but women. In addition to this division on principle, another sore point of the meeting was a joke that Ciasca allegedly made. The priests had insisted that the synodal fathers, as married priests themselves, could not impose on their successors a burden that they themselves had not borne. To this Monsignor Ciasca was said to have responded with a jest: "Non timete, pro una habebunt decem," that is, instead of one wife, their successors would have ten mistresses. The delegation expressed its indignation that the apostolic delegate would thus affront the high standards of morality of married Ruthenian priests and shortly thereafter walked out of the prelate's quarters in high dudgeon.²⁶²

The delegates reported their conversation in full to Bishop Pelesh, who expressed his dismay. Then the delegates met with Metropolitan Sembratovych, who had not yet seen the new resolution; they were joined a little later by Bishop Pelesh. There was considerable mutual distrust between the delegates and the metropolitan, and the meeting was tense. The metropolitan continued to insist that the words of St Paul to the Corinthians had to appear in the resolution, but when the delegates refused to compromise on this issue, the metropolitan broke off discussion and walked out. Afterwards Bishop Pelesh promised the delegates that he would work out some mutually acceptable solution on the next day. He provided horses and a carriage to take them the short distance back from the metropolitan's palace to the seminary. Arriving about midnight at the seminary, the delegates found that the lights were still on in all the rooms and that the

priests were waiting anxiously for a report. The delegates gave a full account of their encounters.²⁶³ “The fathers accepted the report with great satisfaction and resolved to stand firmly for their cause.”²⁶⁴

Late that same night (or perhaps early the next morning), the Ruthenian bishops met with Monsignor Ciasca and explained to him what he already knew: that the synodal fathers wanted to omit the passage from St Paul’s letter to the Corinthians. The apostolic delegate responded: “Sunt schismatici! et si Vos etiam cum illis hoc vultis, Vos estis etiam schismatici!”²⁶⁵

The next morning the Lviv seminary was rife with rumours. Bishop Pelesh had promised to come in the morning and deal with the celibacy issue, but he was absent. Some said he was ill, some that he had left the synod in protest, some that he was avoiding a plot by the canons of Lviv archeparchy to discredit him.²⁶⁶

The synod returned to regular business with a session of the Third Commission dealing with deanery councils. The session had not proceeded very far when Metropolitan Sembratovych entered and asked those attending the session, as well as all participants of the synod, to come to a larger auditorium. He wanted to explain the events of the preceding evening, in particular why he had walked out on the delegation without so much as saying goodbye.

The metropolitan expressed his bewilderment that the delegation had consisted only of priests from Przemyśl eparchy and that they were all very young. He may have, if Nehrebetsky was to be believed, referred to them as “young rebels” who led the other synodal fathers by the nose. He may even have accused them of coming under Protestant influence. He found that the delegation’s objections to the words of St Paul to the Corinthians smacked of heresy. He pointed out that the apostolic delegate thought the same thing and begged the priests not to give the Holy See the wrong impression about the Ruthenian clergy. He gave his word that he had no intention of introducing compulsory celibacy. He himself had been raised the son of a priest and he knew the married clergy’s “pious and righteous life,” but he also knew that there was a need for more celibate priests to occupy higher posts in the eparchy. He recalled that in 1862 the Reverend Dr Iosyf Cherliunchakevych, then a professor of theology at Lviv University, had declared that the sons of priests were “*illegitimi thori*.”²⁶⁷ When the metropolitan himself had become a professor of theology, he had wanted to set the record straight and had searched for the legal basis of the Ruthenian tradition of ordaining married men to the priesthood. He had discovered that neither the Union of Brest nor the Synod of Zamość had specifically mentioned the right

of the Eastern church to married clergy. Therefore, he wanted this present synod to state expressly and confirm this right. He wished that the synodal fathers could see into his heart, that he had the best interests of the Ruthenian church at heart. When the delegates of the previous night would not go along with any of his emendations to their proposed resolution, he walked out.

Father Nehrebetsky exchanged some sharp words with the metropolitan during or after this presentation, but the most sensational incident was when Father Iosyf Krushynsky publicly declared that the Ruthenian clergy refused to pay with celibacy for Metropolitan Sembratovych's mitre.²⁶⁸

In the afternoon a group of canons from all the eparchies tried to work out a new, compromise text based on a modification of the draft by Father Milnytsky. No sooner had they worked out a text that they felt all could agree upon than Father Ioann Kopystiansky appeared with a new text that he had composed together with Father Teofil Sembratovych. This text, said Father Kopystiansky, had met with the approval of the metropolitan. All listened attentively as he read the text of the resolution, which would eventually end up as the resolution formally adopted by the fathers of the Lviv provincial synod.²⁶⁹

The present provincial synod firmly confesses the teaching of the holy universal Catholic church that the unmarried state is more perfect than the married state, according to the words of the holy Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 7:38: "He who marries his betrothed does well, and he who does not marry does better." But because, furthermore, the Saviour in the Gospel of St Matthew, 19:12, said: "Whoever is able to accept it, let him accept it," the celibate state as a more perfect state is only an evangelical counsel and can be imposed on no one from above; and therefore the holy Church has always considered and considers the marriage of priests of the Eastern church as lawful and permitted. For the Ruthenian Catholic church as a part of the whole holy Church this permission remains also for the future, that those who have finished theological studies have the freedom before ordination, according to the grace given by God, either to marry or to remain unmarried. Therefore the present synod determines that this permission and complete freedom remain for the future for the Ruthenian Catholic church and that no one be subjected to any pressure in this regard from the seminary authorities. The latter are only free, in consideration of the justified benefit and need of the Ruthenian Catholic church, to confirm in their holy intentions by good and intelligent counsel those who have expressed their intention to remain unmarried, calling their attention, however, to the words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 7:9, who said: "It is better to marry than to burn."²⁷⁰

The informal gathering approved the new text.

Bishop Pelesh did show up in the afternoon, and he held a formal meeting of the First Commission at 4:45 p.m. to discuss the new text. First Father Teofil Dmokhovsky read another proposed draft, and then Father Kopystiansky read his. The participants in the session approved the Kopystiansky text unanimously.²⁷¹

The synod as a whole met in the seminary church on Tuesday, 6 October, to take the formal final decision regarding the text of the celibacy resolution. The apostolic delegate Agostino Ciasca absented himself from this session. Metropolitan Sembratovych ordered the synod's secretary to read the proposed text of the resolution. The synodal fathers were surprised to hear not the text that had been unanimously approved on the previous day, that is, Father Kopystiansky's version, but the episcopate's original proposal, the one including the contested words of Paul to the Corinthians, only slightly revised.²⁷² Thus, the session *in pleno* reopened the debate completely.

Again, as in the commission, most of the speakers opposed the episcopate's resolution and defended the tradition of a married clergy.²⁷³ Father Emylian Ohonovsky, professor of Ukrainian language and literature at Lviv University, pointed out that the metropolitan himself used the term "Ruthenian Catholic church," thus admitting that it is a church with national characteristics. The married clergy led the Ruthenian national movement in the 1840s and also created the intelligentsia. Thus, at present the adherents of the church union were not only peasants, but educated Ruthenians, by and large the sons of Ruthenian priests. If the church began to move in the direction of celibacy, the numbers of the Ruthenian intelligentsia would diminish. And if there were no Ruthenian intelligentsia, who would defend the church union against schismatics? Peasants alone were not up to the task. If the Ruthenian church were to fulfil the important mission entrusted to it in the Catholic world, it must retain the ancient traditions allowed by the popes. If too many Latin practices should be introduced, the Ruthenian church would in time turn into a Latin Catholic church. There would then be no more Ruthenian Catholic church, and this would eliminate the hope for converting the Orthodox East to union with the Holy Roman See.

During the debate, Father Ioann Reshetylo rose and proposed that Isydor Sharanevych of the Stauropelial Institute be allowed to speak. Since the question of lay participation at the synod was a very delicate one, the bishops were first consulted, and they gave their consent.²⁷⁴ Sharanevych spoke at first in Ruthenian and then in Latin, "which is more suitable for precise thought." In the Ruthenian portion of his speech, he defended the right of lay representatives,

specifically members of the Stauropegial Institute, to participate in provincial synods. The Latin portion of his speech largely reiterated the text of the petition that he had submitted to the apostolic delegate on Sunday, 4 October; that is, he emphasized the importance of the married clergy to the Ruthenian national cause. Only two priests spoke in favour of the resolution: Father Iosyf Kobylansky, a widower and canon of Lviv archeparchy, the same who had written in praise of celibacy and cited the contested words of St Paul to the Corinthians in *Ruskii Sion* in 1884, and Father Kelestyn Kostetsky, Greek Catholic pastor of Chernivtsi in largely Orthodox Bukovina. The latter argued that in a missionary situation, as in Bukovina, it was better to have celibate priests, since the parishes were too poor to support families and the priests' duties too demanding to allow them a normal family life. However, in order to appeal to the Orthodox population of the region, priests should wear beards and the long, loose cassocks (*riasy*) of the Eastern church. This incongruous mix of Western and Eastern customs struck the listeners as amusing.²⁷⁵

When the debate drew to a close, Metropolitan Sembratovych spoke. He regretted that the fathers seemed deliberately to misread his intentions. He was not trying to introduce compulsory celibacy; in fact, he wished to see the Ruthenian church's custom of ordaining married men solemnly sanctioned in a synodal resolution. Nevertheless, there was a need for more celibate priests in the church. In the end, the metropolitan asked Father Kopystiansky to read his version of the resolution. The fathers accepted it unanimously, although there seem to have been three abstentions.²⁷⁶ This text was thus formally accepted by the synod.

The same text was solemnly read from the pulpit of St George's cathedral at the last session of the synod on Thursday, 8 October 1891. Some priests feared that the metropolitan would substitute the text of the first version at the last moment and thus made preparations for a protest. Their fears in this particular case were misplaced.²⁷⁷

In general, however, the priests were right to fear that their decision to adopt Father Kopystiansky's text would not be accepted. As Revertera expressed it to Kálnoky on 25 April 1895, the decisions of the synod were accepted by Propaganda "with a few inessential changes."²⁷⁸ What these changes were became clear in 1896, when the resolutions of the synod were published, in Latin in Rome and in Ruthenian in Lviv.²⁷⁹ The resolution on celibacy that was included in the official acts was neither the episcopate's original proposal nor Father Kopystiansky's, but an entirely new text that the fathers of the Lviv provincial synod had never even considered. This new text included the words of St Paul to the Corinthians that had been in

the original proposal but left out of the text accepted at the synod. The new text read:

This Synod firmly recognizes that the unmarried state is more perfect than the married state, according to the words of the Apostle: "The unmarried man is solicitous about the things of the Lord, how to please the Lord; but the married man is solicitous about the things of the world, how to please his wife, and he is divided." Because, however, the Catholic Church for grave reasons has permitted and permits seminarians of our rite before ordination, or in the lower orders, to have the freedom, according to the grace given to them by God, either to remain always in celibacy, which would be best, or to marry a virgin, the Synod, recognizing this freedom and leaving it undisturbed, nonetheless, in consideration of the benefit and need of our church, urges the seminary authorities to support and confirm in their intention, by benevolent and prudent counsel, those seminarians well disposed to accept celibacy.²⁸⁰

How did this new version find its way into the official publication of the acts? It was once thought that Metropolitan Sembratovych himself changed the text before sending it off to Rome,²⁸¹ but Myron Stasiv's research in the archives of the Oriental Congregation has proven that this was not the case; the Ruthenian bishops sent Father Kopystiansky's version to Rome. The author of the new version, it turns out, was Monsignor Ciasca. He was dissatisfied with the resolution actually adopted at the synod. He felt it had inexact phrasing inappropriate to a synodal document; moreover, it was formulated primarily as a defence of clerical matrimony, as a pledge for its continued existence in the future. Monsignor Ciasca had laid out his objections to the Ruthenian bishops, but they had refused to change what the fathers had accepted at the synod. They asked the apostolic delegate to consider the complexities of the moment; what was required now was prudence and patience. Monsignor Ciasca sent an account of this conversation to Propaganda, but nonetheless urged the congregation to substitute either the original text as proposed by the Ruthenian episcopate or the new text that he had formulated. Propaganda was dissatisfied with the text actually adopted at the synod and decided to accept instead the version that Monsignor Ciasca had authored; thus it came to be inserted into the official published acts of the synod.²⁸²

A series of eparchial synods was supposed to confirm the acceptance of the acts of the Lviv provincial synod. Not surprisingly, the Ruthenian clergy protested the inclusion of the new text on celibacy at the eparchial synods of Lviv and Przemyśl.²⁸³ The Lviv archeparchial synod was held 7–9 December 1897. A group of priests in attendance

drafted a document that pointed out that the text of the resolution in the published acts was incorrect; they requested that the resolution actually accepted by the synod, the text of which was included in their document, be registered in the protocols of the archeparchial synod.²⁸⁴ Thirty-six priests signed the document and presented it to the metropolitan. The document was not read aloud at the synod, but it was filed with the synod's acts.²⁸⁵ The Przemyśl eparchial synod was held 1–3 November 1898. A similar protest was drafted and ninety-one priests signed it.²⁸⁶ It too was filed with the acts of the synod. The bishop of Przemyśl, Konstantyn Chekhovych, considered briefly mentioning the protest in the published acts of the Przemyśl synod,²⁸⁷ but in fact no such mention found its way into print.²⁸⁸

The priests of the Lviv synod were right to fear that the resolution on celibacy was intended as more than a means to fill posts in eparchial administration, as Metropolitan Sylvestr Sembratovych argued; they were right that it represented the first step towards the general introduction of clerical celibacy in the Greek Catholic church. This would become clear in the 1920s, when compulsory celibacy was imposed on candidates to the priesthood in the Przemyśl and Stanyslaviv eparchies (similar plans had also been made in Lviv archeparchy, but Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky changed his mind and put them on hold).

Although celibacy was the most absorbing issue at the Lviv synod, it was only a part of the larger issue of seminary reform. The synod laid the foundations for a major reorganization of the Greek Catholic seminary system. In particular, eparchial seminaries were strengthened and established in the early twentieth century so that bishops could more closely supervise their candidates for the priesthood. In his brief time as bishop of Stanyslaviv (1899–1900), Andrei Sheptytsky bought a piece of land on which to erect an eparchial seminary and acquired 280,000 crowns from the Austrian government for its construction.²⁸⁹ The seminary opened in 1907. Przemyśl eparchy had had a four-year seminary since 1845, but a new seminary building was erected at government expense in 1912 and a complete seminary began operation.²⁹⁰ In 1903 Sheptytsky, then metropolitan of Halych, undertook a reform of the seminary in Lviv.²⁹¹

Indirectly connected with the Lviv synod was a reform of Ruthenian seminaries outside Galicia. In 1893 the Greek Catholic seminary in Vienna was closed down. This was something the Austrian government had been considering seriously since 1874 because of Russophile influences there. In particular, Ruthenian seminarians had kept in contact with the Russian embassy and the pan-Slav activist at the embassy church, Father Mikhail Raevsky. But the government had

not closed down the seminary at that time, having been mollified by the appointment of Iulian Pelesh as rector.²⁹² His performance in this post, as we have seen, satisfied the Austrian minister of religion and education to such an extent that Pelesh was promoted to episcopal office. However, his absence from Vienna resulted in the reassertion of the Russophile spirit at the seminary. By 1890 the government was again considering closing down the seminary and solicited the opinions of Bishops Jan Puzyna and Pelesh. Puzyna recommended closing it, but Pelesh was not as sure. Although in 1891 the Galician lieutenant, Badeni, urged the minister of religion and education, Gautsch, to close it, the minister decided, in light of Bishop Pelesh's hesitations, to hold off.²⁹³

However, an incident in 1893 changed the minister's mind. In June of that year Metropolitan Sylvestr Sembratovych and Bishop Kulovsky arrived in Vienna, on their way back to Galicia after a pilgrimage to Rome. A group of Ruthenian students surrounded the metropolitan at the train station and began shouting that he was a traitor to the Ruthenian church, a sell-out to Rome, because he was trying to introduce celibacy. The students then pelted the metropolitan with rotten eggs.²⁹⁴ It turned out that some seminarians were involved in the protest, and on 3 July 1893 Minister Gautsch recommended to the emperor that he close the Vienna seminary, which he did by a decree of 13 July. On this occasion the emperor also supported the recommendations of the Lviv synod by urging that eparchial seminaries be erected for the Greek Catholic church in Galicia.²⁹⁵

The elite seminary in Vienna was to some extent replaced by the establishment of the Ruthenian College in Rome in 1897.²⁹⁶ Prior to this, there had been a few Ruthenians studying at the Greek college of St Athanasius in Rome, but Leo XIII had great plans for bringing Greece into union with the Catholic church and wanted to restore St Athanasius's as a completely Greek institution. Moreover, now that the Vienna seminary was closed, it would be useful to have more places in Rome for Ruthenian seminarians. In addition to these considerations, there was some hope that a seminary in Rome would encourage clerical celibacy. It was assumed that seminarians who went to Rome would not marry; there was even a practical barrier at work – Rome was distant enough from Galicia to make courtship very difficult. By educating part of the Ruthenian clergy in Rome and ordaining these men in celibacy, it would be possible to experiment with phasing in a celibate clergy.²⁹⁷

As well as taking steps to reform the seminaries, the synod also accomplished the other major task expected of it: its resolutions on

liturgical practice provided a basis for new editions of liturgical books, notably the *Liturgikon* of 1905.²⁹⁸

Other Measures

In addition to the major interventions described in the previous sections, other measures, more limited in scope, were taken in the mid-1880s to reform the Greek Catholic church and combat the pro-Russian, pro-Orthodox currents within it. These measures, diverse in content, agency, and effect, will be presented here in roughly chronological order.

In the immediate wake of the Hnylychky affair, in early February 1882, a series of missions intended to nurture Catholic sentiment was organized in villages in the easternmost regions of Galicia. The missions were conducted by Polish Jesuits, and this, of course, exacerbated Ruthenian opposition. The national populist newspaper *Dilo* condemned the "uninvited missionaries,"²⁹⁹ and there was also resistance from within the Ruthenian church, notably from the Lviv consistory³⁰⁰ and from Bishop Stupnytsky of Przemyśl.³⁰¹ Polish sources maintained that only the Ruthenian intelligentsia opposed the missions and that the peasantry, in spite of all the agitation, were attracted to and impressed by them.³⁰² The missions lasted into May 1882, but they were apparently discontinued when the Jesuits came under additional fire in connection with the Basilian reform.

It is probably true that the Jesuit missions met with a favourable response among the Ruthenian peasantry, judging by the popularity of the earlier Ruthenian missions conducted in the course of the sobriety campaign. The peasants also lacked at this time the Ruthenian intelligentsia's national-historical consciousness and its readiness to become agitated over relatively abstract points. But one of the measures undertaken to re-Catholicize Rus' provoked a limited but genuine popular resistance. This was the campaign conducted by the Galician authorities against a concrete and visible symbol: the three-barred cross. This issue had already surfaced in the aftermath of the Chełm conversion, and it re-emerged in the aftermath of Hnylychky. The Vatican feared and the Polish authorities in Galicia at least pretended to be convinced that the erection of three-barred crosses on new or renovated Greek Catholic churches was intended to demonstrate a sympathy with Russian Orthodoxy. It is true that three-barred

crosses had largely passed from customary usage and that the Russophiles made a cult of them, but the crosses of the mid-1880s were not necessarily Russophile in inspiration. Some pastors and parishioners set them up as a symbol of demarcation from the Poles; they were raised, sometimes in a spirit of defiance, as marks of national-religious self-differentiation rather than as pro-Russian, pro-Orthodox insignia.

In May 1882 the county captain of Brody set off the campaign by ordering the parish of Zaliztsi to remove the three-barred crosses from the church. The parish refused, and the matter was brought to the ministry of religion and education and contested in court. The Greek Catholic ordinariate of Lviv was called upon to render a decision and did so, in favour of retaining three-barred crosses.³⁰³ In 1884 the commune of Tysmenytsia, Tovmach county, finished reconstruction of its church, and the building committee decided to erect three-barred crosses on it. The county captaincy learned of the decision and sent a letter prohibiting the crosses, "because the erection of three-barred crosses fosters unrest, awakens suspicions of inclination to schism, and thus can lead to scandalous scenes and even disturb the peace and public order, and because, moreover, the erection of three-barred crosses is prohibited by the government and spiritual authorities."³⁰⁴ The status of three-barred crosses in civil and ecclesiastical law was not as clearly defined as the captaincy's letter indicated. The ritual commission of Lviv archeparchy at this time still defended in principle the right to erect three-barred crosses,³⁰⁵ but in the particular case of the church in Tysmenytsia, the ordinariate issued a decision prohibiting their erection.³⁰⁶

There were numerous other incidents in the mid-1880s, some involving the civil authorities, some not: builders who had constructed the new wooden church in Dryshchiv, Pidhaitsi county, were refused payment at the insistence of the landlord's son because they had put up three-barred crosses;³⁰⁷ in Ponykva Velyka, Brody county, the estate administrator amputated the extra bars from a three-barred cross that had been, according to Ruthenian custom, cut from the ice for the feast of the Theophany (Jordan), and in response the peasants changed all the crosses on the icons and banners in the church to three-barred crosses;³⁰⁸ in Kniahynychi, Bibrka county, a three-barred cross graced the newly renovated church, and gendarmes and a commission were sent from the captaincy to investigate;³⁰⁹ in Zarudie, Zolochiv county, a Greek Catholic priest who had emigrated to Galicia from Chełm eparchy caused considerable consternation among the peasants when he had the arms sawn off the cross on the ciborium;³¹⁰ the Zalishchyky captaincy, at the urging of a local Latin-rite pastor, banned a three-barred cross in the Greek Catholic cemetery in

Nyrkiv and sent two gendarmes to the village to quell alleged unrest,³¹¹ and a Latin-rite priest held a mission in Khodoriv, Bibrka county, during which he allegedly told the peasants that the three-barred cross was a schismatic idol and that they should not remove their caps when passing a church adorned with one.³¹²

The issue was combustible, since peasants could feel quite strongly about it,³¹³ and the legal uncertainties only exacerbated the problem. The matter was finally brought to Rome for a definitive decision. On 19 May 1887 Propaganda (Oriental Affairs) ruled that there was no absolute identification of three-barred crosses with schism, but nonetheless, because of the particular circumstances, no new three-barred crosses were to be erected and those already in existence were to be replaced as the opportunity arose.³¹⁴

During the same period as the issue of three-barred crosses flared up, the Ruthenians' liturgical calendar also came under attack. The agitation against the Julian calendar was not explicitly linked to alleged schismatic leanings of the Ruthenians, but it seems to have been a product of the prevailing mood in the Polish Roman Catholic church in the wake of Hnylychky. In March 1883 Father Stanisław Stojałowski, a controversial populist-cum-chauvinist, distributed a petition among the peasantry, including the Ruthenian peasantry, calling upon the emperor to establish a single liturgical calendar for all of Galicia. Although the formal motivation of the petition was economic (i.e., work was interrupted by too many holy days) and although the petition claimed to be indifferent to whether the Gregorian or Julian calendar was chosen ("new or old, we leave this to Your high wisdom"), the Ruthenian intelligentsia immediately recognized that the petition was nationally motivated and aimed at their calendar.³¹⁵ But there was some danger that peasants could be deceived by the cleverly worded petition, distributed moreover by populist activists. Therefore, both Greek Catholic bishops, Sylvestr Sembratovych and Ioann Stupnytsky, issued currendas to be read from the pulpit forbidding the clergy and faithful to sign these petitions.³¹⁶ Although Father Stojałowski was a maverick element within both Polish society and the Polish church, this particular campaign met with some sympathy in other Polish circles.³¹⁷ The issue resurfaced early in 1885, after Łukasz Solecki, the Latin-rite bishop of Przemyśl, called upon the crownland administration to do away with all Greek Catholic holy days not celebrated by the Roman church.³¹⁸ A radical reform of the Ruthenian calendar was not, however, envisioned by the Vatican at this time. On the eve of the Lviv synod of 1891, rumours had circulated that the apostolic delegate Agostino Ciasca was going to impose the Gregorian calendar on the

Ruthenian church. Nothing so drastic was afoot, but there was an attempt to have the synod approve the addition to the Ruthenian calendar of a number of Latin-rite saints, including St Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit order. The synodal fathers successfully rebuffed this.³¹⁹

The Greek Catholic hierarchy took a number of "housekeeping" measures with the aim of keeping religious Russophilism in check. On 15 February 1884 the metropolitan ordinariate published a currenda against pilgrimages to the Orthodox monastery at Pochaiv, just across the Russian border from Galicia. In the preceding fall, a "Pochaiv Brotherhood" had been established during the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the monastery's return to Orthodoxy.³²⁰ Two of the brotherhood's aims were to encourage pilgrimages from across the Austrian border and to propagate Orthodoxy among those who came. A formerly Greek Catholic (pre-reform) Basilian from Galicia was charged with propaganda among Galicians. The currenda, which was sent to the deaneries near the border, instructed pastors "first of all and conscientiously" to determine whether any of their parishioners took part in pilgrimages to Pochaiv. If so, the pastor was to speak to them privately and explain the perils to which they were exposed. If private persuasion failed and the number of such pilgrims increased, priests were to speak about the matter from the pulpit.³²¹ In the spring of 1886 Metropolitan Sembratovych and Bishop Pelesh prohibited the clergy and faithful from reading *Nauka* and *Slovo Bozhe*, periodicals founded and edited by Father Ioann Naumovych.³²² In December 1892 the Ruthenian episcopate placed a similar ban on the Russophile organ *Halytskaia Rus'* (which formally ceased publication and re-emerged in 1893 as *Halychanyn*).³²³

The Galician authorities also did their housekeeping. They kept a close watch on publications entering the crownland from Russia. In 1885 customs officials in the border town of Brody intercepted a shipment of 324 brochures aimed at propagating Orthodoxy among the Ruthenian rural population. The shipment, sent from St Petersburg, was addressed to the editorial boards of Russophile publications (*Nauka*, *Novyi prolom*, *Slovo*) and to the Russophile Mykhail Kachkovsky Society. The police confiscated the brochures, and their action was upheld by the court.³²⁴

More substantively, the Galician government reformed the pay scales of the Greek Catholic clergy, passing a law in 1885 that was phased in gradually over 1886 and 1887.³²⁵ The law brought about a modest increase in the income of Ruthenian priests. The intention behind the reform was to weaken Russophile influence. Economic inequality between priests of the Greek and Latin rite had been a

chronic source of discontent among the Ruthenian clergy, and the reform was partly aimed at alleviating a situation that played into the hands of Russophiles. Furthermore, Russia could take advantage of the indigence of Greek Catholic priests, as happened most notoriously in the case of the emigration from Galicia to Chelm in the 1860s and 1870s.

Bishops

When the Vatican was considering episcopal appointments in 1883–84, it had worried that Sylvestr Sembratovych was too pliant and had believed that Iulian Pelesh would make a better metropolitan. Nonetheless, in order to avoid unnecessary conflict with the Ruthenians, it decided to appoint Sembratovych metropolitan and Pelesh bishop of Stanyslaviv. The decision turned out to be correct and the assessment of the characters of the two men to be wrong. Sylvestr showed himself to be a man of firm will, able to pursue a consistent program of re-Catholicizing the Ruthenian church, combatting Russophile influence, and promoting Polish-Ruthenian rapprochement. He carried on in spite of the persistent unpopularity of his person and policies in Ruthenian society. After ten years on the metropolitan throne, in 1895, he was rewarded for his perseverance by being named a cardinal.³²⁶

Iulian Pelesh, however, proved to be a disappointment. In spite of great promise, wrote Evhen Olesnytsky in his memoirs, Pelesh ended miserably, “as a bishop, a Ruthenian, and a person” (“Rozpochav shumno, a skinchyv sumno iak Iepyskop, rusyn i liudyna”).³²⁷ Ivan Franko was of the same opinion: although talented and well liked as a professor, Pelesh “literally went to waste under the mitre.”³²⁸ By the time he was transferred to Przemyśl eparchy (1891), it seems he had developed a serious alcohol problem,³²⁹ which may explain his rather erratic behaviour at the Lviv provincial synod.

Both bishops had originally enjoyed some popularity among the national populists, since both leaned towards the Ukrainophile orientation and opposed Russophilism. While Sylvestr Sembratovych was auxiliary bishop, but before the crisis of 1882, some national populists, including Father Danylo Taniachkevych, hoped that Iosyf Sembratovych would resign in favour of his more progressive nephew. However, in connection with the events of 1882, rumours began to circulate that Sylvestr had come to a private understanding with the Poles, that they would make him metropolitan if he promised to fulfil

certain obligations.³³⁰ By the time of his formal appointment as metropolitan in 1885, the estrangement between him and the national populists had reached the point that the secular intelligentsia boycotted his solemn investiture.³³¹ The national populists were still quite positively disposed to Iuliiian Pelesh at that time and expected much from him. A brilliant speech in the Galician diet soon after his appointment to the Stanyslaviv bishopric seemed to confirm their hopes. However, very shortly thereafter Bishop Pelesh withdrew from political life. When the national populists held the general meeting of the popular-educational Prosvita Society in Stanyslaviv, the bishop did not even bother to make an appearance.³³² From the first, neither bishop enjoyed any popularity among the Russophiles. Even before they had assumed episcopal office, both had delivered powerful blows to religious Russophilism, Sylvestr with *Ruskii Sion* and Pelesh with his two-volume history of the Ruthenian Catholic church.

It should be pointed out that the contemporary Ruthenian view of Sylvestr Sembratovych was extremely one-sided, probably owing to the circumstances of his appointment. He was unfairly blamed, both at the Lviv synod and later, for trying to impose celibacy on the clergy; moreover, the basest of motives was ascribed to him – a service rendered in exchange for his metropolitan's mitre. His actions in defence of the traditions of the Greek Catholic church (three-barred crosses, Julian calendar) should have led contemporaries to reassess their view of him as a Polish pawn, but they did not.

Ruthenian public opinion of Sylvestr should also have been reconsidered in light of the metropolitan's stand on the Luka Bobrovych affair, even though all of the details may not have been known to the public. Father Luka Bobrovych had been a priest of Chełm eparchy who fled to Galicia after the abolition of the Uniate church there. In Galicia he attached himself for a while to the Resurrectionists. In 1886 he published the newspaper *Rus'* in Lviv. Although the paper called itself a fortnightly on its masthead, in fact it came out very irregularly. It seems that almost the entire paper was written by Bobrovych himself. Ultra-Catholic and pro-Polish, it was extremely unpopular with the Ruthenian reading public and attacked by every Ruthenian faction.³³³ Father Stefan Kachala summed up the opinion of Galician *Rus'* when he said that the paper, though printed in Ruthenian letters, was written in a totally Polish spirit.³³⁴ The paper indeed exuded not so much an anti-Ruthenian animus as an anti-Galician Ruthenian animus. Bobrovych had never forgiven the Galician Ruthenians their role in the suppression of the union in his native Chełm eparchy, and his articles gave full expression to his wounded feelings. The opinion of Galician Ruthenian society was that Bobrovych was just ingratiating himself with Polish society in order to get a rich benefice,³³⁵ namely

the parish of SS Peter and Paul in Lviv, a post that usually carried with it canonical honours. The patron of the church of SS Peter and Paul was Dawid Abrahamowicz, the leader of the most conservative and anti-Ruthenian party in Galicia, the so-called Podolians. He wished to exercise his right of presentation³³⁶ in favour of Bobrovych, but in 1888 the metropolitan consistory declared Bobrovych unfit for the post. Abrahamowicz contested the decision, and the case was brought to the Oriental Congregation. In spite of Metropolitan Sembratovych's protests that the appointment of Father Bobrovych to this parish would cause damage to the union in Galicia, the Congregation decided in June 1890 to accommodate Abrahamowicz and grant the parish to Bobrovych. Metropolitan Sembratovych was so upset by this decision that he offered his resignation.³³⁷

As already mentioned in connection with the delay in the convening of the Lviv provincial synod, Bishop Ioann Stupnytsky of Przemyśl died in 1890. He was replaced by Iuliiian Pelesh, and Stupnytsky's coadjutor, Iuliiian Sas-Kuilovsky, was made bishop of Stanyslaviv. The appointment of Kuilovsky, a man "permeated with a Polish spirit,"³³⁸ was not intended to appeal to Ruthenian society. Kuilovsky was the son of a Greek Catholic priest, but a priest who was also a member of the Polonophile petty gentry. The youthful Kuilovsky was involved in Polish revolutionary adventures and was arrested for conducting anti-Austrian propaganda in 1846. During the revolution of 1848–49, he joined the Polish legions that aided the Hungarian revolt against the Habsburgs, and eventually found himself in exile in Turkey. After studying theology in Paris, he was ordained a priest in 1854. At the intervention of Hryhorii Iakhy-movych, then bishop of Przemyśl, he was amnestied by the Austrian government in 1857, and he began pastoral work in Galicia. In 1882 he was elected to the Przemyśl cathedral chapter. He became coadjutor to Ioann Stupnytsky owing to the lobbying of the Polish gentry with the Galician lieutenant.³³⁹ His appointment as bishop of Stanyslaviv understandably pleased the Poles and just as understandably displeased the Ruthenians. Although the bishop did not prove to be a tool in the hands of the authorities, as many Ruthenians had feared, he did not have much sympathy for the Ruthenian national movement and at one point, as we shall see, he even chastised priests for establishing reading clubs.

On 22 April 1896 Bishop Pelesh passed away. He was replaced by Canon Konstantyn Chekhovych, at first as administrator and then as bishop of Przemyśl eparchy.³⁴⁰ Chekhovych, who had been appointed to the Przemyśl cathedral chapter by Bishop Stupnytsky in 1887, stood out as one of the few influential clergymen of the Ukrainophile orientation in Przemyśl eparchy, which was still a

Russophile stronghold. As bishop, he worked to reduce the Russophile influence among his clergy and was popular with the national populists. The fact that he was a widower (the last one to become a Greek Catholic bishop in Galicia) contributed to his popularity in Ruthenian society, exercised as it was by the issue of clerical celibacy in the 1890s; in fact, the Lviv provincial synod of 1891 had stipulated that widowers could not become bishops, but an exception was made in Chekhovych's case. He was a good bishop. Twice passed over for the office of metropolitan, he displayed no bitterness or discouragement; instead, he collaborated closely and energetically with the outstanding metropolitan of Halych Andrei Sheptytsky (appointed in 1900).³⁴¹

Metropolitan Cardinal Sylvestr Sembratovych had been in declining health since the mid-1890s, and he passed away on 4 August 1898.³⁴² The choice of his successor was one that surprised many people. On 30 August 1899 Pope Leo XIII confirmed the emperor's earlier nomination of Bishop Iulian Sas-Kuilovsky as Greek Catholic archbishop of Lviv and metropolitan of Halych. The selection was surprising, not so much because of the bishop's political past, but because he had been seriously ill for several years. In fact, he was a dying man. He was to serve less than a year, passing away on 4 May 1900.³⁴³

The nomination of Bishop Kuilovsky as metropolitan riled the Ruthenians. The national populist organ *Dilo* published a sharp and unusually frank commentary: "After the death of Cardinal Sylvestr Sembratovych, there was the hope that his successor would be the bishop of Przemyśl, Konstantyn Chekhovych, a Ruthenian national populist by conviction, with many services to the national cause to his credit." Instead, Bishop Kuilovsky had been chosen. "If the Ruthenians also had some say in the nomination of the Ruthenian hierarchy, the choice would probably have been different." *Dilo* pretended, however, to take comfort from the fact "that from the political and even national point of view the person of the metropolitan no longer has, thanks to the politics of our dear friends [the Poles, of course], the same importance for the Ruthenians that it once did." The paper expressed the hope that the new metropolitan would at least defend the rights of the Ruthenian church. It also hoped that now that the bishop would be "in Lviv, in the centre of Rus' and all Ruthenian patriotic activity," he would not give rise to the same complaints he had engendered in Stanyslaviv.³⁴⁴ As it turned out, however, Metropolitan Kuilovsky did not live long enough to confirm the national populists' hopes or fears.

Why was a dying man chosen to be metropolitan in 1899? The answer can be found in the person of Bishop Kuilovsky's replacement

on the throne of Stanyslaviv, Andrei Sheptytsky. This relatively young man (he was thirty-three in January 1899 when he was named bishop) was being groomed for the position of metropolitan, and his predecessor was selected with an eye to avoid longevity.

Andrei was a descendant of the same Sheptytsky family that had produced some outstanding Ruthenian Catholic bishops in the eighteenth century. However, he himself was born into the Latin rite into what was now considered a Polish aristocratic family. His mother tongue was French, his culture Polish. Deeply religious from childhood on, the young Count Roman Szeptycki, as he was known then, formed the intention of entering the monastic life in the Ruthenian church of his ancestors. In 1888 he changed from the Latin to the Greek rite and entered the Basilian novitiate in Dobromyl. It was here that he took the name Andrei.

The news was reported in the Ruthenian press. *Dilo* carried a brief announcement in November 1888 that "Count Sheptytsky has already entered the Basilian monastery and remains in the Dobromyl novitiate under the administration of the Jesuit fathers (*patry iezuity*)."³⁴⁵ Although the announcement was terse – apparently a mere registration of fact – it in fact conveyed a strong connotation of disapproval. No one in Ruthenian Galicia in 1888 needed to be reminded that the Dobromyl monastery was under Jesuit control, and the reference to the young novice simply as "Count Sheptytsky" was not, under the circumstances of the bitter socio-national conflict in Galicia, a neutral statement. If the announcement in *Dilo* was written in a kind of code for the initiated, the same cannot be said of what appeared in *Bat'kioshchyna*, the national populist newspaper for the peasantry. That announcement began by repeating what *Dilo* had published, but then it provided the peasants with a translation into simpler language: "Count Sheptytsky has already entered the Basilian monastery and is staying in the Dobromyl monastery for his novitiate ... In the past century there have already been several bishops in Rus' from the Sheptytsky family; so it is obvious that now too the Jesuits are preparing a Polish nobleman for us as a bishop."³⁴⁶

Confirmation that the young nobleman was destined for episcopal office could be found in the rapid pace of his advancement in Basilian ranks. He made the formal profession of his vows and received ordination at the hands of Bishop Pelesh in 1892. The very next year he was entrusted with the responsible post of master of novices at Dobromyl monastery. In 1896, at the age of thirty, he was named hegumen of the St Onuphrius monastery in Lviv.

In 1898, when Metropolitan Sembratovych had become too ill to perform all the functions of his office, he requested an auxiliary

bishop. Among the candidates proffered to him was Andrei Sheptytsky, but the metropolitan rejected his candidacy. Sheptytsky was still "a bit too young and immature"; also, he did not enjoy, "generally speaking, the sympathy of the Ruthenians." The appointment of Sheptytsky could provoke new turbulence in the Ruthenian church and thus cause more harm than good.³⁴⁷

Thus, the announcement of Andrei Sheptytsky's nomination as bishop of Stanyslaviv provoked consternation in Ruthenian circles and satisfaction in Polish. He was, in the words of Vienna's liberal daily, "persona gratissima – among the Poles."³⁴⁸ Even a Polish paper, *Głos Narodu*, thought that the nominations of Kuilovsky as metropolitan and "the Pole Father Sheptytsky" as bishop of Stanyslaviv went too far and played into the hands of those who accused the Poles of persecuting the Ruthenians.³⁴⁹ For Ruthenians, the new appointments seemed to confirm the fears once expressed by Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych that "Singulare praesidium," by allowing Polish Roman Catholics to enter the Basilian order and by renewing Basilian pretensions to episcopal office, would soon result in Polish domination of Greek Catholic episcopal sees. As *Dilo* put it, "There will be a repetition of that period in the history of the Uniate church when the order of St Basil the Great stood at the head of the white clergy and brought the clergy to that miserable state from which Austria finally delivered our church."³⁵⁰

It would be hard to find a more apposite illustration of the workings of Hegel's "cunning of reason" than the appointment of Andrei Sheptytsky as bishop of Stanyslaviv and, soon thereafter, as metropolitan of Halych. Everyone had it wrong.

Andrei Sheptytsky as Bishop of Stanyslaviv

The Poles soon realized that Andrei Sheptytsky was anything but "their man" and that his assumption of the Greek rite and Ruthenian nationality sprang from the purest sincerity. Many Polish political, and even ecclesiastical, leaders came to resent him with that particular resentment reserved for renegades.³⁵¹ And the Ruthenians-Ukrainians of Galicia discovered in him a powerful and dedicated advocate, a saintly and righteous pastor and a historical personality towering high above his contemporaries. By the strength of his personality and his vision, he was to usher in a new era in the history of the Greek Catholic church.

