



The President and Fellows of Harvard College

The Greek Catholic Church in Galicia, 1848-1914

Author(s): JOHN-PAUL HIMKA

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 1/4, Ukrainian Church History (2002-2003), pp. 245-260

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036853>

Accessed: 03/03/2013 09:30

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

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



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

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Greek Catholic Church in Galicia, 1848–1914

JOHN-PAUL HIMKA

In 1848, according to eparchial schematisms, there were 1,587 Greek Catholic parishes in Galicia embracing 2,149,383 faithful.¹ The archbishop of Lviv and metropolitan of Halych was Mykhail Levyts'kyi, who was already quite advanced in age and made his residence in the village of Univ. The day-to-day administration of Lviv eparchy was entrusted to suffragan bishops: Hryhorii Iakhymovych (1841–1848), Ioann Bokhens'kyi (1850–1857), and Spirydon Lytvynovych (1857–1858). On 5 September 1848 Iakhymovych became bishop of Przemyśl (Peremyshl), succeeding Ioann Snihurs'kyi who had died in the previous year. However, for most of 1848–1849 Iakhymovych remained in Lviv to take part in the momentous political events of those years of upheaval.²

The year 1848 marked the start of a new period in the history of the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia. No substantive internal changes occurred within the Church in that year, but 1848 was a turning point because with it began the Greek Catholic Church's fateful involvement in Ruthenian politics.³ The year 1848 was, of course, one of revolution throughout Europe and it had immense repercussions for the Greek Catholic Ruthenian population of Galicia. In that year the Ruthenians formed their first political organization, the Supreme Ruthenian Council (*Holovna Rus'ka Rada*), and published their first newspaper, *Zoria Halys'ka*; most importantly, in 1848 serfdom was abolished, thus freeing the mass of the Ruthenian population for the tremendous social and cultural advancement that would mark the remaining decades of Austrian rule.

The Greek Catholic clergy played a leading role in Ruthenian politics during the revolution of 1848–1849.⁴ Membership in the Supreme Ruthenian Council was restricted to Greek Catholics. The council first met in the consistory of St. George's Cathedral and later in the Greek Catholic seminary. Its branches outside Lviv were organized to coincide with Greek Catholic diocesan deaneries. The

Harvard Ukrainian Studies XXVI (1–4) 2002–2003: 245–60.

president of the council was Bishop Iakhymovych, one of the vice presidents was the canon Mykhaïl Kuzemskyi, and one of the secretaries the canon Mykhail Malynovskiy. Of 66 council members, 19 were priests and 10 theology students. The council announced as its primary goal the acquisition of equal rights for the Greek Catholic Church. Of 25 Ruthenian deputies elected to the constituent Austrian parliament (Reichstag), 8 were priests. The involvement of the Greek Catholic clergy in Ruthenian national politics during the revolution was so pronounced that many spokesmen of the rival Polish movement in Galicia dismissed the Ruthenian movement as simply a clerical intrigue. Greek Catholic priests active in the Supreme Ruthenian Council worked for the partition of Galicia into separate Polish and Ruthenian provinces, supported the aspirations of the newly emancipated peasantry to own forests and pastures, and remained unwaveringly loyal to the Habsburg court.

After the defeat of the revolution, during the decade of neoabsolutism, political life came to a standstill. Such Ruthenian political representation as existed in the 1850s was limited to the higher clergy of the Greek Catholic Church in Lviv. In 1850, largely through the initiative of Bishop Iakhymovych, the Ruthenians obtained the emperor's agreement in principle to the establishment of a third eparchy in Stanyslaviv (but this was to remain a dead letter until the 1880s). In 1852 they succeeded in reopening the Greek Catholic seminary residence in Vienna, which had been closed in 1848. In 1859, when Count Agenor Gołuchowski, the governor of Galicia who was soon to become minister of the interior, tried to impose the Latin alphabet on the Ruthenians, Greek Catholic ecclesiastics, including Bishops Iakhymovych and Lytvynovych, were instrumental in preserving the traditional Cyrillic alphabet. During the 1850s the Greek Catholic clergy also established hundreds of Ruthenian parish schools, where cantors provided peasants with a primary education.

Metropolitan Levytskyi, who had been elevated to the cardinalate in 1856,⁵ passed away on 14 January 1858. Hryhorii Iakhymovych replaced him as archbishop of Lviv and metropolitan on 23 March 1860. In the same year Toma Polianskyi replaced Iakhymovych as bishop of Przemyśl.

The tenure of Metropolitan Iakhymovych was short (he died on 29 April 1863), but eventful. It saw the restoration of constitutional politics, as the Habsburg monarchy sought to reform itself in the wake of defeat in the Italian war of 1859. One symptom of the new order was a revival of the Ruthenian press in Galicia. The newspaper *Slovo* began to appear in January 1861. At first it enjoyed the moral and financial support of Metropolitan Iakhymovych, but his attitude cooled to the paper when it began to criticize the Greek Catholic higher clergy. Electoral politics was also revived, and a number of Greek Catholic priests acquired seats in the Galician diet, including Canon Malynovskiy. The great issue of the 1860s was the restructuring of the monarchy. The Ruthenian leadership, which was

concentrated in the Lviv consistory, submitted a series of (ultimately fruitless) memoranda to the emperor and his ministers reiterating the Ruthenians' desire to see Galicia partitioned, stressing their loyalty to the central government, and importuning the government not to favor the Poles.