That there was something different about this bishop was evident at the very ceremony of his episcopal ordination, held at St George's cathedral in Lviv on 17 September 1899. Perhaps no Ruthenian consecration attracted so many representatives of the Polish upper class as this one. Such crowds were anticipated that admission to the church was by ticket. However, and unusually for this sort of occasion, the guards at the door did not turn away the common people, but admitted them inside the cathedral. The nominate was dressed in vestments fashioned strictly according to the tradition of the Greek rite, from silk cloth he had had made to order in Lyon. His father, Count Jan Kanty Szeptycki, appeared in the raiment of a Ruthenian boyar. After the service, the clergy in attendance were served breakfast in the consistory's conference room. The newly ordained bishop visited the priests to thank them for their participation and also shared with them how he understood his obligations as a bishop. "The people are completely right," he said, "to demand certain things from a bishop, and it is absolutely correct to censure him if he shirks the task that he has to perform on behalf of the church and his people." He assured them he would try to do what was expected of him as a Ruthenian bishop. Impressed by the pageantry, by the gesture to the common people, and by the sentiments expressed in the new bishop's words to the clergy, *Dilo* took a second look at Sheptytsky: "We greet with joy the declaration of the new bishop that he wants to labour for the good of the people and facilitate all honest and conscientious work on their behalf. On this basis we can all, without exception, come together, whether priest or layman, whether bishop or peasant."³⁵²

Within the next few days, the enthusiasm for the new bishop grew. In his first pastoral letter, Bishop Sheptytsky took a stand that marked him off clearly from his predecessor in the see of Stanyslaviv. While Bishop Kuilovsky had spoken out against the discord caused by reading clubs, Bishop Sheptytsky said: "Establish, my brothers, reading clubs and day-care centres in the villages!"³⁵³ This brief passage made a great impression on contemporaries who contrasted the views of "the two bishops, old and young."³⁵⁴

The young bishop's appeal to the clergy to establish reading clubs should not, however, be interpreted as a purely political initiative. As the context of this first pastoral letter suggests and as subsequent pastoral letters make explicit, Bishop Sheptytsky saw the reading clubs primarily as religious instruments. He envisioned that literate peasants in the reading clubs would read aloud his pastoral letters and other spiritual literature; thus the reading clubs would serve to extend pastoral care, particularly to remote villages and to villages in predominantly Orthodox Bukovina that might be located far from

a Greek Catholic church.³⁵⁵ Sheptytsky's consideration of the pastoral potential of the reading club undoubtedly owed much to his experience as a Basilian and intimate involvement with their very successful popular periodical, *Misionar'*.

During his year and a half in the see of Stanyslaviv, Bishop Sheptytsky wrote eight pastoral letters, all of them substantive. He would continue to write them frequently and substantively for all his remaining decades in episcopal office. His practice, at least during the Stanyslaviv period, was to take a day or two off from all other obligations of his office in order to devote himself to the composition of a letter. Many of the letters that resulted are remarkable. That first letter, with the brief endorsement of reading clubs that attracted so much attention, was (at least in my opinion) even more noteworthy for the emotive force of its style. It reads in many passages like a love letter, which in fact it was. It is worth quoting, since it gives an insight into the man:

From this moment on, at the command of Christ, I have to be not only your brother, but your pastor – and your *father*.

From now on I have to live *only for you*, with all my heart and soul I am to work *for you*, devote all *to you*; but more than that even – if necessary, I am to *give my life for you* ...

And at this very moment I would like (if only it were possible in this world) that you would be free of suffering and trouble. That all of you – each and every one: old and young, learned and illiterate, poor and rich – that you all were happy, happy in this life, and in the other for eternity.

I would so like to *wipe away the tears* from those who weep, *comfort* everyone who is sad, *give strength* to everyone who is weak and feeble, *make healthy* everyone who is ill, *enlighten* everyone who is ignorant!

I would like to become all things to all, in order to save all ...

Thus today I say and declare along with the Apostle (and God is my witness that I can declare this with a clear conscience): "*I would even wish to be cut off from Christ on behalf of my brothers, my own flesh and blood!*" (Romans 9:3.)

Let me die today, let me not know happiness in eternity, let me be cut off from Christ – if only you, My Brothers by blood, might be saved! ...

And how can I not cry to you at the very beginning of my care for you (and I want to cry so loud that my voice would enter each of your houses, that each of you would hear and understand it).³⁵⁶

And when he wrote his last, farewell pastoral letter to the clergy and faithful of Stanyslaviv eparchy, Bishop Sheptytsky struck much the same tone:

A year and a half ago I greeted you with a word of love. And my heart to this day is filled with a hot love – a love I have not had the opportunity either to express or to transform into action.

This is not an empty word! For the whole work of a pastor of souls has to be permeated with love.

Let then the last word in this moment of parting be a word of love!³⁵⁷

Another remarkable letter from this period was a pastoral letter specifically addressed to the Hutsuls, a Carpathian mountain folk who inhabited the Kosiv and Bukovina deaneries of Stanyslaviv eparchy. Bishop Sheptytsky had made a point of visiting the Hutsuls of both Galicia and Bukovina, even riding on horseback to more isolated villages.³⁵⁸ After concluding his visitation of the Kosiv deanery, Bishop Sheptytsky penned an epistle “To My Beloved Hutsuls”; the letter was published entirely in the Hutsul dialect.³⁵⁹ It used earthy expressions and flattery and showed a deep concern for the people it addressed; yet it was primarily a letter of reprimand, designed to convince the Hutsuls to change their ways. The Hutsuls at the time were plagued by syphilis, and alcoholism and usury were undermining the foundations of their economic life. The bishop warned the Hutsuls that they stood at the brink of extinction, that through sexual profligacy, drunkenness, and indebtedness they were hastening into the abyss, both in this life and in the hereafter. Although these three themes dominated the letter, the bishop also took the opportunity to preach hygiene to the Hutsuls, praising the virtues of soap, recommending that the Hutsuls build chimneys in their homes instead of letting the smoke seep out the thatched roofs, and informing them about windows that could open to let in fresh air.

The extraordinary pastoral solicitude that found expression in the numerous letters he addressed to the faithful was also evident in the frequent and often arduous visitations that Sheptytsky undertook, in spite of poor health, both as bishop of Stanyslaviv and later as archbishop of Lviv. In the latter office he succeeded in visiting every parish in Lviv archeparchy.³⁶⁰ He was bishop of Stanyslaviv for too brief a period to accomplish the same in that eparchy, but he certainly made a good start. The Greek Catholics of Bukovina, who were attached to Stanyslaviv eparchy, had not enjoyed a visitation from their bishop since Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych came to them in 1880. Sheptytsky visited them in 1900.³⁶¹ Unlike Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, however, Bishop Sheptytsky made a point of visiting the Orthodox metropolitan of Bukovina,³⁶² an act that indicated the preoccupation with ecumenism and church unity that distinguished his entire episcopal career.

Although in his farewell pastoral letter to Stanyslaviv eparchy Sheptytsky lamented that he left "many matters started, but unfinished, ... many promises made, but unfulfilled,"³⁶³ he had really accomplished much in his year and a half in office. In addition to the letters and visitations, Sheptytsky left the eparchy a concrete legacy: as was mentioned previously, he bought property on which to erect an eparchial seminary; he established an eparchial library, donating 3,870 volumes himself, including many old imprints, and setting up an endowment for future purchases;³⁶⁴ and he had the sanctuary of the cathedral (formerly a Roman Catholic church) decorated with frescoes.³⁶⁵ It was an auspicious beginning.

B: Ruthenian National Politics and the Church

The Politics of Sylvestr Sembratovych

Sylvestr Sembratovych intervened actively in Ruthenian politics at two junctures: in the mid-1880s, that is, at around the time of his appointment as metropolitan, and in the early 1890s. In the first period he established a political newspaper, *Myr*, and ran a slate of candidates in the parliamentary elections of 1885; in the second period he helped put together a Ruthenian-Polish compromise, the “new era.” The aims of his political activity were to strengthen the Catholic element in public life and to mitigate the Polish-Ruthenian conflict in Galicia.

The newspaper *Myr* was founded as the political organ of the metropolitan early in 1885, and it lasted a little over two years, folding in the middle of 1887. Coming out three times a week, the newspaper attempted to compete with *Slovo* and *Dilo* and interpret Ruthenian political affairs from a Catholic perspective. *Myr* was never, however, able to attract political journalists of a calibre to offer the established papers any serious competition. The first editor was Father Aleksandr Bachynsky, who was well equipped to edit a religious periodical – *Ruskii Sion*, for example – but out of his depth when it came to politics. Another editor was Ivan Em. Levytsky, the outstanding Ruthenian national bibliographer and biographer. Although the son of the same Father Emylian Levytsky who had been suspended in 1882 along with Father Ioann Naumovych, Ivan Em. Levytsky was “neither a Russophile, a Ukrainophile, nor a Polonophile”; he was a “loner” who “tried to remain aloof from these controversies.” He was no “theorizer,”³⁶⁶ but rather preferred the detailed, concrete work of compiling bibliographies and biographies and enjoyed collecting Ruthenian visiting cards. It is hard to imagine a less suitable addition to the editorial board of a fledgling political newspaper. In the case of *Myr*, though, which was to be a Catholic political paper, a less suitable addition was in fact found, namely in the person of Orest Avdykovsky, a prominent Russophile publicist who collaborated with *Myr*, Evhen Olesnytsky said, only because he wanted the

money.³⁶⁷ Others involved with the paper included Fathers Iosyf Komarnytsky and Onufrii Lepky.

Contemporaries judged *Myr* harshly.³⁶⁸ A Russophile wag pointed out that *Myr* spelled backwards was *Rym*, the Ruthenian name for Rome.³⁶⁹ Other Russophiles called it “a product of Jesuit fantasy”³⁷⁰ and “a Resurrectionist-Jesuit political paper in (supposedly) the Ruthenian language.”³⁷¹ The national populists did not care for it either. Kost Levytsky referred to it as a “Jesuit-Ruthenian periodical.”³⁷² Olesnytsky wrote: “At the same time as he came to the throne, Metropolitan Sembratovych began to create a conservative, pro-government and Polonophile party and founded, with the help of the government and the Poles, the political organ *Myr*, edited with these aims in mind. It was an organ of extreme obscurantism.”³⁷³ Ivan Franko characterized *Myr* as “pale and colourless in every respect.”³⁷⁴ Suffice it to say that as an attempt to influence Ruthenian public opinion, *Myr* was a total failure; it could not even garner support from the Ruthenian clergy.³⁷⁵

Myr was also disliked because of its association with Sylvestr Sembratovych’s activities during the 1885 parliamentary elections. While the Russophiles and national populists ran a joint slate of candidates in these elections, the metropolitan joined with the Galician government and Polish conservatives, running separate Ruthenian candidates in electoral districts where it would have been difficult to elect a Polish landowner and where the Ruthenian candidate would have been expected to win. With the Ruthenian vote divided and the clergy at a loss what to do, only one candidate from the Ruthenian national slate was elected and three from the metropolitan’s slate (there was also one independent Ruthenian candidate elected).³⁷⁶ It was indeed a very odd moment. Iuliiian Pelesh, for example, was one of the national candidates defeated by a candidate of the metropolitan.³⁷⁷ The defeat of the prominent national populist Iuliiian Romanchuk by the obscure Canon Mykhail Singalevych particularly embittered the Ruthenian national camp.³⁷⁸ The metropolitan’s motives in running his own candidates are evident – he was offering Catholic candidates against a slate that harboured Orthodox sympathizers and he was trying to construct a new politics based on Polish-Ukrainian compromise rather than Polish-Ukrainian conflict. These aims were entirely consistent with his episcopal calling, and it is hard to fault them on principle. However, as in the case of *Myr*, the execution of the good intentions was disastrous. It is also hard not to agree with Father Severyn Matkovsky that the fielding of his own candidates in the elections was a poorly conceived idea that did great damage to the metropolitan’s authority and significance in Ruthenian political life.³⁷⁹

Metropolitan Sembratovych did not repeat his error by fielding candidates in subsequent elections. *Myr* collapsed in the middle of 1887 and the metropolitan withdrew from politics for several years, until the 1890s. What brought him back into politics was a new attempt at reaching a Polish-Ukrainian understanding, the so-called new era.

The new era, the complex origins of which "stretched from Vienna to Kiev,"³⁸⁰ was an attempt to put an end to the conflict of nationalities in Galicia. The main partners in the compromise were the Polish conservative Stańczyks and the Ruthenian national populists. The latter were to drop their opposition to the government, the former to make concessions to the Ruthenians. After preparatory meetings, the new era was inaugurated by Iuliian Romanchuk's declaration in the Galician diet on 27 November 1890.³⁸¹ The Polish-Ruthenian understanding lasted, but uneasily, until early in 1894.³⁸²

Behind the failure of the new era lay a fundamental difference in what each party to the compromise expected from it. Ivan L. Rudnytsky summarized the matter well: "No precise terms had ... been agreed upon. Thus the attempt at compromise was, from the very first, vitiated by a basic misunderstanding. The Poles were willing to make certain minor concessions to the Ukrainians in the field of education and linguistic rights ... But what the *narodovtsi* [national populists] had expected was a change in the political system, and this was not forthcoming."³⁸³ Aside from some trivial concessions (such as Ruthenian signs on some streets in Lviv), the concrete results of the new era for the Ruthenians were the establishment of a chair of Ruthenian-Ukrainian history at Lviv University, which was to be occupied by the great Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky, and the opening of a Ukrainian gymnasium in Kolomyia. These achievements seemed meagre to the Ruthenian national populist leadership, which had been reluctant to enter into the compromise in the first place. Moreover, the new era was quite unpopular from the beginning with the rank and file of the national populist movement and even with some of its leaders (notably Evhen Olesnytsky), who were reluctant to abandon their struggle with the untrustworthy Poles. The Russophiles and radicals opposed the new era immediately and consistently, and they gained the sympathies of many Ruthenians for their stance. So it was that when the national populists abandoned the new era in 1894, they did so with hard feelings.

The entire episode further undermined the position of Metropolitan Sembratovych in Ruthenian society, since he was one of the initiators of the new era,³⁸⁴ a strong supporter of it even when it was collapsing in 1894³⁸⁵ and in favour of continuing it after it had collapsed. I have the impression, however, that contemporaries exaggerated the

metropolitan's responsibility for the new era.³⁸⁶ In 1896 Father Aleksii Toronsky was already suggesting that the metropolitan was hardly in a position to be the prime mover behind such a major shift in Ruthenian politics as the new era represented.³⁸⁷ As Metropolitan Sembratovych himself said at a crucial preparatory conference with the Galician lieutenant and Ruthenian politicians, he was not able to take on political leadership; his role would be supportive.³⁸⁸ But I imagine that the national populist leadership was not averse to allowing the metropolitan to serve as a scapegoat for its own political error. This was probably all the easier since the metropolitan was so unpopular for other reasons during this period; it was during the new era that he was insulted by the clergy at the Lviv provincial synod and greeted with rotten eggs by students at the railroad station in Vienna.

There was a small faction of national populists who continued to observe the compromise after 1894. Its leader was Oleksander Barvinsky, who was in fact the Ruthenian politician most active in putting the new era together in the first place. With the composer Natal Vakhnianyyn, he headed a new but numerically insignificant group in Ruthenian politics that emerged out of the new era and modelled itself on the all-Austrian Christian social movement. In 1896 they founded the "Catholic Ruthenian-National Union," and in the next year, with a subsidy from the Austrian ministry of foreign affairs, they began to publish the "Christian-social daily" *Ruslan*. Metropolitan Sembratovych supported the new Christian social tendency in Ruthenian politics. In December 1896 he even summoned delegates from all the deaneries to a special conference in Lviv to discuss organizing a political organization of the Ruthenian clergy that would defend both Catholic interests and the Ruthenian nation, but the delegates unanimously turned this proposal down. It was not until 1911 that the Christian social tendency was able to organize as a formal political party, under Barvinsky's leadership.³⁸⁹

Russophilism and National Populism

The events of 1882 and the subsequent interventions on the part of the Austrian government and papacy did damage to Galician Russophilism from which it never recovered. Although Mykhailo Draho-manov, a perceptive observer of the Galician political scene, wrote that he had seen Russophilism in decline even before 1882,³⁹⁰ there

can be no question that 1882 represented a turning point. Draho-manov's former disciple, Ivan Franko, wrote that the trial of the Russophiles in 1882 was "a hard blow for the Russophile party in Galicia." It made the Galician Ruthenian public gravitate towards national populism and led to the failure of Russophile candidates during elections.³⁹¹ At the annual meeting of the Russophile Kachkovsky Society, on 31 August 1882, the president, Canon Teofil Pavlykov, complained that "many merchants and bookstores did not want ... to take the [society's] booklets for sale, out of fear that they contain some agitations against the state. Members' dues came in very irregularly."³⁹² The historian (and later lieutenant of Galicia) Michał Bobrzyński wrote that after 1882 parish priests who had hitherto concealed their preference for the national populists in order to avoid incurring the disapproval of the consistory now increasingly entered the movement.³⁹³

The state and higher church authorities had sent a clear message that Russophilism would no longer be tolerated. Those who continued to adhere to the orientation after 1882 did so with the sure knowledge that they were taking a risk. Since martyrdom can breed intransigence, the persecution of Russophilism could have had the effect of making it more popular among the Ruthenians, but the opposite happened.

Perhaps this is in part attributable to certain weaknesses in the position of the Russophile leaders. They had essentially become agents of a foreign, indeed hostile, power, on which they depended both for short-term financial support and long-term deliverance in the form of annexation. This was a position so dangerous that it could only be known to a small group of insiders. The rank and file of the movement, particularly the peasants, but also many priests, had no clear idea of the real content of the political tendency to which they belonged. The irredentist aims were masked by formal declarations of loyalty to Austria in the Russophile press and public statements. Accusations made by Poles or those they had informed were dismissed out of hand. Thus, the Russophile leadership ran into the problem that many conspirators have faced: they could not gain popular support for their program because they could not explain it to the people without endangering the conspiracy. The Galician Russophiles were clever propagandists, but they were unable to resolve this dilemma until a new breed of radical Russophiles emerged, Russophiles who took their full program to the public.

The Russophiles of the nineteenth century left many people baffled about where exactly they stood. This was clearly demonstrated at the 1882 trial. The chief ideologue of the national populists, Volodymyr

Barvinsky, wrote in *Dilo* immediately after the trial: "Perhaps the subject discussed most [at the trial] was religion, Orthodoxy. But even today it is hard to say what Father Naumovych, V. Ploshchansky, and Ad. Dobriansky stand for. For Orthodoxy, or for the Union? ... We can only feel sorry for [the defendants] I. Shpunder and Zalusky [a peasant and burgher], who, having heard all the declarations of their brothers and tutors from the intelligentsia, only shook their heads and had no idea at all what 'the faith of our forefathers' is."³⁹⁴

The Russophiles' ability to build a disciplined mass movement was also hindered by their lack of incentive, since their saviour was to be a foreign power rather than their own people, and by the artificiality of the Russophile national program, since there were a great many differences, after all, between Galician Ruthenians and Russians. Even Ioann Naumovych would write in the local Ukrainian vernacular rather than in Russian or near-Russian when addressing the peasants.

In sum, the authorities' actions against the Russophiles may have succeeded in lessening rather than increasing sympathy for Russophilism because they were directed against a structure that lacked firm foundations.

However, another, and I think weightier, explanation suggests itself as well. Had Russophilism been the only expression of the national aspirations of the Galician Ruthenians, the authorities' measures might have backfired. But there was a rival national movement, namely the Ukrainophile national populist movement, that was laying all the firm foundations that the Russophiles lacked. Its program did not threaten the integrity of Austria, and its adherents did not have to wear two faces. Through their popular-educational Prosvita Society and their popular newspaper *Bat'kivshchyna*, the national populists systematically developed a mass following in the villages. Their solution to the problem of Galician Ruthenian identity, namely that the Ruthenians were the same people as the Little Russians or Ukrainians of the Russian empire, struck many as most reasonable in light of what the historical, linguistic, and ethnographic research of the past half-century had revealed. They were already on the rise before 1882, having established Prosvita in 1868, *Bat'kivshchyna* in 1879, and their primary organ, *Dilo*, in 1880. Thus, when the authorities attacked Russophilism, Ruthenians did not face the choice of fighting or surrendering, but the choice of Russophilism or national populism. The national populist movement was to be the principal beneficiary of the interventions of the 1880s and 1890s. The fate of the two movements is well symbolized by what happened to their major newspapers. The Russophiles had the older newspaper, *Slovo*, founded in 1861. Hounded by the authorities and losing subscribers,

it folded in 1887, and no Russophile newspaper thereafter enjoyed any longevity. In the year after *Slovo* collapsed, the national populists' *Dilo* became a daily (*Slovo* had come out three times a week), and it lasted, except for interruptions during wartime, until 1939.

Although the events of 1882 accelerated the national populists' assumption of leadership in the Ruthenian national movement, the national populists were at first hesitant to capitalize on the Russophiles' misfortune. In the immediate aftermath of the 1882 trial, Volodymyr Barvinsky wrote a long, serialized article in *Dilo* under the title "After the Trial for High Treason."³⁹⁵ Barvinsky touched on a number of fundamental problems in Galician public life in his article, but one of them was the problem of Russophilism. He denounced the hypocrisy of the Russophile leadership and called for a Ruthenian political program that emphasized independent development and grass-roots organization. Barvinsky's article, however, was exceptional. The other national populists objected to it, and he had to break it off abruptly, without ever bringing it to a conclusion.³⁹⁶

The general consensus in national populist circles at that time was that the government's attacks on the Russophiles and the Vatican's interventions in the Ruthenian church were directed against Ruthenian society as a whole; in that context, solidarity was necessary, not political infighting. On the whole in the 1880s, the national populists cooperated with the Russophiles. Both the national populist and Russophile press expressed the same reactions to the major events in Ruthenian ecclesiastical life: both protested the Jesuits' involvement in the Basilian reform, both lamented the resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, both defended three-barred crosses.³⁹⁷ In 1883 and 1884, after the death of Volodymyr Barvinsky, who would have opposed these tactics, the national populists joined with the Russophiles to sponsor public assemblies (*vicha*) in Lviv where Ruthenian politics and church affairs would be discussed. In 1885 the national populists and the Russophiles put up a joint slate of candidates for election to parliament. And from 1883 until late 1890 the Russophiles and national populists formed a single club in the Galician diet. As a result of this rapprochement, the real weakness of the Russophiles was not clearly exposed for years. And in the early 1890s the Russophiles enjoyed a modest windfall of popularity because of their opposition to the new era.³⁹⁸

The declining public support for the Russophiles meant that they had to increase their dependency on patrons outside Ruthenian society. The Russian government had been sending 6,000 roubles to the Russophiles every year since 1881 (with additional sums for Nau-movych, however, after his arrest), but as of 1886, in light of the difficulties the Russophiles were facing and as a result of the intercession

of Naumovych, the subsidy was doubled.³⁹⁹ The Russophiles' search for patronage took a bizarre turn in the 1890s: they looked for protection to a Polish political party, namely the Podolians, the conservative, traditionally anti-Ruthenian party of the East Galician landlords. The flirtation seems to have begun in 1892, when both the Russophiles and Podolians found themselves on the same side of a major political issue – namely opposition to the new era. An article in the Podolian organ *Gazeta Narodowa* declared that “the Russophiles in principle are not such rabid enemies of the Poles as the national populists.”⁴⁰⁰ The Podolians were interested in the Russophiles partly in order to maintain division within the Ruthenian movement and partly because the Russophiles were not the social radicals that the national populists tended to be. The Russophiles were looking for a source of support. The alliance came to fruition during the lieutenancy of Count Leon Piniński (1898–1903), a leader of the Podolians.⁴⁰¹ It continued during the tenure of Piniński's successor, Count Andrzej Potocki (1903–1908) and resurfaced in a revised form in interwar Poland. As a result of this alliance, the Russophiles received some critical support at elections, Russophile priests gained advantages in obtaining parishes, and the authorities became more tolerant towards Russophile political activity.

The Russophile movement did not completely disappear from Galicia until the Soviet period, but by the end of the nineteenth century it was marginalized within Ruthenian society, at least within educated Ruthenian society. It had lost control of the main instrument for forming Ruthenian public opinion, the periodical press. Of nineteen Ruthenian periodicals published in Galicia in 1899 (excluding governmental and eparchial periodicals), sixteen were Ukrainophile in orientation, only two were Russophile, and one seemed to maintain neutrality.⁴⁰² These figures may suggest an exaggerated picture of the replacement of Russophilism by national populism among the Ruthenian intelligentsia. My own, admittedly impressionistic, estimate would be that by the late 1890s Ukrainophiles made up about two-thirds of the Ruthenian intelligentsia, the Russophiles one-third, where twenty years earlier the proportions would have been reversed.⁴⁰³ The Ukrainophile orientation was stronger among the younger generation of the intelligentsia, while Russophilism found its adherents mainly among the older generation. Among the organized peasantry, however, judging by recent revisionist research into the Kachkovsky Society, the Russophile movement may still have been somewhat stronger than the national populist movement in the late 1890s,⁴⁰⁴ but this is a question that deserves further exploration and reflection.

There were still many priests associated with the Russophile movement after 1882. For example, twenty priests joined the Kachkovsky Society in 1884–85 and forty in 1890–91.⁴⁰⁵ At the society's annual meeting in 1896, during which a peasant protested against celebrating the anniversary of the Union of Brest and also called upon the society to distribute portraits of Ioann Naumovych, a priest presided, indeed an honorary canon of Lviv archeparchy (Teodor Lisevych).⁴⁰⁶ In the early 1890s Russophiles controlled the reading room (*chytal'nia*) in the Lviv seminary. When eighty-four seminarians petitioned the administration of the reading room to subscribe to national populist periodicals, the administration refused, because "the reading room has Ruthenian (*russkyie*) periodicals, and there are no funds for Polonophile ones." However, in 1895 the national populists took over the reading room. They expelled the Russophiles from it and from all other associations within the seminary. By the turn of the century, according to an informed contemporary count, there were only 53 Russophiles among 218 Greek Catholic seminarians in Lviv.⁴⁰⁷

The retention of Russophile sympathies among some of the clergy must have stemmed partly from sheer social inertia. For close to two decades Russophilism had been the dominant Ruthenian movement; many priests had been associated with it, taken positions in it, made friends and enemies because of it, gained a certain standing in society from activities within its framework, and found there a cogent enough explanation for what was happening about them. It cannot be a surprise that many were reluctant to abandon it. From the very end of the nineteenth century onward, the division over political orientation in the clergy was largely generational, with older priests Russophile and younger ones national populist. This generational difference would become generational conflict in the early twentieth century, when a new generation of national populist priest-activists would propagate their ideas and institutions among the parishioners of elderly pastors of the Russophile persuasion. The old Russophiles were nicknamed "bison" by the young priests – an ancient, shaggy species on the verge of extinction.⁴⁰⁸

Apart from this, it must be kept in mind that many of the priests in the movement might be more accurately classified as Old Ruthenians rather than Russophiles in the strict sense. A perceptive conservative observer of Greek Catholic church affairs, Father Ievhenii Hornytsky, argued that Russophilism attracted the clergy because it was a more conservative orientation than Ukrainophilism. "The Russophiles [after the mid-1880s] continued in the leadership of the Ruthenian conservative camp, and a large part of the clergy supports their party's activities in the political and social spheres, although

they cannot subscribe to the anti-Catholic and pan-Slavic aspirations of the Russophile leaders."⁴⁰⁹

The linguistic factor was one element in Russophilism's attractiveness to conservatives. The Russophiles held to the etymological spelling of the Ruthenian language, which linked it more closely to other Slavic languages, particularly Russian. This spelling incorporated more characters from Church Slavonic than did the phonetic orthography favoured by the Ukrainophiles (who even conducted brief experiments with the Latin alphabet). The lexicon of the Russophile version of Ruthenian also used many more Church Slavonicisms than did the mixture of literary Ukrainian and pure Galician vernacular written by the national populists. The Russophile literary language had much in common with the adulterated Church Slavonic of the old, pre-nineteenth-century Ruthenian-Ukrainian literary language; it could be seen as the continuation of a tradition. The national populists' literary language was an innovation of the era of national revival. As is known from the history of East European national awakenings generally, the process of the codification of the modern literary language often involved a struggle between the historic literary language, which could be associated with liturgical usage as well, and the vernacular dialects.⁴¹⁰ Proponents of the historical principle were often to be found among the clergy. Thus, although it may seem odd to us today, it is not really so unusual that some priests gravitated towards the Russophile camp because they cherished hard signs after final consonants and the tricky but ingenious letter *iat'* and because they preferred stately, if archaic, Slavonicisms to crude-sounding expressions of plebeian provenance.

The other factor that brought conservatives into the Russophile camp was not so much something that was attractive about Russophilism as repellant about national populism. "The young party of national populists," wrote Father Hornytsky, "... began to alienate all the conservative elements in Rus' by their free-thinking and anti-religious manifestations, from which again the Russophile organs handily benefited, pointing out time after time these blameworthy and pernicious tendencies of the young party and thus gaining the sympathies of Ruthenian conservatives."⁴¹¹ The view that the national populists were secular, even agnostic or atheistic, liberals and radicals stemmed partly from the erroneous conflation of the early Ruthenian socialists of the 1870s and 1880s, who were Ukrainophile in national orientation, with the national populists. Since the first Ruthenian socialists in Galicia had entered student politics within the Russophile camp, but had then switched to the Ukrainophile orientation, Father Naumovych felt justified in commenting thus (after their

arrest and trial): "From the innocent [phonetic] orthography of Kulish, from the negation of our old alphabet, some of our youth have gone all the way to the negation of the entire existing order."⁴¹²

Although in reality the radicals, as these socialists soon came to be called, and the national populists were two distinct strands in Ruthenian political life and although the Russophiles were probably guided more by political advantage than by objective scrutiny in equating the two, the Russophiles were nonetheless correct that the Ukrainophile orientation provided more hospitable ground for the emergence of socialist tendencies than the Russophile orientation. The national populists *were* more secular in spirit and more influenced by liberal doctrines than the Russophiles. Clerical writers accused the national populist press, and especially *Bat'kivshchyna*, the paper for peasants, of religious indifference.⁴¹³ An incident in 1884 seemed to confirm the scandalous reputation of the national populists: one of their number, Adolf Narolsky, was buried without religious services, and students sang the Ukrainian national anthem ("Shche ne vmerla Ukraina") over his grave.⁴¹⁴ Moreover, the national populists worked closely with the Ukrainophile movement in Russian-ruled Ukraine, which, because the church there was controlled by the Russian state, numbered few churchmen and many anti-clericals in its ranks. The issue of the Ukrainian national poet, Taras Shevchenko, was still a sticking point in this period. Four young men were expelled from the Lviv seminary in 1886 for attending an evening in the poet's honour and submitting a letter of solidarity to the organizers of the commemorative event.⁴¹⁵ In 1892 Nykolai Herasymovych was denied readmission to the seminary primarily because he had sung in concerts of the Boian choir at which Shevchenko's poem in honour of Jan Hus was performed, "which testifies to his lack of a Catholic spirit."⁴¹⁶ Thus, priests made anxious by the corrosion of religious conviction and the increasing secularization of society might well have ended up joining the more traditionalist Russophile camp.

Russophilism also had its own religious agenda, which exercised a certain appeal among the clergy. The Russophiles' advocacy of the preservation of the traditions of the Greek Catholic church and of the purification of the rite from Latin influences expressed the sentiment prevailing among the Ruthenian parish clergy. That this was the case is indicated by the stance that the overwhelming majority of the priests took at the Lviv provincial synod of 1891.

Moreover, the Russophile view took on a particular cogency in the period 1882-99. All along, the Russophiles had been warning that the Vatican, in league with the Poles, was trying to latinize their church and erode its distinct status. This view seemed especially difficult to

reject in light of the far-reaching interventions recounted earlier. Indeed, one peculiar result of the interventions of 1882–99 was that some priests who had previously been pillars of the small pro-Roman group in the Greek Catholic church crossed over to the Russophile camp, apparently convinced that Rome and the Poles had gone too far. For example, Father Nykolai Malyniak, who had studied at St Athanasius's in Rome, received holy orders in celibacy there, and published the controversial "Notes of a Roman" in *Ruskii Sion* in 1880, became an ardent Russophile later in the 1880s and died in 1915 in Thalerhof (a concentration camp in which Russophiles were interned by the Austrians during the First World War).⁴¹⁷ Another example is the case of Father Aleksandr Bachynsky. Bachynsky had been a prominent member of the *Sion* group and editor of both *Sion* and *Myr*, but by the early twentieth century, we find him with the Russophiles. In fact, the young priests of Ukrainophile orientation considered him part of the "Muscovite trinity" (*katsaps'ka troitsa*) in the metropolitan consistory.⁴¹⁸ Yet another example: Father Iosyf Kobyliansky, who had written in favour of celibacy and taken staunchly Catholic positions in *Ruskii Sion* in the mid-1880s and who had supported the original celibacy resolution at the Lviv provincial synod, was defending the Russophiles and contributing to their periodicals by the early twentieth century. In Father Kobyliansky's case, the primary reason for the move to Russophilism seems to have been an obsessive concern with the unorthodox religious ideas of the Ukrainian poet Shevchenko.⁴¹⁹

Thus, the impetus to retain and reinforce the distinctive character of the Greek Catholic church as a branch of Eastern Christianity was a factor inclining the clergy to Russophilism. It was not until a new era opened in the history of the Galician Ruthenian church that a metropolitan of Halych, Andrei Sheptytsky, was able to formulate a vision of the Greek Catholic heritage that disentangled the easternizing tendency from Russophilism and laid the foundations for a "neo-Byzantine" approach to Ukrainian Catholicism.

Father Hornytsky stated that "we do not find a real inclination to schism even among the secular Russophiles ... and this is even more true of the clergy belonging to the Russophile orientation; they did not have and do not now have such an inclination."⁴²⁰ On two grounds I think that this is, at best, an oversimplification. First, the priests who were involved in a defence of the Eastern traditions of the Greek Catholic church felt, as we know from their protests over the Basilian reform and the celibacy resolution, that the curia and the Poles were destroying their church. Given the emotionally charged atmosphere of these conflicts and the relative weakness of Catholic loyalties com-

pared to national loyalties among the Ruthenian clergy of that era, I think it stretches credulity to imagine that there were no priests who believed that they would be better off free of Roman and Polish tutelage within the bosom of the Orthodox church, a church, moreover, they knew largely as a theoretical ideal rather than as a reality.

Second, the history of the behaviour of Galician Greek Catholic priests under Russian rule indicates that for some priests the major or only deterrent to conversion to Orthodoxy was that conversion was extremely difficult if not impossible under Austrian law. Although an individual priest, even in Austrian Galicia, was legally entitled to convert to Orthodoxy (as Father Naumovych almost did while in prison in Lviv), he would lose by doing so both his salary and his parish; moreover, he could convert only to the "Greek Oriental" church of the Habsburg monarchy, not to the Russian Orthodox church, whose existence in Austria-Hungary was not legally recognized. In circumstances where these deterrents were eliminated or replaced by inducements to convert to Orthodoxy, conversions did indeed take place. Thus, as we have seen, the majority of Galician priests and seminarians who went to Chełm eparchy stayed there after the eparchy was forcibly joined to the Russian Orthodox church in 1875. During the Russian occupation of Galicia in the First World War, dozens of Greek Catholic priests, with their parishes, entered the Russian Orthodox church.⁴²¹ In short, had not the Austrian state placed almost insurmountable obstacles in the way of conversion to Orthodoxy and had it not hounded Galician proponents of the Orthodox idea, "inclination to schism" might have been as evident to Father Hornytsky as it was to the Vatican and the Poles.

A final point needs to be made about Russophilism in this era: it was developing into a regional movement. Although Russophiles could still be found all over Galicia, the Russophile camp was strongest among the Ruthenians of Western Galicia, that is, among the Lemkos. Partly this was because Przemyśl eparchy, in which the Lemkos were located, was not as thoroughly purged as the former Lviv archeparchy (later Lviv archeparchy and Stanyslaviv eparchy) in 1882 and the following years. Partly, too, this was because episcopal supervision was not as strong in Przemyśl eparchy as in Lviv and Stanyslaviv; Ioann Stupnytsky was reputed to be a relatively weak individual and, moreover, in poor health in the latter 1880s, and his replacement by the declining Iuliiian Pelesh did not improve matters. Thus, by the 1890s Przemyśl eparchy was regarded as a Russophile stronghold.⁴²² Aside from this, the region where Russophilism survived best and became the characteristic political tendency was the westernmost extension of Ruthenian settlement, where the Ruthenians constituted a small

minority among the Latin-rite Polish population. In this particularly exposed situation, it has been argued, Russophilism, as a radical ideology of self-differentiation from the Poles, encountered exceptionally favourable conditions and flourished, just as it flourished among the Ruthenians of Transcarpathia under the control of assimilationist Magyars.⁴²³

We now turn to the position of the national populists towards the Greek Catholic church in this period. Official statements, such as Romanchuk's declaration in the diet in 1890⁴²⁴ or the program of the national populists' political organization, *Narodna rada*, of 1892,⁴²⁵ stressed loyalty to Greek Catholicism. This was not, however, the whole story. The national populists were generally critical of the Greek Catholic hierarchy, but loath to alienate the rank and file of the clergy.⁴²⁶ The national populists depended on the parish priests, because "being in direct contact with the people, they can and should accomplish a great deal for our national and civic cause."⁴²⁷ In other words, the national populists counted on the priests to organize reading clubs and other national associations in the village and to campaign for national populist candidates during elections. The alliance between the national populists and lower clergy was fairly successful, at least from the national populist point of view. Father Hornytsky, however, characterized it thus: "Out of opportunism [the national populists] flirt with the clergy, a significant part of which is in solidarity with them out of national opportunism, without, unfortunately, exercising any positive influence on them in the religious-moral sphere."⁴²⁸ But this problem will be considered in more detail later on.

The national populists were well aware that the majority of the Ukrainian nation with which they identified was of the Orthodox faith.⁴²⁹ However, because the Orthodox church in Dnieper Ukraine kept apart from the Ukrainian national movement and served the Russian state as an instrument of Russification, the national populists in this period never gravitated towards Orthodoxy. (Only after the appearance of the nationally conscious Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox church did some ideological descendants of the national populists argue that the Galicians, in the name of the religious unity of the entire Ukrainian nation, should abandon Greek Catholicism for Ukrainian Orthodoxy.) What the national populists sought in this period was a relatively independent Greek Catholic church, a Ruthenian Catholic church, what is today called a "particular church." They did not want to constitute merely an Eastern rite run centrally from Rome with Polish Roman Catholics as the immediate supervisors. Their position was characterized accurately, if rather mordantly, by Father Henryk Jackowski:

The other part of Rus' wants nothing to do with schism or abandoning the union, and a traditional attachment to the Catholic faith and Holy See is alive in the depths of its soul; nonetheless, and probably for the most part without even realizing it, they strive towards the creation of something on the order of a national church. Reminiscent of the Gallicanism and Josephinism of times past and the Bismarckian Catholicism of the present, a certain part of our Ruthenians does not want indeed to break with Rome, but it would gladly free itself from its influence in everything which at the moment seems not to be entirely in accordance with the immediate interest of its own nation. According to them, there should be a certain equality between Rome and Rus', and if some sort of subordination is absolutely necessary, then Rome should rather be at the service of Rus', not Rus' at Rome's.⁴³⁰

Radicalism

In the 1890s the Greek Catholic church confronted a Ruthenian political movement that seemed to pose a far greater threat to its interests than either Russophilism or national populism. Radicalism had emerged as a political current in Galicia in the late 1870s, but with the founding of the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party in 1890, the radical current made the transition from a loose grouping of intellectuals with a few adherents in certain select villages to a dynamic popular movement with its own organizational structures, differentiated party organs, and mass following in villages almost throughout Ruthenian Galicia.⁴³¹ At least through the mid-1890s, it boasted an extremely talented leadership. The ideological father of radicalism was the exiled Ukrainian political thinker Mykhailo Drahomanov, whose great erudition, forceful logic, and political imagination set him apart as the finest intellect that nineteenth-century Ukraine produced. His death in 1895 was a catastrophe for the party. Brilliant in other ways was the erratic and eclectic Ivan Franko. He lacked Drahomanov's originality and integrated world-view, but where Drahomanov's pen pounded out his marshalled arguments, Franko's just soared, carrying the reader with it on its flight. A talented journalist in Ukrainian, Polish, and German, a versatile poet and prose writer, an accomplished scholar in several disciplines, he was a great asset to the Radical Party, so much so that his departure from the radicals in 1899 almost killed the party. The third major figure in the movement was Mykhailo Pavlyk. He lacked the intellectual

capabilities of Drahomanov or Franko, he was a prickly character without the least sense of tact, but he worked extremely hard, willingly suffered privation, persecution, and humiliation for the cause, and possessed, or rather was possessed by, a tenacious devotion to the powerful teachings of his mentor, Drahomanov. He remained true to the party until his death in 1915. The party leadership also included some colourful, charismatic characters, political showmen really, such as Viacheslav Budzynovsky (later nicknamed "*revun*," the "roarer") and Kyrylo Trylovsky (who cut an exotic figure in his Austrian hat with exaggerated brim and sweeping feathers, with his cloak and walking stick). In addition, the party could rely on some excellent activists from among the peasantry, men who could sway a crowd with the heart-felt passion of their oratory and could devastate an opponent with a funny story or a finely crafted insult.

As for doctrine, radicalism was a variant of socialism tailored specifically to the Ruthenian-Ukrainian situation. In its orthodox form, as Drahomanov conceived it and Pavlyk nurtured it, it abjured the Marxism that dominated the socialist movement elsewhere in continental Europe in the last decade of the nineteenth century, drawing more from the anarchist doctrines of mid-century (Proudhon, Bakunin). Instead of championing the interests of the industrial proletariat, which did not even exist in Galicia, it took up the cause of a social class that socialists to the west had virtually written off, namely the peasantry. Concretely, radicalism aimed at the expropriation of the large estates, which were to be replaced by collective agricultural enterprises owned and worked by the local peasant commune (*hromada*). Like the national populist movement, it was Ukrainophile in national orientation and stressed grass-roots education and organization in the villages. Unlike the national populist movement, however, it was openly and profoundly anticlerical.

There were several sources of this anticlericalism, some more serious than others. As the two most serious, I would single out the rationalist convictions characteristic of late-nineteenth-century Europe, which found a persuasive formulation in the Ukrainian idiom in the works of Drahomanov, and a rebellion against the traditional dominance in Ruthenian society and in the Ruthenian national movement of the Greek Catholic clergy. Pavlyk captured the radical sentiment exactly in a statement from the mid-1880s: "Until clericalism disappears completely from the Ruthenian movement, as happened long ago in the West of Europe, we will not move very far ahead."⁴³² Furthermore, the radicals' social doctrines could not have been expected to sit well with the conservatively disposed clergy, especially since the church had unequivocally condemned socialism

as a modern error and since the priests' and peasants' economic interests did not always, as we shall see, coincide.

But there was also a series of less important but nonetheless contributory factors connected with the personal influence of Drahomanov on the Galician movement. Drahomanov came from Dnieper Ukraine, where the Orthodox clergy was at best indifferent and sometimes hostile to the Ukrainian movement and the Ukrainian movement reciprocated in full. The ubiquitous presence of clergymen in the Ruthenian movement in Galicia was something to which Drahomanov could never reconcile himself; indeed, he seems to have had almost a physical aversion to priests. Lying beneath the surface, moreover, was a particular aversion to the Catholic, Uniate church, which, like a touch of anti-Semitism, Drahomanov could not help absorbing from his particular environment, even though consciously he rejected the Orthodox church root and branch. But it was often the case that agnostic or heterodox Ukrainians from Orthodox Dnieper Ukraine were unable to overcome prejudices against the Roman church and could not help but regard Uniatism as something monstrous; famous cases in point are the poet Taras Shevchenko and the historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky.⁴³³ Aside from these matters of attitude, there was a doctrinal disturbance that fed Drahomanov's dislike of the Greek Catholic clergy. Drahomanov had come up with the proposition that a consistent Ukrainophile had to become a socialist and that a socialist on Ukrainian territory had to become a Ukrainophile. This was because, as he argued, the Ukrainian nation consisted only of peasants; it had "neither its own clergy, nor landed nobility, nor merchant class, nor state."⁴³⁴ The Greek Catholic clergy in Galicia constituted the only notable, and – for the egalitarian Drahomanov – very irritating, exception to the plebeian constitution of the nation. In Drahomanov's view, socialists in Galicia had to fight harder against their clergy than socialists in Dnieper Ukraine, since in Galicia the clergy had "not so openly rejected Ukrainian nationality" and sometimes deceived itself and others that it defended the peasants' interests.⁴³⁵

The radicals' views on religion proper, as distinct from their views on the clergy, fluctuated. At various times they promoted out-and-out atheism, rationalist agnosticism, and even Protestantism. In fact, Drahomanov and Pavlyk in particular hoped that Stundism, a Ukrainian variant of Baptism, would spread to Galician Rus', and they popularized the sect in their writings addressed to the Galician peasantry, placing special emphasis on the Stundists' rejection of clergy and hierarchy. Drahomanov wrote several popular works on the history of Protestantism and was buried by Protestant ministers,⁴³⁶

and Pavlyk found among his teacher's posthumous papers notes about project for founding a new religion based on the principles of brotherhood and rationality.⁴³⁷ Propagating socialism, Protestantism, anticlericalism, Darwinism, and rationalism in all strata of Galician Ruthenian society, the radicals were the full-blown nightmare that the Greek Catholic clergy had thought they had glimpsed in national populism.

At least such were the views of the orthodox "old" radicals. One of the problems besetting the party from the beginning (and it was to lead to a three-way split in 1899) was a division between the "old" radicals, led by Pavlyk and Franko, and the "young" radicals, led by Budzynovsky and Father Aleksandr Bachynsky's son Iuliiian. The main issues separating the old and young were whether or not to adopt a Marxist social democratic program and whether or not to aim for the creation of an independent Ukrainian state; on both of these issues the young replied affirmatively, the old negatively. Differences between the old and young radicals, however, came to the fore as well in their respective attitudes to the church. The old radicals waged a campaign against the clergy as a whole and also had no use for the Greek Catholic church. The young radicals considered this a very short-sighted policy. As Budzynovsky later wrote, "An anti-landlord party, a democratic political party began to be transformed into a religious sect opposing priests."⁴³⁸ The young radicals argued that it was better to win over the lower clergy and only attack the hierarchy; they also felt, as did the national populists, that the rights of the Greek Catholic church were an extension of Ruthenian national rights and that the Ruthenian church had to be defended against latinization and subordination to Polish Roman Catholic interests. The divergence in views was reflected in the two groups' stands on the celibacy issue. Pavlyk thought that celibacy would hasten the process of de-clericalization in Galician Rus' and so supported it to a degree. The young radicals (and Franko) opposed it. In fact, in 1893 some of the young radicals in Vienna joined the Russophile students who insulted Metropolitan Sembratovych at the train station. Pavlyk took them to task in the party organ, *Narod*, both for engaging in a tactless joint protest with the Russophiles and for taking up an issue that radicals should leave alone. Radicals had no business defending the interests of Greek Catholic priests, he said. "After all, they [the priests] destroy our radical movement in almost every single village. Our primary goal is to liberate the people from their tutelage, which has been and is on the whole a catastrophe for it."⁴³⁹ At the 1893 Radical Party congress in Stanyslaviv, the old and young radicals reached a compromise on the party's attitude to the church: the party would con-

tinue to struggle against clericalism, but members would be free to make their own decisions in matters of tactics.⁴⁴⁰

In practice, at the village level, the views of the old radicals prevailed. The young radicals were primarily students and had little opportunity to conduct agitation in the countryside, while the old radicals had already established contacts in the villages and, moreover, controlled the party press, including the newspaper for the peasantry, *Khliborob*. The latter kept up a steady barrage of accusations against priests, who were invariably referred to by the derogatory term *popy*, instead of the neutral *sviashchennyky*.

In particular, the radicals fanned peasant resentment against the fees that priests charged for performing various sacramental rites, especially baptisms, marriages, and burials. This was an issue that had long exercised the Galician Ruthenian peasantry, and Polish opponents of the Ruthenian national movement raised it from time to time in an effort to undermine the peasantry's trust in the Ruthenian political leadership, which on the local level consisted largely of priests.⁴⁴¹ The radicals were the first Ruthenian political current to attempt to make political capital out of the peasants' grievances against sacramental fees. *Khliborob* printed numerous letters from peasants complaining about how much the priests charged. A particularly egregious case was that of Father Ioann Kozakevych, pastor of Uhniv, Rava Ruska county, who demanded an exorbitant 60 gulden for a Christian burial.⁴⁴² When a shoemaker refused to pay that much for his mother's burial, Father Kozakevych told him: "If you don't have the money, then skin your mother, make boots, sell them, and pay me." The priest also told his parishioner to spend 50 kreuzer on a rope to hang himself. The mother was buried without Christian services, and as a result, the people of Uhniv believed, "she walks," that is, her ghost haunted the community. *Khliborob* published not only an account of the case from one of Father Kozakevych's parishioners, but also an official document from the Rava Ruska captaincy that confirmed all *Khliborob*'s charges against the priest.⁴⁴³ In another village the pastor had trouble with parishioners who stopped giving the customary fees in kind for christenings. He allegedly called these parishioners pigs and gave their children Jewish names like Isaak.⁴⁴⁴ Another priest, it was said, beat a widow bloody because she would only pay 1 gulden to bury her six-year-old son.⁴⁴⁵

Aside from publicizing sensational cases of extortionate sacramental fees, the radicals reprinted and distributed in the countryside a Josephine patent that stipulated how much a priest could accept as an honorarium for various sacramental services. Although this eighteenth-century document was clearly inappropriate to the conditions

of the late nineteenth century, the radicals argued that it was still valid, since no new law had superseded it. The fees in the patent, of course, were a mere fraction of what priests were customarily charging.⁴⁴⁶ In the thoroughly radicalized village of Morozovychi, Sambir district, the mayor convoked an extraordinary meeting of the commune to discuss sacramental fees; the peasants came up with a fee schedule that they represented as a compromise between existing practice and the Josephine patent, although it was more in the spirit of the latter than the former.⁴⁴⁷

The radical agitation over sacramental fees introduced a new element of distrust into what had long been a sensitive interchange. Peasants now knew that educated Ruthenians were questioning whether priests charged fairly for their services. And perhaps more importantly, when a parishioner pleaded that he or she lacked the money to pay the full fee for a christening or burial, priests wondered whether the parishioner in question was telling the truth or had been affected by radical propaganda. Such uncertainties stood to poison relations between pastors and peasants in many villages. Sometimes priests understood that they had to tread lightly. When the long-time radical Hrytsko Fokshei died in Moskalivka, Kosiv county, Father Markiiian Shankovsky knew enough to charge only 6 gulden for the well-attended burial, although normally his fee was higher.⁴⁴⁸

There were certainly greedy priests, just as there were greedy peasants and greedy tailors, but the incidence of greed, however useful as a focal point for agitation, cannot explain why priests and peasants were enough at odds over sacramental fees for the issue to become such a successful rallying point for the radical movement. The reason for the antagonism was actually quite simple: Greek Catholic priests were underpaid and therefore dependent on the sacramental fees. Generally speaking, a pastor had three sources of income: a farm that came with the parish, a salary from the government's "religious fund" (*congruum*) that varied inversely to the size of the parish farm, and sacramental fees. Priests who had not advanced to the rank of pastor were much worse off and frequently lived in dire poverty. But even in the case of pastors, the income from the farm and salary was insufficient to make ends meet, especially when it is recalled that these priests had families to support. The only flexible portion of their income was the sacramental fees, which, however, had to be extracted directly from parishioners and within the vague limits established by custom. This was the source of antagonistic relations that long predated the appearance of radicals in the village; the tinder had been long prepared, the radicals just provided the spark.

Pavlyk clearly understood what lay at the root of the problem. In 1893 he wrote in *Khliborob*: "We have the misfortune that the matter of maintaining priests is very uncertain and involved. The state considers the priests its employees, but it does not pay them as much as other employees, because it lacks the resources to do so. Therefore priests are allowed to look after themselves as best they can, and everywhere they come to their own arrangements with people and take as much as they can wherever they can." Nonetheless, he urged his peasant readers to hold firm to the low fees of the Josephine patent: "Do not under any conditions come to an agreement with the priests, but just say, for example, 'My father died and I would like you to bury him for me and perform such and such a service; for all this you should get, according to the patent, such and such an amount.' Then lay the money on the table; and if the priest wants to charge too steep a price, then simply don't give it to him, that's all."⁴⁴⁹

The radicals also made use of other economic antagonisms between priests and peasants, such as quarrels over pasturing rights⁴⁵⁰ and wages for work on a priest's farm.⁴⁵¹ Peasants were also under the impression that priests lived too well. While they themselves worked hard from dawn to dusk and had little to show for it, priests might amuse themselves with "good beer and wine"⁴⁵² and invest in real estate in the town.⁴⁵³ In short, as one peasant put it, many priests "do nothing except eat bread for free."⁴⁵⁴ The radicals cultivated these peasant sentiments and lumped the priests together with other groups that the peasants regarded as exploiters, namely the landlords and the Jews.⁴⁵⁵

Outside the socio-economic sphere was another area of priest-peasant tension that the radicals did not fail to exploit. The Ruthenian peasantry was undergoing a major cultural transformation in the late nineteenth century that introduced disturbances into the traditional relationship between priests and their parishioners. Since the introduction of compulsory education and the proclamation of civil liberties, both in the late 1860s, peasants, especially younger male peasants, were becoming literate as well as involved in the Ruthenian national movement. As a result, a new secular knowledge and new secular ideology were supplementing, and at times supplanting, the traditional religious world-view of the peasantry. The priest's pedestal was no longer so high, especially since the cultural elevation of the peasant was also closing the distance between them. The peasant of the 1890s could not help viewing the priest differently than did the peasant of the 1840s. Emancipated from serfdom, with a smattering

of education and connected, through the newspapers, with educated gentlemen in the cities, peasants had gained a new sense of dignity that they defended tenaciously. A priest who referred to them as "cattle" would be exposed in the press.⁴⁵⁶ Priests who neglected or opposed the reading club in the village could expect the same.⁴⁵⁷ The priest's authority, in short, no longer went unquestioned.

Although the radical movement was generally hostile to the clergy, in fairness it should be mentioned that the radical press did, on rare occasions, praise the activities of individual priests. For example, a peasant correspondent wrote in *Khliborob*: "A few years ago, to our good fortune, we received as the priest (*sviashchennyk*) in Uhryniv Dolishnii and Uhryniv Horishnii H. Rybchak, a great friend of enlightenment, who with the help of the local landlord, J. Burzyński (a Pole), began to propagate enlightenment in our village and thus to destroy old, stupid, and harmful customs. After a year of hard work the aforementioned priest founded a reading club in our village with an affiliated choir."⁴⁵⁸

The radicals entered Ruthenian politics with a big splash in 1890, but the party had a very checkered development thereafter. Its uncompromising opposition to the new era and the prestige of Ivan Franko won it relatively widespread sympathy at first. The party suffered from unremitting persecution on the part of the Galician authorities, and this certainly retarded its development, but internal problems also contributed. The young radicals were probably right that the overemphasis on anticlericalism lost the party support. Even Pavlyk had to admit in a private letter to Drahomanov that anti-religious agitation among the peasantry was backfiring. After distributing some of Drahomanov's brochures on religion among the peasants of Lviv county, Pavlyk noted that "the priests attack us more vehemently, and the peasants themselves, after reading [our literature], abandon us, to such an extent that they will not even come to sing-alongs."⁴⁵⁹ In its first year of existence, 1890, the radical organ *Narod* had 251 subscribers, including forty priests, but with every year that passed, the number of subscribers declined: 1891 - 193, 1892 - 168, 1893 - 136, 1894 - 93, and 1895 - 78.⁴⁶⁰ Moreover, the fissures in the party between the young and old radicals ran deep and almost led to the dissolution of the party in 1899, when the young radicals on the left broke off to form the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party and the young radicals on the right, together with Franko, broke off to form the Ukrainian National Democratic Party. With Drahomanov dead and Franko and the young intelligentsia gone, Pavlyk was left as captain of the sinking radical ship. The party would revive by the

mid-1900s, but it was to remain thereafter a minority party in Ruthenian politics, with the National Democrats occupying centre stage.

Ironically, however, although radicalism never realized the political potential it seemed to possess in 1890 and although too strident an anticlericalism played a role in this failure, a more urbane variant of the radicals' anticlericalism seeped into educated Ukrainian society from the turn of the century until the First World War. The leadership of all three major Ukrainian political parties – the National Democrats, the Social Democrats, and the remaining radicals – had emerged from the Radical Party and passed through the radicals' school of anticlericalism. Only the National Democrats constituted a partial exception, since most of the former national populists also entered the party. The receptivity to anticlericalism among the *fin-de-siècle* Ruthenian intelligentsia was probably also in part a reaction to the interventions in Ruthenian church life after 1882 and the growing conviction that the Greek Catholic church had come under foreign control.

Although some priests feared that the Radical Party found "more sympathy than all other Ruthenian parties among the masses of the people,"⁴⁶¹ this was not the case. Radicalism tended to flourish mainly in those peasant communities where the relationship between priests and peasants was bad to begin with. A priest who charged extortionate fees might well create a breeding ground for radicalism, but discontent over the very same or a related issue could also lead Ruthenian peasant communities to other forms of mass protest, such as transfer to the Latin rite⁴⁶² (or, in the early twentieth century, conversion to Orthodoxy). In the twentieth century, radicalism, like Russophilism, took on a regional colouration, with its stronghold in the Carpathian foothills around Kolomyia and Kosiv and pockets of support elsewhere (e.g., around Sokal).

Even though the radicals' success proved in the end to be modest, they were the source of great consternation for the Greek Catholic church. Exceptionally, individual priests might sympathize with the radicals, because they agreed with their social program or had close friends in the movement. The mass of the clergy, however, felt towards the radicals as the radicals did towards them. The hierarchy, of course, prohibited the clergy and faithful from reading radical publications.⁴⁶³ Pastors preached against the radicals in church, often using strong language,⁴⁶⁴ or otherwise fought against the movement.⁴⁶⁵ The most successful campaign against radical influences, however, was that waged by the reformed Basilians. In 1897 they began publishing a popular religious periodical called *Misionar'*, which skilfully reinforced the religious sentiment of the peasantry

and combatted radical influences.⁴⁶⁶ But this was part of a larger initiative that we shall return to shortly.

Pastoral Activity and the National Movement

The Greek Catholic clergy in the late nineteenth century found themselves in a ticklish situation. On the one hand, their service mentality and long-standing commitment to the Ruthenian national movement motivated them to take an active role in the propagation of the national movement in parishes, specifically by organizing reading clubs and other voluntary associations. On the other hand, however, the progress of the national movement in a priest's village and sometimes in the very institutions that he himself established could generate dissension between the priest and his parishioners and could influence the villagers in ways that were clearly at odds with the interests of the Greek Catholic church. Service to both the nation and the church was becoming complicated.

The Greek Catholic clergy had imbibed a very Josephine conception of pastoral activity. Although the ideal was not always maintained in practice, Ruthenian priests did not see their role as limited to preaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments; they felt instead that they owed the community in which they were stationed a much more rounded form of service. Many priests instructed their parishioners in agricultural techniques,⁴⁶⁷ and it will be recalled that Father Naumovych administered homeopathic treatments and fostered bee-keeping. On this level of pastoral activity, the priest's wife was often a great help. She might set herself up as an amateur apothecary and visit the sick,⁴⁶⁸ or she might organize a church sorority or women's club where she taught better ways to sew and cook.⁴⁶⁹ The priest thus saw himself as an all-round elevating force in the village, and it was only a natural extension of this self-image to see himself also as an activist of the national movement, especially since the organizations associated with the movement were so patently beneficial to his parishioners: reading clubs encouraged literacy, cooperatives encouraged thrift and saved the peasants from unnecessary exploitation, insurance companies and volunteer fire departments protected the peasants' property, gymnastic clubs built a strong body, and so forth. Thus, the clergy would have been attracted to the national movement for pastoral reasons even if they had had no connection to it otherwise. But this, of course, was not the case, since the clergy had

led the national awakening in the first place, had assumed political leadership of the movement in 1848 and the early 1860s, and had continued to associate themselves with it thereafter when (literally) their sons and daughters had taken over.

Furthermore, the secular leadership of the national movement, whether Russophile or national populist, depended on the clergy from the late 1860s on to act as agents of the movement in the countryside. Social pressure was exercised to keep the priests active. "Good" priests were patriots and activists, "bad" priests were apathetic or disinclined to take part in the organic work of nation building. Both the Russophiles and the national populists were as ready as the radicals to castigate in their press a parish priest who did the wrong thing, who, for example, supported the metropolitan's candidate during the 1885 elections, made war on the reading club, became cozy with the Polish authorities, or simply stood apart from the political struggle. Priest-activists, on the contrary, were praised in the papers and honoured by their fellows as well as by the secular intelligentsia.

National activism also, however, had its drawbacks for the clergy. For one thing, the social pressure brought to bear on priests to be active in the movement could be uncomfortably hard and criticism of slackers could be quite sharp and broad. For example, a peasant speaking at a mass assembly (*viche*) in Zhovkva in 1893 declared:

We see that the reading clubs are being poorly managed, and I ask: Why? Who is to blame? Are the authorities prohibiting them? No! It is the fault of the priests who do not go along with the peasants and do not care about reading clubs. There are priests who are national populists and "hard" patriots [i.e., Russophiles], but the greater part is opposed to enlightenment. And look, today [at the assembly] there are hundreds of peasants, but perhaps only fifteen priests. Where are they? The priest lives by peasant bread alone and does not much care about the peasant, while, on the contrary, lawyers and doctors live by landlords' and Jews' bread too and are more concerned [than priests] with peasants. At elections, at primaries, do as you wish [say the priests, i.e., they do not take an active part in the electoral process]. For such work the priests cannot enjoy our trust.⁴⁷⁰

Thus, the assumption that priests had to work for the national cause meant that they continually faced scrutiny and evaluation on the part of national leaders in the city and local leaders in their parish. On the local level, a priest's failure to give what the peasant activists considered sufficient support to a reading club could result in very strained relations in the community. The reading club members by no means had to be associated with the Radical Party for this

to happen, as the experience of national populist reading clubs in the mid-1880s and 1900s amply demonstrates.⁴⁷¹

Dissension in the village could also result if the priest belonged to one political orientation and the reading club activists to another. In Vysloboky, Lviv county, the pastor was a Russophile, but the peasants wanted to open a reading club affiliated with the national populist Prosvita Society. The pastor "called the peasants radicals, atheists, and unbelievers and threatened that he would preach against the reading club in church and that he would expel reading club members from the church committee."⁴⁷² Antagonism very similar in character could also emerge, as it did occasionally in the Lemko region, if the pastor was a national populist and the reading club activists wanted to affiliate their organization with the Russophile Kachkovsky Society. And priests of differing orientations in neighbouring parishes could be at loggerheads and draw the parishioners of their rival into the fray. In short, given the cleavages in the Ruthenian national movement, entrance into national politics did not always foster harmony.

Then, of course, there was the whole issue of the difference between the aims of the church and the aims of the nation; as all of Europe was aware, what might be harmful from the perspective of the Christian religion might be considered beneficial from the perspective of national politics. Since the Ruthenian national movement in both redactions contained certain anti-Catholic tendencies, a number of more conservative churchmen in the 1880s and 1890s were issuing warnings against the dangers of national politics. *Ruskii Sion* in 1883 published an article by a Polish priest admonishing his Ruthenian counterparts to shun excessive nationalism: "Although love of the fatherland is a true virtue, which both natural and divine law commend, yet an exaggerated spirit of nationality or patriotism is one of the most dangerous enemies of the Catholic church in general, and particularly the enemy of the holy union."⁴⁷³ Father Hornytsky wrote that "narrow national patriotism chains the Ruthenian clergy to the anti-Catholic and anticlerical banners of both Ruthenian cliques."⁴⁷⁴ In 1896 Metropolitan Sylvestr Sembratovych made a clumsily worded but nonetheless clear statement on the same topic: "Do we not see today the religious devastation wrought by evil people who consider purely human things, such as their patriotism, and, moreover, often a false patriotism, and not God and salvation to be the aim and goal of glory, who place *nationality* as the ideal of all the people's happiness?"⁴⁷⁵

The tension between national activism and a priestly vocation was resolved in various ways by individual priests. Some just threw them-

selves into national work, regardless of any negative religious consequences. One priest, reflecting in his memoirs on his own behaviour at the turn of the century, wrote: "I openly admit here and sincerely confess before all that my religious education of the people was not an end in itself, but only a means to attain national-political, educational, and economic ends. In this matter I, against my best will and noblest intention, sinned grievously."⁴⁷⁶ Some went to the opposite extreme and withdrew from national work altogether. Their point of view was best expressed in this period by the bishop of Przemyśl, Iulian Sas-Kuilovsky. In a letter to the clergy of his eparchy, he pointed out that the clergy worked energetically for the national cause, but that they had not demonstrated sufficient prudence in reconciling secular matters with divine. "Instead of confirming in the people the teaching of the Holy Gospel and the holy church, they have established reading clubs, which bring more spiritual harm than benefit; instead of national love they have awakened in our peasant self-love and arrogance."⁴⁷⁷

Between these extremes was a conception, worked out in the 1890s at the Lviv provincial synod⁴⁷⁸ and in articles in the clerical press,⁴⁷⁹ that priests should take an interest in reading clubs and exercise a supervisory and moderating influence in them, discouraging subscriptions to radical, materialist, and pro-Orthodox periodicals and encouraging the members to read morally uplifting literature, particularly the lives of the saints.

The most far-reaching response to the national movement from a Christian perspective was that of the reformed Basilian order. What the order did was to borrow and improve upon the methods of the national movement in order to initiate a religious revival among the spiritually endangered Ruthenian peasantry. In 1897 the reformed Basilians began to publish their own popular monthly, *Misionar'*, written in extremely simple language. They sold it for a pittance – 2 kreuzer an issue plus the cost of postage (thus encouraging group subscriptions). Each issue explained basic truths of the faith and recounted the lives of the saints in an accessible and interesting way. The editors were not even above playing on the peasants' superstitious proclivities, regaling them with tales of how God struck down with lightning this one for uttering a curse and that one for working on a Sunday.⁴⁸⁰ *Misionar'* developed an unusually devoted readership; some peasant readers ordered dozens of copies and hawked them among the peasants of neighbouring villages.⁴⁸¹ In its first year of publication, the periodical received over a thousand letters from readers.⁴⁸² It had a print run that dwarfed all other popular newspapers in Ruthenian Galicia. It first came out in 10,000 copies,⁴⁸³ but

within three months it began appearing in 15,000 copies.⁴⁸⁴ By comparison, the national populist *Bat'kivshchyna* came out in 855–1,500 copies in 1885⁴⁸⁵ and the radical *Khliborob* came out in 1,000 copies in 1895.⁴⁸⁶ In addition to *Misionar'*, the Basilians published numerous religious booklets in an attractive format for the peasantry.

Just as the various Ruthenian parties organized mass peasant assemblies (*vicha*), the Basilians organized missions that drew between ten and fifteen thousand peasant participants.⁴⁸⁷ For comparison, radical *vicha* in the same period might draw five hundred to a thousand peasants.⁴⁸⁸

Although the main emphasis of the Basilians' popular movement was on religion, certain issues from the Ruthenian national movement were also introduced. For example, the Basilians supported the boycott of Jewish stores and taverns that all the Ruthenian political parties urged;⁴⁸⁹ in their anti-Jewish agitation, however, the Basilians exhibited more religious prejudice than the parties, which instead emphasized national and economic antagonism to the Jews.

In their efforts to win over the peasantry, the Basilians made use of and promoted expressions of popular piety that had proven a success in Western Europe – for example, emotive devotion to the Sweetest Heart of Jesus. Critics of the Basilian order have charged it with latinizing the Greek Catholic church. While the charge is by no means without basis, it should not be forgotten that one of the reasons the Basilians promoted Latin-rite cults was that they found in them ready and effective instruments for the revival of the peasantry's religious sentiment. Such instruments were not at hand in the pure tradition of the Ruthenian church, since it was only now confronting the mass secularization that West European Catholicism had experienced much earlier. The Basilians, like many other Greek Catholic priests of the late nineteenth century, considered the church in the countryside imperilled; they used whatever means they could to save it, including Latin-rite means, about which, to be sure, they almost alone in the Ruthenian church had few reservations.

CONCLUSIONS

During the decade I was working on this book, the study of nationalism underwent a significant paradigm shift. The traditional view was that historically formed ethnic groups passed through an almost natural process of transformation into nationhood.¹ The essential work of national differentiation and definition had been, it was assumed, done by history, and the national intelligentsias breathed life and consciousness into history's creations. National characteristics were givens, and the intelligentsias endowed them with political salience and raised their cultural prestige. The intelligentsia served as midwife at the birth of the higher entity, the nation, but it was not actually the mother, who remained History herself. The intelligentsia's role was not insignificant under the traditional paradigm, but it was nothing like the role ascribed to it by the new literature of the 1980s.

In the new literature, represented by authors such as Ernest Gellner and E.J. Hobsbawm, nationality is understood as a cultural construction, an artifact, which the intelligentsia itself produced. The national characteristics were not given, but were fashioned consciously. The new approach is agency centred and, by contrast to the traditional view, posits a large sphere for the exercise of free will in the construction of nationality. While in the traditional view the national grammarians merely codified the pre-existing languages, in the new view the national grammarians are seen as carefully selecting dialectical and historical elements to forge what are in essence new languages. Of course, the new view probably bends the stick too far in the other direction, but it has so far had a most fruitful influence on the study of East Central European nationalism.

The new view seems to have particular relevance for the case of the Greek Catholics in Galicia (and vice-versa, I should think), for here is a stunningly transparent instance of how much agency and choice can be involved in the construction of nationality. As we have seen, two alternative, crisply distinct constructions of nationality existed for exactly the same population: the pan-Russian and pan-Ukrainian.

The proponents of each construction had their own approach to one of the most important of East Central Europe's national characteristics

– religion. The Russophiles were engaged in a project of reconstruction. They emphasized, right from the beginning (Naumovych's "Glimpse into the Future" of 1866), the ideal of the religious unity of all of Greater Rus'. This ideal did not conform to the inherited reality of mid-century Greek Catholicism, so they sought to refashion their religion to make it approximate more closely to their ideal. This took manifold forms along a spectrum that included wearing beards and kolpaks, "purifying" church rituals, and even repudiating the jurisdiction of the Apostolic See.

The Ukrainophiles, on the other hand, downplayed the importance of the religious characteristic, and not just because they were more tinged with the spirit of nineteenth-century liberalism and positivism. As the Russophiles, they were aware that there was quite a difference between the real-existing Galician Greek Catholicism and the Orthodoxy that was dominant in the central Ukrainian lands. Unlike the Russophiles, however, they assessed the influence of the Russian Orthodox church negatively, not because it was Orthodox, but because it was Russian. Characteristically, in the late twentieth century some of the historical descendants of the Ukrainophiles in Galicia would gravitate towards Orthodoxy in the name of pan-Ukrainian religious unity, but only after a specifically Ukrainian Orthodoxy had come into existence. In the political context of the nineteenth century, however, the Ukrainophiles preferred to keep some distance from religious questions, since religion formally divided rather than united the national community. While the Russophile religious program had many aspects, the Ukrainophile program really had only one plank: independence for the Greek Catholic church, independence from either Polish or Russian domination, similar to the national (not necessarily state) independence that they also championed.

Although not directly under the lens in this book, there was also, clearly, a third approach to the religious characteristic: that of the Polonophile Uniates of Chełm eparchy. They had modified Uniatism to bring it into close conformity with Polish Roman Catholicism. They held views almost exactly contrary to those of the Galician Russophiles, but they shared with them a reconstructive project, fashioning their religion to conform to a national religious ideal.

How these reconstructive projects worked out in reality demonstrates some of the qualifications that must be introduced into an agency-centred interpretation. It is true that the Galician Russophiles and Chełm Polonophiles could imagine and make progress towards realizing a revised version of their religion, but whether they could succeed or not depended on circumstances beyond the control of the

agents themselves. In both of our cases, the existing state set limits to and ultimately undermined the program of revision: the Russian state forcibly imposed ritual conformity on the Chełm Uniates and ultimately suspended the union altogether, while the Austrian state (and the papacy) thwarted and largely succeeded in destroying the work of the Russian-leaning revisionists in Galicia.

The interference of Vienna and Rome in the religious affairs of Lviv and Przemyśl had an impact that far transcended the purely ecclesiastical realm; it also had an influence on the resolution of the question of national identity in Galician Ruthenia, undermining the Russophile construction and by default contributing to the consolidation of its Ukrainophile competitor. It is impossible, within a study devoted specifically to the religion-nationality relationship, to say how decisive the role of this particular relationship was in the overall determination of national identity in Galicia; obviously, many other contributing factors would have to be brought into consideration and the various parts they played sorted out and analysed. Nonetheless, it should be clear that the purge of the Russophiles within the church substantially weakened their position in both society as a whole and in the national movement in particular.

So far these concluding remarks have looked at the nationality side of the religion-nationality relationship. It is also necessary to say a few words about the other side.

The papacy in the late nineteenth century was extremely uncomfortable with nationalism, partly as a result of its particular experience with Italian nationalism and partly because it understood nationalism to be an ideology that competed with religion, that displaced the Catholic, Christian perspective with an alien one. The papacy's experience with Ruthenian nationalism could only reinforce its fundamental distrust. The same desire for national unity that led to the loss of the papal states in the Italian case threatened to result in the loss of Catholicism's largest Eastern-rite population in the Galician case. Ruthenian nationalism could and did lead to religious indifferentism and even apostasy. The Vatican, it seems, was never close enough to the situation in Galicia to appreciate that there was also subtler evidence for its own perspective, such as the high degree to which work on behalf of the national movement absorbed the pastoral energies of the Greek Catholic clergy. However, although Rome never formulated it quite this way, it had a basic understanding that nationalism challenged the heritage of the Greek Catholic church at the same time that it drew strength from the church as an institution.

There were some Greek Catholic churchmen who shared or nearly shared this perspective: the *Sion* group, Metropolitan Sylvestr Sembratovych, and, above all, the reformed Basilian order. They formed a minority within a church whose rank-and-file clergymen and laymen overwhelmingly tended to give the national cause precedence over certain traditional principles of their faith. Even this minority, however, found itself unable to reject totally the claims of nationality. From the local perspective they saw things that were perhaps not so clearly visible from Rome, and they differed with Rome in their assessment of certain matters. It was not just that they were tied by social and kinship bonds to other Ruthenians and so induced to make concessions; their somewhat different assessment of the challenge of nationality was rooted in their lived experience and was not only entirely consistent with, but flowed from, the mission and principles of their church. These differences and their motivations would become clearer in the succeeding epoch, that of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky, but they can be discerned already in the period with which this book has dealt. We might distinguish three complexes of these differences and their motivations.

First, there was the issue of the authority of the Greek Catholic church in Ruthenian society. In order for the church to exercise moral and spiritual leadership it had to retain its legitimacy, its authority. If the church, or the church's hierarchy, were to be viewed as indifferent and even hostile to the national aspirations of the Ruthenians and, in particular, if it were to be viewed as favouring the Poles in the Polish-Ruthenian conflict, it would be deprived of all influence on Galician Ruthenian public opinion. It would then be unable to fulfil one of its basic tasks, and the forces which it decried in its isolation would gain greater and greater strength. The Greek Catholic church did indeed approach such a state of impotency in the aftermath of 1882. The man who stood at the helm of the church in that critical period, Sylvestr Sembratovych, seems to have understood the problem well, even if he was not so adroit at resolving it. Clearly, he felt the authority slipping from his grasp and sought ways to regain it. I am sure, for example, that he did not care one way or another about the form of the cross, that the cross had an entirely different meaning for him than it did for those who glorified the three-barred cross in verse or who mutilated it. Yet he took pains to champion the Ruthenian national side on this ultimately quite peripheral issue. He also staunchly and bravely opposed the appointment of Father Luka Bobrovych, the Chełm emigrant who edited the newspaper *Rus'*, to an important Lviv parish. He did not want to see the church's authority eroded even further because of the rise to prominence of a Polonophile priest who had

earned the enmity of Galician Ruthenia. Similarly, ailing and seeking a successor, he cautioned against the appointment of Andrei Sheptytsky as his auxiliary. The church could not afford to court further unpopularity. Rome (and Vienna) understood this strategy, too, as shown, for example, by the search for non-Polish Jesuits to conduct the Basilian reform. But for Rome the problem simply did not loom so large as it did for the metropolitan of Halych.

Secondly, there was the recognition that although nationalism posed a challenge to Christianity, certain aspects of it could be viewed as providential. National activity need not always detract from pastoral work; it could at times enhance that work. A case in point is the sobriety campaign initiated by Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych; here the church's and the national movement's aims were in genuine agreement, and as a result, the campaign enjoyed considerable success. Similarly, it was not necessary to condemn the national enlightenment movement, with its reading clubs, root and branch. As the Basilians and the hierarch who emerged from their midst, Andrei Sheptytsky, well understood, the reading club could be an important conduit for Christian education. The point was to make sure that the reading material in the clubs was appropriate (*Misionar'*, pastoral letters). The larger point was to make distinctions among the various activities and phenomena of the national movement, to decide which served and which undermined the church's mission. Those who worked within the Galician church made these distinctions; from the distance of Rome, however, they became blurred.

Finally, there is the matter of justice. The national aspirations of the Ruthenians in the nineteenth century were essentially aspirations to equality. Moral, principled men who occupied responsible positions in the Greek Catholic church could be indifferent neither to the social and political disadvantages of the population entrusted to their care nor to the movement that sought to eliminate them. This was very clear in the early twentieth century in the case of Andrei Sheptytsky, who often explicitly defended his support of certain national aims on the grounds that they were just. But a similar sense of and commitment to justice motivated some of his predecessors on the metropolitan throne. I think particularly of the agony of Iosyf Sembratovych as he was being forced to resign. He did not cling to office for personal reasons; he resisted the resignation because it would give credence to what he considered the unjust slander of his clergy and faithful. He saw that his people were helpless, with no defenders in Rome and Vienna; the Polish Jesuits and the Polish lieutenant of Galicia had influence, the Ruthenians had none. It simply was not right, so he stood his ground as long as it was possible.