The early 1860s also saw the beginnings of a sharp political cleavage within the Ruthenian movement between Russophiles and Ukrainian national populists (*narodovtsi*).⁶ The higher Greek Catholic clergy considered both movements extremist, the Russophiles because they gravitated toward Russian Orthodoxy, and the national populists because they flirted with liberalism and admired the Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko in spite of anti-Catholic passages in his writings.

Linked to, but not entirely identical with, the nascent Russophile movement was a movement within the clergy to purify the Ruthenian rite of Latinizations.⁷ The more radical of these ritual purists sought to bring liturgical practices in the Greek Catholic Church closer to conformity with practices prevailing in the Russian Orthodox Church. The radical purists published their views in the newspaper *Slovo*, which soon developed a palpably Russophile orientation. The political struggle with the Latin-rite Poles fuelled the passions of the purists, who began to differentiate themselves emphatically from the Latin clergy by growing beards, donning Orthodox-style vestments and headgear, and making demonstrative use of the three-barred crosses that Roman Catholics generally associated with Orthodoxy.

These developments caused concern in Rome. The Vatican remembered that a ritual purification movement had preceded the conversion of the Belarusian and Right-Bank Ukrainian Church to Orthodoxy in 1839. The infatuation of elements of the Galician clergy with things Orthodox suggested the danger of another defection to schism. Moreover, the Vatican was perturbed by the increasing influence that nationalism was acquiring among the Greek Catholic clergy. The greatest enemy of the papacy at that time was the Italian movement, and the Vatican was on principle opposed to every species of nationalism, let alone one that seemed capable of drawing the clergy into schism. The Galician administration was also disturbed by the movement for ritual purification, and in 1862 the presidium of the Galician vice-regency (*namisnytstvo*, *Statthaltere*) instructed Metropolitan Iakhymovych to be on guard against priests altering liturgical practices before the changes had been legally sanctioned by the Church.

In 1862 the Vatican divided the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith into two units, one of which was the Oriental Congregation, with responsibility for the affairs of the Eastern-rite Catholic Churches (it later became a completely separate congregation). Among the first tasks that the Oriental Congregation undertook was the preparation of a legal agreement between the Greek and Roman Catholic bishops in Galicia on matters of contention between them,

including change of rite and the determination of the rite of children of mixed marriages; this "Concordia" was signed by all Galician bishops on 17 July 1863 and officially promulgated on 6 October.⁸ It replaced a previous Concordia that had been signed in 1853, but which was considered unsatisfactory. The Oriental Congregation also responded to the agitation of the ritual purists, issuing over the first few decades of its existence a number of decisions regarding liturgical practice, the form of the cross, and the outward appearance of the clergy. As part of its effort to bring the Greek Catholics more securely into the Catholic orbit, the Vatican also revived the process of canonization of Iosafat Kuntsevych in 1862, and five years later he was officially proclaimed saint.

On 28 September 1863, Spyrydon Lytvynovych was named metropolitan to replace the late Metropolitan Iakhymovych; he was formally installed on 5 May 1864. During his metropolitanate the problems that had begun to develop under his predecessor were exacerbated. Tensions between the Church and the liberally inclined national-populist movement reached a crisis in 1865, when the metropolitan consistory was moved to forbid the faithful to subscribe to the national-populist organ *Meta*. But the major problem for the Church was Russophilism, which became almost hegemonic in Galician Ruthenian society in the late 1860s; at that time, in spite of all the Ruthenians' lobbying and demonstrations of loyalty, the central government decided to turn the administration of Galicia over to the Polish gentry. Although the higher clergy tried to maintain its distance from what it considered extremist politics, the clergy was nonetheless a major component of the Galician Ruthenian political class and played important parts in both the national-populist and, especially, Russophile movements.

Russophilism among the clergy was strengthened owing to events across the border in the last surviving Uniate diocese in the Russian Empire. Here, in the eparchy of Chełm (Kholm), the Uniate Church had been largely Polonized, and the clergy had supported the Polish patriotic demonstrations of 1861 and the Polish insurrection of 1863–1864. The tsarist government was determined to remove Polish influence in the Chełm eparchy and to this end recruited priests and seminarians from Galicia. The material rewards for working in the Chełm eparchy were attractive, since young clerics could expect much more rapid advancement here than at home in Galicia. Aside from economic motivations, however, political and religious factors also came into play. Coming from an environment in which they had been fighting a losing political battle against the Poles, the emigrants were moving to one in which, thanks to government backing, they were certain to emerge victorious. For the Russophiles among them, it was a chance to serve the Russia they so admired. For ritual purists, the move to Chełm meant an opportunity to shed Latin accretions and restore the pure Eastern rite without the government interference that hindered them at home; in Chełm, in fact, the tsarist government would encourage them in their efforts at

purification. In addition to priests and seminarians, a bishop was brought over from Galicia; Canon Mykhail Kuzem'skyi was consecrated bishop of Chełm on 9 April 1866. Thus, the Galician Church became inextricably involved in the fate of the Chełm eparchy.⁹

In 1869 both Greek Catholic episcopal thrones in Galicia fell vacant; Metropolitan Lytvynovych died on 4 June and Bishop Polians'kyi of Przemyśl on 10 November. The appointment of their replacements became a highly contested issue, not only because of the delicate situation within the Greek Catholic Church, but because various influential figures in the Austrian government and in the Vatican supported different candidates. The appointments also took place in a new political situation, in which the Polish viceroy of Galicia had a decisive say. In the end, on 18 May 1870, the emperor named as metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych, the administrator of Przemyśl eparchy and a participant at the First Vatican Council.¹⁰ In 1872 Ioann Stupnyts'kyi was made bishop of Przemyśl. The appointments of Sembratovych and Stupnyts'kyi were widely regarded at the time to be the result of Polish influence.