This page intentionally left blank

APPENDIX

Chronology, December 1881 to November 1882

December 13–26	Hnylychky declarations signed and submitted to civil and religious authorities
December 25	Klymentii Sarnytsky and Henryk Jackowski write to the pope proposing that Jesuits reform the Basilian order
January 6	Alarming letter from Jackowski to nuncio in Vienna regarding the Hnylychky incident, the unreliability of the consistorial commission, and Orthodox corrosion in general
January 10–11	Consistorial commission in Hnylychky
mid-January	Searches of Russophiles begin
February	Arrests of Russophiles begin
mid-February	Vatican considering removal of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych
end of February	Jackowski travels to Rome to discuss Basilian reform
March 16–17	Special Vatican commission examines proposal for Basilian reform
April 27	Metropolitan's currenda against slanderous Polish press
April 29	Meeting of bishops convened by lieutenant to discuss Basilian reform
May 12	"Singulare praesidium"
May 20	Charges laid against the eleven defendants in the trial of Russophiles
May 20	<i>Slovo</i> and <i>Dilo</i> react to "Singulare praesidium," denouncing Jesuit-directed reform of the Basilian order
May 23	Protest of forty Basilian monks against the reform
June 2	Sembratovych's pastoral letter praising the Greek Catholic clergy
June 6	Simeoni's letter to Sembratovych about the Basilian reform
June 6	Sembratovych's response to the protest of the forty Basilian monks
June 12	Trial of Russophiles opens

June 13	First memorandum of Potocki to minister of religion and education, urging removal of Sembratovych
June 15	Dobromyl monastery formally transferred to Jesuit control
late June	Potocki in Vienna discussing resignation of Sembratovych with nuncio and Austrian ministers
June 28	Sembratovych summoned to Rome
June 29	Second memorandum of Potocki to minister of religion and education, urging removal of Sembratovych
June 30	Second memorandum made available to nuncio
July 15	Sembratovych arrives in Rome
July 23 or 24	Sembratovych's first audience with Leo XIII
July 29	Trial of Russophiles closes
late July	Father Ioann Naumovych suspended
August 16	Sembratovych's pastoral letter in support of the Basilian reform
late August	Sembratovych promises pope he will resign
August 30	Sembratovych arrives in Vienna
August 31	Sembratovych has audience with emperor
September 4	Sembratovych submits promise to resign to emperor
September 5	Sembratovych's letter of resignation to the pope
October 21	Resignations of Mykhail Malynovsky and Ioann Zhukovsky
November 3	Naumovych suspended <i>ab officio et beneficio</i> and excommunicated
November 11	Sylvestr Sembratovych named apostolic administrator of Lviv archeparchy

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

- 1 In particular: Himka, "The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Building," "The Greek Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Nation," "Stratificazione sociale," and "The Construction of Nationality."
- 2 This nomenclature was proposed to the empress by a synod, held in Vienna in 1773, of all the Eastern-rite Catholic bishops of (historical) Hungary. Baran, *Iepyskop Andrei Bachyns'kyi*, 24–5.
- 3 On the problem of determining when Przemyśl eparchy was founded (some ascribe its origins to the late ninth century), see Senyk, *A History*, 139–42.
- 4 Petrushevych, "Iosyf Shumlianskii."
- 5 For a fuller account of this reform and its significance, see Himka, "The Conflict between the Secular and the Religious Clergy."
- 6 For particulars, see Stasiw, *Metropolia Haliciensis*.
- 7 *Schematismus universi venerabilis cleri dioeceseos gr.-cath. Premisliensis pro anno Domini 1900; Shematyzm vsechestnoho klyra mytropol. arkhidiitsezii hreko-katolycheskoi L'vivskoi na rik 1900; Shematyzm vseho klyra hreko-katolycheskoi eparkhii Stanyslavivskoi na rik bozhii 1900.*
- 8 Bociurkiw, *The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church*.
- 9 For an overview of the history of the usage of the term, see *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, s.v. "Ruthenians" by John-Paul Himka.
- 10 Himka, *Galician Villagers*.
- 11 The best historical survey of Russophilism remains Andrusiak, *Narysy z istorii halyts'koho moskvofil'stva*, but it is not satisfactory. I have dealt with the Russophile orientation at some length in "The Construction of Nationality."
- 12 *Rocznik Statystyki Galicyi 1889–91*, 1–2.
- 13 More information on the administrative divisions of Galicia, local government, and other technical matters can be found in Himka, *Galicia and Bukovina*.
- 14 I have written on the Greek Catholic church during the periods outside the 1867–1900 framework in "The Conflict between the Secular and the Religious Clergy"; "The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Building";

- “The Greek Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Nation”; “German Culture and the National Awakening in Western Ukraine”; “Sheptyts’kyi and the Ukrainian National Movement before 1914,” in Magocsi, ed., *Morality and Reality*, 29–46; and “Metropolita Szeptycki wobec zagadnień reformy wyborczej, 1905–1914,” in Zięba, *Metropolita Andrzej Szeptycki*, 143–53.
- 15 On Malynovsky’s work in church history, see Himka, “‘Apolohiia’ Mykhaila Malynovs’koho,” 368–9.
- 16 On Pelesh’s merits as a historian, see Nazarko, “Iepyskop Iu. Pelesh.”
- 17 In Rudnytsky, *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*, 315–52; and Markovits and Sysyn, eds, *Nationbuilding*, 23–67.
- 18 Fink, *Das Vatikanische Archiv*.
- 19 Letter from the director, Hofrat Dr Berthold Waldstein-Wartenberg, to author, 6 May 1986.
- 20 Neck, “The Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv”; Bittner et al., *Gesamtinventar des Wiener Haus-, Hof und Staatsarchivs*.
- 21 Stropp, “Die Akten des k.u.k. Ministeriums des Äussern 1848–1918.”
- 22 Dashkevych, “Materialy I.O. Levyts’koho iak dzherelo dlia biohrafich-noho slovnyka.”

PART I

- 1 Ioan Naumovych [Odyn imenem mnohykh], “Ot L’vova. (Pohliad v buduchnost’),” *Slovo* 6, no. 59 (27 July [8 August] 1866): 1–2.
- 2 Didytskii, *Svoiezhyt’evyi zapysky*, 1:6–7.
- 3 On the ritual movement of the early 1860s, see Hordyns’kyi, *Do istorii kul’turnoho i politychnoho zhytia*, 63–89; and Glinka, *Gregorio Jachymovyč*, 193–214, 337–8. For a biography and political portrait of Terletsy, see Ivan L. Rudnytsky, “Hipolit Vladimir Terlecki,” in Rudnytsky, *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*, 143–72.
- 4 Naumovych’s emphasis.
- 5 This prudence struck some contemporaries from the rival national populist camp as nothing less than hypocrisy. Referring to a Russophile declaration in the Galician diet (c. 1869–70) that the Ruthenians constituted a nation separate from both the Poles and the Russians, a leading national populist wrote in his memoirs: “Ot i kharakter vam! Na ulytsi inakshe, v sudi inakshe, v Iuri inakshe v Vydili kraievim inakshe, inakshe v soimi, inakshe pered ministrom, inakshe v dushi, inakshe na slovakh!
 “A shcho skazaty pro hipokryzyiu! Na soborchyku dekanal’nim – adin narod; a u koliatora na pokoiakh – porządkiewicz non plus ultra! Ne moskvityzmu, pravoslaviia, ale i rodu svoho ruskoho vypre sia!”
 Vakhnianyn, *Prychynky do istoriji ruskoi spravy*, 97–8.

- 6 Hordyns'kyi, *Do istorii kul'turnoho i politychnoho zhytia*, 72 n. 3.
- 7 There is a vast, sharply divided literature on St Iosafat. The Catholic view is perhaps best represented by Solovii and Velykyi, *Sviatyi Iosafat Kuntsevych*, and the Orthodox by Kudryk, *Zhyttia Iosafata Kuntsevycha*. For a more balanced insight into the man and his spiritual life, I recommend Senyk, "The Sources of the Spirituality of St Josaphat Kuncevyč."
- 8 "Italiia," *Slovo* 4, no. 95 (28 November [10 December] 1864): 375–6; "Iz L'vova. (Kanonyzatsiia blazh. Iosafata Kuntsevycha – i ks. Mykhail Dombrovskii)," *Slovo* 5, no. 35 (5 [17] May 1865): 2–3.
- 9 "Iz L'vova. (Arkhiep. Iosafat Kuntsevych – i vel. Kantsler Lev Sapiha v h. 1622)," *Slovo* 5, no. 36 (8 [20] May 1865): 2–3.
- 10 "Iz L'vova. (Stat'ia Peterburhskoho zhurnala o bl. Iosafati Kuntsevychu)," *Slovo* 5, no. 41 (26 May [7 June] 1865): 3.
- 11 At this point, I am abstracting from one exception, an article entitled "Unyia" that appeared in the national populist organ *Rus'* in June 1867. It will be discussed in another context below, in the section on "The National Populists and the Church."
- 12 "Iz L'vova. (Holos Videnskykh tsentralov o rymskykh kanonyzatsiakh)," *Slovo* 7, no. 54 (12 [24] July 1867): 2–3.
- 13 "Iz L'vovskoi eparkhii. (Obholoshen'e kanonyzatsii bl. Iosafata sered pechal'noho sostoianiiia halytskoi Rusy)," *Slovo* 8, no. 48 (19 June [1 July] 1868): 3.
- 14 "Honeniia pravoslavnoi Rusi za vremen Iosafata Kuntsevycha," *Halychanyn* 2, no. 15 (12 June 1868): 233–40, no. 16 (19 June 1868): 245–56, no. 17 (3 July 1868): 267–72.
- 15 [Bohdan A. Didytskii,] "Narodnaia istoriia Rusi," *Halychanyn* 2, no. 17 (3 July 1868): 264–6. Ivan Em. Levyts'kyi, in his detailed bibliography, lists another work on Iosafat that appeared in 1868, but which I have been unable to consult: *Zhyzneopysaniie Iosafata Kuntsevycha, arkhiepyskopa polotskoho, sochynenio na osnovanii avtentychnykh aktov polotskoi dukhovnoi konsystorii i biohrafichnoho sochyneniia uniatskoho monakha o. Kul'chynskoho* (Lviv: Iz pechatni Instytutu Stavropyhiiskoho, 1868). Judging by the title (no "St" before Iosafat's name, the protest of authenticity, the reference to the "Uniate monk"), this twenty-four-page booklet is consistent in spirit with the other literature on Iosafat that appeared in Ruthenian Galicia in 1868. The papal nuncio in Vienna was aware of the Russophile press's degradation of St Iosafat in 1868 and reported on this to the Vatican secretary of state. Falcinelli to Antonelli, 2 October 1868, ASV, ANV, 481, 179.
- 16 Solovii and Velykyi, *Sviatyi Iosafat Kuntsevych*, 386–9.
- 17 Kachala, *Korotka istoriia Rusi*, 78–9. This work was an abridged translation of his Polish-language work *Polityka Polaków względem Rusi* of 1879. Kudryk, *Zhyttia Iosafata Kuntsevycha*, 110–12, cites similar passages from the earlier, Polish version.

- 18 Solovii and Velykyi, *Sviatyi Iosafat Kuntsevych*, 361; Pavlyk, "Pochytannia sv. Iosafata," 101.
- 19 Solovii and Velykyi, *Sviatyi Iosafat Kuntsevych*, 385.
- 20 "Iz L'vova. (Stat'ia Peterburhskoho zhurnalna o bl. Iosafati Kuntsevychu)," *Slovo* 5, no. 41 (26 May [7 June] 1865): 3.
- 21 *S. Josaphat hieromartyr*, 268–73.
- 22 He was unable to get along with the other postulator, Father Nicola Contieri of Grottaferrata. (Partenii Pavlyk, "Pochytannia sv. Iosafata," 116.) Also, in his fundraising appeals, Father Dombrovsky publicly berated both Polish society and the Galician episcopate for not donating enough to the canonization cause. This upset the Galician bishops enough that the Latin-rite archbishop of Lviv protested to the nuncio in Vienna (15 May 1865). (ASV, ANV, 480, 269.)
- 23 "Iz L'vova. (Kanonyzatsiia blazh. Iosafata Kuntsevycha – i ks. Mykhail Dombrovskii)," *Slovo* 5, no. 35 (5 [17] May 1865): 2–3.
- 24 Solovii and Velykyi, *Sviatyi Iosafat Kuntsevych*, 362–3.
- 25 Glinka, *Diocesi ucraïno-cattolica di Cholm*, 56.
- 26 Hordyns'kyi, *Do istorii kul'turnoho i politychnoho zhytia*, 105–16.
- 27 [Petrov,] *Kholmskaia Rus'*, 190.
- 28 Glinka, *Diocesi ucraïno-cattolica di Cholm*, 50, 52.
- 29 Hordyns'kyi, *Do istorii kul'turnoho i politychnoho zhytia*, 128–9.
- 30 For a detailed account, see his obituary: "Mykhail Kuzemskii," *Slovo* 19, no. 128–9 (29 November [11 December] 1879): 1.
- 31 Sylvestr Sembratovych to Vienna nuncio Mariano Falcinelli-Antoniacci, 21 May 1871, in Glinka, *Diocesi ucraïno-cattolica di Cholm*, 155.
- 32 ASV, ANV, 433, 568–71; 481, 83–5; Glinka, *Diocesi ucraïno-cattolica di Cholm*, 62.
- 33 Glinka, *Diocesi ucraïno-cattolica di Cholm*, 105.
- 34 Likowski, *Dzieje Kościoła Unickiego*, 2:187.
- 35 TSDIAL, 201/4/3277, 2–3.
- 36 TSDIAL, 201/4/3277, 4–9.
- 37 See Pius IX to Kuzemsky, 19 June 1871, and Kuzemsky's response of 8 September 1871, in Glinka, *Diocesi ucraïno-cattolica di Cholm*, 159, 162–3.
- 38 See the exchange of letters between Falcinelli and Kuzemsky, 1 and 28 March 1869, in *ibid.*, 111–12.
- 39 Malynovsky to Falcinelli, 23 March 1870, ASV, ANV, 473, 77.
- 40 The "Extractus relationum" is in Glinka, *Diocesi ucraïno-cattolica di Cholm*, 124–31.
- 41 Kuzemsky to Falcinelli, 2 March 1870, in *ibid.*, 132–3.
- 42 The excerpts from *Pravtiel'stovennyi vestnik* were reprinted in "Hreko-uniiatskii volnenniia v Kholmi," *Slovo* 14, no. 27 (7 [19] March 1874): 2–3, no. 28 (9 [21] March 1874): 2–3.
- 43 Glinka, *Diocesi ucraïno-cattolica di Cholm*, 68–9.
- 44 Letters of 15 and 24 March 1870, in *ibid.*, 134, 136.
- 45 *ibid.*, 136.

- 46 Letter of 8 September 1871, in *ibid.*, 172.
- 47 *Ibid.*, 151–2.
- 48 Letter of 19 June 1871, in *ibid.*, 159–60.
- 49 Letter of 8 September 1871, in *ibid.*, 161–81. The following two selections convey the flavour of this letter: “Non audeo quidem aequiparare angustias, quas ego perpeesus sum, cum illis, quibus Sanctitas Vestra premitur; attamen gloriari me oportet, quod et ego propter fidem catholicam patior” (p. 161); “Ulterius iam non potui sustinere importabile onus; tentet alius, si quis est vir catholicus, bibere calicem, quem ego per triennium bibebam” (p. 172).
- 50 *Ibid.*, 167–8, 70–1. “Haec dioecesis a Galicianis vexatur”; “Unica ergo et sola causa omnis mali, quo dioecesis Chelmensis modo opprimitur, iacet in sacerdotibus e Galicia evocatis”; “Fere totus iunior clerus in Galicia imbutus erat quoad ritum principii doctrinae catholicae Ecclesiae minus faventibus, immo plane nocivis”; “Persuasum habens, quod omnis origo mali proveniat a sacerdotibus e Galicia advenis.”
- 51 See below, pages 82, 188n. 62.
- 52 Beust to the emperor, 3 June 1867, AVA, Neue Kultusakten 33, Fasz. 39, no. 4516 (1867); Antonelli to the Austrian ambassador, 4 August 1865, HHSA, GA, RV, Bd. 86 P54.
- 53 ASV, ANV, 481, 192.
- 54 ASV, ANV, 481, 65 (20 November 1869).
- 55 Especially in the letter signed by Bishop Poliansky to Metropolitan Lytvynovych, 2 June 1866, AVA, Neue Kultusakten 33 (Bistümer), Fasz. 39, no. 4516 (1867).
- 56 Letter of 12 May 1867, AVA, Neue Kultusakten 33 (Bistümer), Fasz. 39, no. 4516 (1867).
- 57 Pavlyk, “Pochytannia sv. Iosafata,” 120.
- 58 ASV, ANV, 433, 701–2, 785–6, 835; ASV, ANV, 481, 191–4.
- 59 Saurer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsernennungen*, 161.
- 60 “Eligimus, facimus, et constituimus, tibi que illius Ecclesiae regimen et administrationem tam in spiritualibus quam in temporalibus, donec aliter per Nos et hanc Sanctam Sedem provisum fuerit, plenarie committimus” (emphasis added). *Documenta Pontificum*, 2:426.
- 61 AVA, Neue Kultusakten 33 (Bistümer), Fasz. 39, no. 11086 (1869).
- 62 See the collection of clippings from *Slovo* in LNB, NTSh, Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka [I.O. Levyts’koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493), S, no. 76.
- 63 Clipping from *Slovo*, 1869, no. 92, in *ibid.*, 42v.
- 64 Saurer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsernennungen*, 158–68.
- 65 Letter to Falcinelli, 19 July 1869, ASV, ANV, 433, 1004v.
- 66 Saurer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsernennungen*, 159.
- 67 Antonelli had wanted a successor “dotto, pio, prudente e zelante.” The Latin-rite archbishop of Lviv characterized Sembratovych to Falcinelli as

- "dotto e santo, ma inetto." Falcinelli to Antonelli, 17 November 1869, ASV, ANV, 481, 61.
- 68 ASV, ANV, 481, 475 (30 June 1869), 6–7 (24 July 1869), 45 (26 October 1869), 61 (no. 2244; December 1869); *ibid.*, 433, 1052.
- 69 Bishop Mykhail Kuzemsky also thought that Shashkevych would make a good metropolitan and recommended him to Nuncio Falcinelli. Glinka, *Diocesi ucraino-cattolica di Cholm*, 139.
- 70 ASV, ANV, 481, 66 (17 November 1869).
- 71 Vatican secretary of state Antonelli in a coded telegram to the nuncio, 16 November 1869: "See to it that you get the nomination of Provost Shashkevych as archbishop of Lviv suspended before a new announcement appears." (ASV, ANV, 433, 1136–7v.) Another such telegram, 9 December 1869, instructed the nuncio "to recommend Monsignor [Iosyf] Sembratovych for nomination to the Ruthenian archbishopric of Lviv." (*Ibid.*, 1166–7.)
- 72 ASV, ANV, 433, 1148–9.
- 73 *Ibid.*, 481, 64 (20 November 1869).
- 74 *Ibid.*, 481, 66 (17 November 1869).
- 75 *Ibid.*
- 76 Falcinelli to Antonelli, 12 February 1870 (ASV, ANV, 481, 113): "La fama che ha questo prete nella Galizia, e fuori, non può essere peggiore. Infatti é noto per la sua immoralità nella provincia, ed in Vienna, quand era Deputato sotto Schmerling, un giorno all'uscir dalla sessione egli con oltri colleghi assoltarono con atti indecenti una donna in pieno giorno, del qual' atto ne parlarono i giornali." Particularly damning characterizations of Iuzychynsky by Iosyf Sembratovych, Mykhail Malynovsky (then administrator of Lviv archeparchy), Mykhail Kuzemsky, and Iosyf Cherliunchakevych can be found in ASV, ANV, 473, 3, 43–6, 51–51v, 60–61v, 64–70. Kuzemsky introduced his characterization with the following sentence: "Consuetus de fratribus meis nil nisi bona proferre, video me coactum a meo principio declinare, cum mihi nihil bonum notum sit, quod de Custode Cathedralis ecclesiae premisliensis Revmo. Canonico Juzyczynski proferam" (p. 60).
- 77 Ia. Hordyns'kyi, "Mykhailo Kuzems'kyi," 3.
- 78 See, for example, Falcinelli's letter to Antonelli, 3 March 1870, ASV, ANV, 121.
- 79 Saurer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsernennungen*, 164.
- 80 *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2:429.
- 81 Nazarko, *Kyivs'ki i halyts'ki mytropolyty*, 197.
- 82 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 26, K. 29, no. 12; HNSA, GA, RV, III, k. 55; Saurer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsernennungen*, 168–70; ASV, ANV, 481, 332c, 342.
- 83 Kuzemsky to Falcinelli, 24 March 1870, in Glinka, *Diocesi ucraino-cattolica di Cholm*, 139.

- 84 "Iz Peremyshlia. (Prymichaniia po dilu izbyraniia epyskopa)," *Slovo* 11, no. 48 (19 June [1 July] 1871): 3; "Iz nad Dunaia. (Kan. Stupnytskii i epyskopstvo Peremyshl'skoie)," *Slovo* 11, no. 55 (14 [26] July 1871): 2.
- 85 "Ob epyskopstvi peremyshl'skom," *Slovo* 12, no. 33 (15 [27] April 1872): 1–2.
- 86 "Novyi epyskop dlia Peremyshlia," *Slovo* 12, no. 56 (15 [27] June 1872): 1.
- 87 This rumour was reported to Falcinelli by Sylvestr Sembratovych. Letter of 21 May 1871, in Glinka, *Diocesi ucraino-cattolica di Cholm*, 154.
- 88 Glinka, *Diocesi ucraino-cattolica di Cholm*, 189.
- 89 "Ot Ustryk. ('Pastyrskoie bohosloviie' o. Pelesha)," *Slovo* 16, no. 31 (13 [25] March 1876): 2.
- 90 TSDIAL, 201/4v/315, 5–9, 11–19v.
- 91 "Iz nad Dnistra. ('Ruskii Sion' i ieho ieresi)," *Slovo* 14, no. 21 (21 February [5 March] 1874): 3, no. 22 (23 February [7 March] 1874): 3; "Iz Ne Siona dlia 'Siona,'" *Slovo* 14, no. 38 (6 [18] April 1874): 2–3, no. 39 (9 [21] April 1874): 2; "Iz Zalishchytskoho. ('Sionskii' nauky)," *Slovo* 15, no. 4 (11 [23] January 1875): 2.
- 92 See especially [Ioann] Sh[ykh], "V spravi obriada," *Ruskii Sion* 8, no. 1 (1 [13] January 1878): 15–18, no. 4 (15 [27] February 1878): 108–12.
- 93 "Zapysky Rymlianyna" appeared in *Ruskii Sion* 10, nos 10–17, 19–20 (1880): 317–19, 350–3, 384–8, 419–21, 448–51, 481–4, 513–17, 541–5, 610–12, 640–3.
- 94 *Ibid.*, no. 19, 611.
- 95 Aleksander Bachyn'skii, "Do p.t. chytateliv 'Ruskoho Siona,'" *Ruskii Sion* 10, no. 21 (1880): 671–2.
- 96 Franko, *Narys istorii ukrains'ko-rus'koi literatury*, 308; Ivan Em. Levyts'kyi, *Halytsko-ruskaia bybliohrafiia*, 2:351; TSDIAL, 408/1/877, 12–12v (biographical sketch of Malyniak, based on his unpublished autobiography).
- 97 On Rus', see Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 102–3.
- 98 Odyn v imeni mnohykh, "S peremys'koi ieparkhii," *Osnova*, no. 52 (16 [4] July 1872): 1–2.
- 99 O.S., "Unyia. Z Pidhirria," *Rus'* 1, no. 25 (24 June 1867): 1–2.
- 100 "Sviashchenstvo rus'ke," *Rus'* 1, no. 27 (30 June 1867): 1.
- 101 Taniachkevych, *Pys'mo narodovtsiv rus'kykh*, 14.
- 102 Another activist, completely forgotten today, was Oleksa Sliusarchuk. Matkovs'kyi, *Try synodal'ni arkhiierei*, 49 n.
- 103 Vakhnianyn, *Prychynky do istoryi ruskoi spravy*, 95–6.
- 104 Letter of Volodymyr Barvinsky to Oleksander Barvinsky, late 1879, in Barvins'kyi, *Spomyny z moho zhytia*, 2:99.
- 105 Eugen. Hornicki, "Stronnictwa ruskie w Galicyi a ruskie duchowieństwo," *Przegląd Powszechny*, tom XXVIII, nr. 83, r. 7, zes. 11 (November 1890): 168.

- 106 N.M. Ohonovskii, "Iz Stanyslavova," *Ruskii Sion* 7, no. 6 (15 [27] March 1877): 181–4.
- 107 Ievhenii Zhelekhovskii, "Z Stanyslavova," *Ruskii Sion* 7, no. 9 (1 [13] May 1877): 281–7, no. 10 (15 [27] May 1877): 311–16 (see the editorial note on 316); Nykolai M. Ohonovskii, "Z Stanyslavova," *Ruskii Sion* 7, no. 12 (15 [27] June 1877): 374–6, no. 13 (1 [13] July 1877): 405–11 (see especially 375). See also M.P. Drahomanov, "Shevchenko, ukrainofily i sotsializm," in Drahomanov, *Literaturno-publitsychni pratsi u dvokh tomakh*, 2:7–25.
- 108 Editorial note signed Syl'v. Sembratovych, following Nykolai M. Ohonovskii, "Z Stanyslavova," *Ruskii Sion* 7, no. 12 (15 [27] June 1877): 374–6, no. 13 (1 [13] July 1877): 411.
- 109 Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 115–16.
- 110 "Mysli dlia sohlasnoho postupovan'ia halytskykh Rusyniv v dilakh svoikh narodnykh." The Ruthenian text was first published five years later, in response to accusations made by *Dziennik Polski* in the aftermath of the Chełm conversion that St George's cathedral chapter was pro-Russian and pro-Orthodox. ([Mykhail Malynovs'kyi,] "Sviaty Iur i 'Dziennik Polski,'" *Ruskii Sion* 6, no. 21 [1 (13) November 1876]: 674–6. An overtly anti-Ukrainian version of the same program published by Matvii Stakhiv sixty years later, with no source given, is spurious. (Stakhiv, *Moskoofil'stvo*, 54–5.) A German-language version, apparently abridged to eight points instead of the original ten, appeared in the Viennese clerical organ *Volksblatt* in 1871 and then was reprinted in *Fremdenblatt* and elsewhere. It is from the discussion of this German version in *Slovo* that it is possible to establish that the Ruthenian version published by Malynovsky in *Ruskii Sion* in 1876 is genuine and that the version published by Stakhiv in 1936 is false. ("Novaia 'hal.-russkaia prohrama,'" *Slovo* 11, no. 85 [27 October (8 November) 1871]: 1.)
- 111 "Novaia 'hal.-russkaia prohrama,'" *Slovo* 11, no. 85 [27 October [8 November] 1871]: 1.
- 112 Cited in Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 117.
- 113 When publishing the text in 1876, Malynovsky referred to it as "its [St George's] political program from 1871." ([Mykhail Malynovs'kyi,] "Sviaty Iur i 'Dziennik Polski,'" *Ruskii Sion* 6, no. 21 (1 [13] November 1876): 674.
- 114 "We should use our ... language as it lives on the lips of our people ... and so as not to efface its independent distinction from Polish, Russian (Great Russian), and other Slavonic languages."
- 115 "We should use our ... language ... as our writers, of whom we can boast that they exist from the most ancient times, formulated it in grammatical rules so as not to break with the ancient monuments of our literature."

- 116 "Novaia 'hal.-russkaia prohrama,'" *Slovo* 11, no. 85 (27 October [8 November] 1871): 1, no. 86 (30 October [11 November] 1871): 1. Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 116–17.
- 117 See Himka, "Priests and Peasants," 6.
- 118 Sembratovych, *Arkhiiereiskoie poslaniie o vysokom dostoinstvi chelovika*.
- 119 LNB, NTSh, *Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka* [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493), no. 33, 14v–15.
- 120 Sembratovych, *Arkhiiereiskoie poslaniie o vysokom dostoinstvi chelovika*, 82.
- 121 Iosyf [Sembratovych], "V dilakh zavedeniia bratstv tverezosti," *Slovo* 5, no. 60 (5 [17] June 1875): 1–2.
- 122 Iosyf Sembratovych, "Arkhiiereiskoie poslaniie, vzyvaiushcheie vch. dukhovenstvo l'vovskoi arkhiieparkhii k zaviazuvaniiu bratstv vozderzhnosti," *Slovo* 14, no. 88 (10 [22] August 1874): 1–2, no. 89 (13 [25] August 1874): 2, no. 90 (16 [28] August 1874): 2–3, no. 91 (20 August [1 September] 1874): 2–3.
- 123 The only notable exceptions were some youthful radicals under the influence of the Dnieper Ukrainian political thinker Mykhailo Draho-manov. See Himka, *Socialism in Galicia*, 55, 125. The radicals will be treated in Part II below, 149–58.
- 124 See Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 174.
- 125 Luzhnyts'kyi, *Ukrains'ka tserkva mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom*, 522; *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*, 2:188.
- 126 For a brief, sympathetic biography of Popel, see "O. Markel Popel'," *Slovo* 14, no. 62 (6 [18] June 1874): 2. For the other side of the story, see "Iz Kholmshchyny," *Ruskii Sion* 6, no. 7 (1 [13] April 1876): 216.
- 127 The full text was reprinted in *Slovo*: "Poslanie kholmsskoi konsystorii," *Slovo* 14, no. 21 (21 February [5 March] 1874): 2, no. 22 (23 February [7 March] 1874): 2.
- 128 Likowski, *Dzieje Kościoła Unickiego*, 2:220–21. The peasant resistance to ritual purification in Chełm eparchy would make a very rewarding topic for treatment from a social-historical perspective.
- 129 *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2:438–41.
- 130 Many of the official documents of the conversion were reprinted in *Slovo*: "Akty o vozsoiedynenii kholmsskykh uniatov," *Slovo* 15, no. 37 (3 [15] April 1875): 2, no. 38 (5 [17] April 1875): 2, no. 39 (8 [20] April 1875): 1–2, no. 40 (10 [22] April 1875): 1–2; "Deputatsiia kholmsskykh uniatov v Peterburzi," *Slovo* 15, no. 42 (19 April [1 May] 1875): 1–2; "Hreko-uniatskiie deputaty v Isaakiievskom sobori 31-ho marta," *Slovo* (24 May [5 June] 1875): 2–4; "Rich' o. Markella O. Popelia," *Slovo* 15, no. 68 (26 June [8 July] 1875): 1–2.
- 131 TSDIAL, 201/4/3474, 52v.
- 132 Emphasis in the original. "Otvit halychan," *Slovo* 15, no. 93 (28 August [9 September] 1875): 1.

- 133 Ibid., no. 94 (30 August [11 September] 1875): 2.
- 134 "Ot Vostoka. (Sud'ba nasha i sud'ba kholm'skykh halychan)," *Slovo* 15, no. 40 (10 [22] April 1875): 2–3.
- 135 *Stenograficzne Sprawozdania*, 717.
- 136 Iu. P[ele]sh, "Tserkovni visti," *Ruskii Sion* 5, no. 7 (15 [27] April 1875): 217–19.
- 137 Statistics from Glinka, *Diocesi ucraino-cattolica di Cholm*, 93.
- 138 Halychany, "Iz Pryvyslianskoho kraia. (Halychane v kholm'skoi Rusi)," *Slovo* 15, no. 83 (31 July [12 August] 1875): 2; "Otvit halychan," *Slovo* 15, no. 94 (30 August [11 September] 1875): 2.
- 139 Glinka, *Diocesi ucraino-cattolica di Cholm*, 93.
- 140 N., "Nam pyshut iz Kholmshchyny," *Slovo* 15, no. 7 (18 [30] January 1875): 1.
- 141 "Ochyshcheniie sv. obriada v kholm'skoi eparkhii," *Slovo* 14, no. 32 (19 [31] March 1874): 1.
- 142 "Iz Kholma. (Uniatskii dila)," *Slovo* 14, no. 51 (7 [19] May 1874): 2.
- 143 "Iz Kholma. (Arkhiiepyskop Sokol'skii. Rukopolozheniie stavlennykov. Bezporiadky v Sidletskom)," *Slovo* 14, no. 129 (26 November [8 December] 1874): 2.
- 144 "Otvit halychan," *Slovo* 15, no. 94 (30 August [11 September] 1875): 2.
- 145 Halychany, "Iz Pryvyslianskoho kraia. (Halychane v kholm'skoi Rusi)," *Slovo* 15, no. 83 (31 July [12 August] 1875): 2.
- 146 "Otvit halychan," *Slovo* 15, no. 94 (30 August [11 September] 1875): 2.
- 147 Venedykt Ploshchans'kyi [Taki B.P.], "Nasha uniiia a ul'tramontany," *Slovo* 17, no. 77 (14 [26] July 1877): 1.
- 148 "L'vov 18. (30. ianv.). Sud'ba kholm'skoi nashei bratii ...," *Slovo* 15, no. 7 (18 [30] January 1875): 1.
- 149 "L'vov 19. fevralia (3. marta)," *Slovo* 14, no. 20 (19 February [3 March] 1874): 1.
- 150 "Polytycheskoe znachenie relyhioznoi unii," *Slovo* 15, no. 6 (16 [28] January 1875): 1.
- 151 "O kholm'skykh 'muchenykakh,'" *Slovo* 14, no. 61 (4 [16] June 1874): 1.
- 152 "Iz peremyshl'skoi eparkhii. (Kholm'skii sviashchennyky-emyhranty i preosv. epyskop Stupnytskii)," *Slovo* 15, no. 31 (18 [30] March 1875): 2, no. 32 (20 March [1 April] 1875): 2, no. 33 (22 March [3 April] 1875): 1–2.
- 153 "L'vov 18. (30) marta. Zapros Herovskoho i dr., ...," *Slovo* 15, no. 31 (18 [30] March 1875): 1. Another article directed against the Chełm refugees: "Ot Peremyshlia. (Kholm'skii sviashchennyky i ruskaia konsystoriii v Peremyshli.)," *Slovo* 15, no. 6 (16 [28] January 1875): 2.
- 154 Likowski, *Dzieje Kościoła Unickiego*, 2:258–89.
- 155 Glinka, *Diocesi ucraino-cattolica di Cholm*, 88, 94–5.
- 156 "Iz sela," *Slovo* 15, no. 18 (15 [27] February 1875): 2; "Iz l'vovskoi arkhiieparkhii," *Slovo* 15, no. 21 (22 February [6 March] 1875): 1–2; "Do istorii:

- Mytropolychii ordynariat i 'Slovo,'" *Slovo* 15, no. 22 (25 February [9 March] 1875): 1, no. 23 (27 February [11 March] 1875): 1.
- 157 I.K., "Odna duzhe vazhna uvaha vzhlidom Unii i Pravoslaviia ...," *Ruskii Sion* 5, no. 7 (15 [27] April 1875): 196–200, no. 8 (1 [13] May 1875): 228–32, no. 9 (15 [27] May 1875): 267–70, no. 10 (31 May [12 June] 1875): 298–302; Iu. P[eleš], "Tserkovni visti," *Ruskii Sion* 5, no. 7 (15 [27] April 1875): 217–19; "Iz Kholmshchyny," *Ruskii Sion* 6, no. 7 (1 [13] April 1876): 216.
- 158 Aside from the three articles in *Pravda* briefly discussed below, a fourth reported on the conversion in a fairly neutral fashion. It seems to have been written by a Ukrainian from Dnieper Ukraine: "Khronika rosyiska," *Pravda* 8, no. 13 (3 [15] July 1875): 529–30.
- 159 "Kholmški uniatiy i 'Moskovskie vedomosti,'" *Pravda* 7, no. 3 (1 [13] March 1874): 135–6.
- 160 "Uniatski sviashchenyky z Kholma," *Pravda* 7, no. 5 (9 [21] April 1874): 238–9.
- 161 "Perekhid kholmshkykh uniativ na pravoslavyie," *Pravda* 8, no. 4 (16 [28] February 1875): 162–3.
- 162 "Ot Sianoka," *Slovo* 15, no. 4 (11 [23] January 1875): 1; "Ot Sianoka," *Slovo* 15, no. 18 (15 [27] February 1875): 2.
- 163 The issue was raised in the Polish and Ruthenian press at least as early as February 1876. "Ot Sokalia. (Russkii kresty)," *Slovo* 16, no. 20 (17 [29] February 1876): 1–2.
- 164 Pastoral letter of Ioann Stupnytsky, 30 July 1877; printed copy in HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 253–53v. For Propaganda's thinking on the matter, see its letter to Nuncio Jacobini, 22 March 1877, in Mojoli, *Attività liturgica*, 193.
- 165 K.V., "Iz pod Nemyrova," *Slovo* 18, no. 129 (8 [20] December 1878): 2.
- 166 For half a century I have been standing guard over this village / As a sign of sufferings and hope of salvation, / And the Ruthenian and the foreigner honoured me / And looked to me in life's tribulation. // But now they are calling me a Muscovite / And slandering me as an enemy of the fatherland, – / I see: the atheist and thief is raising / A heavy axe to slay me. T.K. Blonskii, "Tryramennyi krest," *Slovo* 18, no. 113 (21 October [2 November] 1878): 2.
- 167 "Iz L'vova. (Vpreosv. mytropolyt o tryramennykh [vos'mykonechnykh] krestakh)," *Slovo* 18, no. 46 (29 April [11 May] 1876): 2–3.
- 168 "Iz pod karpatskykh hor," *Slovo* 18, no. 131 (14 [26 December] 1878): 1–2; [Ioann] Sh[ykh], "V spravi obriada," *Ruskii Sion* 8, no. 4 (15 [27] February 1878): 108–12.
- 169 *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2:442–3.
- 170 "Iz peremyshl'skoi eparkhii. (O tom, kohda kolpak [kamylavka] pry rozlychnykh sviashchenno-diistviiakh snymaietsia. Druhii 'holovnyi'

- ukrasheniia vostochnoi tserkvy. Pros'by k arkhiiereiam," *Slovo* 21, no. 49 (7 [19 May] 1881): 2.
- 171 HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11.
- 172 The harsh winds of fortune were also eventually to carry this small congregation to a mission in Bermuda.
- 173 TSDIAL, 146/4/1983, 2, 70–1.
- 174 Reply to the lieutenant, 13 December 1879, *ibid.*, 22–22v.
- 175 Reply to the presidium of the lieutenantcy, 10 January 1880, *ibid.*, 24–6.
- 176 Reply to the presidium of the lieutenantcy, 24 February 1880, *ibid.*, 29–31. The metropolitan knew his faithful. When the Resurrectionists' intentions became public knowledge, an indignant correspondent of *Slovo* protested: "We are not Bulgarians." "Zmartvykhvstantsy i usloviia unii," *Slovo* 21, no. 45 (28 April [10 May] 1881): 1.
- 177 "Zmartvykhvstantsy i usloviia unii," *Slovo* 21, no. 45 (28 April [10 May] 1881): 1–2; -f -i, "Iz horoda. (Ksendzy Zmartvykhvstantsy i ikh pol'skii rohy)," *Slovo* 21, no. 82 (1 [13 August] 1881): 1–2; I.E. Levytskii, "Iz L'vova. (Internat ruski ks. Zmartwychwstańców we Lwowie)," *Slovo* 21, no. 93 (1 [13] September 1881): 1–2, no. 94 (3 [15] September 1881): 2, no. 95 (5 [7] September 1881): 2, no. 96 (9 [21] September 1881): 2, no. 97 (12 [24] September 1881): 2.
- 178 *Stenograficzne Sprawozdania*, 714–20. The speech is also printed, but in a quite different version of Ruthenian, in "Rich' posla Kachaly," *Slovo* 21, no. 111 (17 [29] October 1881): 1, no. 112 (20 October [1 November] 1881): 1–2.
- 179 "Posol o Kachala," *Slovo* 21, no. 110 (15 [27] October 1881): 1.
- 180 HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 329. See also "Protsey Ol'hy Hrabar i tovaryshiv o zlochyn'stvo holovnoi zrazy," *Dilo* 3, no. 45 (12 [24] June 1882): 1, no. 46 (16 [28] June 1882): 1.
- 181 I have been unable to ascertain who these applicants were.
- 182 "Shcho chuvaty u oo. Zmartvykhvstantsiv?" *Dilo* 3, no. 19 (10 [22] March 1882): 3; Franko, *Narys istorii ukrains'ko-rus'koi literatury*, 307.

PART II: 1882–1900

- 1 Also known as Hnylytsi Mali.
- 2 Dated 13 December 1881. Silvester Morariu-Andrievici, Orthodox archbishop of Chernivtsi, to lieutenantcy, 5 (17) January 1882, TSDIAL, 146/4/2310, 5–5v.
- 3 Dated 13 December. A German translation of the declaration is in HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11.
- 4 Dated 14 December. (TSDIAL, 146/4/2309, 10.) The petition was actually sent on 25 December. (*Ibid.*, 3.)

- 5 The members of the commission were Fathers Iakiv Malyshevsky (the dean of Zbarazh), Iieronim Kostetsky (the pastor of Zbarazh), and Stefan Kachala.
- 6 Stef. Kachala, "Sprava pravoslaviia v Hnylychkakh," *Dilo* 3, no. 2 (9 [21] January 1882): 1–2.
- 7 Iosyf Sembratovych to the lieutenantancy presidium, 23 January 1882, TSDIAL, 146/4/2310, 21–28v.
- 8 The peasants' hopes of saving money by converting to Orthodoxy shrivelled as soon as their plans were exposed to the light of Austrian law. It was perfectly legal for the peasants to change their religion, but the church building in Hnylychky would remain the legal property of the Greek Catholic church. The peasants' ardour for Orthodoxy quickly cooled once they understood that the change of religion would indeed free them from liability for the church construction in Hnylytsi Velyki, but then they would have to purchase land and build a new, Orthodox church entirely at their own cost in Hnylychky.
- 9 TSDIAL, 146/7/4257, 7.
- 10 ASV, ANV, 570, 560ff.
- 11 Della Scala was in Vienna when the commission visited Hnylychky. After he read Kachala's account of the commission's findings in *Dilo*, he went to the captain of Zbarazh and indignantly denied that he had anything to do with the affair. He said that the commission had manufactured this version of events to cover up the fact that the real source of Orthodox agitation lay within the Greek Catholic clergy itself. (Memorandum of Lieutenant Alfred Potocki to the minister of religion and education, Sigmund Conrad von Eybesfeld, 7 February 1882, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11.) Della Scala sued Kachala and the editorial board of *Dilo* for defamation of character.
- 12 Memorandum of 7 February 1882, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11.
- 13 For example, an anonymous letter justifying the conversion to Orthodoxy was sent from Hnylychky to the lieutenantancy presidium on 6 January 1882. After an initial declaration that "what is at issue here is not a religious principle, but a political one," the letter focused exclusively on the character of Kaucki, the captain of Zbarazh. Kaucki, said the anonymous author, "was not a little, but perhaps very much, responsible for this." "He treats a peasant like a dog!" He said crude things to legitimate peasant deputations ("Pocajujcie mnie w d.....!"). (TSDIAL, 146/4/2309, 23–23v.) Mincing no words, focusing on concrete peasant grievances, this was much more clearly a peasant document.
- 14 Report of the captain of Zbarazh to the lieutenantancy presidium, 1 January 1882, TSDIAL, 146/4/2309, 3–8v.

- 15 Testimony of Ioann Naumovych during investigation. Naumovych confirmed his authorship during the treason trial. HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 237v, 239v.
- 16 The popular Ukrainian national populist newspaper *Bat'kivshchyna* summarized the Polish political agenda accurately, if bluntly: "Their plan is as follows: they want to present all Ruthenians as either socialists [a reference to the trial of Ukrainian socialists in 1878] or supporters of Russia so as to demonstrate to the government and emperor that the Ruthenians are not to be trusted, that one can rely only on the Poles and therefore that the Poles should be given complete authority over the Ruthenians."
"‘Bat’kivshchyna’ ob arestakh v Galitsii," in Drahomanov, *Sobranie politicheskikh sochinenii*, 2:612.
- 17 "Lwów 7. stycznia," *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 6 (8 January 1882): 1.
- 18 "Kraków 11 stycznia. Przegląd Polityczny," *Czas*, no. 9 (12 January 1882): 1. On Polish alarmist articles in the wake of the Hnylychky affair, see "Halytsko-pol'ski dnevyky protyv Rusyniv," *Dilo* 3, no. 3 (13 [25] January 1882): 1–2; and "Bludni dorohy," *Dilo* 3, no. 5 (20 January [1 February 1882]): 1.
- 19 "Mytropolychii ordynariiat," *Dilo* 3, no. 32 (28 April [10 May] 1882): 3. See also "Uviaznenia na halytskii Rusi, Przegląd Lwowski i holosy v dumi derzhavnii," *Halytsii Sion* 3, no. 6 (15 [27] March 1882): 184–5.
- 20 Vannutelli to Count Gustav Kálnoky, 12 January 1882, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28; also in ASV, ANV, 570, 548. Vannutelli received Jackowski's letter on 11 January. (ASV, ANV, 570, 551v.) Father Jackowski had earned the respect he enjoyed in the Vatican. In 1876 he disguised himself as a merchant and aided the persecuted Uniates of Chełm eparchy. He was arrested and imprisoned by the Russian authorities. Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 1:21.
- 21 Although Jackowski seems to have been unaware of it, Kachala was no Russophile; rather, he was closely associated with the Ukrainian national populist movement. He probably figures in the letter because of his powerful speech in the Galician diet against the plans of the Resurrectionists to establish a boarding school for Greek Catholics.
- 22 This accusation, referring to Kachala and Malyshevsky, had absolutely no foundation.
- 23 Kostetsky was presumed to be completely dependent on Malyshevsky, his dean.
- 24 French original in ASV, ANV, 570, 572–73v; Italian translation in *ibid.*, 549–50; German version in HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11.
- 25 Letter to Vannutelli, 7 February 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 598–99v.
- 26 "Revizii zadlia rossiiskoi propahandy," *Dilo* 3, no. 5 (20 January [1 February 1882]): 3. Naumovych described how he was searched in "Iz Skalata," *Slovo* 22, no. 5 (16 [28] January 1882): 3.

- 27 "Sudovo-polytsiini revizii i uviaznenia," *Dilo* 3, no. 7 (27 January [8 February] 1882): 3.
- 28 Letter of 31 December 1877, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 247.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 247–47v.
- 30 "Den Verläumdern der orientalischen Kirche," HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 229–36.
- 31 Naumovych to Orest Avdykovsky, n.d., HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 227–27v.
- 32 Naumovych to Ploshchansky, n.d., HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 217–17v.
- 33 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 225–26. The letter was signed by Nykolai, but his father told the authorities that he was in fact the author. Nykolai Naumovych, like all of the Naumovych children, was educated in the Russian empire and held Russophile views. The authorities were unable to determine for which periodical the letter was intended. In connection with the Hnylychky affair, Nykolai Naumovych published a statement in *Slovo* declaring his intention to "return to the faith of my forefathers," that is, Orthodoxy. "Zaiavlenie," *Slovo* 22, no. 5 (16 [28] January 1882): 3–4.
- 34 The defendants were Olha Hrabar, Adolf Dobriansky, Iosyf Markov, Venedykt Ploshchansky, Ioann Naumovych, Nykolai Naumovych, Rev. Nykolai Ohonovsky (a Greek Catholic stationed in Bukovina), Isydor Trembytsky, Apolon Nychaiv, Ivan Shpunder, and Oleksa Zalusky. *Dilo* 3, no. 36 (12 [24] May 1882): 1.
- 35 For the proceedings of the trial, see "Protse Ol'hy Hrabar i tovaryshiv o zlochyn'stvo holovnoi zrazy," *Dilo* 3, no. 42 (2 [14] June 1882): 1–8, no. 43 (5 [17] June 1882): 1–3, 5, no. 44 (9 [21] June 1882): 1–5, no. 44 (9 [21] June 1882): 1–5, no. 45 (12 [24] June 1882): 1–5, no. 46 (16 [28] June 1882): 1–3, no. 47 (19 June [1 July] 1882): 1–3, no. 48 (23 June [5 July] 1882): 2–3, no. 49 (26 June [8 July] 1882): 1–4, no. 50 (30 June [12 July] 1882): 1–3, no. 51 (3 [15 July] 1882): 1–3, no. 52 (7 [19 July] 1882): 1–2, no. 53 (10 [22 July] 1882): 1–3, no. 54 (14 [26 July] 1882): 1–4, no. 55 (17 [29 July] 1882): 1–4, no. 56 (21 July [2 August] 1882): 1–2, no. 57 (24 July [5 August] 1882): 2, no. 58 (28 July [9 August] 1882): 2; and "Poslidnyi akt rozpravy O'ly Hrabar i tovaryshiv," *Dilo* 3, supplement to no. 55 (17 [29] July 1882): 5–6. For an interesting contemporary analysis, see M.P. Drahomanov, "Protse postyidnyi vo vsekhn otnosheniakh," in Drahomanov, *Sobranie politicheskikh sochinenii*, 2:626–37. Konstantin Pobedonostsev expressed his outrage at the trial at length to Tsar Alexander III. Letter of 11 March 1883, in Pobedonostsev, *Pis'ma Pobedonostseva k Aleksandru III*, 2:9–13.
- 36 "Protse Ol'hy Hrabar i tovaryshiv o zlochyn'stvo holovnoi zrazy," *Dilo* 3, no. 42 (2 [14] June 1882): 2.

- 37 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 237–37v, 239–39v.
- 38 “Protses Ol’hy Hrabar i tovaryshiv o zlochyn’stvo holovnoi zrady,” *Dilo* 3, no. 45 (12 [24] June 1882): 1.
- 39 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 217.
- 40 *Ibid.*, 221.
- 41 “Lwów 20. maja,” *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 116 (21 May 1882): 1.
- 42 Letter of Vienna nuncio Mariano Falcinelli-Antoniacci to Vatican Secretary of State Giacomo Cardinal Antonelli, 24 October 1867, primarily concerned with problems in Chełm eparchy and also relating the proposal of a “correspondent from Cracow.” ASV, ANV, 480, 336.
- 43 For the background, see Himka, “The Conflict between the Secular and the Religious Clergy.” Plans to reform the Basilians had been discussed since the 1850s, and more intensely since 1880. Pidručnyj, “Documenti,” 353–5, 360–7.
- 44 Copy of letter of Vannutelli to Ludwig Paar (Austrian ambassador to the Holy See), 8 May 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11; Karovets’, *Velyka reforma*, 1:35–7, 43. Karovets’, 1:219–20, published the letter of Vannutelli to Paar, 8 May 1882, but without having been able to ascertain who wrote to whom when.
- 45 “Prawda, szczo zakon Wasyljan upadaje ... ,” in *Stenograficzne Sprawozdania*, 719.
- 46 Olesnyts’kyi, *Storinky z moho zhyttia*, 1:177.
- 47 Persistent and widespread rumours maintained that the very protohegumen of the Basilian order in Galicia, Father Klymentii Sarnytsky, had a lover and did not even bother to manage the liaison with discretion. (Iz Vostoka, “Halytskaia Rus’, Chyn sv. Vasyliia V. i papskaia bulla,” *Slovo* 22, no. 59 [3 (15) June 1882]: 2; Olesnyts’kyi, *Storinky z moho zhyttia*, 1:177; Kupchanko, *Die Schicksale*, 108.) According to a manuscript kept among the papers of Teofil Kostruba, Sarnytsky quit the Basilian order in 1901, when he retired from his professorship at the university, and spent the rest of his life “in the care of his well-known ‘housekeeper.’” When he died in 1910, no Basilians attended his funeral. (TSDIAL, 408/1/877, 13.) (According to Pidručnyj, “Documenti,” 355, Sarnytsky remained protohegumen of the unreformed Basilians until his death in 1909.) If the rumours about Father Sarnytsky’s mistress were known in the Vatican or Vienna, they did not figure among the motives for reforming the Basilians. On 22 November 1882 Father Martyn Pakizh informed Propaganda that the protohegumen was a source of scandal, although from the summary of his letter in Pidručnyj, “Documenti,” 400, it is not clear whether Pakizh specified the nature of the scandal. (Olesnyts’kyi, *Storinky z moho zhyttia*, 1:177.) During his canonical visitation to the Buchach monastery in the fall of 1881, Metropolitan Sembratovych asked Hegumen Ostroverkha to introduce a new daily routine in the monastery, but the

hegumen refused. (Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 1:90 [see also 1:101–2 for a defence of Ostroverkha].)

- 48 Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 1:33; Pidručnyj, "Documenti," 367.
- 49 Sembratovych to Simeoni, 2 January 1882, in Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 1:88–9.
- 50 Father Jackowski's own account: "In December 1881 it was reported to me that the provincial of the Basilian fathers, Rev. Klymentii Sarnytsky, wanted to make my acquaintance in order to obtain my advice and in this particular case to acquire the aid of my order in reviving the monastic spirit in the congregation entrusted to his supervision. As is fitting, I showed my readiness to perform a spiritual service, and around Christmas Father Sarnytsky came to visit me in Cracow. After a few days of recollections and after several conferences with me, he addressed a short letter to the Holy Father Leo XIII." Jackowski, *Bazylianie i reforma dobromilska*, 5.
- 51 Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 1:48–55.
- 52 *Ibid.*, 1:131–2.
- 53 *Ibid.*, 1:133–5.
- 54 Pidručnyj, "Documenti," 369.
- 55 Cardinal Simeoni, the prefect of Propaganda, in his letter of 27 March to the Viennese nuncio, stressed how much more important it was now to provide the Ruthenian secular clergy with the salutary example of monks animated by a true religious spirit, zealous and sincerely devoted to the Holy See. (ASV, ANV, 570, 258v.) The view that the reform of the Basilian order was one of the measures intended to treat the problem of which Hnylychky was a symptom was also expressed in another letter of Simeoni to Vannutelli, 19 May 1882, *ibid.*, 249–50.
- 56 Simeoni to Vannutelli, 27 March 1882, *ibid.*, 254v–58v; Pidručnyj, "Documenti," 370–7.
- 57 Conrad to Kálnoky, 8 May 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11. This document is published in Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 2:105–7.
- 58 Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 2:42–8 (report of Lieutenant Potocki to the ministry of religion and education on 5 May). Father Sarnytsky's account of the meeting, contained in a letter to Father Jackowski of 1 May, agreed substantially with the lieutenant's report, except that Bishop Stupnytsky was to have suggested not only that the Basilians reform themselves, but that, if this were not possible, some order other than the Jesuits be employed. (*Ibid.*, 2:85–6.) The press reporting on the conference is interesting. *Dziennik Polski*, which probably obtained its information directly from Lieutenant Potocki, stated that the Greek Catholic metropolitan approved the reform, including the establishment of a novitiate under Jesuit direction at the Dobromyl monastery, and that Bishop Stupnytsky had approved the reform, albeit with reservations. ("Lwów 1. lipca,"

- Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 149 [2 July 1882]: 1.) The Russophile *Slovo* informed its readers that the metropolitan had agreed to the reform only under the condition that the Jesuits involved adopt the Greek rite, and Bishop Stupnytsky was said to have rejected the reform altogether. ("Anketa v dili reorhanizatsii Chyna sv. Vasyliia V.," *Slovo* 22, no. 45 [27 April (9 May) 1882]: 3.) According to the national populist organ *Dilo*, both Sembratovych and Stupnytsky had opposed a reform conducted by the Jesuits. ("Upadok chyna sv. Vasyliia," *Dilo* 3, no. 33 [1 (13) May 1882]: 3 [reprinted in Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 2:138–42].) In another article, *Dilo* mentioned only the opposition of Bishop Stupnytsky. ("Chy se poslidne slovo?" *Dilo* 3, no. 35 [8 (20) May 1882]: 1.) The information in the Ruthenian newspapers probably stemmed from circles close to Metropolitan Sembratovych.
- 59 Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 2:50.
- 60 Ibid., 2:143–53; *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2:452–9. Ukrainian translations: Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 2:153–65; "Apostol's'kyi lyst," 346–52.
- 61 "Perplacuit Nobis communis Episcoporum et Monachorum voluntas et leniri coeptus est animi Nostri dolor Ruthenorum causa susceptus, de quibus quoties cogitamus, toties angimur; non enim possumus vel illatas fidei catholicae iacturas non deplorare vel praesentia pericula non extimescere."
- 62 Jackowski himself had opposed the renewal of the Zamość stipulation. He preferred the Jesuit rule that prohibited members of the order from seeking episcopal office or even accepting it, save at the direct command of the pope. He explained the mention of the Zamość article as merely "a historical reminiscence" that the Holy Father probably included in the bull at the suggestion of "some prelate in Rome" who thought the renewal of the privilege would strengthen the Basilian reform. (Jackowski, *Bazylianie i reforma dobromilska*, 11–12.) This "prelate in Rome" was probably Cardinal Giovanni Simeoni, who had brought up the issue at the First Vatican Council. See Cholij, *Clerical Celibacy*, 174. Many contemporaries interpreted the pope's mention of the Zamość article to mean precisely that the Basilians' monopoly on episcopal office was formally restored. For example: "Lwów 20. maja," *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 116 (21 May 1882): 1; "Chy se poslidne slovo?" *Dilo* 3, no. 35 (8 [20] May 1882): 1; "L'vov, 8 (20) maia," *Slovo* 22, no. 49 (8 [20] May 1882): 1; I ... witsch, *Material zur Denkschrift*, 9, 18. When Simeoni himself formally explained to Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych the meaning of the pope's reference, he shed no light on the matter at all. He professed not to know why the reference caused concern; after all, the pope "added nothing and subtracted nothing" from the Zamość article. (Letter of 6 June 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 320.)
- 63 "Lwów 20. maja," *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 116 (21 May 1882): 1; *Gazeta Narodowa*, as cited in "Chy se poslidne slovo?" *Dilo* 3, no. 35 (8 [20] May 1882): 1.
- 64 The periodical came out alternately under the titles *Strażnica Polska* and *Sztandar Polski* in order to save money on taxes.

- 65 Police directorate in Lviv to the lieutenantcy presidium, 2 August 1882, *TSDIAL*, 146/4/388, 69–70.
- 66 “Chy se poslidne slovo?” *Dilo* 3, no. 35 (8 [20] May 1882): 1. There is a French translation in *ASV, ANV*, 570, 301–2v.
- 67 “L’vov, 8 (20) maia,” *Slovo* 22, no. 49 (8 [20] May 1882): 1–2.
- 68 The original petition (in Polish) can be found in *TSDIAL*, 146/4/387, 20–1. It was also printed without signatures in Ruthenian translation: “Protest oo. Vasyliian Buchatskoho monastyria,” *Dilo* 3, no. 39 (22 May [3 June] 1882): 1–2. A German translation is in *HHSA*, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7.
- 69 The bishop had gone to take the waters at Karlovy Vary. Stupnytsky to Vannutelli, 6 July 1882, *ASV, ANV*, 362–63v.
- 70 Collective protests were issued by the deaneries of Iavoriv, Lubaczów, Oleszyce, Przemyśl, and Sambir. *APPPrz, ABGK*, 452.
- 71 From the protest of Oleszyce deanery. *Ibid.*
- 72 Pidručnyj, “Documenti,” 388–9.
- 73 Karovets’, *Velyka reforma*, 2:175–93.
- 74 Simeoni to Vannutelli, 21 September 1882, *ASV, ANV*, 570, 371–72v. Propaganda had been looking earlier for a non-Polish Jesuit who knew Ruthenian; in this regard the congregation wrote to the Jesuit general Beckx on 22 May 1882. (Pidručnyj, “Documenti,” 382 [see also 396–7].) Eventually a Tyrolean, Father Erich Brandiss, was named rector of the Dobromyl noviciate, although the former, Polish rector, Father Gaspar Szczepkowski, remained in Dobromyl as master of novices. (“Novynky. Iezuity v Dobromyli,” *Dilo* 3, no. 1 [4 (16) January 1883]: 3.)
- 75 Pidručnyj, “Relazioni dei Gesuiti,” 214. The same idea is expressed in Jackowski’s letter to Vannutelli of 20 September 1882, *ASV, ANV*, 570, 105v.
- 76 “Nashi chasopysy v relyhiinim vzhljadi,” *Ruskii Sion* 13, no. 3 (1 [13] February 1885): 83. See also “V spravi ruskoi kil’ka uvah do sviashchenykyv dobroj voli,” *Ruskii Sion* 11, no. 3 (16 [28] February 1883): 69–70; and “Reforma oo. Vasylianiv cherez oo. Iezuityv,” *Ruskii Sion* 12, no. 8 (16 [28] April 1884): 251–2. However, at the very outset *Sion* had expressed reservations about having Polish Jesuits entrusted with the reform. (“Perehliad tserkovnopolytychnyi,” *Halytskyi Sion* 3, no. 11 [1 (13) June 1882]: 347.) To put this in context, it should be noted that Father Isydor Dolnytsky, a man of incontestably pro-Roman views, also opposed the participation of Polish Jesuits and expressed his opinion in a letter to Propaganda on 13 May 1882. (Pidručnyj, “Documenti,” 381.)
- 77 “Do rusyniv halytskykh virnykh svoiei tserkvi i narodovi!” Copy in *TSDIAL*, 146/4/387, 87–88v; reprinted in *Dziennik Polski*: “Do Rusinów halickich wiernych swej cerkwi i narodowi,” *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 153 (7 July 1882): 1.
- 78 Hai near Lviv, Pidhirtsi, and Sasiv.
- 79 “Lwów 6. lipca,” *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 153 (7 July 1882): 1.
- 80 Many are listed in the bibliography.

- 81 Kupchanko, *Die Schicksale*, 111–35.
- 82 “Rezoliutsii Ruskoho Vsenarodnogo Vicha, Rezoliutsiia v spravi Dobromyl’skii,” *Dilo* 4, no. 68 (18 [30] June 1883): 2.
- 83 “Viche Rusyniv mista L’vova,” *Dilo* 5, no. 47 (24 April [6 May] 1884): 1.
- 84 Mykhailo Dymet, Volodyslav Fedorovych, Vasyl Kovalsky, Denys Kulachkovsky, Emilian Ohonovsky, and Isydor Sharanevych.
- 85 A copy of the memorandum, dated 22 February 1885, is in TSDIAL, 146/4/389, 98–103. A Ruthenian translation of the revised version of the memorandum eventually presented in Vienna was published in *Slovo*: “Memorandum v vasyliiansko-iezuitskom dili podannoie Ie.V. Imperatoru 18 (30) aprilia t.h.,” *Slovo* 25 (1885), nos 66–7, 69–81, supplement to nos 80–1, 84–6, 89–93, 95–108.
- 86 The delegation was received on 30 April 1885 by the emperor, Prime Minister Eduard Taaffe, Vannutelli, Conrad, and Florian Ziemiałkowski (minister for Galicia). Clippings from *Novyi prolom* 1885 in LNB, Viddil rukopysiv, f. 1, spr. 493, s.v. “Sharanevych, Isydor,” 37–39v.
- 87 “Nova khmara,” *Dilo* 5, no. 32 (17 [29] March 1884): 1.
- 88 Von einem griechisch-katholischen Pfarrer, “Die Kulturarbeit der Jesuiten in Galizien,” *Ruthenische Revue* 3, no. 6 (late March 1905): 149. Priests also criticized the Basilian reform at the Lviv provincial synod of 1891. V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*, 26.
- 89 Olesnyts’kyi, *Storinky z moho zhyttia*, 1: 180. This was also the view of Franko, *Narys istorii ukrains’ko-rus’koi literatury*, 307–8. See also the letter of the ex-radical Teofil Okunevsky to Father Makarii Karovets, in Karovets’, *Velyka reforma*, 1:229.
- 90 Stasiv, “Synodus Leopolitana,” 38, states that the Holy See decided in 1877 that Sembratovych should resign. The source he cites for this information (Matkovs’kyi, *Try synodal’ni arkhiierei*, 63) says no such thing; however, it is possible that Stasiv obtained this information from documents of the Oriental Congregation to which he had access. In March 1877 Lieutenant Alfred Potocki reported to the ministry of the interior that Sembratovych was a man of weak character, too easily influenced by his environment; this was exactly what Potocki would argue in connection with his efforts to remove Sembratovych in 1882. Saurer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsernennungen*, 170.
- 91 Cracow Jesuit Michał Mycielski to nuncio Vannutelli, 19 February 1882 [misdated 1881], ASV, ANV, 570, 28, 29v. Lieutenant Potocki noted that not long after 7 February he learned “from a trustworthy source” that Rome was considering “decisive steps” to rectify the situation in the Greek Catholic church. (Memorandum to Conrad, 13 June 1882, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 158.) In a letter to Vannutelli of 19 May 1882, Cardinal Simeoni wrote that Propaganda had been thinking about Sembratovych’s removal “for some time.” (ASV, ANV, 570, 250v.)

- 92 ASV, ANV, 570, 249–52v.
- 93 Rumours had already been leaked to the Polish press by mid-May. “We learn from a certain source that the metropolitan throne at St George’s in Lviv will soon be vacated. Sembratovych will receive a cardinal’s hat and be summoned to Rome permanently.” (“Przegląd polityczny. Lwów 12. maja,” *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 110 [13 May 1882]: 3.) The “certain source” was either Lieutenant Potocki or someone close to him. Sembratovych, however, may have discounted such reports as merely part of the campaign of slander against his person and the Ruthenian Greek Catholic church.
- 94 Ruthenian original of Metropolitan Sembratovych’s pastoral letter of 2 June 1882: TSDIAL, 146/4/387, 22–3; reprinted: “Arkhüiereiskoie poslanie,” *Slovo* 22, no. 61 (6 [20] June 1882): 2; German translation: HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 174–77v, also 256–59v. See also the warm endorsement of this letter from the clergy of Kudryntsi deanery: “Adres blahodarnosti,” *Halytskii Sion* 3, no. 13 (1 [13] July 1882): 385–7.
- 95 The reference was to the phrase “animi Nostri dolor Ruthenorum causa susceptus.” The Vatican knew that the phrase bothered Sembratovych. On 6 June, Simeoni wrote to him, defending the pope’s words by reference to the Chełm and Hnylychky incidents: “Relatum quoque est Amplitudinem Tuam vehementer doluisse eo quod Summus Pontifex declaraverit moerorem suum de illatis Ecclesiae Ruthenae jacturis et impendentibus malis. Atqui haec ita explorata sunt ut demonstratione non ageant, ipse enim et vidisti et timenda rursus esse non semel declarasti. Nondum enim animo exciderunt Chelmensis Ecclesiae ruinae, et gravissimum discrimen in quod fideles oppidi Hniliczki nuperrime vocati sunt. Quod si providentissimus Deus avertit, eo tamen exemplo monuit strenue ad vigilandum contra clandestinas adversariorum machinationes, et impendentia catholicae fidei pericula. Habeo itaque potius in illis verbis singulare testimonium benevolentiae et amoris quo Ecclesiam Ruthenam Summus Pontifex merito prosequitor: et dignum profecto est si ipse Episcopus Summi Pastoris moerori condolicesti.” ASV, ANV, 570, 321.
- 96 “Soblazn hazetiarskii i chvan’e relyhiine,” *Halytskii Sion* 3, no. 13 (1 [13] July 1882): 405–8.
- 97 “Lwów 17. czerwca,” *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 138 (18 June 1882): 1.
- 98 And judging by the timing of the attacks on the pastoral letter in the Polish press, the newspapers took their cue from him.
- 99 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 182–83v (also 260–61v).
- 100 *Ibid.*, 162–65v.
- 101 *Ibid.*, 208v.
- 102 This is a curious matter. In the context of the papacy’s profound concern over Orthodox-inspired liturgical innovations, the metropolitan ordinar-

iate issued two currendas, both dated 30 March, "Against Changes in the Church Liturgy" (HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 172–3 [also on 249–50]) and "On the Dress of the Clergy" (HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 251–51v). But instead of dealing with liturgical practices and vestments borrowed from Russian Orthodoxy, the currendas prohibited such latinizations as the ringing of bells and kneeling during the consecration and forbade the Greek Catholic clergy to dress in clothes of a more secular design as was common among the Roman Catholic clergy. Thus, the currendas were more in keeping with the spirit of the Ruthenian movement for ritual purification than with the mood in Rome. The significance of these currendas was entirely lost on Lieutenant Potocki. (See also HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 208.) The exact same confusion, not surprisingly, was evident in the Polish press. "Not long ago Sembratovych issued a currenda objecting to schismatic innovations in the Uniate church, and yet in recent days he circulated another currenda resolutely praising the conduct of the Ruthenian clergy." The two currendas contradict each other. ("Lwów 14. czerwca," *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 135 [15 June 1882]: 1.)

- 103 In fact, the lieutenant was correct. At the deanery council in Mykulyntsi on 22 June, the clergy unanimously voted not to sign addresses of loyalty, because the clergy and faithful had never stopped being loyal to the pope and emperor and a declaration of this loyalty would be superfluous. ("Na soborчыku dekanal'nim v Mykulyntsiakh," *Dilo* 3, no. 50 [30 June (12 July) 1882]: 4.) The council of Horodok deanery also refused to sign declarations of loyalty. ("Novynky. Vsech. dukhovenstvo horodetskoho dekanata," *Slovo* 22, no. 64 [15 (27) June 1882]: 3.)
- 104 Memorandum of 13 June, 165v.
- 105 The metropolitan was accused of tolerating protests of the reform in a lead article that appeared in *Dziennik Polski: Ksiądz-unita*, "Reforma zakonu OO. Bazylianów," 15, no. 129 (7 June 1882): 1. He was accused of hypocrisy with regard to the reform in another lead article that appeared later in the same paper: "Lwów 1. lipca," *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 149 (2 July 1882): 1.
- 106 ASV, ANV, 570, 298–301v. The metropolitan's view was known in detail to the Vienna correspondent of the conservative Cracow paper *Czas*; the source was probably the papal nuncio. "Korepondencya 'Czasu.' Wiedeń 30 czerwca," *Czas*, 7 July 1882, 1–2 (clipping in ASV, ANV, 570, 368–68v).
- 107 ASV, ANV, 570, 318–22v.
- 108 "Korepondencya 'Czasu.' Wiedeń 30 czerwca," *Czas*, 7 July 1882, 1–2 (clipping in ASV, ANV, 570, 368–68v).
- 109 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 178–78v (also 254–54v).
- 110 I have dealt with Malynovsky and his forced resignation in detail in Himka, "'Apolohiia' Mykhaila Malynovskoho." Malynovsky was

suspected in Polish Roman Catholic and Vatican circles of being the main organizer of opposition to the Basilian reform, perhaps even the author of the protest of the Buchach monks. Pidručnyj, "Documenti," 385, 387, 391.

- 111 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 158–65v, 184–9.
- 112 Conrad to Kálnoky, 24 June 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 184–84v.
- 113 Kálnoky to Paar, 29 June 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 193–94v (also 156–56v, 157, 198–98v).
- 114 According to a newspaper report, he left Vienna on 28 June after several days' visit. ("Korespondencya 'Czasu.' Wiedeń 29 czerwca," *Czas*, no. 147 [1 July 1882]: 1.) However, Potocki signed his second memorandum to the minister of religion and education "Wien am 29. Juni 1882." (HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 208v.)
- 115 "Lwów 1. lipca," *Dziennik Polski* 15, no. 149 (2 July 1882): 1. According to this same report, Taaffe then asked Vannutelli if it were not appropriate to replace Sembratovych. Vannutelli was said to have replied that the removal of a bishop was impossible.
- 116 "Korespondencya 'Czasu.' Wiedeń 29 czerwca," *Czas*, no. 147 (1 July 1882): 1. Potocki had already discussed the removal of Sembratovych with Vannutelli in early April. Draft of letter of Vannutelli to Simeoni, 4 April 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 30, 31–31v, 32.
- 117 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 200–8v.
- 118 *Ibid.*, 209–61v.
- 119 *Ibid.*, 199.
- 120 ASV, ANV, 570, 54–90v.
- 121 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 279v–80.
- 122 Pidručnyj, "Documenti," 390; ASV, ANV, 570, 357v; telegram of Paar to the ministry of foreign affairs, 4 July 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 286 (also 287).
- 123 "Kraków 3 lipca. Przegląd polityczny," *Czas*, no. 149 (4 July 1882): 1; "Bezodnia klevety," *Dilo* 3, no. 48 (23 June [5 July] 1882): 1.
- 124 Pastoral letter of Iosyf Sembratovych, Rome, extra portam Flaminiam, 16 August 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 45.
- 125 Simeoni to Vannutelli, 22 July 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 40.
- 126 Pastoral letter of Iosyf Sembratovych, Rome, extra portam Flaminiam, 16 August 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 45.
- 127 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 26 July 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 273.
- 128 *Ibid.*, 273–73v.
- 129 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 25 August 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 109; Serafino Cretoni to Kálnoky, 27 August 1882, *ibid.*, 111. There was some concern that the metropolitan would go back on his word

- after he returned to Lviv and the environment that influenced him so negatively. He was enjoined to secrecy about his resignation plans.
- 130 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 21 July 1882, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 135. Von Rosty was reporting a conversation that took place shortly after 15 July. The treason trial was concluded on 29 July.
- 131 *Ibid.*, 137v–38. At one point, von Rosty confronted Sembratovych about Malynovsky. Sembratovych responded that he had heard warnings before, from Lieutenant Potocki, but no one ever had any proof for their accusations. The metropolitan said that he could not act on the basis of mere insinuations, especially in a land where accusations of disloyalty were made so freely. Malynovsky, as far as he was concerned, deserved his complete confidence. *Ibid.*, 138–9.
- 132 Pidručnyj, “Documenti,” 393.
- 133 Rome, extra portam Flaminiam, 16 August 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 45, 46v; Latin translation, 47, 48; original reprinted: “Arkhiiereiskoie poslaniie,” *Slovo* 22, no. 91 (24 August [5 September] 1882): 1–2.
- 134 Simeoni to Vannutelli, 22 August 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 44, 45v.
- 135 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 21 July 1882, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 137.
- 136 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 26 July 1882, *ibid.*, 273–73v.
- 137 “Novynky. Naiiasn. Pan,” *Halytskii Sion* 3, no. 4 (15 [27] February 1882): 124.
- 138 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 21 July 1882, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 136.
- 139 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 7 August 1882, *ibid.*, 119.
- 140 Simeoni to Vannutelli, 22 July 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 40, 41v.
- 141 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 18 August 1882, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 114.
- 142 Draft of telegram of Vannutelli to Simeoni, n.d., ASV, ANV, 570, 52.
- 143 Draft of letter of Vannutelli to Simeoni, 4 September 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 50; draft of telegram of Vannutelli to Simeoni, 4 September 1882, *ibid.*, 93.
- 144 Simeoni to Sembratovych, 11 September 1882, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 70–70v (also 90); ASV, ANV, 570, 108, 111v.
- 145 He arrived on the morning of 7 September. “O ustupleniu Vpr. mytropolity Iosyfa Sembratovycha,” *Dilo* 3, no. 67 (28 August [9 September] 1882): 3.
- 146 “Kraków 6 września. Przegląd polityczny,” *Czas*, no. 204 (7 September 1882): 1.
- 147 “O ustupleniu Vpr. mytropolity Iosyfa Sembratovycha,” *Dilo* 3, no. 67 (28 August [9 September] 1882): 3.
- 148 “Po povodu ustuplenia mytropolity Sembratovycha,” *Dilo* 3, no. 67 (1 [13] September 1882): 1.

- 149 "Pamiaty resyhnatsii Vysokopreosviashchenniishoho Mytropol. Kyr Iosyfa," *Halytskii Sion* 3, no. 18 (15 [27] September 1882): 570–2.
- 150 Simeoni to Vannutelli, 9 September 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 101, 102–2v.
- 151 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 186v.
- 152 Simeoni to Vannutelli, 19 May 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 251. Simeoni seems to have been mistaken about Puzyna's original adherence to the Greek rite.
- 153 Potocki to Vannutelli, 21 September 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 115, 116–16v.
- 154 Jackowski to Vannutelli, 27 September 1882, *ibid.*, 124, 126–26v. See also Jackowski to Vannutelli, 20 September 1882, *ibid.*, 103, 104–4v, 105v.
- 155 In his 13 June memorandum, Potocki rejected Sylvestr because he enjoyed no respect among the Greek Catholic clergy and lacked the strong will necessary to restore order in the archeparchy. (HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 185v.) Jackowski considered Sylvestr to be of faltering intelligence and worse than feeble character. (Jackowski to Vannutelli, 20 September 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 103, 104–4v, 105v.)
- 156 It was particularly Potocki who pressed the urgency of the matter in his letters to Vannutelli of 20, 21, 25 September, 19 October, and 3 November 1882. (ASV, ANV, 570, 113–40v.) Ambassador Paar asked the pope to make the appointment as soon as possible during an audience on 6 November. (Paar to Kálnoky, 10 November 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 54v–55.)
- 157 Conrad to Kálnoky, 17 October 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 83.
- 158 *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2:459–60; Ruthenian translation: "Arkhiiereiskoie poslaniie," *Slovo* 22, no. 126 (23 November [5 December] 1882): 2.
- 159 See Paar to Kálnoky, 29 February 1884, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 12, 343–5; draft of same: HNSA, GA, RV, IV, Fasz. 30, 178–79v.
- 160 *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2:467–9.
- 161 "Novynky. [12 (24) oktiabria.] V sviatom Iuri," *Slovo* 22, no. 110 (12 [24] October 1882): 3; draft of letter of Vannutelli to Simeoni, 6 November 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 149; "Novynky. [25 noiabria (7 dekabria).] Iz sv. Iura," *Slovo* 22, no. 127 (25 November [7 December] 1882): 3.
- 162 Sokolov, *Protoierei Ioann Grigor'evich Naumovich*, 18. Under the pressure of events, Naumovych temporarily shaved off his beard and dressed in Western garb in 1882. See the illustrations at the beginning of this volume.
- 163 See Magocsi, "The Kachkovs'kyi Society."
- 164 "Poslidnyi akt rozpravy O'lhy Hrabar i tovaryshiv," *Dilo* 3, supplement to no. 55 (17 [29] July 1882): 5–6.
- 165 "Novynky. Sehodnia," *Dilo* 4, no. 141 (15 [27] December 1883): 3, "Novynky. O. Iv. Naumovych'," *Dilo* 5, no. 95 (16 [28] August 1884): 3.
- 166 "Novynky. O. Ivana Naumovycha," *Dilo* 3, no. 59 (31 July [12 August] 1882): 3.