If Iosyf Sembratovych was indeed a Polish candidate, it did not take him long both to lose favor with the Poles and to win acceptance among the Ruthenians. He took an interest in Ruthenian political life, tried to steer the warring factions toward conciliation and moderation, and initiated a major temperance campaign in the mid-1870s, enlisting the parish clergy to combat the influence of alcohol among the peasantry.

During Sembratovych's reign as metropolitan, a group of Greek Catholic priests, disaffected by the growing Russophilism among their compatriots and demonstratively loyal to Rome, began to publish the journal *Sion*. (It first appeared in 1871 as *Sion Ruskii*; from 1872 to late 1880 and again from 1883 to 1885 it bore the title *Ruskii Sion*; from late 1880 through 1882 it was called *Halytskii Sion*.) Among the leading lights of the *Sion* group were Syl'vestr Sembratovych, Iulian Pelesh, Aleksii Torons'kyi, and Aleksandr Bachyn'skyi (all of whom were to acquire great influence in the Church in the late 1880s and 1890s). In late 1880 the journal fell afoul of Metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych when it published the Rome-educated Rev. Nykolai Malyniak's "Notes of a Roman" (*Zapysky Rymlianyna*) criticizing the situation in the Greek Catholic seminary and indirectly the Greek Catholic hierarchy. Metropolitan Sembratovych reorganized the editorial board and renamed the journal.

The problems that had dogged Metropolitan Sembratovych's predecessors were to prove his undoing. In particular, affairs in the Chełm eparchy took a turn for the worse. Recruitment of clerics from Galicia continued, but by the early 1870s it became clear that the Russian government was moving in the direction of suppressing the Church Union in Chełm and forcibly converting the eparchy to Orthodoxy. In 1871 Bishop Kuzem'skyi returned from Chełm to Galicia.

The administration of the eparchy fell to another Galician emigrant, the fervid Russophile Markel Popel'. After a thoroughgoing ritual reform in 1873–1874, the Union was abolished in the eparchy in 1875. Resistance to the abolition of the Church Union was largely confined to the native Chełm clergy; 143 Galician emigrants embraced Russian Orthodoxy and remained in Chełm, constituting almost half of the eparchy's clergy in 1881. The main Russophile newspaper in Galicia, *Slovo*, praised the Galician emigrants for their role in bringing the Chełm region into the Orthodox fold. Metropolitan Sembratovych banned the paper, but the damage had already been done. The Galician Greek Catholic Church fell under a dark cloud of suspicion, both in the Vatican, which felt that the Union in Galicia itself was seriously endangered, and in Vienna, which now questioned the loyalty of a people situated on the border of what had become its greatest foreign rival.¹¹

The Vatican sent the nuncio Domenico Maria Jacobini to Galicia in 1877 to investigate personally the situation in the Greek Catholic Church; he came to the conclusion that proschismatic tendencies there were rife. The Polish press and individual Poles with influence in the government and the curia fanned suspicion further by interpreting every instance of Ruthenian self-assertion as a manifestation of pro-Russian or pro-Orthodox sympathies. In 1879 the Polish order of Resurrectionists decided they wanted to open a religious boarding school for Greek Catholics in Galicia in order to instill a Catholic spirit in Ruthenian youth. Sembratovych and Stupnyts'kyi both opposed the plan, as did Ruthenian public opinion; Father Stefan Kachala, a leading figure in the national-populist movement, accused the Resurrectionists of Polonizing intentions in a much-publicized speech in the Galician diet in November 1881.¹² The Ruthenians' objections to the Resurrectionists' initiative struck both the Galician administration and the Vatican as further proof that the Greek Catholic Church was falling away from Catholicism.

Matters came to a head in 1882. In December 1881 inhabitants of the village of Hnylychky in Zbarazh county announced their intention to convert from Greek Catholicism to Orthodoxy. Although at the root of the peasants' decision lay a purely local grievance that had nothing to do with either religion or nationality and although the peasants were soon convinced to retract their declaration, the Vatican and the state authorities viewed the incident as a most dangerous symptom of pro-Orthodox, pro-Russian sentiments in the Greek Catholic Church. Their suspicions seemed confirmed when they learned that the Russophile priest Ioann Naumovych had encouraged the peasants to change religion and had even authored their declaration of intent. The Polish press in Galicia made much of the issue; alarmist articles depicted the events in Hnylychky as merely the tip of a schismatic iceberg. The Greek Catholic metropolitan Iosyf Sembratovych and his consistory felt that the press and the Galician administration were purposely

exaggerating the significance of what happened at Hnylychky in order to slander the Ruthenian Church and people in the eyes of the Vatican and the imperial court. The metropolitan's protestations, however, only undermined his standing in Rome and Vienna, both of which took the Hnylychky affair very seriously.¹³

The Galician viceroy Alfred Potocki ordered a thorough and wide investigation that included many searches of Ruthenian institutions and individuals suspected of Russophile leanings. Arrests were made, and in June and July 1882 eleven Russophiles, including Father Naumovych, were tried on charges of high treason.