- 167 "Novynky. Pry povoroti o. Naumovycha," *Halytskii Sion* 3, no. 16 (15 [27] August 1882): 505.
- 168 The text of Iosyf Sembratovych's decree of suspension and excommunication: "Korespondentsii 'Slova.' Iz sela. (*Excommunicatio maior*)," *Slovo* 22, no. 122 (13 [25] November 1882): 2.
- 169 "Novynky. Mytropol. Konsystoriia," *Halytskii Sion* 3, no. 23 (1 [13] December 1882): 730–1. Metropolitan Sembratovych had told von Rosty in Rome on 20 July that he would take energetic action against Levytsky. HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 138v.
- 170 Emilianus Lewicki and Emylian Levytskii, "Publica confessio et revocatio. Publychna isповid' i vidklykan'e," *Halytskii Sion* 3, no. 24 (15 [27] December 1882): 761. Levytsky was subsequently reinstated.
- 171 In late January Naumovykh announced in *Slovo* that he had written a letter to the pope but that the Latin version had not yet been prepared. This was to be done within a few days. ("Novynky. O. Naumovykh'," *Dilo* 4, no. 2 [8 (20) January 1883]: 3.) The letter to the pope was sent by mid-late February. ("Novynky. O. Ivan Naumovykh'," *Dilo* 4, no. 15 [8 (20) February 1883]: 3; "Novynky. O. Ivan Naumovykh'," *Dilo* 4, no. 17 [12 (24) February 1883]: 3.)
- 172 "Apelliatsiia k papi L'vu XIII russkoho uniatskoho sviashchennyka mistechka Skalat (l'vovskoi mytropolii v Halytsii) Ioanna Naumovycha protyv velykoho otlucheniia ieho ot tserkvi po obvyneniiu v skhyzmi 1883 hoda," *Slovo* 23, no. 119 (22 October [3 November] 1883): 2, no. 120 (25 October [6 November] 1883): 2, no. 121–2 (28 October [10 November] 1883): 2–3, no. 123 (1 [13] November 1883): 2, no. 124 (3 [15] November 1883): 1–2, no. 125 (5 [17] November 1883): 2, no. 126 (9 [21] November 1883): 2, no. 127–8 (12 [24] November 1883): 2–3, no. 129–30 (15 [27] November 1883): 2–3, no. 131 (17 [29] November 1883): 2, no. 132 (19 November [1 December] 1883): 1–2, no. 133 (23 November [5 December] 1883): 2, no. 134–5 (26 November [8 December] 1883): 2–3, no. 136 (29 November [11 December] 1883): 2–3, no. 137 (1 [13] December] 1883): 2–3.
- 173 Naumovykh, *Appelliatsiia k pape L'vu XIII*. That the brochure was published in Russia is mentioned in Monchalovskii, *Zhyt'e i diiatel'nost' Ivana Naumovycha*, 87.
- 174 "Novynky. O. Ivan Naumovykh'," *Dilo* 5, no. 46 (21 April [3 May] 1884): 3; "Novynky. O. Ivan Naumovykh'," *Dilo* 5, no. 48–9 (28 April [10 May] 1884): 6; correspondence between Sylvestr Sembratovych and Simeoni, July 1884, *TS/DIAL*, 201/4b/976, 25–34v.
- 175 Of particular importance was an article that appeared in Ivan Aksakov's *Rus'* (Moscow): I. Naumovich, "Pis'mo ottsa Naumovicha k redaktoru 'Rusi,'" *Rus'* 5, no. 5 (2 February 1885): 3–4. It was translated and discussed in "Noviishi i davniiishi fakty," *Ruskii Sion* 13, no. 4

- (16 [28] February 1885): 118–26. Naumovych also wrote the article “Rym i halytsko-ruskaia tserkov’,” which led to the confiscation of the 31 January (N.S.) issue of *Slovo*. “Novynky. Piataia konfyskata ‘Slovo,’” *Slovo* 25, no. 7–8 (22 January [3 February] 1885): 4.
- 176 “Protocollon conscriptum die 27. Decembris 1884 in Cancellaria Curiae Metropolitanae in causa Joannis Naumowicz,” *TSDIAL*, 201/4b/978, 9–9v, 17–17v. Naumovych’s main source of income in this period seems to have been funds from his Russian supporters. Tsar Alexander III, at Pobedonostsev’s recommendation, sent Naumovych a thousand roubles in the spring of 1883. Letter of Pobedonostsev to the director of the economic administration, 2 March 1883, and letter of Mikhail Raevskii to Pobedonostsev, 11 April 1883, in Pobedonostsev, *K.P. Pobedonostsev i ego korrespondenty*, 309, 331.
- 177 M.Kh., “Otkrytoie pys’mo k o. I. Naumovychu,” *Slovo* 24, no. 139 (18 [30] December 1884): 1; “Apeliatsiia o. Naumovycha, uniiia i Rym,” *Slovo* 24, no. 142–3 (29 December 1884 [10 January 1885]): 2–3; “Korespondentsiia ‘Slova.’ Iz nad Svichy,” *Slovo* 25, no. 3–4 (10 [22] January 1885): 3; “Novynky. O. Naumovychu,” *Slovo* 25, no. 3–4 (10 [22] January 1885): 4; “Novynky. Zaiavlenie,” *Slovo* 25, no. 7–8 (22 January [3 February] 1885): 4; “Vyzov o. Naumovicha v Rim,” *Rus’* 5, no. 2 (12 January 1885): 8–10; Naumovich, “Pis’mo ottsa Naumovicha k redaktoru ‘Rusi,’” *Rus’* 5, no. 5 (2 February 1885): 3–4.
- 178 Texts: “O. I. Naumovych,” *Slovo* 25, no. 54 (23 May [4 June] 1885): 1; “Tekst ispovidaniia viry o. I. Naumovycha,” *Slovo* 25, no. 54 (23 May [4 June] 1885): 1–2. Commentary: “O. Naumovych i ieho apeliatsiia,” *Slovo* 25, no. 51 (15 [27] May 1885): 1–2.
- 179 “Novynky. O. I. Naumovych,” *Slovo* 25, no. 63 (13 [25] June 1885): 3.
- 180 “Kurrenda protyv o. Ivana Naumovycha,” *Slovo* 25, no. 76 (16 [28] July 1885): 1. That the kurrenda was in fact issued at the end of July (N.S.) is clear from notices about developments in the case appearing in *Slovo*. See, for example, “Poslidnii visti,” *Slovo* 25, no. 75 (13 [25] July 1885): 4. It is also clear from a letter of Vannutelli to Sylvestr Sembratovych, 4 August 1885, *TSDIAL*, 201/4b/976, 94.
- 181 “Novynky. O. Ivan Hr. Naumovych,” *Slovo* 25, no. 79 (23 July [4 August] 1885): 3.
- 182 “Novynky. Konfyskata ‘Slova,’” *Slovo* 25, no. 87 (13 [25] August 1885): 3.
- 183 “Novynky. Torzhestvennyi perekhod v pravoslaviie o. Ivana Naumovycha,” *Slovo* 25, no. 77 (18 [30] July 1885): 3.
- 184 “Novynky. O. Naumovych’ i p. Ploshchan’skii,” *Dilo* 5, no. 116 (6 [18] October 1884): 3; “Novynky. O. Ivan Naumovych’,” *Dilo* 5, no. 143 (13 [25] December 1884): 3; “Novynky. Revyziia za o. Naumovychem,” *Slovo* 25, no. 27 (13 [25] March 1885): 3; “Novynky. O. I. Naumovych’,” *Slovo* 25, no. 30 (20 March [1 April] 1885): 3; “Novynky. Obid,” *Slovo* 25,

- no. 40 (16 [28] April) 1885): 3; "Novynky. O. Naumovych," *Slovo* 25, no. 75 (13 [25] July 1885): 3.
- 185 "Novynky. O. Naumovych," *Slovo* 25, no. 60 (6 [18] June 1885): 3; "Novynky. O. I. Naumovych," *Slovo* 25, no. 63 (13 [25] June 1885): 3; "Novynky. O. Naumovych," *Slovo* 25, no. 64 (15 [27] June 1885): 3; "Novynky. O. I. Naumovych," *Slovo* 25, no. 79 (24 August [5 September] 1885): 2.
- 186 Naumovych enjoyed the favour of Pobedonostsev, who recommended him very warmly to the tsar. Pobedonostsev to Tsar Alexander III, 23 October 1885, in Pobedonostsev, *K.P. Pobedonostsev i ego korrespondenty*, 507.
- 187 Monchalovskii, *Zhyt'e i diiatel'nost' Ivana Naumovycha*, 88–96.
- 188 Malynovs'kyi, *Die Kirchen-und Staats-Satzungen*, 501–18. Malynovsky also proposed a bishopric in Ternopil.
- 189 "Stanyslavivske epyskopstvo i Poliaky," *Dilo* 5, no. 145 (18 [30] December 1884): 1; Vakhnianyn, *Prychynky do istoryi ruskoï spravy*, 20.
- 190 "Novynky. Stanyslavovskoie russkoie epyskopstvo," *Slovo* 22, no. 16 (13 [25] February 1882): 3.
- 191 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 15 September 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7; Jackowski to Vannutelli, 20 and 27 September 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 103, 104–4v, 105v, 124, 126–26v; Potocki to Vannutelli, 19 October and 24 December 1882, *ibid.*, 136, 137–37v, 138v, 159, 160–60v.
- 192 Confidential letter of Kálnoky to Paar, 15 January 1884, HNSA, GA, RV, IV, Fasz. 30, 180–2.
- 193 *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2:460–7.
- 194 "Torzhestvo intronyzatsii stanyslavovskoho epyskopa Iuliana," *Slovo* 26, supplement to no. 1 (1 [13] January 1886): 3–4.
- 195 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 15 September 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 94v.
- 196 Von Heidler (Rome) to Kálnoky, 30 July 1883, HNSA, F. 28, K. 11, no. 12, 381–3.
- 197 Paar to Kálnoky, 29 February 1884, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 12, 343–5; draft of same: HNSA, GA, RV, IV, Fasz. 30, 178–79v.
- 198 "Stanyslavivske epyskopstvo i Poliaky," *Dilo* 5, no. 145 (18 [30] December 1884): 2.
- 199 Both were dated 29 December 1885. "Adresy k Imperatoru i Papi," *Slovo* 26, no. 49 (6 [18] May 1886): 1–2.
- 200 On 24 May 1886. "Deputatsiia stanyslavovskoi eparkhii v Budapeshti i v Vini," *Slovo* 26, no. 52 (13 [25] May 1886): 1.
- 201 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 15 September 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 95.
- 202 *Schematismus universi venerabilis cleri Archidioeceseos metropolitanae graeco-catholicae Leopoliensis pro anno Domini 1848*.

- 203 Von Rosty to Kálnoky, 15 September 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 94v–95.
- 204 Draft of letter of Paar to Kálnoky, 21 December 1883, HNSA, GA, RV, IV, Fasz. 30, 184–6.
- 205 Of eleven members of the Lviv chapter in 1886, nine had been members in 1882 before the resignations of the metropolitan and two canons; of sixteen members of the Lviv consistory, eleven had been members in 1882. *Shematyzm vsechestnoho klyra mytropol. arkhidiitsezii hreko-katolycheskoi L'vivskoi na rik 1882; Shematyzm vsechestnoho klyra mytropol. arkhidiitsezii hreko-katolycheskoi L'vivskoi na rik 1886.*
- 206 Jackowski to Vannutelli, 20 September 1882, ASV, ANV, 570, 103, 104–4v, 105v.
- 207 Ioann Naumovych called Pelesh's *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom* "a terrible sword directed against the Rus'." (Naumovych to Orest Avdykovsky, n.d., HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 227.) On Pelesh's work as a church historian, see Nazarko, "Iepyskop Iu. Pelesh."
- 208 Draft of letter of Paar to Kálnoky, 21 December 1883, HNSA, GA, RV, IV, Fasz. 30, 184–6; Paar to Kálnoky, 29 February 1884, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 12, 343–5 (draft of same: HNSA, GA, RV, IV, Fasz. 30, 178–79v). In these letters Paar was reporting to Kálnoky on the Vatican's view of the situation.
- 209 The Vatican's deep concern about discipline problems in the Lviv seminary is reflected in the correspondence between Simeoni and the nuncio in Vienna, Luigi Galimberti, 1888–89: ASV, ANV, 634, 104–6, 232, 332–4. Among the Vatican's informants concerning the "deplorable state of the Ruthenian seminary" was the lieutenant of Galicia, Kazimierz Badeni; he had a long conversation with Galimberti on this topic in the fall of 1889 (105v–6).
- 210 Stasiv, "Synodus Leopolitana," 46–7.
- 211 *Ibid.*, 47–47bis.
- 212 Alexander Baran, *From the History of the S. Congregation "De Propaganda Fide,"* 53–4.
- 213 Report of the Galician lieutenant to the minister of religion and education, 26 July 1888, HNSA, PA XI, 265, L IX, 28–28v.
- 214 Gautsch to Kálnoky, 20 October 1888, *ibid.*, 27–31.
- 215 HNSA, PA XI, 265, L IX, 1–25, 33–53; ASV, ANV, 634, 78–9, 280–1.
- 216 Revertera to Kálnoky, 5 December 1888, HNSA, PA XI, 265, L IX, 19v–20.
- 217 On the liturgical books, see Revertera to Kálnoky, 30 November 1888, *ibid.*, 12–12v.
- 218 Alfred Potocki's memorandum of 13 June 1882, HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 189.
- 219 See the correspondence among the ministries of foreign affairs and religion and education, the Austrian embassy to the Holy See, and the

- Vatican secretary of state, 24 September 1886 to 2 October 1887, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 12.
- 220 Revertera to Kálnoky, 29 January 1889, *ibid.*, 34–7.
- 221 Alexander Baran, *From the History of the S. Congregation "De Propaganda Fide,"* 81. Here the date is incorrectly printed as 12 September 1889. Stasiv, "Synodus Leopolitana," 66, gives the correct date. I have been able to confirm Stasiv's date from a photocopy of the relevant document from the Oriental Congregation's archives: Archivum S. Congregationis Orientalis, *Lettere*, vol. 22, 297v.
- 222 TSDIAL, 201/4b/1021a, 176; Alexander Baran, *From the History of the S. Congregation "De Propaganda Fide,"* 81–2. According to Isydor Sharanevych, Metropolitan Sylvestr Sembratovych told the synod on 29 September 1891 that the schemas had never been sent to Rome for approval. V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*, 23.
- 223 The Vatican secretary of state Rampolla had approached the Austrian ambassador to the Holy See, Count Friedrich Karl Revertera-Salandra, in early March 1891 and asked him to speed up the appointment of a Greek Catholic bishop for Przemyśl in order that the provincial synod could take place. Revertera to Kálnoky, 9 March 1891, HHSA, Adm. Registr., F. 26, K. 31, 2–2v.
- 224 Revertera to Kálnoky, 6 July 1891, HHSA, PA XI, 265, L IX, 67v. Ciasca was a specialist in Greek and Hebrew who had interpreted for Oriental bishops at the First Vatican Council. In 1872 he was named consultor for Propaganda (Oriental Affairs). Shortly before his appointment as apostolic delegate, in the spring of 1891, he was also named prefect of the Vatican archives and archbishop of Larissa. In June 1893 he was made secretary of Propaganda and devoted special attention to the reorganization of Catholic missions and their administration in the Near East and Galicia. A cardinal as of 1899, he died in Rome in 1902. *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, s.v. "Ciasca, Agostino" by J.A. Soggin.
- 225 Revertera to Kálnoky, 6 July 1891, HHSA, PA XI, 265, L IX, 67v–68; Brandis to Kálnoky, 7 September 1891, *ibid.*, 95v.
- 226 Brandis to Kálnoky, 11 August 1891, *ibid.*, 86.
- 227 Cholij, *Clerical Celibacy*, 174–7.
- 228 Iosyf Kobyljan'skii, "O. Kachala a Iezuity i Zmartvykhvstantsi," *Ruskii Sion* 12, no. 4 (16 [28] February 1884): 123, 125, no. 7 (1 [13] April 1884): 214–15; Iosyf Kobyljan'skii, "Tselybat," *Ruskii Sion* 12, no. 8 (16 [28] April 1884): 248–51, no. 9 (1 [13] May 1884): 278–82, no. 10 (16 [28] May 1884): 303–8.
- 229 I have generally retranslated scriptural references from the Latin and/or Slavonic.
- 230 Information from Father Roman Cholij (letter of 13 July 1993 in the author's possession).

- 231 "Novynky. 'Pryiateli sv. ruskoho obriadu i katolytskoi tserkvy,'" *Dilo* 5, no. 92 (9 [21] August 1884): 3.
- 232 The Russophile *Chervonaia Rus'* (22 July [3 August] 1889) had stated that the Jesuits would be entrusted with reforming the Lviv seminary and that celibacy would be introduced. See the note from 5 August 1889 in HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 12.
- 233 Stasiv, "Synodus Leopolitana," 214, 216. A copy of Zaleski's letter is in Archivum S. Congregationis Orientalis, Scrittura riferite, a. 1885, no. 3584 (photocopy in the possession of the author).
- 234 TS_{DIAL}, 201/4v/315, 2v.
- 235 Stasiv, "Synodus Leopolitana," 222.
- 236 The celibacy issue was being raised in one more context in the Greek Catholic church in this period. Massive Ruthenian immigration to North America in the 1880s and 1890s had created the need for Greek Catholic clergy to work in the new world. The first Ruthenian priest in America, Father Ioann Voliansky, was recalled to Europe in 1889 because the local Latin-rite hierarchy objected to the presence of married Catholic clergy. On 1 October 1890 the Vatican issued a decree formally stipulating that all Greek Catholic priests serving in the United States had to be celibate. It would therefore seem logical that the need for celibate priests for North American work would have figured as one of the arguments for encouraging celibacy at the Lviv synod. Oddly enough, however, this theme was never mentioned at the synod or in any of the documentation relating to the synod. Perhaps no one at that time considered the presence of Greek Catholics in North America to be anything more than an ephemeral phenomenon.
- 237 Archivum S. Congregationis Orientalis, Lettere, vol. 22, 302; Stasiv, "Synodus Leopolitana," 221.
- 238 The Ruthenian text is preserved in TS_{DIAL}, 201/4b/1021a, 149v; the same text, with minor variations, appears also in Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 176. The Latin text is preserved in TS_{DIAL}, 201/4b/1133, 47–47v; it also appears, with minor variations, in Stasiv, "Synodus Leopolitana," 221. It was once supposed that the acts of the Lviv synod were lost ([Stefanovych,] *Vysvitlenia*, 2; Gerych, "Problema tselibatu," 116) or deliberately destroyed by Metropolitan Sembratovych (Kudryk, *Malovidome*, 1:230), but in 1989 I discovered them in the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Lviv among the papers of the Greek Catholic metropolitan consistory: TS_{DIAL}, 201/1a/423–8 and 201/4b/1018–22. I published some of the most important documentation in Himka, "The Issue of Celibacy," 648–70.
- 239 Even the Austrian embassy in Rome was unable to get a copy. Brandis to Kálnoky, 7 September 1891, HNSA, PA XI, 265, L IX, 93v.

- 240 Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 177. Martyniuk published part of the notebook of Rev. Myron Podolynsky, a delegate to the synod from the Przemyśl cathedral chapter. Every evening Podolynsky recorded what had transpired at the synod that day. He also made a point of copying the texts of important documents. Martyniuk selected for publication those portions of the notebook that concerned the celibacy issue. "Rusko-katolytskii synod u L'vovi," *Dilo* 12, no. 208 (16 [28] September 1891): 1.
- 241 As was mistakenly maintained by Stefanovych, *Vysvitlenia*, 10, "a draft, supposedly put forward by Rome, that introduced *general celibacy* in our clergy." In notes accompanying materials on the Lviv synod that he donated to the Shevchenko Scientific Society in 1924, Stefanovych wrote: "The metropolitan's original proposal imposed absolute and general celibacy on our whole clergy." (TS_{DIAL}, 201/4v/324, 15v.) Stefanovych did not have access to the original text, but was relying on the memory and interpretation of Father Ioann Nehrebetsky.
- 242 Stasiv, "Synodus Leopolitana," 90.
- 243 According to Isydor Sharanevych, on 24 September Nehrebetsky and Iosyf Krushynsky (who was later to participate with Nehrebetsky in one or two audiences with the apostolic delegate) proposed that representatives of Ruthenian organizations be allowed to participate in the synod with a consultative vote. Metropolitan Sembratovych spoke against this proposal. Sharanevych's notes on the synod, in V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*, 10.
- 244 "I was from beginning to end an opponent of the metropolitan's text; I was the first to point out that in it celibacy was furtively (*skryto*) being introduced." (Nehrebetsky to Stefanovych, 1898, TS_{DIAL}, 201/4v/324, 28.) See also Teofil' Kormosh, "Zhonatyi klyr i bezhenstvo klyru," *Dilo* 42, no. 123 (5 June 1924): 4–5. This is in fact a memoir by Nehrebetsky ("Z istorii L'vivs'koho provintsional'noho Synodu") with a brief foreword and afterword by Kormosh; Kormosh described the anonymous author as "a very dignified priest, excellent theologian, a citizen who has merited much respect for his service to church and nation." Nehrebetsky's authorship has been established on the basis of TS_{DIAL}, 201/4v/324, 17.
- 245 According to Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 179, Nehrebetsky was the sole author. According to Nehrebetsky (1898), "I together with Father Chernetsky [and] Krushynsky started [*spovodovalys'mo*] a petition." TS_{DIAL}, 201/4v/324, 28.
- 246 Iosyf Zaiachkivsky, Nykolai or Aital Kobrynsky, Lev Hrynevetsky, and Nykolai Rozdolsky.
- 247 Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 178–80.
- 248 This account of the debates of the commission is based on the official minutes of the synod published in TS_{DIAL}, 201/1a/427, 94–98v (Himka,

- "The Issue of Celibacy," 656–63), as well as on Sharanevych's notes (V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*, 27–31).
- 249 Not to be confused with the Galician awakener of the same name. The Iosyf Levytsky who spoke at the synod was born in 1837.
- 250 1 Cor. 7:9.
- 251 On the episode of the intervention of Paphnutius, see Cholij, *Clerical Celibacy*, 85–92. (Cholij considers it a fabrication.)
- 252 According to Sharanevych, only three votes were cast in favour of merely modifying the resolution. Among those who voted for modification was Father Lev Turkevych, member of the Lviv chapter. According to Podolynsky (Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 181), only Father Isydor Dolnytsky voted for modification over deletion.
- 253 Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 181; V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*, 33–4.
- 254 The following account of the first audience relies primarily on the 1898 version of Nehrebetsky's recollections. (TSDIAL, 201/4v/324, 28–33v.) Contemporary testimony offers partial corroboration of Nehrebetsky's story: Podolynsky in Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 181; and "Rusko-katolytskii synod," *Dilo*, no. 214. It is quite possible that Nehrebetsky himself was the source of the press reports of the audience with Monsignor Ciasca.
- 255 Characteristically, the self-aggrandizing Nehrebetsky added the following parenthetical remark in his letter to Stefanovych (1898) containing his recollections of the synod: "How well informed he was!" TSDIAL, 201/4v/324, 29.
- 256 Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 181.
- 257 Nehrebetsky 1898 (TSDIAL, 201/4v/324, 29v–30); Nehrebetsky 1924 (TSDIAL, 201/4v/324, 4v); Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 183.
- 258 Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 182–3; V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*, 34, 51–2 (Sharanevych's notes on the "tempestuous scene" and Mardarovych's submission to the synod court concerning the suspension threat); TSDIAL, 201/4v/324, 29v.
- 259 V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*, 34–6; Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 183.
- 260 The Ruthenian text is in Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 184.
- 261 *Ibid.*, 184–5. [Stefanovych,] *Vysvitlenia*, 13–14 (however, Stefanovych, basing his account on Nehrebetsky's recollections, has the text of the new resolution wrong, confusing it with a version drafted later).
- 262 [Stefanovych,] *Vysvitlenia*, 14–15; TSDIAL, 201/4v/324, 6–7, 30–30v; Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 185.
- 263 Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 187; [Stefanovych,] *Vysvitlenia*, 15–17; TSDIAL, 201/4v/324, 7–9, 30v–31v.

- 264 [Stefanovych,] *Vysvitlenia*, 17.
- 265 Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 187.
- 266 Ibid., 186; [Stefanovych,] *Vysvitlenia*, 17; TSDIAL, 201/4v/324, 9–10, 31v.
- 267 The Reverend Dr Cherliunchakevych was one of the more accomplished Greek Catholic theologians of his time, having studied in Rome and lectured in Rome, Lviv, and Cracow. He did indeed attack the Eastern tradition of married clergy in the 1860s. At the synod, however, he spoke against the celibacy resolution both in the commission on 30 September and during the general debate *in pleno* on 6 October.
- 268 Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 186–9; [Stefanovych,] *Vysvitlenia*, 17–18; TSDIAL, 201/4v/324, 5, 10, 32–32v; V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*, 36 (Sharanevych's notes).
- 269 Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 189–90.
- 270 Ruthenian text in Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 189–90; the same text, with minor variations, appears also in [Stefanovych,] *Vysvitlenia*, 13–14; Latin text in Stasiv, "Synodus Leopolitana," 232–3.
- 271 TSDIAL, 201/1a/427, 102 (Himka, "The Issue of Celibacy," 663–4).
- 272 Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 190–1; V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*, 38 (Sharanevych's notes).
- 273 The official minutes of the debate are in TSDIAL, 201/1a/424, 29–33v (Himka, "The Issue of Celibacy," 664–9). Another full account of the debate is in Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 191–7. Some of the speeches are provided in full in V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*.
- 274 According to Nehrebetsky, this was a tense moment, involving an initial refusal by Monsignor Ciasca and the metropolitan to allow the layman to speak and heated protest by Sharanevych and "all the fathers." ([Stefanovych,] *Vysvitlenia*, 19.) None of the other sources, including Sharanevych's own notes, indicate that anything like this occurred. Moreover, Monsignor Ciasca was not even present.
- 275 V.R. Vavryk, *Materialy*, 39–40 (Sharanevych's notes).
- 276 According to the official minutes, Father Kopystiansky's version was accepted unanimously; no mention is made of abstentions. (TSDIAL, 201/1a/424, 33v [Himka, "The Issue of Celibacy," 669].) According to Father Podolynsky's notes, everyone voted for the resolution except Fathers Kobyliansky, Kostetsky, and Dolnytsky. (Martyniuk, *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka*, 197.)
- 277 Stefanovych, *Vysvitlenia*, 20.
- 278 HHSA, PA XI, 265, L IX, 101.
- 279 *Acta et decreta; Chynnosti i rishenia*.
- 280 *Chynnosti i rishenia*, 216–17; *Acta et decreta*, 138–9.
- 281 This was the view of [Stefanovych,] *Vysvitlenia*.
- 282 Stasiv, "Synodus Leopolitana," 233–5. According to Father Roman Cholij, who worked in the archives of the Oriental Congregation and

- studied the materials relating to the Lviv provincial synod, "In the volume at the Oriental Congregation Archives dealing with the Synod there are two pages of hand-written annotation, from a general congress of the Congregation, indicating the need to alter 'version 2' [i.e., the text actually adopted at the synod]. Ciasca did not seem to have the decisive word on the matter." Letter of 13 July 1993 in the author's possession.
- 283 It is possible that the clergy also protested at the Stanyslaviv eparchial synod in 1897, but I have not been able to establish whether this was the case. Research in the Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast State Archives should answer this question.
- 284 The text of the document has been published in [Stefanovych,] *Vysvitleniia*, 22–3. Two manuscript copies of the protest are in TSDIAL, 201/4v/324, 25–7.
- 285 [Stefanovych,] *Vysvitleniia*, 23–4.
- 286 APPRZ, ABGK, 441, 251–4 (published in Himka, "The Issue of Celibacy," 669–70).
- 287 Letter to Father Aleksii Toronsky, 19 January 1899, APPRZ, ABGK, 441, 85–6 (published in Himka, "The Issue of Celibacy," 670).
- 288 *Sobor ruskii*.
- 289 Ann Slusarczuk Sirka, "Sheptyts'kyi in Education and Philanthropy," in Magocsi, ed., *Morality and Reality*, 271.
- 290 *Entsyklopediia Ukrainoznavstva*, s.v. "Dukhovni seminarii."
- 291 "Kil'ka sliv pro reformu rus. dukh. semynaryi u L'vovi," *Katolyts'kyi Vskhid*, 1904, no. 3, 122–30.
- 292 Matkovs'kyi, *Try synodal'ni arkhiierei*, 32–3.
- 293 TSDIAL, 201/4v/315.
- 294 "Zbezcheshchenie mytropolyta," *Khliborob* 3, no. 11–12 (19 June 1893): 72–3; Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 267.
- 295 TSDIAL, 201/4v/315.
- 296 *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2:485–6.
- 297 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 26, K. 44.
- 298 Victor J. Pospishil, "Sheptyts'kyi and Liturgical Reform," in Magocsi, ed., *Morality and Reality*, 216 (see also 211–12 for a discussion of the limitations of the Lviv synod's liturgical work).
- 299 "Nepoklykani misionery," *Dilo* 3, no. 21 (17 [29] March 1882): 1.
- 300 HNSA, Adm. Registr., F. 28, K. 11, no. 7, 163v.
- 301 Saurer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsernennungen*, 154.
- 302 "Korespondencya 'Czasu.' Lwów 10 maja," *Czas*, no. 108 (12 May 1882): 1; Jackowski, *Bazylianie i reforma dobromilska*, 22.
- 303 "Protse o tryramennyi krest na tserkvi zalozetskii," *Dilo* 3, no. 61 (7 [19] August 1882): 3; "Protse o tryramennyi krest," *Dilo* 3, no. 62 (11 [23] August 1882): 1–2; "Borba o tryramenni kresty na tserkvi v Zalitzsiakh,"

- Dilo* 4, no. 80 (16 [28] July 1883): 3; "Bor'ba o tryramennyi kresty na tserkvi v Zaloztsakh," *Slovo* 23, no. 80 (19 [31] July 1883): 3.
- 304 Cited in M.V., "Pys'mo z Tys'menytsi," *Bat'kivshchyna* 6, no. 41 (10 October [28 September] 1884): 255.
- 305 "Tryramennyi krest i obriadovaia komysiia," *Slovo* 24, no. 128–9 (24 November [6 December] 1884): 4.
- 306 Sosid Tys'menitsy, "Ot Stanyslavova," *Slovo* 24, no. 118 (30 October [11 November] 1884): 2.
- 307 T.Iv.D., "Ot Podhaiets," *Slovo* 24, no. 17 (14 [26] February 1884): 2.
- 308 "Ot Brodov," *Slovo* 24, no. 19 (18 February [1 March] 1884): 2.
- 309 O.T.P., "Pys'mo z sela," *Bat'kivshchyna* 6, no. 44 (31 [19] October 1884): 275–6.
- 310 P., "Ot Zolocheva," *Slovo* 24, no. 130 (27 November [9 December] 1884): 2–3.
- 311 "Bor'ba o tryramennyi krest," *Slovo* 26, no. 125 (5 [17] December 1886): 1–2.
- 312 "Ieshche o tryramennom kresti i nachalo bor'by protyv neho," *Slovo* 27, no. 71 (11 [23] July 1887): 1.
- 313 Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 203–4.
- 314 Text of the decree in "Tryramennyi krest i Rym," *Slovo* 27, no. 69 (7 [19] July 1887): 1.
- 315 A Ruthenian translation of the petition is published in Vash, "Ot Zborova," *Slovo* 23, no. 28 (12 [24] March 1883): 2.
- 316 "Kurenda Preosv. ep. Syl'vestra," *Dilo* 4, no. 34 (24 March [5 April] 1883): 2; "Kurenda Pr. ep. Ioana Stupnytskoho protyv ahytatsii kalendar-skykh," *Dilo* 4, no. 51 (7 [19] May 1883): 2; "Kurrenda preosv. epyskopa Ioanna Stupnytskoho v dili kalendar-skykh ahytatsii," *Slovo* 23, no. 53 (12 [24] May 1883): 2.
- 317 "Kalendar' i ekonomii abo pol'skii lik na rusku bidu," *Dilo* 4, no. 36 (29 March [10 April] 1883): 2.
- 318 "Kalendar' ruskii," *Dilo* 5, no. 148 (29 December 1884 [10 January 1885]): 4; "Noviishi i davniishi fakty," *Ruskii Sion* 13, no. 4 (16 [28] February 1885): 120–22; "Nash kalendar' i ieho protyvnyky," *Slovo* 25, no. 22 (28 February [12 March] 1885): 1.
- 319 "Rusko-katolytskii synod u L'vovi," *Dilo* 12, no. 213 (21 September [3 October] 1891): 1. See also Clercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, 697 n. 4.
- 320 Actually, though, the monks at Pochaiv went over to Orthodoxy in 1831, not 1833.
- 321 "L'vovskii hreko-kat. mytropolychii ordynariiat contra Pochaiev," *Slovo* 24, no. 13 (4 [16] February 1884): 2.
- 322 I. Naumovych, "Zapreshchenie 'Nauky,'" *Slovo* 26, no. 39–40 (10 [22] April 1886): 1.
- 323 Ihnatiienko, *Bibliohrafiia ukrains'koi presy*, 93.

- 324 TSDIAL, 146/7/4352.
- 325 "Rehuliatsiia konhrui," *Slovo* 25, nos 10–14 (1885); "Zakon konhrua'nyi," *Dilo* 6, no. 33 (21 March [2 April] 1885): 1–2. I have explained the income of priests and the 1885 law in more detail in *Galician Villagers*, 107–10.
- 326 He was elevated to the cardinalate on 29 November 1895. *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2:480–2.
- 327 Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, 1:205.
- 328 Franko, *Narys istorii ukrains'ko-rus'koi literatury*, 347–8.
- 329 According to the diary of Father Myron Podolynsky, custos of the Przemysl cathedral chapter, the same Father Podolynsky who kept such accurate notes on the Lviv provincial synod; extracts from the diary (from 1891 to 1896) are in TSDIAL, 201/4v/310 and (the same text) 408/1/810.
- 330 Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, 1:194–5.
- 331 Matkovs'kyi, *Try synodal'ni arkhiierei*, 73. The investiture took place on 5 May 1885. Nazarko, *Kyivs'ki i halyts'ki mytropolyty*, 208.
- 332 Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, 1:204, 220.
- 333 [Luka Bobrovych,] "Terroryzm halytsko-ruskoj prasy," *Rus'* 1, no. 1 (1 [13] January 1886): 4–6.
- 334 [Luka] B[obrovych], "Otvit O. Stefanu Kachali," *Rus'* 2, no. 21 (25 April [7 May] 1887): 2.
- 335 See, for example, Franko, *Narys istorii ukrains'ko-rus'koi literatury*, 309.
- 336 The patron of a parish, usually a Polish nobleman in Galicia, had the right to choose the pastor from a list of three candidates provided by the consistory.
- 337 Stasiv, "Synodus Leopolitana," 73–6.
- 338 Words of Kost Levytsky, cited in Doroshenko, *Velykyi mytropolyt*, 14.
- 339 A biographical sketch of Bishop Kulovsky is in Nazarko, *Kyivs'ki i halyts'ki mytropolyty*, 214–20.
- 340 Chekhovych was nominated Pelesh's successor on 17 November 1896; he was formally installed on 21 February 1897.
- 341 *The Modern Encyclopedia of Religions*, s.v. "Chekhovych, Konstantyn (Constantine)" by John-Paul Himka; D. Koronets', "Pamiaty Preos'viashchenoho Konstantyna Chekhovych," *Dilo* 36, no. 228 (20 (1915): 1–2.
- 342 Nazarko, *Kyivs'ki i halyts'ki mytropolyty*, 211–12.
- 343 *Ibid.*, 219–20.
- 344 "Halytskii mytropolyt," *Dilo* 20, no. 7 (11 [23] January 1899): 1.
- 345 "Hraf Sheptytskii," *Dilo* 9, no. 247 (5 [17] November 1888): 3.
- 346 "Graf Sheptytskii," *Bat'kivshchyna* 10, no. 47 (11 [23] November 1888): 290.
- 347 Draft of letter of Sylvestr Sembratovych to Mieczyslaw Ledóchowski (prefect of Propaganda [Oriental Affairs]), 18 June 1898, TSDIAL, 201/4b/1159, 27–8.

- 348 *Neue Freie Presse*, 26 January 1899, cited in Saurer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsnennungen*, 178.
- 349 Cited in "Holosy prasy o mytropolyti," *Dilo* 20, no. 9 (13 [25 January] 1899): 2.
- 350 "Holosy prasy o mytropolyti," *Dilo* 20, no. 9 (13 [25 January] 1899): 2. The view that "the faithful and clergy accepted this nomination with great joy and put great hopes on it" (Nazarko, *Kyivs'ki i halyts'ki mytropolyty*, 226) is erroneous, although the error is understandable in light of the enormous respect in which Andrei Sheptytsky was later to be held.
- 351 For a detailed, nuanced treatment, see Andrzej A. Zięba, "Sheptyts'kyi in Polish Public Opinion," in Magocsi, ed., *Morality and Reality*, 377–405.
- 352 "Khyrotoniia ep. Sheptytskoho," *Dilo* 20, no. 200 (6 [18] September 1899): 1–2.
- 353 Sheptyts'kyi, *Tvory*, vol. 1: *Pastyrs'ki lysty*, 13.
- 354 "Dva vladyky – molodyi i staryi," *Dilo* 20, no. 236 (19 October [1 November] 1899): 1. "At a time when pronouncements issued from various quarters that a priest should tend only to the altar and to the task entrusted to him, he alone [i.e., Bishop Sheptytsky] openly summoned the clergy to go to the people, to reading clubs, and to sow there enlightenment among the semi-ignorant masses of the people." (T., "Vstuplenie na Mytropolychii Prestol Vysokopreosviashchennoho Kyr Andreia," *Bohoslovskii vistnyk* 2, no. 2 [1901]: 149.)
- 355 Sheptyts'kyi, *Tvory*, vol. 1: *Pastyrs'ki lysty*, 52, 72, 105.
- 356 *Ibid.*, 1–2, 4. All emphasis in the original.
- 357 *Ibid.*, 123. Emphasis in the original.
- 358 "Pys'mo z Bukovyny," *Dilo* 20, no. 120 (30 May [12 June] 1900): 2.
- 359 Sheptyts'kyi, *Tvory*, vol. 1: *Pastyrs'ki lysty*, 78–107.
- 360 Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew*, 105.
- 361 "Pys'mo z Bukovyny," *Dilo* 20, no. 120 (30 May [12 June] 1900): 1–2. Before assuming episcopal office, Sheptytsky had also visited Bukovina in 1891, accompanying a French bishop who wanted to meet with the Old Believer colonies there. Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew*, 76–7.
- 362 "Pys'mo z Bukovyny," *Dilo* 20, no. 120 (30 May [12 June] 1900): 2.
- 363 Sheptyts'kyi, *Tvory*, vol. 1: *Pastyrs'ki lysty*, 123.
- 364 Ann Slusarczuk Sirka, "Sheptyts'kyi in Education and Philanthropy," in Magocsi, ed., *Morality and Reality*, 271.
- 365 Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew*, 569–70.
- 366 Magocsi, "Nationalism," 85, 87, 103.
- 367 Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, 1:195–6.
- 368 An exception was Father Hornytsky: Eugen. Hornicki, "Stronnictwa ruskie w Galicyi a ruskie duchowieństwo," *Przegląd Powszechny*, tom XXVIII, nr. 83, r. 7, zes. 11 (November 1890): 173–4.

- 369 Ruslav, "Kaleidoskop," *Slovo* 25, no. 23 (2 [14] March) 1885): 1.
- 370 Sviashchenyk, "Ot Ternopolia," *Slovo* 25, no. 31 (23 March [4 April] 1885): 2.
- 371 "Perehliad katolytskii," *Slovo* 25, no. 18 (19 February [3 March] 1885): 3.
- 372 Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 215.
- 373 Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, 1:195.
- 374 Franko, *Narys istorii ukrains'ko-rus'koi literatury*, 308–9.
- 375 Eugen. Hornicki, "Stronnictwa ruskie w Galicyi a ruskie duchowieństwo," *Przegląd Powszechny*, tom XXVIII, nr. 83, r. 7, zes. 11 (November 1890): 174.
- 376 Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 215–17.
- 377 Kupchanko, *Die Schicksale*, 140; Matkovs'kyi, *Try synodal'ni arkhiierei*, 72.
- 378 "Canon Singalevych is a mere marionette of the Polish party ... a weak-willed man, completely removed from politics, totally indifferent to all public affairs." (Kupchanko, *Die Schicksale*, 141.) "Romanchuk was already at that time the most outstanding Ruthenian politician in the diet ... and Singalevych was only a canon and, moreover, a person completely unknown and without the least ability." (Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, 1:197.) "The metropolitan and the Poles together with the Jews ran their own ... candidate, whom none of us Ruthenians either knew or wanted – Father Singalevych." (Vyborets', "Pys'mo z Bobretskoho," *Bat'kivshchyna* 7, no. 26 [26 (14) June 1885]: 183.) After Canon Singalevych's victory was announced in Kalush, a group of Jews, who supported the Polish slate in these elections, gathered to celebrate in front of the home of the Greek Catholic pastor, Father Ihnatii Hubchak, who, as dean of Kalush, had also supported Singalevych's candidacy. Some of Father Hubchak's own parishioners shouted at him: "This is not our pastor, but a Jewish rabbi." (i-[hard sign]-[hard sign], "Ot Kalusha," *Slovo* 25, no. 57–8 [1 (13) June 1885]: 3.)
- 379 Matkovs'kyi, *Try synodal'ni arkhiierei*, 72.
- 380 Ivan L. Rudnytsky, "The Ukrainians in Galicia under Austrian Rule," in Markovits and Sysyn, eds, *Nationbuilding*, 57.
- 381 Gruchała, *Rząd austriacki*, 36.
- 382 *Ibid.*, 46.
- 383 Rudnytsky, "The Ukrainians in Galicia," in Markovits and Sysyn, eds, *Nationbuilding*, 58.
- 384 Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 237, 240; Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, 1:237–8.
- 385 Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, 2:50.
- 386 For example: Matkovs'kyi, *Try synodal'ni arkhiierei*, 74–8.
- 387 "Deshcho z pobutu nashoho dukhoven'stva," *Dushpastyr'* 10, no. 17 (15 [27] September 1896): 422.
- 388 Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 237.

- 389 Ibid., 289–90, 302; Ihnatiienko, *Bibliohrafiia ukrains'koi presy*, 109.
- 390 Drahomanov, "Protseess postydneyi vo vsekh otnosheniakh," in Drahomanov, *Sobranie politicheskikh sochinenii*, 2:635.
- 391 Franko, *Narys istorii ukrains'ko-rus'koi literatury*, 293.
- 392 "Zahal'ne sobranie obshch. Kachkovskoho," *Halytskii Sion* 3, no. 17 (1 [13] September 1882): 540–1. See also Magocsi, "The Kachkovs'kyi Society," 68.
- 393 Manuscript version of his memoirs, cited in Gruchała, *Rząd austriacki*, 31.
- 394 [Volodymyr Barvins'kyi,] "Po protsesi o holovnu zradu," *Dilo* 3, no. 59 (31 July [12 August] 1882): 2.
- 395 "Po protsesi o holovnu zradu," *Dilo* 3, nos 57–9, 65–6 (1882).
- 396 In what turned out to be the last instalment, Barvinsky had promised to continue his series. ([Volodymyr Barvins'kyi,] "Po protsesi o holovnu zradu," *Dilo* 3, no. 66 [25 August (6 September) 1882]: 1–2.) The article is discussed in Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, 1:175–6.
- 397 In a report to the Galician lieutenantancy dated 20 May 1884, Bishop Ioann Stupnytsky remarked on the unusual truce in Galician politics. Where once *Dilo* had "valiantly fought the Great Russian aspirations," since the 1882 trial it had been "on the side of its old opponents"; where once it had stayed clear of church politics, it had now opened its columns to the discussion of purely ecclesiastical affairs, supposedly to protect the Ruthenian rite from the influence of Latinism. Karovets', *Velyka reforma*, 2:59.
- 398 "The Russophile party, which was already approaching liquidation, gained new strength as an opposition party that defended the rights of the people." Olesnyts'kyi, *Storinky*, 1:239.
- 399 Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (St Petersburg), 776/1/22, 1–4. I am grateful to Iaroslav Dashkevych for letting me use his notes from this archive.
- 400 *Gazeta Narodowa*, no. 306 (22 December 1892): 1, cited in Gruchała, *Rząd austriacki*, 44.
- 401 Gruchała, *Rząd austriacki*, 59.
- 402 Tallied from Ihnatiienko, *Bibliohrafiia ukrains'koi presy*, 114–16.
- 403 When the crownland school council called a conference of Ruthenian professors to standardize spelling in May 1892, sixty-three voted for the Ukrainophile phonetic orthography, twenty-one for the Russophile etymological orthography. Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 255.
- 404 Magocsi, "The Kachkovs'kyi Society," 65. Magocsi argues that the national populist Prosvita Society only began to outstrip the Kachkovsky Society in 1906.
- 405 Ibid.
- 406 "Noviishi podii v Stanyslavovi," *Dushpastyr'* 10, no. 16 (30 August [11 September] 1896): 409.