The Vatican, working in concert with the Austrian state, also took measures to curb the Russophile tendencies in the Greek Catholic Church. For some time it had been considering a reform of the Basilian order, in which monastic discipline had declined and which contributed little positive to Greek Catholic Church life. The Hnylychky incident, however, moved Pope Leo XIII to decisive action in this regard.¹⁴ Acting on a plan worked out by Rev. Henryk Jackowski, the Jesuit provincial in Galicia, the pope issued a bull on 12 May 1882 ("Singulare praesidium") announcing that the Jesuits would reform the Basilian order. The Basilian monastery at Dobromyl would be transferred temporarily to Jesuit control and would become the center of a reformed novitiate. The overall intention of this reform was to create a renovated Basilian order that would function as an energetic defender of Catholicism within the Ruthenian Church. The pope's decision to entrust the reform to the Jesuits, and in the concrete circumstances of Galicia these were necessarily Polish Jesuits, elicited vehement protest from almost all sectors of Ruthenian society. Basilian monks in a petition in May 1882, secular clergy in deanery conferences in June 1882, parliamentary deputies, newspapers of both the Russophile and the Ukrainian national-populist persuasion, public assemblies held in Lviv in June 1883 and May 1884, a deputation of Ruthenian leaders to the emperor in April 1885—all voiced their objections to a Jesuit-directed reform of the Basilian order. Both the Vatican and the Austrian state, which had given its consent to the reform, interpreted these protests as further evidence of the anti-Catholic undercurrent in the Greek Catholic Church, and Metropolitan Sembratovych was held responsible for not being able to stem the wave of protests that erupted in the spring and summer of 1882. Moreover, in June Sembratovych issued a statement on the Basilian reform that was understood in both Rome and Vienna as a demonstration of the metropolitan's own opposition to it.

Iosyf Sembratovych's tenure as metropolitan had been under a cloud ever since the conversion of the Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy. Thought had been given to his removal as early as 1877, but the idea reemerged in Vatican circles after the peasants of Hnylychky declared that they wished to leave the Greek Catholic Church. By June 1882, the idea found an ardent champion in Viceroy Potocki, who wrote two long memoranda detailing the dangers of Russophilism and the

alleged responsibility of Sembratovych and his closest advisors for tolerating it. The memoranda singled out for criticism the metropolitan's lack of support for the Basilian reform and also a pastoral letter of 2 June 1882, in which Sembratovych not only praised the Ruthenian clergy for its services to Church and nation, but even urged it to stand firm in the face of slander. Potocki's memoranda circulated in the curia and Austrian cabinet and convinced them that Sembratovych and the canons Malynov'skyi and Ioann Zhukov'skyi had to be removed from office.

Iosyf Sembratovych was summoned to Rome in July and pressured to resign. He stood his ground for some time, but at the personal insistence of both Pope Leo XIII and Emperor Franz Joseph, he submitted his resignation to the pope on 5 September 1882. He remained in office, however, until an apostolic administrator was named for the Lviv archeparchy on 11 November. In his last weeks on the metropolitan throne, he suspended and excommunicated the Russophile priest Naumovych.¹⁵

The replacement of Iosyf Sembratovych posed a difficult problem for the Vatican and Austrian authorities, since their suspicions of the Galician Greek Catholics now ran so deep that they were unwilling to trust any Ruthenian cleric with the post of metropolitan. They even considered appointing a Latinrite clergyman to administer the Lviv archeparchy, but decided that this would alienate the Ruthenian population too profoundly. In the end, they settled upon the former metropolitan's nephew and suffragan Syl'vestr Sembratovych, but appointed him apostolic administrator rather than metropolitan, since they had grave doubts about his capabilities. Although misgivings still lingered, eventually, on 26 March 1885, Syl'vestr was named archbishop of Lviv and metropolitan of Halych.

In connection with the crisis of 1882, the long moribund plan of erecting a third Greek Catholic eparchy in Stanyslaviv was finally brought to fruition. The idea of an eparchy in Stanyslaviv had first been broached in 1842, and the imperial government had agreed to it in principle in 1850 as a reward for the Ruthenians' loyalty during the revolution. However, budgetary difficulties had prevented implementation of the plan and it was not considered seriously until the autumn of 1882, when the Vatican urged Austria to invest in the new eparchy—partly to assuage the Ruthenians, who were unhappy about the forced resignation of a popular metropolitan, and partly to facilitate closer supervision of the Greek Catholic clergy. The Lviv archeparchy, with over a million and a half faithful, was one of the largest Catholic dioceses in the empire. Considering its problems and its long border with Russia, it made sense to divide the archeparchy into two more manageable entities. As the Vatican secretary of state Luigi Jacobini put it to the Austrian ambassador to the Vatican: "Divide et impera."