- 407 Hlib Iaremets'kyi, "Z zhytia v Dukhovnim semynari," *Moloda Ukraina* 1, no. 6 (1900): 232–5.
- 408 "Zubry" in Ukrainian. The name was well chosen. The shagginess of the bison suggested the long hair and beards favoured by some Russophiles. Moreover, there was a bit of a pun in the word, since the founder of the Russophile movement in the early nineteenth century was Denys Zubrytsky.
- 409 Eugen. Hornicki, "Stronnictwa ruskie w Galicyi a ruskie duchowieństwo," *Przegląd Powszechny*, tom XXVIII, nr. 84, r. 7, zes. 12 (December 1890): 375.
- 410 Famous cases include the debate over the Greek language (classical/Byzantine versus demotic, with *katharevousa* as a compromise), Vuk Karadžić's struggle for the vernacular against Serbian churchmen who favoured a modernized Church Slavonic, and the Yiddish-Hebrew polarization in the Jewish national movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
- 411 Eugen. Hornicki, "Stronnictwa ruskie w Galicyi a ruskie duchowieństwo," *Przegląd Powszechny*, tom XXVIII, nr. 84, r. 7, zes. 12 (December 1890): 375. "The liberalism and lack of religion" of the national populists was also criticized in I.B., "Nashi chasopysy v relyhiinim vzhliadi," *Ruskii Sion* 13, no. 3 (1 [13] February 1885): 79–80.
- 412 Cited in Himka, *Socialism in Galicia*, 68.
- 413 Iosyf Kobyljan'skii, "Nashi chasopysy v relyhiinim vzhliadi," *Ruskii Sion* 13, no. 2 (16 [28] January 1885): 56; Eugen. Hornicki, "Stronnictwa ruskie w Galicyi a ruskie duchowieństwo," *Przegląd Powszechny*, tom XXVIII, nr. 84, r. 7, zes. 12 (December 1890): 383. See also Jakowski, *Bazylianie i reforma dobromilska*, 19.
- 414 Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 229.
- 415 TSDIAL, 201/1h/983, 33–38v.
- 416 Memorandum of the rector, Aleksandr Bachynsky, TSDIAL, 201/1h/37, 57–57v.
- 417 TSDIAL, 408/1/877, 12–12v.
- 418 Sil's'kyi parokh, "L'vivs'ka konsystoriia na sluzhbi moskvofiliv," *Dilo* 29, no. 190 (25 [12] August 1908): 2. The other members of the "trinity" were Fathers Andrei Biletsky and Havryil Kryzhanovsky.
- 419 TSDIAL, 358/2/172–7.
- 420 Eugen. Hornicki, "Stronnictwa ruskie w Galicyi a ruskie duchowieństwo," *Przegląd Powszechny*, tom XXVIII, nr. 84, r. 7, zes. 12 (December 1890): 376.
- 421 A contemporary observer, Father Aleksandr Stefanovych, commented as follows in a letter to Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky, 26 December 1917: "It is true that we comfort ourselves with the thought that apostates from the clergy constituted only a small group and that the number of

Orthodox parishes created here was not really so large. But this is self-deception! Because, first, the number of priests-apostates was nonetheless fairly significant and seriously compromised us before the Catholic world. And also, we should not hide from the truth, but must openly say: What would have happened if the Austrian government had not evacuated a large number of the most ardent Russophile priests to [the concentration camp at] Thalerhof? Then apostasy would have taken on incomparably greater dimensions and we would have seen the scandal that not a few dozen, but hundreds of our priests would have gone over to schism and would have zealously worked at the destruction of the church union in our land and the propagation of Orthodoxy. We also have to admit that if Russia had been able to hold on to us, then our church union, precisely with the help of our Russophile priests, would have completely collapsed in a short time." *TS DIAL*, 408/1/33, 2v.

- 422 [A. Torons'kyi], "Deshcho z pobutu nashoho dukhoven'stva," *Dushpastyr'* 10, no. 18 (30 September [12 October] 1896): 443; Prystai, *Z Truskavtsia*, 2:215.
- 423 Eugen. Hornicki, "Stronnictwa ruskie w Galicyi a ruskie duchowieństwo," *Przegląd Powszechny*, tom XXVIII, nr. 84, r. 7, zes. 12 (December 1890): 374.
- 424 Gruchała, *Rząd austriacki*, 36.
- 425 Kost' Levyts'kyi, *Istoriia politychnoi dumky*, 259.
- 426 In January 1899 *Dilo* wrote: "The Ruthenian clergy today walks in step with the intelligentsia and the people; it does not blindly follow the will of its religious superior and has even proven that it knows how to free itself from the influence of the hierarchy. The metropolitan must either go with the people or stand aside." Cited in Gruchała, *Rząd austriacki*, 53.
- 427 On the other hand, the national populists called for "the emancipation of politics from the authority of the church hierarchy, which, as for example in Galicia, is falling into the hands of the Jesuits." From the program of the national populist journal *Pravda* of 1889, cited in Drahomanov, *Vybrane*, 548.
- 428 Eugen. Hornicki, "Stronnictwa ruskie w Galicyi a ruskie duchowieństwo," *Przegląd Powszechny*, tom XXVIII, nr. 84, r. 7, zes. 12 (December 1890): 383.
- 429 Volodymyr Barvinsky was closer to the Catholic church than many other national populists, yet he argued that "a genuine Ruthenian position" (*stanovyshche shchyro-rus'ke*) demanded that "a Ruthenian be tolerant towards all religions, since we have not only Ruthenian Uniates and *latynnyky* [Ukrainian-speaking Roman Catholics], but a large, indeed very large, population of Orthodox in Bukovina and Ukraine who are Ruthenians exactly as we are." [Volodymyr Barvins'kyi], "Po protsesi o holovnu zradu," *Dilo* 3, no. 59 (31 July [12 August] 1882): 2.

- 430 Jackowski, *Bazylianie i reforma dobromilska*, 19.
- 431 For an account of the origins of radicalism up to the founding of the party, see Himka, *Socialism in Galicia*.
- 432 Mykhailo Pavlyk, *Tvoxy*, 504.
- 433 I would like to thank my colleague Bohdan Krawchenko for directing me to this observation.
- 434 Cited in Himka, *Socialism in Galicia*, 46.
- 435 Drahomanov “‘Perednie slovo’ [do ‘Hromady’] 1878 r.,” in Drahomanov, *Vybrane*, 314.
- 436 Drahomanov died in Bulgaria. He had written Pavlyk that he would prefer to be buried by “washed priests” (*umyty popy*), that is, Protestant clergymen, rather than “unwashed,” that is, Orthodox, priests. M. Pavlyk, *Pamiaty Mykhaila Drahomanova*, 41.
- 437 *Ibid.*, 25.
- 438 Cited in Hrytsak, “‘Molodi’ radykaly,” 87.
- 439 Mykhailo Pavlyk [Redaktsiia], “Tserkov i radykaly,” *Narod* 4, no. 12–13 (1 July 1893): 114–15.
- 440 Hrytsak, “‘Molodi’ radykaly,” 89.
- 441 Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 134–5.
- 442 For comparison, peasants in other villages complained when they were charged 30 gulden (“Z Zaberezha,” *Khliborob* 3, no. 20 [15 October 1893]: 144) or over 30 (Ivan Mikhas, “Prosvita narodu i pevni ruski ottsi dukhovni v Sambirshchyni,” *Khliborob* 3, no. 21–3 [October 1893]: 154). No particulars were given, but one correspondent of *Khliborob* said that he knew a priest who charged 100 gulden for a burial (Andrei Dovbushov, Shmyhel’skii, “Dopys’ z pid Zbarazha,” *Khliborob* 2, no. 12 [15 June 1892]: 96). It seems that most priests charged around 10 gulden.
- 443 Ia.R., “Z Uhnova,” *Khliborob* 4, no. 5 (1 March 1894): 30; “Odpis,” *ibid.*, 30–1.
- 444 Radykal, “Iz Kniazha,” *Khliborob* 3, no. 13 (15 July 1893): 95.
- 445 “Iz sela Trofanivky, kolo Hvizdtsia,” *Khliborob* 3, no. 6 (1 April 1893): 36–7.
- 446 For a clerical response to this particular radical tactic, see Iu.D., “Slivtse pro patent Iosyfyn’skii,” *Dushpastyr’* 10, no. 22 (30 November [12 December] 1896): 543–6.
- 447 For comparison, here are the fees for burial: for a child under fifteen – 1 gulden, for a young adult of sixteen to twenty-four – 2 gulden, for an adult – 1 gulden for every 1.25 *Joch* of land (a better-off peasant would pay just over 10 gulden, an average peasant closer to 5). Nykolai Baida, “Straik hromady Morozovychi protiv platni za treby tserkovni,” *Khliborob* 4, no. 3–4 (1 and 15 February 1894): 21–3.
- 448 Nykola Tymkiv, “+Hrytsko Fokshei,” *Khliborob* 3, no. 21–3 (October 1893): 159.

- 449 "Vid redaktsii," *Khliborob* 3, no. 14 (15 July 1893): 93.
- 450 Chytal'nyky, "Ahitator 'Kóľka rolniczego," *Narod* 1, no. 11 (1 June 1890): 171.
- 451 Ivan Iakymets', "Bezzakonnist' tserkovnykiv," *Khliborob* 3, no. 7 (15 April 1893): 47.
- 452 "Khito vynen," *Khliborob* 3, no. 1 (1 January 1893): 5–6.
- 453 Ivan Mikhas, "Prosvita narodu i pevnri ruski ottsi dukhivni v Sambirshchyni," *Khliborob* 3, no. 21–3 (October 1893): 154.
- 454 Mykolai Turyn, "Dopys' iz Staromishchyny," *Khliborob* 2, no. 8 (15 April 1892): 61–2.
- 455 For instance, at a radical assembly held in Morozovychi on 27 December 1898, the peasant agitator Petro Novakivsky singled out the "popy, pany i zhydy" (priests, lords, and Jews) as those "who want to keep the peasants in ignorance as long as possible." Uchasnyk, "Vicha v seli Morozovychakh," *Hromads'kyi holos*, 1899, no. 3, 20.
- 456 Ia.R., "Z Uhnova," *Khliborob* 4, no. 5 (1 March 1894): 30.
- 457 Chytal'nyky, "Vovchkovetska chythal'nia i iei vorohy," *Narod* 1, no. 4 (15 February 1890): 50–1; Chytal'nyky, "Ahitator 'Kóľka rolniczego," *Narod* 1, no. 11 (1 June 1890): 171; Mykola Turyn, "Dopys' zi Staromishchyny kolo Pidvolochysk," *Khliborob* 2, no. 1 (1 January 1892): 6; "Dopys' z Bortnyk kolo Tovmacha," *Khliborob* 2, no. 10 (15 May 1892): 81; Ivan Iakymets', "Bezzakonnist' tserkovnykiv," *Khliborob* 3, no. 7 (15 April 1893): 47.
- 458 Petro Halushka, "Dopys' z Uhrynova horishnoho," *Khliborob* 3, no. 16 (15 August 1893): 110–11. For other examples, see "Chest' komu chest'!" *Hromads'kyi holos*, 1899, no. 5, 42; and "V Hlubichku velykim," *Hromads'kyi holos*, 1900, no. 16, 133.
- 459 Letter of 2 January 1895, in Mykhailo Pavlyk, ed., *Perepyska Mykhaila Drahomanova*, 8:173.
- 460 Zhyvotko, "Do istorii ukrains'koho radykal'noho chasopysu 'Narod,'" 152–3.
- 461 "Z sotsiial'nykh pytan'," *Dushpastyr* 11, no. 10 (31 May [12 June] 1897): 220.
- 462 "Khito vynen?" *Khliborob* 3, no. 1 (1 January 1893): 5–6. Peasants compared prices for Greek- and Latin-rite services: Antin Volchuk, "Dopys' z Mariampolia," *Khliborob* 3, no. 14 (15 July 1893): 93.
- 463 *Narod* was banned by a currenda from the metropolitan ordinariate dated 25 June 1890. (Zhyvotko, "Do istorii ukrains'koho radykal'noho chasopysu 'Narod,'" 146.) The ban on *Narod* was renewed and extended to *Khliborob* in a currenda signed by all three bishops and dated 30 December 1892. (Franko, *Monoloh ateista*, 194.) See also Selianyn radykal, "Shcho diialosia na vizytatsii epyskopskii u Karlovi ta inshykh selakh sniatynskoho povitu," *Khliborob* 2, no. 17 (1 September 1892): 130.

- 464 "Dopys' z Bortnyk kolo Tovmacha," *Khliborob* 2, no. 10 (15 May 1892): 81; Radykal, "Iz Kniazha," *Khliborob* 3, no. 13 (15 July 1893): 95; Ivan Mikhas, "Prosvita narodu i pevni ruski ottsi dukhovni v Sambirshchyni," *Khliborob* 3, no. 21–3 [October 1893]: 154.
- 465 One priest sent village councilmen to a radical's home to confiscate copies of *Khliborob*. (Ivan Iakymets', "Bezzakonnist' tserkovnykiv," *Khliborob* 3, no. 7 [15 April 1893]: 46.) Another threatened to have the bishop of Stanyslaviv excommunicate parishioners who joined the radical organization Narodna volia. ("Z Zaberezha," *Khliborob* 3, no. 20 [15 October 1893]: 144.)
- 466 It was an exaggeration to claim that *Misionar'* was "almost exclusively devoted to the radicals" ("Misiiia protiv 'Misionaria,' " *Hromads'kyi holos*, 1899, no. 7: 54–5), but the Basilians' periodicals did take on "those smart-alecks (*mudraheli*) who would twist the Saviour's teachings" ("Lysty z kraiu do Misionaria," *Misionar'* 2, no. 2 [1 June 1898]: 31). It was difficult for the radicals to carry on debates directly with *Misionar'*, since the censor confiscated almost everything they wrote in reply. But in 1900 Social Democratic deputies presented an interpellation in parliament that allowed the radicals to answer *Misionar'* at greater length. ("Iesuits'ki shtuchky," *Hromads'kyi holos*, 1900, no. 10, 85–7.)
- 467 Hryniuk, *Peasants with Promise*, 129–30.
- 468 *Ibid.*, 184.
- 469 Prystai, *Z Truskavtsia*, 2:243.
- 470 A. T[orons'kyi], "Z nahody vidbuvshykh sia vich'," *Dushpastyr'* 8, no. 1 (15 [27] January 1894): 13. In his article Father Toronsky responded to the peasant: "We for our part can only express our conviction, confirmed by experience, that, although some priests do not perform their duties as they should, nonetheless many, very many (we shall not say whether a majority or minority, because we cannot say for certain) both in the church and in the school, labour very ardently in the national and civic field for the spiritual and temporal good of their parishioners and contribute quite a bit to the general good." *Ibid.*, 15–16.
- 471 Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 133–42.
- 472 M. Zeleny, teacher and secretary of the reading club in Vysloboky, to the Prosvita administration in Lviv, 12 October 1896, *TS DIAL*, 348/1/1498, 46.
- 473 "V spravi ruskoi kil'ka uvah do sviashchennykiv dobroj voli," *Ruskii Sion* 11, no. 1 (16 [28] January 1883): 7.
- 474 Eugen. Hornicki, "Stronnictwa ruskie w Galicyi a ruskie duchowieństwo," *Przegląd Powszechny*, tom XXVIII, nr. 84, r. 7, zes. 12 (December 1890): 390.
- 475 Cited in Doroshenko, *Velykyi mytropolyt*, 14.
- 476 Prystai, *Z Truskavtsia*, 2:210.

- 477 "Dva vladyky – molodyi i staryi," *Dilo* 20, no. 236 (19 October [1 November] 1899): 1.
- 478 *TS DIAL*, 201/1a/1423, 29v.
- 479 Notably: A. T[orons'kyi], "Z nahody vidbuvshykh sia vich'," *Dushpastyr'* 8, no. 1 (15 [27] January 1894): 16–17; I. Bartoshevskii, "Chytal'ni narodni," *Dushpastyr'* 8, no. 18 (30 September [11 October] 1894): 443–7, no. 19 (15 [27] October 1894): 467–72; I[eronym] A[leksevykh], "O vymohakh nynishnoho chasu do sviashchenychoho stanu v vsikh napriamakh publychnoho zhytia," *Dushpastyr'* 11, no. 2 (31 January [12 February] 1897): 29.
- 480 "Visty misionarski," *Misionar'* 2, no. 4 (1 August 1898): 61; "Znevazhena sviata nedilia," *Misionar'* 2, no. 6 (15 September 1898): 94–5.
- 481 "Lysty z kraiu do Misionaria," *Misionar'* 2, no. 2 (1 June 1898): 31.
- 482 *Ibid.*, 30.
- 483 Nazarko, *Kyivs'ki i halyts'ki mytropolity*, 225.
- 484 "Missionar'," *Dushpastyr'* 11, no. 12–13 (30 June [12 July] 1897): 303.
- 485 Himka, *Galician Villagers*, 70.
- 486 Dmytruk, *Narys z istorii ukrains'koi zhurnalistyky*, 133.
- 487 "Visty misionarski z kraiu," *Misionar'* 2, no. 3 (1 July 1898): 45.
- 488 Uchasnyk, "Vicha v seli Morozovykh," *Hromads'kyi holos*, 1899, no. 3, 19–21.
- 489 "Visty misionarski," *Misionar'* 2, no. 5 (1 September 1898): 79; "Visty misionarski," *Misionar'* 2, no. 8 (15 October 1898): 126.

CONCLUSIONS

- 1 Well captured in the following passage from one of my earlier works: "In 1860, the Ruthenians formed an inchoate mass of atomized villagers. By 1890, however, this mass had become a nation. The Ruthenians had undergone the decisive stage of national formation that transforms a people, an ethnically differentiated folk, into a conscious and organized nation." Himka, *Socialism in Galicia*, 178.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

ALLGEMEINES VERWALTUNGSARCHIV (VIENNA)

Neue Kultusakten, Sign. 33, Fasz. 36a, 38-40; Sign. 57, Fasz. 391.

ARCHIVIO SEGRETO VATICANO (VATICAN CITY)

Archivio della Nunziatura di Vienna, vols 375, 415, 432-4, 442, 456-7, 473, 480-1, 570, 587, 608-9, 616-21, 624-5, 634.

Processus Consistoriales, vols. 263, 291-2.

ARCHIWUM PAŃSTWOWE W PRZEMYŚLU (PRZEMYŚL)

Archiwum Biskupstwa grecko-katolickiego w Przemyślu.

HAUS-, HOF- UND STAATSARCHIV (VIENNA)

Die Akten des k.u.k. Ministeriums des Äussern 1848-1918:

Administrative Registratur, Fach 26, K. 19, 29, 31, 33, 44; Fach 28, K. 11-13.

Gesandtschaftsarchiv, Rom-Vatikan, III, Bd. 55, 71, 86; IV, Fasz. 30.

Politisches Archiv:

XI: Italienische Staaten 1848-1918, Päpstlicher Stuhl 1848-1918, 265, Liasse Rom IX.

XI: Interna, 210.

L'VIVS'KA NAUKOVA BIBLIOTEKA IM. V. STEFANYKA NAN UKRAINY, VIDDIL RUKOPYSIV (LVIV)

Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, Materialy do biohrafichnoho slovnyka [I.O. Levyts'koho] (=f. 1, spr. 493).

TSENTRAL'NYI DERZHAVNYI ISTORYCHNYI ARKHIV UKRAINY U M. L'VOVI (LVIV)

Fond 146. Halyts'ke namisnytstvo: opysy 4, 7.

Fond 201. Mytropolycha hreko-katolyts'ka konsystoriia, m. L'viv: opysy 1a, 1h, 2, 4, 4b, 4v, 5.

Fond 358. Sheptyts'kyi Andrii: opysy 1, 2.

Fond 408. Hreko-katolyts'kyi mytropolychyi ordynariat, m. L'viv: opys 1.

CONTEMPORARY PRESS CONSULTED

- Bat'kivshchyna* (Lviv), 1884.
Bohoslovskii vistnyk (Lviv), 1900–1902.
Bukovyna (Chernivtsi), 1885–86, 1888–91.
Dilo (Lviv), 1880–85, 1888, 1890–91, 1899–1905, 1907–15.
Dushpastyr' (Lviv), 1894–97.
Halychanyn (Lviv), 1862–63.
Halychanyn (Lviv), 1896, 1900, 1908–10.
Halytskii Sion (Lviv), 1882.
Hromads'kyi holos (Lviv), 1899–1900.
Katolytskyi Vskhid (Lviv), 1904.
Khliborob (Lviv and Kolomyia), 1892–94.
Misionar' (Zhovkva), 1898.
Moloda Ukraina (Lviv), 1900–1903, 1910.
Narod (Lviv and Kolomyia), 1890, 1893.
Nauchno-lyteraturnyi sbornyk (Lviv), 1905–1906, 1908.
Nyva (Lviv), 1912, 1916.
Osnova (Lviv), 1872.
Österreichisches Statistisches Handbuch (Vienna), 1901.
Przegląd Powszechny (Cracow), 1890, 1893, 1912.
Rocznik Statystyki Galicyi (Lviv), 1889–91.
Rus' (Lviv), 1867.
Rus' (Lviv), 1886–87.
Rus' (Moscow), 1885.
Ruskii Sion (Lviv), 1873–79, 1883–85.
Ruslan (Lviv), 1905–1906, 1908–1909.
Ruthenische Revue (Vienna), 1905.
Schematismus universi venerabilis cleri dioeceseos gr.-cath. Premisliensis pro anno Domini ... (Przemysł), 1900.
Shematyzm vsechestnoho klyra mytropol. arkhidiitsezii hreko-katolycheskoi L'vivskoi na rik ... (Lviv), 1882, 1886, 1900.
Shematyzm voseho klyra hreko-katolycheskoi eparkhii Stanyslavivskoi na rik bozhii ... (Stanyslaviv), 1900.
Slovo (Lviv), 1861–87.
Vistnyk peremyskoi eparkhii (Przemysł), 1897–99.
Vremennyyk Instytutu stavropryhiiskoho (Lviv), 1893, 1896–97, 1903–1904, 1906–1908.

REFERENCE WORKS, SOURCE PUBLICATIONS,
 AND SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Acta et decreta Synodi provincialis Ruthenorum Galiciae habitae Leopoli an. 1891.*
 Rome: Ex typographia polyglotta S.C. de Propaganda Fide, 1896.

- Andrusiak, Mykola. *Narysy z istorii halyts'koho moskvofil'stva (z portretamy moskvofil's'kykh diiachiv)*. Biblioteka "Zhyttia i znannia," 15. Lviv: Prosvita, 1935.
- "Apostol's'kyi lyst sviatishoho ottsia nashoho bozhym provydinniam papy L'va XIII pro reformu Chynu sv. Vasyliia V. ukrains'koi natsii v Halychyni." *Analecta OSBM*, Sectio II, vol. XI (XVII), Fasc. 1-4 (1982): 346-52.
- Baran, Alexander [Oleksander]. *From the History of the S. Congregation "De Propaganda Fide."* Reprinted from "Sacrae Congregationis De Propaganda Fide Memoria Rerum." Rome, Freiburg, Vienna: Herder, 1970-76.
- *Iepyskop Andrei Bachyns'kyi i tserkovne vidrozhennia na Zakarpatti*. Biblioteka Lohosu, 33. Yorkton, Sask.: Redeemer's Voice Press, 1963.
- Baran, Stepan. *Mytropolyt Andrei Sheptyts'kyi. Zhyttia i diial'nist'*. Munich: Ukrains'ke vydavnyche tovarystvo "Vernyhora," 1947.
- Barvins'kyi, Oleksander. *Spomyny z moho zhytia*. 2 vols. Lviv, 1912-13.
- Bezstoronnyi, Ivan. *Obiektivnyi pohliad na otnoshenia obriadovi v Vskhidnii Halychyni*. Lviv: Nakladom avtora, 1893.
- Bittner, L., et al. *Gesamtinventar des Wiener Haus-, Hof und Staatsarchivs aufgebaut auf der Geschichte des Archivs und seiner Bestände*. Inventare österreichischer staatlicher Archive, 5. Inventare des Wiener Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchivs, 4. 5 vols. Vienna: Verlag Adolf Holzhausens Nachfolger, 1936-40.
- Bobák, Joannes. *De caelibatu ecclesiastico deque impedimento Ordinis Sacri apud Orientales et praesertim apud Ruthenos*. Rome: Officium libri Catholici, 1941.
- Bociurkiw, Bohdan Rostyslav. *The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the Soviet State (1939-1950)*. Edmonton, Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1996.
- Chernets'kyi, Vasyli'. *Litopys' monastyrnia oo. Vasylian v Krystynopoli vid ieho osnovania 1763 do 1890 r.* Lviv: Iz typohrafii Stavropyhiiskoho instytutu, [1890].
- Cholij, Roman. *Clerical Celibacy in East and West*. Leominster, U.K.: Fowler Wright Books, 1988.
- Chynnosti i rishenia ruskoho provyntsial'noho sobora v Halychyni vidbuvs'ho sia vo L'vovi v rotsi 1891*. Lviv: Nakladom I'vivskoho hr. kat. Mytropolychoho Ordynariata, Iz typohrafii Stavropyhiiskoho instytutu, 1896.
- Clercq, Charles de. *Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux*. Vol. 11: *Conciles des orientaux catholiques*. Part 2: "De 1850 à 1949." Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1952.
- Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide seu decreta instructiones rescripta pro apostolicis missionibus*. 2 vols. Rome: Ex typographia polyglotta S.C. de Propaganda Fide, 1907.
- Cz.W. *Kościół i cerkiew w Galicyi Wschodniej*. Odbitka z "Gazety Kościelnej." Lviv: Z drukarni Józefa Chęcińskiego, 1909.
- Danilenko, S.T. *Uniaty*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1972.
- Dashkevych, Ia.R. "Materialy I.O. Levyts'koho iak dzherelo dlia biohrafichnoho slovnyka." *Istorychni dzherela ta ikh vykorystannia*, vyp. 2 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1966), 35-53.

- De Marchi, Giuseppe. *Le Nunziature Apostoliche dal 1800 al 1956*. Sussidi eruditi, 13. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1957.
- Denkschrift über die Nothlage des griechisch-katholischen Clerus von Galizien und Bukowina*. Lviv, 1883.
- Didytskii, Bohdan A. *Svoiezhyt'evy zapysky*. 2 parts. Lviv: Pechatnia Stavropyhiiskoho Instytutu, 1906–1908.
- Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960–.
- Dmytruk, V. *Narys z istorii ukrains'koi zhurnalistyky XIX st.* Lviv: Vydavnytstvo L'vivs'koho universytetu, 1969.
- Dobrians'kyi, Antin. *Nauky tserkovnyi na vsi prazdnyky v rotsi dlia zhytelei sel'skykh*. 2nd ed. Przemyśl: Nakladom Elenia i Lanha, 1894.
- Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia (1075–1953)*. Vol. 2: 1700–1953. Edited by Athanasius G. Welykyj. Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio III: Documenta romana Ecclesiae Unitae in terris Ucrainae et Belarussiae. Rome: PP. Basiliani, 1954.
- Dokumenty rozpovidaiut'*. Uzhhorod: Karpaty, 1971.
- Doroshenko, Vol[odymyr]. *Velykyi mytropolyt (Pamiaty Mytrop. A. Sheptyts'koho)*. *Spohady i narysy*. Vidbytko z Lohosu. Biblioteka Lohosu, 17. Yorkton, Sask.: Drukarnia Holosu spasytelia, 1958.
- Drahomanov, Mykhailo Petrovych. *Literaturno-publitsychni pratsi u dvokh tomakh*. 2 vols. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1970.
- *Sobranie politicheskikh sochinenii*. [Edited by B.A. Kistiakivs'kyi.] 2 vols. Paris: Société nouvelle de librairie et d'édition, 1905–1906.
- *Vybrane. ... mii zadum zlozhyty ocherk istorii tsvyilizatsii na Ukraini*. Pam'iatky istorychnoi dumky Ukrainy. Kyiv: Lybid', 1991.
- Enciclopedia Cattolica*. 12 vols. Vatican City: Ente per l'Enciclopedia Cattolica e per il Libro Cattolico, [c. 1949–54].
- Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. 5 vols. Edited by Volodymyr Kubijovyč and Danylo Husar Struk. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984–93.
- Encyklopedyja Powszechna*. 28 vols. Warsaw: Nakład, druk i własność S. Orgelbranda księgarza i typografa, 1859–68.
- Engel-Janosi, Friedrich. *Österreich und der Vatikan 1846–1918*. 2 vols. Graz, Vienna, Cologne: Verlag Styria, 1958–60.
- Enloe, Cynthia H. "Religion and Ethnicity." In *Ethnic Diversity and Conflict in Eastern Europe*, edited by Peter F. Sugar, 347–71, 497–500. Joint Committee on Eastern Europe Publication Series, 8. Barbara, Oxford: ABC-Clio, 1980.
- Entsyklopediia Ukrainoznavstva*. Slovnynkova chastyna. Edited by Volodymyr Kubiiovych [Kubijovyč]. NTsh. Paris, New York: Molode zhyttia, 1955–.
- Fink, Karl August. *Das Vatikanische Archiv: Einführung in die Bestände und ihre Erforschung*. 2nd, rev. ed. Rome: W. Regenberg, 1951.
- Franko, Ivan. *Monoloh ateista*. Lviv: Kameniar, 1973.
- *Narys istorii ukrains'ko-rus'koi literatury do 1890 r.* Pysania Ivana Franka, 1. Lviv: Nakladom Ukrains'ko-rus'koi vydavnychoi spilky, 1910.

- *Radykal'na taktyka*. Chast' II. III. *Radykaly i relihiia*. Khlops'ka biblioteka, 15. Lviv: Nakladom redaktsyi "Hromads'koho holosu," 1898.
- *Radykal'na taktyka*. Chast' IV. V. *Radykaly i popy*. Khlops'ka biblioteka, 17. Lviv: Nakladom redaktsyi "Hromads'koho holosu," 1898.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Gerych, Iurii. "Problema tselibatu na L'vivs'komu Provintsiinomu Synodi (1891)." In *Zbirnyk na poshanu Vasylia Orelets'koho 1895–1976*, edited by Zynovii Sokoliuk [Zynovij Sokoluk] and Volodymyr Didovych [Didovychz], 111–46; *Fakul'tet prava i suspil'no-ekonomichnykh nauk*, Naukovyi Zbirnyk, 9. Munich: Ukrain's'kyi Vil'nyi Universytet, 1982.
- Glinka, Luigi. *Diocesi ucraino-cattolica di Cholm (Liquidazione ed incorporazione alla Chiesa russo-ortodossa) (Sec. XIX)*. *Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio I: Opera*, 34. Rome: PP. Basiliani, 1975.
- *Gregorio Jachymovyč – Metropolita di Halyč ed il suo tempo (1840–1865)*. 2nd ed. *Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio I: Opera*, 30. Rome: PP. Basiliani, 1974.
- Gruchała, Janusz. *Rząd austriacki i polskie stronnictwa polityczne w Galicji wobec kwestii ukraińskiej (1890–1914)*. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach*, 981. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski, 1988.
- Hankevych, Iuliiian. *Nedel'nyi propovidy*. 2 vols. Lviv: V typohrafiu Stavropyhiiskoho instytutu, 1876.
- *Prazdnychnyi propovidy*. 2 vols. Lviv: V typohrafiu Stavropyhiiskoho instytutu, 1876.
- *Sluchainyi propovidy*. 2 vols. Lviv: V typohrafiu Stavropyhiiskoho instytutu, 1877.
- Hann, Chris. "Christianity's Internal Frontier: The Case of Uniates in South-East Poland." *Anthropology Today* 4, no. 3 (June 1988): 9–13.
- "Religion and Nationality in Central Europe: The Case of the Uniates." *Ethnic Groups* 10, no. 1–3 (1993): 201–13.
- Harasiewicz, Michael. *Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenae*. Lviv: Typis instituti Rutheni Stauropigiani, 1862.
- Himka, John-Paul. "'Apolohiia' Mykhaila Malynovs'koho: do istorii kryzy u hreko-katolyts'kii tserkvi 1882 roku i kharakterystyky pohliadiv 'sviatouirt-siv.'" *Zapysky NTSh*, vol. 225: *Pratsi istorychno-filosofs'koi sektsii* (1993), 365–92.
- "The Conflict between the Secular and the Religious Clergy in Eighteenth-Century Western Ukraine." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 15, no. 1–2 (June 1991): 35–47.
- "The Construction of Nationality in Galician Rus': Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions." In *Intellectuals and the Articulation of the Nation*, edited by Michael D. Kennedy and Ron Suny. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, forthcoming.
- *Galicia and Bukovina: A Research Handbook about Western Ukraine, Late 19th and 20th Centuries*. Historic Sites Service, Occasional Paper, 20. [Edmonton]: Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism, Historic Resources Division, 1990.

- *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century*. Edmonton, London, New York: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, Macmillan, St Martin's Press, 1988.
 - "German Culture and the National Awakening in Western Ukraine before the Revolution of 1848." In *German-Ukrainian Relations in Historical Perspective*, edited by Hans-Joachim Torke and John-Paul Himka, 29–44. Edmonton, Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1994.
 - "The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Building in Galicia, 1772–1918." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8, no. 3–4 (December 1984): 426–52.
 - "The Greek Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Nation in Galicia." In *Religious Compromise, Political Salvation: The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-building in Eastern Europe*, edited by James Niessen, 7–26. The Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies, no. 1003. Pittsburgh: Center for Russian and East European Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 1993.
 - "The Issue of Celibacy at the Lviv Provincial Synod of 1891: Unpublished Documents from the Lviv and Przemysl (Peremyshl) Archives." In *Mappa Mundi: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' na poshanu Iaroslava Dashkevycha z nahody ioho 70-richchia, Studia in honorem Iaroslavi Daskevych septuagenario dedicata*, edited Ihor Hyrych et al., 648–70. Lviv, Kyiv, New York: Vydavnytstvo M.P. Kots', 1996.
 - "Priests and Peasants: The Greek Catholic Pastor and the Ukrainian National Movement in Austria, 1867–1900." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 21, no. 1 (1979): 1–14.
 - *Socialism in Galicia: The Emergence of Polish Social Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism (1860–1890)*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1983.
 - "Stratificazione sociale e movimento nazionale ucraino nella Galizia dell'ottocento." *Quaderni storici* 28, no. 3 (December 1993): 657–78.
- Hordyns'kyi, Iaroslav. *Do istorii kul'turnoho i politychnoho zhytia v Halychyni u 60-tykh rr. XIX v.* Zbirnyk Fil'ol'ogichnoi seksii NTsh, 16. Lviv: NTsh, 1917.
- "Mykhailo Kuzems'kyi kandydatom na mytropolychy prestil." *Zapysky NTsh* 112 (1912): 124–8.
- Hroch, Miroslav. *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Hryniuk, Stella. *Peasants with Promise: Ukrainians in Southeastern Galicia 1880–1900*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1991.
- Hrytsak, Iaroslav. "'Molodi' radykaly v suspil'no-politychnomu zhytti Halychyny." *Zapysky NTsh* 222 (1991): 71–110.
- Hudal, Alois. *Die österreichische Vatikanbotschaft 1806–1918*. Munich: Pohl & Co., 1952.
- Ihnatienko, V. *Bibliohrafiia ukrains'koi presy 1816–1916*; reprint: State College, Pa.: Vyd-vo "Ukrains'ka nova knyha," 1968.

- Ihnatowicz, Ireneusz. *Vademecum do badań nad historią XIX i XX wieku*. 2 vols. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1967–71.
- In causa graec. cath. Synodi Leopoliensis ex anno 1891*. Lviv: Typis Officinae Societatis Scientiarum Ševčenkianae Ucrainensium Leopoliensis, 1926.
- Isaiv, Petro. *Istoriia peremys'koho iepyskopstva shhidnoho obriadu*. Philadelphia: Ameryka, 1970.
- Ivanyshyn, Vasył'. *Ukrains'ka tserkva i protses natsional'noho vidrozhennia*. 2nd ed. Drohobych: L'vivs'kyi oblasnyi instytut udoskonalennia vchyte-liv, 1990.
- I ... witsch, A. *Material zur Denkschrift der galizischen Russen über die Massregeln, welche neuester Zeit unter dem Vorwande einer Reform des galizischen Regularclerus in's Leben gerufen, die griechisch-katholische Kirche Galiziens in ihrem Bestande gefährden*. (Separatabdruck aus dem "Parlamentär.") Vienna: Verlag des "Parlamentär," 1885.
- Jackowski, Henr[ylk]. *Bazylianie i reforma dobromilska*. Odbitka z "Przeglądu Powszechnego." Cracow: Druk Wł.L. Anczyca i Spółki, 1884.
- Kachala, Stefan. *Korotka istoriia Rusi*. Ruska istorychna biblioteka, 1. Ternopil: Z drukarni Iosyfa Pavlovskoho, 1886.
- [–] *Shcho nas hubyt' a shcho nam pomochy mozhe. Pys'mo dlia ruskykh selian*. Lviv: Prosvita, 1869.
- Kann, Robert A., and Zdeněk V. David. *The Peoples of the Eastern Habsburg Lands, 1526–1918. A History of East Central Europe*, 6. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press, 1984.
- Karovets', M. *Velyka reforma chyna sv. Vasyliia V. 1882 r.* Part 1. Zhovkva: Drukarnia oo. Vasyliian, 1933. Part 2. Lviv: Vydavnytstvo chyna sv. Vasyliia V., 1933. Part 3. Zhovkva: Vydavnytstvo chsvv, 1936.
- [Kasprowicz, Jan.] *Moskwa w obec Unii i Polski*. Lviv: Nakładem Towarzystwa im. Stanisława Staszica, 1889.
- Korcok, Anton. *Die griechisch-katholische Kirche in Galizien*. Osteuropa-Institut in Breslau. Leipzig and Berlin, 1921.
- Korolevsky, Cyril [Korolevskij, Cyrille]. *Metropolitan Andrew (1865–1944)*. Translated and revised by Serge Keleher. Lviv: Stauropegion, 1993.
- *Métropolitte André Szeptyckij 1865–1944*. Opera Theologicae Societatis Scientificaе Ucrainorum, 16–17. Rome, 1964.
- Kossak, E. [Prawdolub]. *Odpowiedź na historię "o unii kościoła grec. kat. ruskiego" przez Michała Malinowskiego, kanonika świętojurskiego we Lwowie, w 1862 r. wydana*. Lviv: Z drukarni M.F. Poremby, 1863.
- Kozik, Jan. *Między reakcją a rewolucją. Studia z dziejów ukraińskiego ruchu narodowego w Galicji w latach 1848–1849*. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 381, Prace Historyczne, 52. Cracow, 1975.
- "Moskalofilstwo w Galicji w latach 1848–1866 na tle odrodzenia narodowego Rusinów. (Praca magisterska)." M.A. thesis. Cracow: Jagiellonian University, 1958.

- *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia: 1815–1849*. Edited by Lawrence D. Orton. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986.
- *Ukraiński ruch narodowy w Galicji w latach 1830–1848*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1973.
- Krawczak, Tadeusz. *“Zanim wrocila Polska”: Martyrologium ludności unickiej na Podlasiu w latach 1866–1905 w świetle wspomnień*. Unici podlascy, 5. Warsaw: Neriton, 1994.
- Kudryk, Vasył'. *Malovidome z istorii Hreko-katolyts'koi Tserkvy*. 4 vols. Winnipeg: Vydavnycha spilka Ekleziia [vol. 1]. Vydavnycha spilka “Tryzub” [vols 2–4], 1952–56.
- *Zhyttia Iosafata Kuntsevycha. Istorychna rozvidka na pidstavi katolyts'kykh dzherel*. Winnipeg: Vydavnycha spilka Ekleziia, 1948.
- Kulich [Kulisch], P.A. *Vergewaltigung der Basilianer in Galizien durch Jesuiten*. Vienna: Im Selbstverlage des Verfassers, 1882.
- Kunys'kyi, Leontii. *Spohady molodykh lit ta zaslannia*. Toronto: [J.B. Kunycky], 1990.
- Kupchanko, Hryhorii [Gregor Kupczanko]. *Die Schicksale der Ruthenen*. Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Friedrich, 1887.
- Lacko, Michael. *Atlas hierarchicus ecclesiarum catholicarum orientalium*. 3rd ed. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1972.
- Lencyk, Wasył [Vasył Lentsyk]. *Rym i Ukraina. Istoriia ukrains'koi tserkvy v datakh*. Lviv, 1993.
- Levyts'kyi, Ivan Em. *Halytsko-ruskaia bybliohrafiia XIX-ho stolitiia s uvzhliadnenniem ruskykh izdaniï poiavyvshykhsia v Uhorshchyni i Bukovyni (1801–1886)*. 2 vols. Lviv: Stavropyhiiskii instytut, 1888–95.
- Levyts'kyi, Kost'. *Istoriia politychnoi dumky halyts'kykh ukraintsiv 1848–1914*. 2 vols. Lviv: Nakladom vlasnym, Z drukarni oo. Vasyliian u Zhovkvi, 1926–27.
- Likowski, Edward. *Dzieje Kościoła Unickiego na Litwie i Rusi w XVIII i XIX wieku uważane głównie ze względu na przyczyny jego upadku*. 2nd ed. Biblioteka Dzieł Chrześcijańskich. 2 parts. Warsaw, Cracow: Skład główny w Księgarni Gebethnera i Wolffa, G. Gebethner i S-ka, 1906.
- Litterae S.C. de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam Catholicam Ucrainae et Bielarussiae spectantes*. Vol. 7: 1790–1862. Edited by Athanasius G. Welykyj. Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio III: Documenta romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarussiae. Rome: PP. Basiliani, 1957.
- Lockwood, William G. “Religion and Language as Criteria of Ethnic Identity: An Exploratory Comparison.” In *Ethnicity and Nationalism in Southeastern Europe*, edited by Sam Beck and John W. Cole, 71–82. Amsterdam: 1981.
- Luk'ianenko, Denys. *Ivan Franko v borot'bi proty religii, tserkvy i Vatikanu*. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo politychnoi literatury, 1955.
- Luzhnyts'kyi, Hryhor. *Ukrains'ka tserkva mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom. Narys istorii ukrains'koi tserkvy*. Philadelphia: Nakladom Soiuzu ukraintsiv-katolykiv “Provydinnia,” 1954.

- Madey, Johannes. *Kirche zwischen Ost und West: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Ukrainischen und Weissruthenischen Kirche*. Monographien, 15. Munich: Ukrainische Freie Universität, 1969.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert. *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographic Guide*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1983.
- "The Kachkovs'kyi Society and the National Revival in Nineteenth-Century East Galicia." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 15, no. 1-2 (June 1991): 48-87.
 - "Nationalism and National Bibliography: Ivan E. Levyts'kyi and Nineteenth-Century Galicia." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 28, no. 1 (January 1980): 81-109.
 - , ed. *Morality and Reality: The Life and Times of Andrei Sheptyts'kyi*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1989.
- Malynovs'kyi, Mykhail. *Istorychna vidomost' o mytropolii ruskoj v Halychi*. Lviv: Z drukarni tovarystva imeni Shevchenka, 1875.
- [Michael Ritter von Malinowski]. *Die Kirchen- und Staats-Satzungen bezüglich des griechisch-katholischen Ritus der Ruthenen in Galizien*. Lviv: Druckerei des Stauropigianischen Instituts, 1861.
- Markovits, Andrei S., and Frank E. Sysyn, eds. *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982.
- Martyniuk, Pliaton. *Nepodil'ne sertse sviashchenyka v sluzhbi Boha i tserkvy*. Zhovkva: Drukarnia oo. Vasylilian, 1935.
- Matkovs'kyi, Severyn. *Try synodal'ni arkhiierei. Spomyny z zhyttia i diial'nosti preosviashchenykh o. Iuliana Kulovs'koho, dra Iuliana Pelesha i dra Syl'vestra Sembratovycha*. Lviv: Nakladom o. Aleksandra Stefanovycha, Z drukarni "Bibl'os," 1932.
- The Modern Encyclopedia of Religions in Russia and the Soviet Union*. Gulf Breeze, Fla.: Academic International Press, 1988-
- Mojoli, Giuseppe. *Attività liturgica della S. Congregazione "de Propaganda Fide" per gli Affari di Rito Orientale nel periodo 1862-1892*. Venice: Tip. Ed. "ESCA," 1977.
- Monchalovskii, O.A. *Zhyt'e i diiatel'nost' Ivana Naumovycha*. Izdaniie polytychnoho Obshchestva "Russkaia rada" vo L'vovi. Lviv: Iz typohrafii Stavropyhiiskoho instytutu, 1899.
- Nacherk istorii unii rus'koi tserkvy z Rymom*. Lviv: Nakladom Komytetu iuvyleinoho, 1896.
- Naumovych, Ioann. *Appelliatsiia k pape L'vu XIII russkago uniatskago sviashchennika mestechka Skalat (I'vovskoi mitropolii v Galitsii) Ioanna Naumovicha protiv velikago otlucheniia ego ot tserkvi po obvineniiu v skhizme*. Perekhod s latsinskago iazyka. N.p., 1883.
- Nazarko, Irynei. "Iepyskop Iu. Pelesh - istoryk tserkvy." *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 18:118-27.
- *Kyivs'ki i halyts'ki mytropolyty. Biohrafichni narysy (1590-1960)*. Zapysky chsvv, Seriiia II, Sektsiia I: Pratsi, 13. Rome, 1962.
- Neck, Rudolf. "The Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv: Its History, Holdings, and Use." *Austrian History Yearbook* 6-7 (1970-71): 3-16.

- Olesnyts'kyi, Evhen. *Storinky z moho zhyttia*. 2 parts. Lviv: Nakladom vydavnychoi spilky "Dilo," 1935.
- Pałosz, Jerzy. "Sprawy kościelno-polityczne na forum Galicyjskiego Sejmu Krajowego w okresie 'austriackiego Kulturkampf' (1861–1874)." *Studia Historyczne* 28, no. 3 (110) (1985), 363–79.
- Patent cesarza Józefa Drugiego o Taksach za jura stolae. Z przedmową Dra Seweryna Daniłowicza. Przełożył z ruskiego i wydał Michał Pawlik. Kolomyja: Z drukarni Michała Biłousa, 1893.
- Patrylo, Isydor I. *Dzherela i bibliohrafiia istorii ukrains'koi tserkvy*. Zapysky chsvv, Seriiia II, Sektsiia I: Pratsi, 33. Rome, 1975.
- "Dzherela i bibliohrafiia istorii ukrains'koi tserkvy." *Analecta OSBM*, Series II, Sectio II, vol. 10 (16) (1979), Fasc. 1–4, 406–87.
 - "Dzherela i bibliohrafiia istorii ukrains'koi tserkvy," *Analecta OSBM*, Series II, Sectio II, vol. 12 (18) (1985), Fasc. 1–4, 419–525.
 - "Narys istorii Halys'tkoi provintsii chsvv." *Analecta OSBM* 17 (1982): 43–130.
- Pavlyk, Mykhailo. *Pamiaty Mykhaila Drahomanova*. Biblioteka dlia suspil'nykh nauk, 1. Chernivtsi, 1902.
- *Tvory*. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1959.
 - , ed. *Perepyaska Mykhaila Drahomanova z Mykhailom Pavlykom*. (1876–1878). 7 vols., numbered 2–8. Chernivtsi, 1910–12.
- Pavlyk, Partenii. "Pochytannia sv. Iosafata u Grottaferats'komu monastyri." *Bohosloviia* 31, no. 1–4 (1967): 100–26.
- Pelesz, Julian. *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom von den aeltesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. 2 vols. Würzburg-Vienna: Leo Woerl, 1878–81.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Confessor between East and West: A Portrait of Ukrainian Cardinal Iosyf Slipyj*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990.
- [Petrov, N.I.] *Kholmkaia Rus'. Istoricheskiia sud'by Russkago Zabuzh'ia*. St Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1887.
- Petrovich, Michael B. "Religion and Ethnicity in Eastern Europe." In *Ethnic Diversity and Conflict in Eastern Europe*, edited by Peter F. Sugar, 373–417, 501–10. Joint Committee on Eastern Europe Publication Series, 8. Barbara, Oxford: ABC-Clio, 1980.
- Petrushevych, Antonii. "Iosyf Shumlianskii, pervyi l'vovskii uniiatskii epyskop." *Halychanyn*, kn. I, vyp. I (1862): 117–24.
- Pidručnyj, Porfirio. "Documenti riguardanti l'inizio della riforma Basiliiana in Galizia (1880–1882)." *Analecta OSBM*, Sectio II, vol. XI (XVII), Fasc. 1–4 (1982): 353–403.
- "Relazioni dei Gesuiti sulla Riforma Basiliiana di Dobromyl' (1882–1904)." *Analecta OSBM*, Series II, Sectio II, vol. XII (XVIII), Fasc. 1–4 (1985): 210–54.
- Pobedonostsev, K.P. *K.P. Pobedonostsev i ego korrespondenty. Pis'ma i zapiski*. 2 parts. Moscow, Petrograd: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1923.
- *Pis'ma Pobedonostseva k Aleksandru III*. 2 vols. Moscow: Novaia Moskva, 1925–26.

- Pravda pro uniiu. Dokumenty i materialy*, 2nd, exp. ed. Lviv: Kameniar, 1968.
- Prokoptschuk, Gregor. *Metropolit Andreas Graf Scheptyckyj: Leben und Wirken des grossen Förderers der Kirchenunion*. 2nd ed. Munich: Verlag Ukraine, 1967.
- Prystai, O[leksa]. *Z Truskavtsia u svit khmaroderiv. Spomyny z mynuloho i suchasnoho*. 4 vols. Lviv, New York: Nakladom vlasnym, 1935–37.
- Rede des Abgeordneten Zaklinski, in der Budgetdebatte des österreichischen Abgeordnetenhauses am 5. Mai 1879, bezüglich der Errichtung des griechisch-katholischen Bisthums in Stanislawow*. [Vienna:] Aus der k.k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, [1879].
- Rudnytsky, Ivan L. *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*. Edited by Peter L. Rudnytsky. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987.
- Rudovych, Ioan. *Korotka istoriia halytsko-l'vivskoi ieparkhii. Na osnovi hrets'kykh zherel i inshykh noviiшыkh pidruchmykiv*. (Vidbytkha z Shematyzmu Arkhieparkhii lvivskoi na r. 1902.) Zhovkva: Pechatnia oo. Vasyliian, 1902.
- *Unii v l'vivskii eparkhii*. Lviv: Nakladom avtora, Z drukarni Stavropyhiiskoho instytutu, 1900.
- S. *Josaphat hieromartyr: Documenta romana beatificationis et canonizationis*. Vol. 3: 1637–1867. Edited by Athanasius G. Welykyj. *Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio III: Documenta romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae*. Rome: PP. Basiliani, 1967.
- Saurer, Edith. *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsnennungen 1867–1903. Forschungen zur Kirchengeschichte Österreichs*, 6. Vienna, Munich: Verlag Herold, 1968.
- Sembratovych, Iosyf. *Arkhiiereiskoe poslaniie o vysokom dostoinstvi chelovika*. Lviv: Iz typohrafii Stavropyhiiskoho instytutu, 1874.
- Senyk, Sophia. "The Education of the Secular Clergy in the Ruthenian Church before the Nineteenth Century." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 53, no. 2 (1987): 387–416.
- *A History of the Church in Ukraine*. Vol. 1: *To the End of the Thirteenth Century*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1993.
- "Le métropolitte André Šeptyc'kyj: Dimension spirituelle de sa vie et de son oeuvre." *Irénikon* 64, no. 1 (1991): 57–71.
- "The Sources of the Spirituality of St Josaphat Kuncevyč." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 51, no. 2 (1985): 425–36.
- "The Ukrainian Church and Latinization." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 56, no. 1 (1990): 165–87.
- Sharanevych [Iwanowicz], I. *Über die historische Bedeutung des Basilianenordens in Galizien und seine gegenwärtigen Verhältnisse*. Leipzig: Gustav Wolf, 1885.
- Sheptyts'kyi, Andrei. *Tvory*. Vol. 1: *Pastyrs'ki lysty (2.VIII.1899 r.-7.IX.1901 r.)*. Pratsi Ukraïns'koho bohoslòvs'koho naukòvoho tovarystva, 15. Toronto: Drukarnia oo. Vasyliian, 1965.
- Sobor ruskii eparkhiiial'nyi peremyskii vidpravlenyi v rotsi 1898 Konstantynom Chekhovychem ...* Lviv: Stavropyhiiskii instytut, 1899.

- Sokhots'kyi, Isydor. *Shcho daly hreko-katolyts'ka tserkva i dukhovenstvo ukrains'komu narodovi*. Philadelphia: Ameryka, 1951.
- Sokolov, I. *Protoierei Ioann Grigor'evich Naumovich. Kratkii biograficheskii ocherk*. St Petersburg: Synodal'naia tipografiia, 1894.
- Solovii, M.M., and A.H. Velykyi. *Sviatyi Iosafat Kuntsevych. Ioho zhyttia i doba*. Ukrains'ka dukhovna biblioteka. Toronto: Vydavnytstvo oo. Vasyliian, 1967.
- Sorokowski, Andrew Dennis. "The Greek-Catholic Parish Clergy in Galicia, 1900–1939." Ph.D. dissertation: University of London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies, [1991].
- Stakhiv, M. [M. Mykolaievych.] *Moskvofil'stvo, ioho bat'ky i dity. Istorychnyi narys*. Lviv: Nakladom Hromads'koho holosu, 1936.
- Stasiv [Stasiw], Myron. "Synodus Leopolitana." Doctoral thesis, Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1959.
- *Metropolia Haliciensis (Eius historia et iuridica forma)*. *Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio I: Opera, 12*. Rome: PP. Basiliani, 1960.
- [Stefanovych, Aleksandr.] *V oboroni prav nashoi Hreko-katol. tserkvy*. Lviv: Nakladom Ivana Gotia, 1929.
- *Vysvitlenia do istorii l'vivs'kykh synodiv z rokiv 1891 i 1897*. Lviv: Nakladom Ivana Kudlaka, Z drukarni NTSh, 1924.
- Stenograficzne Sprawozdania z czwartej sesyi czwartego peryodu Sejmu Krajowego Królestwa Galicyi i Lodomeryi wraz z Wielkiem Księstwem Krakowskiem w roku 1881. Posiedzenie 1–29*. [Lviv,] n.d.
- Stropp, Robert. "Die Akten des k.u.k. Ministeriums des Äussern 1848–1918: Administrative Registratur." *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 30 (1977): 398–453; 32 (1979): 306–49; 33 (1980): 356–415; 34 (1981): 411–56.
- Syllabus complectens praecipuos nostrae aetatis errores qui notantur in allocutionibus consistorialibus in encyclicis aliisque apostolicis litteris Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii Papae IX*. [Rome, 1864.]
- Taniachkevych, Danylo [Fedor Chornohora]. *Pys'mo narodovtsiv rus'kykh do redaktora politychnoi chasopysi "Rus'" iak protest i memoriial*. Biblioteka "Shashkevychiiany," no. 6. Winnipeg, 1973.
- Tarnavs'kyi, Fylymon. *Spohady. Rodynna khronika Tarnavs'kykh iak prychnok do istorii tserkovnykh, sviashchenyts'kykh, pobutovykh, ekonomichnykh i politychnykh vidnosyn u Halychyni v druhii polovyni XIX storichchia i v pershii dekadi XX storichchia*. Edited by Anatol Mariia Bazylevych and Roman Ivan Danylevych. Toronto: Dobra knyzhka, 1981.
- T.L. *V dvistalitnu richnytsiu unii l'vivskoi arkhyydiitsezii*. Lviv: Nakladom Mytr. Ordynariiata, Z drukarni Stavropyhiiskoho instytutu, 1900.
- Turii, Oleh. "Hreko-katolyts'ka tserkva v suspil'no-politychnomu zhytti Halychyny, 1848–1867." Typescript.
- *Hreko-katolyts'ka tserkva v suspil'no-politychnomu zhytti Halychyny, 1848–1867. Avtoreferat dysertatsii na zdobuttia naukovoho stupenia kandydata istorichnykh nauk*. Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp'iakevycha, 1994.

- Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*. 2 vols. Edited by Volodymyr Kubijovyč. Toronto: Ukrainian National Association, University of Toronto Press, 1963–71.
- Vakhnianyn, Natal'. *Prychynky do istorii ruskoj spravy v Halychyni v litakh 1848–1870*. Peredruk z "Osnovy" z 1871. roku. Lviv: Nakladom L'va Lopatyn'skoho, Z drukarni V.A. Shyikovskoho, 1901.
- Vavryk, Mykhailo. *Bibliografichnyi ohliad istorii Vasyliians'koho Chyna za 1935–1950 rr*. Vidbytka z "Zapysok chsvv," t. III, vyp. 1–2, stor. 237–76. Rome: Nakladom "Zapysok chsvv," 1958.
- *Bibliografichnyi ohliad istorii Vasyliians'koho Chyna za 1950–1970 rr*. Vidbytka z "Zapysok chsvv," t. VII (XIII), vyp. 1–4, stor. 334–424. Rome: Nakladom "Zapysok chsvv," 1971.
- *Narys rozvytku i stanu Vasyliians'koho chyna xvii–xx st. Topografichno-statystychna rozvidka*. *Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio I: Opera*, 40. Rome: PP. Basiliani 1979.
- Vavryk, V.R. *Materialy, otnosiashchiesia k istorii l'vovskoho synoda v 1891*. (= *Vremennyk. Nauchno-lyteraturnyia zapysky l'vovskoho Stavropyhiona* 62 [1932].) Lviv: Typohrafiia Stavropyhiisk. Instytutu, 1931.
- Velykyi, A.H. *Z litopysu khrystyians'koi Ukrainy. Tserkovno-istorychni radioleksyii z Vatykanu*. *Ukrainska dukhovna biblioteka*. Rome: oo. Vasyliian. Vol. 7: *xviii–xix st.* 1975. Vol. 8: *xix st.* 1976. Vol. 9: *xx st.* 1977.
- Weeks, Theodore R. "The 'End' of the Uniate Church in Russia: The *Vozsoedinenie* of 1875." *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 44, no. 1 (1995).
- Winter, Eduard. *Byzanz und Rom im Kampf um die Ukraine 955–1939*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1942.
- *Russland und die slawischen Völker in der Diplomatie des Vatikans 1878–1903*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1950.
- Zaleski, Stanisław. *Kilka uwag nad dziełem ks. dra Pełęsza o unii tom II*. Cracow: Czcionkami drukarni "Czasu," 1881.
- Zięba, Andrzej A., ed. *Metropolita Andrzej Szeptycki. Studia i materiały*. Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Prace Komisji Wschodnioeuropejskiej, 1. Cracow: Nakładem Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności, 1994.
- Zhyvotko, Arkadii. "Do istorii ukrains'koho radykal'noho chasopysu 'Narod.'" *Narodoznavstvo* (Prague) 1–3 (1931): 136–70.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX

- Abrahamowicz, Dawid, 127
alphabet, Cyrillic, 11, 70
anticlericalism, 150–7
Antonelli, Cardinal Giacomo, 42–3, 45, 47
Avdykovsky, Orest, 77, 135
- Bachynsky, Father Aleksandr, 49–50, 135, 146, 152
Bachynsky, Iulian, 152
Badeni, Kazimierz, 106, 120
Bakunin, Mikhail, 150
Baran, Stepan, 16
Barvinsky, Oleksander, 138
Barvinsky, Volodymyr, 139–41
Basilians, 130; opposition to radicalism, 157–8; popular missionary activity, 161–2; reform of 1882, 79–84; reform of 1882, historiography, 18
Bat'kivshchyna (Lviv), 129, 140, 145, 162
Beckx, Rev. Pierre-Jean, 80
Biała Podlaska, 30–1
Bila Piskova, 65
Bobrovych, Father Luka, 126–7, 166
Bobrzyński, Michał, 139
Brest, Union of, 6, 28–9, 114; evaluation by national populists, 53; evaluation by Russophiles, 74–5, 143
Brody, 124
Buchach, 82
Budzynovsky, Viacheslav, 150, 152
Bukovina, 7, 74, 117, 131, 133
Bulgarians, 67–8
Burzyński, J., 156
Byzantine Catholics, 8
- calendar, Julian, 69, 123
cathedral chapters, 7
Catherine II (Russian empress), 32
Catholic Ruthenian-National Union, 138
celibacy, 69, 104–20, 128, 152
- Chekhovych, Konstantyn (bishop of Przemyśl), 119, 127–8
Chełm eparchy: conversion to Orthodoxy, 57–64; conversion to Orthodoxy, historiography, 18; historical background, 32–4; immigration of Galicians into, 34–5, 90; refugees from, in metropolis of Halych, 62–3, 122, 126–7; role of Galician immigrants in, 37, 41, 52, 59–61, 88, 175n. 50
Cherliunchakevych, Father Iosyf, 114, 204n. 267
Chernetsky, Father Vasylii, 107, 110, 113
Chernivtsi, 74, 117
Ciasca, Msgr Agostino, 104–7, 110–14, 116, 118, 123, 200n. 224
Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. *See* Propaganda
Conrad von Eybesfeld, Sigmund, 87, 89
Cracow, 69
Cretoni, Msgr Serafino, 66–7, 99
crosses, three-barred, 64–6, 89, 121–3, 166
Czas (Cracow), 75–6, 87, 93
- Danilenko, S.T., 17
Della Scala, Count, 74
Didytsky, Bohdan, 30
Dilo (Lviv), 128–9, 131, 140–1; on Jesuit missions, 121; on reform of Basilians, 82, 84; and resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, 93; on treason trial of 1882, 140–1
Dmokhovsky, Father Teofil, 116
Dobriansky, Adolf, 140
Dobromyl, 81–3, 106, 129
Dolnytsky, Father Isydor, 105–6
Dombrovsky, Father Mykhail, 31–2, 174n. 22
Drahomanov, Mykhailo, 138, 149–52, 156
Dryshchiv, 122
Dunajewski, Cardinal Albin, 105

- Dymet, Mykhailo, 66
Dziennik Polski (Lviv), 76, 86
- elections, parliamentary, of 1885, 136
- Falcinelli-Antoniacci, Msgr Mariano, 37–8, 43, 46
- Fokshei, Hrytsko, 154
- Franko, Ivan, 125, 136, 139, 149, 152, 156
- Franz Joseph (Austrian emperor), 42, 62; and reform of Basilians, 83; and resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, 92–3; and Resurrectionists, 67
- Galicia, autonomy, 23, 70; territory, population, administration, 12–13
- Gautsch von Frankenthurn, Baron Paul, 102–3, 120
Gazeta Krakowska (Cracow), 76
Gazeta Narodowa (Lviv), 76, 142
- Gellner, Ernest, 163
- Glinka, Father Luigi, 16, 18
Głos Narodu, 130
- Gniewosz, Jan, 82
- Gołuchowski, Count Agenor, 11, 24, 27, 43, 48
- Greek Catholics, nomenclature, 5
- Grottaferrata, 31, 43
- Halych, eparchy of, 6; metropolis of, appointment of metropolitan in 1869–70, 44–7; metropolis of, erection, 7
Halychanyn (Lviv, 1860s), 30
Halychanyn (Lviv, 1890s), 124
Halytskaia Rus' (Lviv), 124
- Harasevych, Father Mykhail, 15
- Herasymovych, Nikolai, 145
- Hnylychky, 73–8, 84–5, 88
- Hnylytsi Velyki, 73
- Hobsbawm, E.J., 163
- Holovatsky, Iakiv, 9, 11, 34–5
- Hordynsky, Iaroslav, 16
- Hornysky, Father Ievhenii, 143–4, 146–8
- Horozhanna, 113
- Hrushevsky, Mykhailo, 137, 151
- Hutsuls, 133
- Iakhymovych, Hryhorii (bishop of Przemyśl, metropolitan of Halych), 10–12, 28, 89, 98, 127
- Ignatius Loyola, Saint, 124
- income of Greek Catholic priests, 124–5, 154
- Iosafat Kuntsevych, Saint (bishop of Polatsk), 28–32, 52
- Ischl, 92
- Iuzychynsky, Canon Antonii, 44, 46–7, 176n. 76
- Ivanyshyn, Vasyl, 17
- Jackowski, Rev. Henryk: and Hnylychky affair, 76; and Lviv synod of 1891, 102; on national populists, 148–9; and reform of Basilians, 80, 83, 187n. 50; and resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, 93
- Jacobini, Cardinal Luigi, 90, 99–100
- Jesuits, 70, 97, 101, 120; and reform of Basilians, 79–80, 82–4, 87, 106
- Jews, 162
- Joseph II (Austrian emperor), 6
- Kachala, Father Stefan, 126; on Basilians, 79; on conversion of Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy, 60; and Hnylychky affair, 74, 76; on Resurrectionists, 69–71; on St Iosafat Kuntsevych, 30; and sobriety movement, 56
- Kachkovsky Society, Mykhail, 57, 95, 108, 124, 139, 142–3, 160
- Kalinka, Rev. Walerian, 67–9, 71
- Kálnoky, Count Gustav, 76, 89, 102, 117
- Kalynsky, Father Ioann (Jan Kaliński), 35, 40–1
- Karovets, Father Makarii, 18
- Katkov, Mikhail, 63
- Khliborob* (Lviv and Kolomyia), 153, 155–6, 162
- Khodoriv, 123
- Kiev. *See* Kyiv
- klobuks, 43, 46–7
- Kniahynychi, 122
- Kobyliansky, Father Iosyf, 49, 105, 117, 146
- Kolomyia, 137, 157
- kolpaks, 66–7
- Komarnytsky, Father Iosyf, 136
- Kopystiansky, Father Ioann, 115–17
- Korczok, Anton, 16
- Korolevsky, Father Cyril, 16
- Kosiv, 157
- Kostetsky, Father Kelestyn, 117
- Kozakevych, Father Ioann, 153
- Krushynsky, Father Iosyf, 107, 110, 115

- Krynitsky, Father Ippolyt, 34–5
 Kudryk, Vasyl, 17–18
Kurier Poznański (Poznań), 76
 Kuzemsky, Father Mykhail (canon, later bishop of Chełm): as bishop of Chełm, 36–41, 60, 63; as candidate for bishop of Przemyśl, 48–9; as candidate for metropolitan of Halych, 39, 47; involvement in Ruthenian movement before 1867, 10–12, 35–6
 Kyiv, 98
- latinization, 97, 116 (see also ritual purification); in Chełm eparchy, 33; in Galicia, 50, 124, 145, 152, 162
 Lavriv, 84
 Ledóchowski, Cardinal Mieczysław, 80, 105
 Lemkos, 147, 160
 Leo XIII, 85–6, 99, 120; and reform of Basilians, 80–3; and resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, 91–2
 Lepky, Father Onufrii, 136
 Levytsky, Father Emylian, 77, 96, 135
 Levytsky, Father Iosyf, 109
 Levytsky, Ivan Em., 29, 135
 Levytsky, Kost, 18, 136
 Levytsky, Mykhail (metropolitan of Halych), 10
 Likowski, Rev. Edward, 18
 Lisevych, Canon Teodor, 143
 Lisikevych, Mykola, 35
 liturgical books, reform of, 103, 120
 Luzhnytsky, Father Hryhor, 17
 Lviv: archeparchial synod of, 1897, 118–19; archeparchy of, 7; as centre of recruitment for emigration to Chełm region, 34; as centre of Ruthenian movement, 9; eparchy of, 6; Greek Catholic seminary in, 6, 50, 53, 143, 145; synod of, 1891, 101–21, 128, 161; synod of, 1891, historiography, 18–19
 Lytvynovych, Spyrydon (bishop, metropolitan of Halych), 42–3, 48; death, 39; political involvement, 11–12, 23–4; and ritual purification, 89
 Lyvchak, Father Nykolai, 30, 59, 61
- Madey, Rev. Johannes, 17
 Magocsi, Paul Robert, 16, 18
 Malyniak, Father Nykolai, 50, 146
 Malynovsky, Canon Mykhail: and Chełm eparchy, 38; as historian, 15; involvement in Ruthenian movement before 1867, 10–12; and kolpaks, 67; resignation, 87–8, 92, 94, 194n. 131; and St George program of 1871, 54–5; and sobriety movement, 56; and Stanyslaviv eparchy, 98
 Mardarovych, Father Illia, 111–12
 Maria Theresa (Austrian empress), 5, 6
 Markov, Iosyf, 78
 Martyniuk, Father Pliaton, 18
 Matkovsky, Father Severyn, 18, 113, 136
Meta (Lviv), 54
 Milnytsky, Father Iosyf, 49–50, 109, 112–13
Misionar' (Zhovkva), 132, 157, 161–2
 missions, 121
 Morawski, Seweryn (Roman Catholic suffragan bishop of Lviv), 81
 Morozovychi, 154
 Moskaliivka, 154
Myr (Lviv), 135–7
- Narod* (Lviv and Kolomyia), 152, 156
 Narodna rada, 148
 Narolsky, Adolf, 145
 national populism: and church, 51–4, 148–9; definition, 51
 nationalism, as a challenge to religion, 165–7
 nationality, construction of, 163–5; theories of, 163
Nauka (Kolomyia), 124
 Naumovych, Father Ioann (Ivan), 90, 94, 124, 140–5, 158; article "A Glimpse into the Future," 24–8; conversion to Orthodoxy, 97–8; death, 98; excommunication, 95–8; and Hnylychky affair, 75–8; on liturgical issues, 24; and Resurrectionists, 69
 Naumovych, Nykolai, 77, 185n. 33
 Nazarko, Father Irynei, 17
 Nehrebetsky, Father Ioann, 107, 110–11, 113–15
 new era, 137–8, 141–2, 156
 Nicholas I (tsar), 33
Novyi prolom (Lviv), 124
 Nyrkiv, 123
- Ohonovsky, Father Emylian, 116
 Ohonovsky, Father Nykolai, 54

- Olesnytsky, Evhen, 79, 84, 125, 135, 137
 Oriental Congregation. *See* Propaganda
Osnova (Lviv), 51, 55
 Ostroverkha, Father Iieron, 79, 82
- Paar, Ludwig, 89–90
 Paphnutius (Egyptian bishop), 109
 Paris, 127
 patriarchate, Ruthenian Greek Catholic, 53
 Patrylo, Father Isydor, 16
 Paul, Saint, 106, 109–11
 Pavlyk, Mykhailo, 149–52, 155–6
 Pavlykov, Canon Teofil, 108, 110, 139
 Pelesh, Iuliiian (bishop of Stanyslaviv, Przemysł), 101, 129, 136; as bishop of Przemysł, 104, 147; as bishop of Stanyslaviv, 99–100, 124; on conversion of Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy, 60; death, 127; general characterization, 125–6; as historian, 15; and Lviv synod of 1891, 108–9, 112–14, 116; rector of Vienna seminary, 50, 120; in *Sion* circle, 49
- Peter of Arbues, Saint, 30
 Pidručnyj, Father Porfirio, 18
 Piniński, Count Leon, 142
 Pius IX, 43, 47–8; and canonization of Iosafat Kuntsevych, 29, 31; and conversion of Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy, 58; and resignation of Bishop Mykhail Kuzemsky, 39–40; and sobriety movement, 56–7
- Ploshchansky, Venedykt, 140
 Poचाiv, 124
 Podlachia, 58, 61
 Podolians, 127, 142
 Polatsk, 28–9
 Poliansky, Toma (bishop of Przemysł), 42–4, 89
 Polish insurrection of 1830–31, 33, 67
 Polish insurrection of 1846, 67
 Polish insurrection of 1863–64, 31, 33, 38
 Ponykva Velyka, 122
 Popel, Father Markell, 24, 30, 34–5, 38–40, 63; and conversion of Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy, 57–9
- Possinger-Choborski, Count Ludwik, 45
 Potocki, Count Alfred: and Hnylychky affair, 74; and reform of Basilians, 80–1; and resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, 86–90, 93–4; and Resurrectionists, 68
- Potocki, Count Andrzej, 142
Pravda (Lviv), 51, 63–4
 Prokoptschuk, Gregor, 16
Prolom (Lviv), 74
 Propaganda: and appointment of Ioann Stupnytsky, 47; and Father Luka Bobrovych, 127; and kolpaks, 66–7; and Lviv synod of 1891, 103–4, 106, 118; and reform of Basilians, 79; and resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, 90–1; and three-barred crosses, 64–5, 123
 Prosvita Society, 51, 126, 140, 160; and sobriety movement, 56–7
 Protestantism, 151–2
 Proudhon, 150
 Prystai, Father Oleksa, 18
Przegląd Kościelny, 76
Przegląd Lwowski (Lviv), 76
 Przemysł: as centre of Ruthenian movement, 9; eparchial synod of, 1898, 119; eparchy of, after death of Bishop Toma Poliansky, 42–4, 47; eparchy of, appointment of bishop in 1871–72, 47–9; eparchy of, early history, 6; eparchy of, persistence of Russophilism in, 147; eparchy of, size, 7; eparchy of, three-barred crosses in, 64–5
- Puzyna, Jan (Roman Catholic suffragan bishop of Lviv), 93, 100, 106, 120
- radicalism, 149–58
 Raevsky, Father Mikhail, 34, 50, 119
 reading clubs, 131–2, 156, 159–61, 167
 Reshetylo, Father Ioann, 116
 Resurrectionists, 67–71, 75, 78, 97, 105, 126
 Revertera-Salandra, Count Friedrich Karl, 117
 revolution of 1848–49, 10, 127
 ritual purification: in Chełm eparchy, 33–8, 57–8, 63; in Galicia, 24, 27–8, 34, 43, 52–3, 89
 Romanchuk, Iuliiian, 136–7, 148
 Rome, 91–2, 97, 120; Ruthenian seminarians in, 120
 Rosty, Sigmund von, 91–2
 Rudnytsky, Ivan L., 18, 137
 Rudovych, Father Ioan, 16
Rus' (Lviv, 1860s), 51–2
Rus' (Lviv, 1880s), 126
Ruskii Sion. *See* *Sion*
Ruslan (Lviv), 138

- Russian Orthodox church, 52, 59, 147, 164
- Russophilism: after the crisis of 1882, 138–48; as conservatism, 143–5; definition, 11; origins, 10; rhetoric, 27–8, 139, 172n. 5; subsidies, 141–2. See also *Slovo*
- Ruthenian Triad, 9, 11
- Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party. See radicalism
- Rybchak, Father H., 156
- Sadowa, battle of, 23
- St George party, 12; decline, 23–5; program of 1871, 54–5, 178n. 110
- St Petersburg, 124
- Sapieha, Lew, 29–30
- Sarnytsky, Father Klymentii, 49, 80–2, 186n. 47
- Sas-Kuilovsky, Iuliiian (bishop of Stanyslaviv, metropolitan of Halych), 104, 120, 127–8, 131–2, 161
- Saurer, Edith, 19, 45
- Seiller, von (Austrian ambassador to the Holy See), 66
- Sembratovych, Iosyf (metropolitan of Halych), 133; as apostolic administrator of Przemyśl eparchy, 42–4; appointment as metropolitan, 45–7; attempt to reconcile Russophiles and national populists, 54; and conversion of Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy, 59, 62–3; and Father Ioann Naumovych, 95–6; and Hnylychky affair, 74, 76; and kolpaks, 66–7; opposition to appointment of Ioann Stupnytsky, 47–8; as postulator for Iosafat Kuntsevych, 32, 43; and reform of Basilians, 79–81, 83, 86–8, 90, 92; resignation, 84–94, 99, 103; and Resurrectionists, 68; and sobriety movement, 56–7; and three-barred crosses, 65–6
- Sembratovych, Cardinal Sylvestr (metropolitan of Halych), 124, 160; appointment as administrator of Lviv archeparchy, 94, 195n. 155; as candidate for bishop of Stanyslaviv, 101; as candidate for metropolitan of Halych in 1869–70, 46; characterization of Andrei Sheptytsky, 129–30; death, 128; and Father Ioann Naumovych, 97; and Father Luka Bobrovych, 126–7; general characterization, 125–6; and Julian calendar, 123; and Lviv synod of 1891, 102–3, 108, 111–18, 120; politics, 135–8, 166; in *Sion* circle, 49, 54
- Sembratovych, Father Teofil, 49, 110, 115
- Semenenko, Rev. Piotr, 67
- seminary reform, 103–4, 119–20
- Senyk, Sister Sophia, 16
- Shankovsky, Father Markiiian, 154
- Sharanevych, Isydor, 112, 116–17
- Shashkevych, Canon Hryhorii: as candidate for coadjutor of Przemyśl, 42–3; as candidate for metropolitan of Halych in 1869–70, 46; conflict with Archbishop Iosyf Sembratovych, 44
- Shashkevych, Markiiian, 9
- Sheptytsky, Andrei (bishop of Stanyslaviv, later metropolitan of Halych): appointment as bishop of Stanyslaviv, 129–30; background, 129; as bishop of Stanyslaviv, 130–4; historiography, 16; as metropolitan of Halych, 40–1, 119, 127, 146, 166
- Shevchenko, Taras, 53–4, 145–6, 151
- Shpunder, Ivan, 78, 140
- Shykh, Father Ioann, 49
- Simeoni, Cardinal Giovanni, 76, 80, 85–7, 92–3, 101–2
- Singalevych, Canon Mykhail, 136, 209n. 378
- Sion* (Lviv), 160; and celibacy, 105; on conversion of Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy, 60, 62–3; and Father Ioann Naumovych, 96; general characterization, 49–51; on kolpaks, 66; on reform of Basilians, 83; on Taras Shevchenko, 54; and resignation of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, 93
- Slusarchuk, Oleksa, 177n. 102
- Slovo* (Lviv), 77–8, 124, 140–1; on appointment of Ioann Stupnytsky, 48; article “A Glimpse into the Future,” 24–8; on canonization of Iosafat Kuntsevych, 29–30; and conflict in Przemyśl in 1867, 44; on conversion of Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy, 59–62; on kolpaks, 66; on liturgical issues, 24; prohibited by ecclesiastical authorities, 63; on reform of Basilians, 82; on St George program of 1871, 55; and three-barred crosses, 65
- Slovo bozhe* (Kolomyia), 124
- Smotrytsky, Meletii (bishop of Polatsk), 28
- sobriety movement, 56–7, 65–6, 95, 167
- Sokal, 157

- Solecki, Łukasz (Roman Catholic bishop of Przemyśl), 123
- Sorokowski, Andrew, 16
- Stańczyks, 137
- Stanyславiv, 152; eparchy of, erection, 98–101; eparchy of, size, 7
- Stasiv, Myron, 19, 118
- Stauropelial Brotherhood, 6
- Stauropelial Institute, 63, 82, 112, 116–17
- Stefanovych, Father Aleksandr, 18, 49
- Stojałowski, Rev. Stanisław, 123
- Stremayr, Karl von, 99
- Stundism, 151
- Stupnytsky, Ioann (bishop of Przemyśl), 121, 123, 127, 147; appointment, 47–9, 51; death, 104; and Resurrectionists, 68; and three-barred crosses, 64–5
- Supreme Ruthenian Council, 10
- Szeptycki, Count Jan Kanty, 131
- Taafe, Eduard, 88
- Taniachkevych, Father Danylo, 52–3, 125
- Tarnavsky, Father Fylymon, 18
- temperance movement. *See* sobriety movement
- Terletsky, Father Vladymyr (Hipolit Terlecki), 24
- Thalerhof, 146
- Theiner, Augustin, 98
- Toronsky, Father Aleksii, 49, 138
- Transcarpathia, 148
- treason trial of 1882, 78, 89, 91, 95–6, 139–41
- Trylovsky, Kyrylo, 150
- Turii, Oleh, 16
- Turkey, 127
- Tysmenytsia, 122
- Uhniv, 153
- Uhryniv Dolishnii, 156
- Uhryniv Horishnii, 156
- Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox church, 148, 164
- Ukrainian National Democratic Party, 156
- Ukrainian Social Democratic Party, 156
- Vahylevych, Ivan, 9
- Vakhnianyn, Natal, 138
- Vannutelli, Msgr Serafino, 76, 80, 85, 89–90, 93, 101–2
- Vatican Council, First, 45, 105
- Vavryk, V.R., 18
- Velyky, Father Atanasii, 17
- Viche (Lviv), 74
- Vienna, 92; as centre of recruitment for emigration to Chełm region, 34; as centre of Ruthenian movement, 9; Greek Catholic seminary in, 6, 43, 53, 106, 119–20
- Vilnius, 35
- Vitsebsk, 28
- Voitsitsky, Father Iakov, 35, 37
- Vyslomboky, 160
- Wierzchleyski, Franciszek Ksawery (Roman Catholic archbishop of Lviv), 68
- Winter, Eduard, 16, 19
- Zaklynsky, Father Aleksii, 99
- Zaleski, Filip, 102, 106
- Zaliztsi, 122
- Zalusky, Oleksa, 140
- Zamość, synod of, 1720, 82, 101, 114
- Zarudie, 122
- Zbarazh, 74
- Zbarazh county, 75
- Zhovkva, 84, 159
- Zhukovsky, Canon Ioann, 87, 94
- Zięba, Andrzej A., 16