After the Austrian government had essentially resolved the problems of funding and boundaries, Pope Leo XIII issued a bull erecting the Stanyslaviv eparchy

on 25 March 1885. A suitable candidate for the new episcopal throne was found in the person of Pelesh, who had been rector of the Greek Catholic seminary in Vienna and there made a favorable impression on the Austrian minister of religion and education. Pelesh, the author of a scholarly German-language history of the Uniate Church that was characterized by a strong Catholic spirit, was the most outstanding intellectual among the Greek Catholic clergy.¹⁶ He seemed such an excellent candidate to the Austrian government that it even considered making him metropolitan and installing Syl'vestr Sembratovych as bishop of Stanyslaviv. However, fearing that this would engender unnecessary bad feeling, Pelesh was left in the new bishopric. He was formally enthroned on 9–10 January 1886.

Now that there were three Greek Catholic eparchies in Galicia, it was possible to hold a provincial synod. One had not been held since the Synod of Zamość (Zamostia) in 1720 and many issues needed to be resolved. The subject of a synod was first broached in 1886, but the Galician administration convinced the central Austrian government as well as the papal nuncio in Vienna that it would be too risky to hold a synod given the oppositional mood among the Ruthenian clergy and faithful. Permission to hold a synod was granted later, in 1888, but on the conditions that all preparatory documents be drawn up in the metropolitan consistory, without preparatory conferences of the clergy in the deaneries, and that laymen be excluded from participation in the synod (an exception was made for one delegate from the Lviv Stauropegial Brotherhood, who was, however, restricted to a consultative role). The ill health and then death of Bishop Stupnyts'kyi of Przemyśl in 1890 interrupted preparations for the synod. After Bishop Pelesh was transferred to Przemyśl and Iulian Sas-Kuïlovskyi made bishop of Stanyslaviv in 1891, the synod could take place.

The provincial synod met in Lviv in September and October 1891. It settled a number of liturgical questions, but its main emphasis was on improving the training of the clergy, in particular, seminary reform. The most controversial issue at the synod was clerical celibacy.¹⁷ In its instructions to the Greek Catholic bishops, the Oriental Congregation had asked that an exhortation to celibacy be included among the resolutions of the synod. The synodal fathers, however, vehemently objected, and the synod witnessed some unpleasant encounters between priests opposed to the celibacy resolution, on the one hand, and Metropolitan Syl'vestr Sembratovych and the apostolic delegate Agostino Ciasca, on the other. The synodal fathers overwhelmingly rejected the text of the resolution on celibacy and replaced it with a new text that emphasized, rather, the Greek Catholic tradition of a married clergy. After the synod, however, Ciasca on his own initiative replaced the text approved at the synod with one of his own composition that accorded with the instructions of the Oriental Congregation. The Galician clergy first saw the new text when the official acts of the synod were published in Rome in 1896. Participants of the 1891 Lviv provincial synod protested the

altering of the text at eparchial synods held in Lviv in 1897 and in Przemyśl in 1898. As late as 1926 surviving synodal fathers lodged a formal protest against the falsification of the acts.

Metropolitan Syl'vestr Sembratovych was the most politically active metropolitan since the time of Hryhorii Iakhymovych, but his political interventions did not win him popularity among the Ruthenians. At the start of his tenure, he alienated both the Russophiles and the national populists by putting forward his own candidates for the parliamentary elections of 1885; these, moreover, entered an electoral alliance with the Poles. Also in 1885 he began to fund his own newspaper, *Myr*, which was conceived as a rival to the main Ruthenian papers, the Russophile *Slovo* and the national-populist *Dilo*, both of which had protested the Jesuits' involvement in the Basilian reform and the forced resignation of his predecessor; *Myr*, however, garnered few subscribers and folded in 1887. The metropolitan was also one of the principal backers of the "New Era" of 1891–1894, in which the Polish Club and the Ruthenian national populists came to an uneasy understanding; the "New Era" collapsed, however, under the weight of bitter mutual recriminations and left a bad taste in Ruthenian political circles. When the metropolitan was named a cardinal on 29 November 1894, this was widely interpreted in Ruthenian society as a reward for political services rendered to the Poles.

During Syl'vestr Sembratovych's term as metropolitan, and in no small measure owing to the decisive interventions of Rome and Vienna in 1882, the Russophile current rapidly lost ground among the Ruthenian intelligentsia, both clerical and lay, and the national populists assumed leadership of the Ruthenian national movement. This posed new problems for the Church, for while Russophilism brought with it gravitation toward Orthodoxy, national populism's mix of liberalism and nationalism brought a decidedly secular and even anticlerical current into Ruthenian society. Already in the 1870s, radical Ukrainophiles from the Russian Empire had inspired a small Ruthenian socialist movement with a markedly anticlerical bent. By 1890 the number of its adherents had grown to the extent that they were able to found the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party (*Rus'ko-Ukraińs'ka Radykal'na Partiia*), which was in fact the first formal political party ever established by Ruthenians-Ukrainians. The party included in its ranks the poet and freethinker Ivan Franko, who was made editor of the most prestigious Ukrainian literary review, *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk*, in 1897. Radicalism also began to develop a following among the peasantry. Anticlerical sentiments were not, however, limited to the radicals. Many national-populist intellectuals had been alienated from the Church in the 1880s and 1890s, because they felt that it had fallen under Polish control. They also had a tendency to view the Church as a national institution rather than a religious one, and Metropolitan

Sembratovych had to remind them that their faith was not an instrument in the service of nationality.

Around the turn of the century, the hierarchy of the Greek Catholic Church was completely replaced. On 22 April 1896 Bishop Pelesh died, and on 21 February 1897 Konstantyn Chekhovych was installed as bishop of Przemyśl. On 4 August 1898 Metropolitan Syl'vestr Sembratovych died, and in the following year Bishop Sas-Kuïlovs'kyi moved from Stanyslaviv to become archbishop of Lviv and metropolitan of Halych (the pope's nomination was dated 30 August 1899). On 2 February 1899 the emperor named Andrei Sheptyts'kyi to replace Sas-Kuïlovs'kyi as bishop of Stanyslaviv. Sas-Kuïlovs'kyi and Sheptyts'kyi were generally considered to be Polish candidates. The new metropolitan had served in the Polish national guard in 1848, and Sheptyts'kyi was a Polish count who had changed from the Latin to the Greek rite in order to enter the Jesuit-controlled Basilian monastery at Dobromyl.¹⁸ After Sas-Kuïlovs'kyi died on 4 May 1900, Sheptyts'kyi, then 36 years old, was named metropolitan (the emperor's nomination was dated 30 October 1900; the pope's 17 December 1900; the formal installation occurred on 17 January 1901). The nomination of Sheptyts'kyi's successor in Stanyslaviv posed many difficulties for the decision makers involved, and it was not until 1904 that they settled on Hryhorii Khomyshyn. In 1900 there were 1,854 Greek Catholic parishes in Galicia with 2,934,278 faithful.¹⁹

Because of his background, Metropolitan Andrei Sheptyts'kyi had to win the confidence of Ruthenian society. He was not to accomplish this completely until 1914, in spite of extraordinary contributions to the Ruthenian cause. He was, for example, very active in the effort to establish a separate Ukrainian university in Lviv. To this end, he supported the secession of Ukrainian students from Lviv University in 1901 by closing down the seminary in Lviv and sending the seminarians abroad to study. On 28 June 1910 he addressed the Austrian House of Lords on the university issue. Moreover, it was through his tireless efforts that a majority of the Polish deputies to the Galician diet finally agreed to the Ukrainians' demand for a separate university in 1914 (however, World War I and the collapse of Austria-Hungary prevented implementation of this agreement). He was also, unlike the Polish episcopate in Galicia, a champion of electoral reform, which benefited the Ukrainians. In 1906 he and the other Ukrainian bishops traveled to Vienna to lobby for universal manhood suffrage in parliamentary elections, and in 1913–1914 he was crucial in bringing about an agreement increasing Ukrainian representation in the Galician diet (this agreement too, however, was stillborn because of the war). Sheptyts'kyi was also a generous benefactor, donating a building for a free walk-in clinic (*Narodna Lichnytsia*) and establishing a national museum. Sheptyts'kyi's efforts on behalf of the Ukrainians sometimes brought him into conflict with the Polish episcopate of Galicia, and particularly with the Latin-rite archbishop of Lviv, Józef Bilczewski.

However, in spite of Sheptyts'kyi's services to the nation, mistrust of his intentions lingered. Partly this was because the anticlericalism that had emerged in the 1890s had become even more pervasive in the 1900s. In 1899 the Radical party split, and its right wing joined with the more progressive of the national populists to form the Ukrainian National Democratic Party (*Natsional'no-Demokratychna Partiiia*). This immediately became the mainstream party of Ukrainian Galicia. The former radicals brought their anticlericalism with them into the new party, and anticlericals dominated the editorial boards of the national-democratic press. Among the leaders of the national democrats was also Professor Mykhailo Hrushev'skyi, head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society; an emigrant from Russian-ruled Ukraine, he had little sympathy for the Greek Catholic Church. The student movement, in which radical and social-democratic influences were paramount, was also anticlerical, as evidenced particularly by the speeches made and resolutions passed at the Ukrainian student congress held in Lviv in July 1909.

Some representatives of the national-democratic camp resented the fact that Sheptyts'kyi's support for the Ukrainian national movement had clearly defined limits. Sheptyts'kyi was only willing to endorse those actions of the national movement that were consonant with Christian teachings. The most dramatic confrontation between Sheptyts'kyi and the Ukrainian movement came in 1908, when a Ukrainian student, acting on his own, shot dead the viceroy of Galicia, Count Andrzej Potocki. Among radicals and students, as well as among many peasants, the assassin, Myroslav Sichyn'skyi, was hailed as a hero. Even moderate national democrats stopped short of an outright condemnation of the assassination, considering it an act of political protest; moreover, they made use of the sensational event to publicize the plight of the Ukrainian nation in the world press. Sheptyts'kyi, however, jointly with the other Ukrainian bishops, strongly condemned the action and all such "politics without God." In response, the radical deputy Kyrylo Tryl'ovs'kyi declared in parliament that Sheptyts'kyi's censure of the assassination was only an example of class and national solidarity, since both Sheptyts'kyi and Potocki were Polish counts; Sheptyts'kyi, he said, was like Mickiewicz's Konrad Wallenrod, who masked his Polish nationality only in order to become influential in the enemy camp and to deal mortal blows to the enemy from within. Bad feeling over Sheptyts'kyi's stance on the Potocki assassination was to linger for years. In 1910, when the metropolitan visited Ukrainian immigrants in western Canada, the more radical elements threw eggs at him and called him a traitor because he had condemned Sichyn'skyi's action.

Another point of tension between the Ukrainian movement and Sheptyts'kyi was the metropolitan's alleged tolerance of Russophilism. The national democrats wanted Sheptyts'kyi to proceed energetically against suspected Russophiles in the Lviv consistory and to identify himself unequivocally with the Ukrainian

movement. Although Sheptyts'kyi was a Ukrainian by personal conviction, he felt that as a bishop he could not afford to identify openly with one political faction or the other. In fact, he went so far as to try to avoid using the term "Ukrainian," preferring when possible to speak of "our people" (which irritated the national democrats and socialists). He also demanded tolerance from his priests. In particular, he tried to restrain national-democratic zealots among his younger clergy, who were agitating among parishioners against pastors of the old persuasion. One of his orders prohibiting interference in the affairs of someone else's parish provoked a vehement editorial in *Dilo* in 1908, in which Sheptyts'kyi was called "a foreigner, inspired by the tradition of Wallenrodism, who has stolen onto the Ruthenian metropolitan throne only, it seems, to weaken its power to resist the enemy onslaught."²⁰

However tolerant Sheptyts'kyi was of political Russophiles, he had no sympathy with a religious orientation on Russian Orthodoxy. Sheptyts'kyi believed in a renewal of the Eastern spirit in the Greek Catholic Church (for example, he revived Eastern monasticism according to the Studite rule), but he was not impressed by Russian Orthodoxy. He considered it a mere instrument of state, with weak spirituality. In his view, Russian Christianity could only be revived by unification with the universal Church, and in 1907 he even traveled incognito to Russia to organize a Russian Catholic Church. A great promoter of Church unity, Sheptyts'kyi also presided over the ecumenical congresses held at Velehrad, in Moravia, in 1907 and 1909.

Sheptyts'kyi was an extraordinary individual, with great personal charisma, deep piety, and exemplary personal courage. He was, however, plagued by illness, which sometimes prevented him from accomplishing all he wished. Bishop Chekhovych of Przemyśl was a trustworthy helper in all the metropolitan's endeavors, whereas Sheptyts'kyi's relations with Bishop Khomyshyn of Stanyslaviv were somewhat strained. They were two very different personalities. The metropolitan was tolerant and gentle, the bishop of Stanyslaviv was stern and at times arbitrary, proceeding against suspected Russophiles, for example, with an almost ruthless energy. Bishop Khomyshyn also, however, quarreled regularly with the national democrats who, in his estimation, were saturated with an anti-Catholic spirit. Moreover, Bishop Khomyshyn found it difficult to overcome his personal dislike of the metropolitan, with his aristocratic background, magnetic personality, and growing prestige.

The Galician bishops had to contend with a new strain of Russophilism between 1908, when Austria annexed Bosnia, and 1914, when war broke out between Austria and Russia. Although Russophilism had by then become a marginal political movement, with little local support, the mounting Austro-Russian tension induced Russia to seek sympathizers in Galicia and among Galician emigrants to North America. Connected with this were some efforts

to promote conversions to Russian Orthodoxy. In August 1911, enthusiasts of this idea, mainly Russian churchmen and Galician Russophile leaders (the latter were all laymen), met at Pochaiv monastery to plan a strategy for propagating Orthodoxy in Galicia. They decided to send Austrian citizens, namely young Russophiles educated in Russia and ordained as Orthodox priests, into Galicia as missionaries. Several such missionaries conducted agitation in Galicia until the Austrian authorities either arrested them as spies or threatened to draft them into the army. However, their efforts did register a limited success, particularly in some villages near the Russian border and in the Lemko region (the westernmost extension of Ruthenian settlement). The Orthodox movement was more successful in parishes where relations between the pastor and his parishioners had already deteriorated because of economic conflict or political differences (this was the same environment in which radicalism thrived).

The Basilian order had emerged from Jesuit tutelage in 1904. Through its missions in the countryside and its popular publications (including the periodical *Misionar'*, founded in 1897), the order did much to spread Catholic piety and combat radical and Russophile influence among the peasantry. By the early twentieth century, perceptive observers of the Galician scene, including the prominent national democrat Ievhen Olesnytskyi and even Ivan Franko, had come to the conclusion that the reform of the Basilians, so heatedly contested by the Ruthenians in the 1880s, had been a blessing in disguise; the reformed Basilians were energetic and patriotic and had produced some eminent ecclesiastics, not least Metropolitan Sheptytskyi. In their efforts to spread popular Catholic piety, however, the Basilians drew freely upon devotional practices and religious literature from the contemporary Catholic West and developed a reputation as Latinizers. On the eve of World War I, the Basilian order had 16 monasteries in Galicia with 211 monks and 23 novices (including missionaries in the new world).

NOTES

1. *Schematismus universi venerabilis cleri Archidioeceseos metropolitanae graeco-catholicae Leopoliensis pro anno Domini 1848* (Lviv: E Typographia Caes. Regii aerarii, n.d.); *Catalogus universi venerabilis cleri Dioeceseos Premisliensis graeco-catholicae pro anno Domini 1848* (Przemyśl: Impressum in Typographia Capituli rit. gr. cath. Premisliensis, n.d.).
2. On Iakhymovych, see Luigi Glinka, *Gregorio Jachymovyč—Metropolita di Halych ed il suo tempo (1840–1865)*, 2nd ed., *Analecta OSBM*, ser. 2, sec. 1, Opera 30 (Rome, 1974).
3. In the late nineteenth century the Ukrainian people in Galicia were divided between those who identified with the Russian nation (Russophiles) and those who espoused a Ukrainian nationality separate from that of both the Poles and Russians. Their own self-designation at that time was “Ruthenians” (*rusyny*). Around 1900 the majority of the Galician intelligentsia began to refer to their nation as Ukrainian, although the Russophiles refused to do so. Depending on the context I will use either the historical name “Ruthenian” or the more modern term “Ukrainian.” Following the convention used by the Greek Catholic Church until the late twentieth century, the names of Ukrainian ecclesiastics are given in their Church Slavonic forms. I have transliterated them according to the Ukrainian pronunciation of Church Slavonic.
4. See Oleh Turii, “Die Griechisch-Katholische Kirche und die Entstehung der ukrainischen nationalen Bewegung in Galizien,” *Ostkirchliche Studien* 47 (1998): 3–21.
5. This was the result of a chain of events that had begun in 1839, when the Uniate Church was abolished in Belarus and Right-Bank Ukraine. To strengthen the Church Union in Galicia, in 1843 the Vatican and Habsburg authorities began to consider elevating the metropolitan of Halych to the rank of patriarch. However, resistance from the Hungarians quashed this project, and instead of an elevation of the office, Levytskyi was personally advanced to the rank of cardinal.
6. There is an excellent new study of the Russophiles: Anna Veronika Wendland, *Die Russophilen in Galizien: Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Rußland, 1848–1915* (Vienna, 2001).
7. Iaroslav Hordynskyi, *Do istorii kul'turnoho i politychnoho zhyttia v Halychyni u 60-tykh rr. XIX v.*, Zbirnyk Fil'ol'ogichnoi seksii NTSh 16 (Lviv, 1917), 63–89.
8. *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide seu decreta instructiones rescripta pro apostolicis missionibus*, n. 1243 (Rome, 1907), 1: 685–88.
9. Luigi Glinka, *Diocesi ucraino-cattolica di Cholm (Liquidazione ed incorporazione alla Chiesa russo-ortodossa) (Sec. XIX)*, *Analecta OSBM*, ser. 2, sec. 1, Opera 34 (Rome, 1975).

10. Edith Saurer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsnennungen 1867–1903*, Forschungen zur Kirchengeschichte Österreichs 6 (Vienna and Munich, 1968), 158–68.
11. John-Paul Himka, *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine: The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement in Galicia, 1867–1900* (Montreal, 1999), 32–41, 57–64.
12. *Stenograficzne Sprawozdania z czwartej sesji czwartego peryodu Sejmu Krajowego Królestwa Galicyi i Lodomeryi wraz z Wielkiem Księstwem Krakowskiem w roku 1881: Posiedzenie 1–29* ([Lviv], n.d.), 714–20.
13. Himka, *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine*, 73–78.
14. M. Karovets', *Velyka reforma chyna sv. Vasyliia V. 1882 r.*, pt. 1 (Zhovkva, 1933), pt. 2 (Lviv, 1933), and pt. 3 (Zhovkva, 1936); Porfirio Pidručnyj, "Documenti riguardanti l'inizio della riforma Basiliiana in Galizia (1880–1882)," *Analecta OSBM*, ser. 2, sec. 2, vol. 11 (17), fasc. 1–4 (1982): 353–403.
15. Naumovych's excommunication was dated 3 November 1882; it was only confirmed, however, on 5 July 1885. Early in 1886 Naumovych, who enjoyed the backing of Konstantin Pobedonostsev, one of the most influential figures in the Russian government and Church, left Galicia permanently and settled in Kyiv, where he converted to Orthodoxy. He died in mysterious circumstances, from poison, in 1891.
16. See Julian Pelesz, *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom von den aeltesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, 2 vols. (Würzburg and Vienna, 1881).
17. John-Paul Himka, "The Issue of Celibacy at the Lviv Provincial Synod of 1891: Unpublished Documents from the Lviv and Przemyśl (Peremyshl) Archives," in *Mappa Mundi: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' na poshanu Iaroslava Dashkevycha z nahody ioho 70-richchia; Studia in honorem Jaroslavi Daškevyč septuagenario dedicata*, ed. Ihor Hrych et al., 648–70 (Lviv, 1996).
18. The best work on Sheptytskyi remains Paul R. Magocsi, ed., with the assistance of Andrii Krawchuk, *Morality and Reality: The Life and Times of Andrei Sheptytskyi* (Edmonton, 1989).
19. *Shematyzm vsechestnoho klyra hr. kat. mytropolytal'noi Arkhydiezezii L'vivskoi na rik 1900* (Lviv, 1900); *Schematismus universi venerabilis cleri dioeceseos gr.-cath. Premisiensis pro anno Domini 1900* (Przemyśl, 1900); and *Shematyzm vseho klyra hreko-katolycheskoï Eparkhii Stanyslavivskoi na rik bozhii 1900* (Stanyslaviv, 1900).
20. "Ad maiorem Poloniae gloriam," *Dilo*, no. 182, 1908. The author of the editorial was the anarchist Mykhailo Lozynskyi. The actual editor of *Dilo*, L'onhyn Tsehelskyi, was forced to resign because of the breach of tact.