

OSTAP SEREDA

*FROM CHURCH-BASED TO CULTURAL
NATIONALISM: EARLY UKRAINOPHILES,
RITUAL-PURIFICATION MOVEMENT AND
EMERGING CULT OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO IN
AUSTRIAN EASTERN GALICIA IN THE 1860s*

This article aims to explore one of the turning points in the history of Ukrainian nation-building in nineteenth-century Austrian Eastern Galicia. This process, and the rivalry among supporters of different concepts of the national identity of Galician Ukrainians (customarily called at that time Ruthenians), became the focus of several path-breaking studies over the last two decades.¹ Some authors treated the shaping of a national identity in terms of profound cultural transformation, discursive shift and elaboration of new meaning.² In the course of forming national discourse(s), educated Ruthenians reconsidered in different ways the identificatory concepts they inherited from the pre-modern era, such as "Slavdom," "Rus'," "Ukraine," "Greek Catholicism," and so on. Nation-building among the Ruthenians of Galicia not only influenced how other potential modern nations, Polish and Russian, were built, but also contributed to the process of the disintegration of various pre-modern, proto-national communities (like Polish noble *natio*, *Slavia Orthodoxa*, or Rus'). As Yaroslav Hrytsak perceptively stresses in a recently published article, "the making of modern Ukraine was not just unmaking of modern Poland, Rus', or Russia. It was also the unmaking of pre-modern Rus'. Therefore, modern nation-building among those Habsburg Ruthenians who also belong to Rus' (Ruthenia) was, in a sense, more complicated than for the Habsburg Poles."³

1. See the most recent historiographical survey of this field in Marian Mudryi, "Natsional'no-politychni orientatsii v ukrains'komu suspil'stvi Halychyny avstriis'koho periodu u vysvitleni suchasnoi istoriografii," *Visnyk L'vivs'koho Universytetu. Seria istorychna* 37/1 (2002): 465-500.

2. See the seminal study of this problem by John-Paul Himka, "The Construction of Nationality in Galician Rus': Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions," in Ronald Grigor Suny and Michael D. Kennedy, eds., *Intellectuals and the Articulation of the Nation* (Ann Arbor, MI: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1999), pp. 109-64.

3. Yaroslav Hrytsak, "Crossroads of East and West: Lemberg, Lwów, L'viv on the Threshold of Modernity," *Austrian History Yearbook* 34 (2003): 108.

This article attempts to highlight one of the aspects of the transition from traditional Ruthenian church culture to modern Ukrainian national culture in Galicia by illustrating how the emerging cult of Taras Shevchenko was connected with the ritual-purification (*obriadovyi*) movement. It shall also shed some light on how religious elements of Ruthenian identity became "nationalized" and politicized, and how in turn a new secular cultural system acquired crypto-religious character.

Since 1848, the entire Ruthenian national movement was organized around the hierarchy of the Greek Catholic Church. It emerged out of ethno-confessional tensions with Polish Roman Catholics, dominant in Eastern Galicia. At that time, loyalty to the Greek Catholic Church was considered an essential part of Galician Ruthenian identity, and the Church was the main symbol of the Ruthenian nation, history and culture. One perhaps may call the Ruthenian national movement prior to the constitutional reforms of the 1860s as "church-based nationalism," paraphrasing how the movement was characterized still in 1862 (*tserkovno-narodnyi*). Starting from the political modernization of the 1860s, new cultural institutions of Ruthenian (Ukrainian) nationalism emerged. By analyzing this evolution, one may observe the interplay of religious and secular elements in modern nationalism, and trace how Ukrainian cultural nationalism gradually superseded the more traditional Ruthenian church-based nationalism. This process was not unique in the case of Galician Ruthenians and reflected the emergence of modern national cultures out of the spiritual sphere of the *Slavia Orthodoxa*.

* * *

Nineteenth-century Galicia was a Habsburg crownland with an agriculturally-based economy and social structure, numerous small towns and two important cultural and administrative centers, L'viv and Kraków. Its population was ethnically diverse and consisted mainly of three ethno-religious groups: Greek Catholic Ruthenians, Roman Catholic Poles and Jews. These three groups comprised in 1857 respectively 44.83 percent, 44.74 percent and 9.69 percent of the whole population.⁴ In the eastern part of

4. These figures are calculated from the 1857 Austrian census. See Krzysztof Zamorski, *Informator statystyczny do dziejów społeczno-gospodarczych Galicji. Ludność Galicji w latach 1857-1910* (Kraków, 1989), pp. 69-71. The absolute number of the inhabitants of Galicia in 1857 was 4,632,866 in total, including 2,077,112 Ruthenian Greek Catholics, 2,072,633 Roman Catholics and 448,973 Jews. According to the 1869 census, these three groups comprised respectively 42.53 percent, 46.08 percent and 10.57 percent of 5,444,689 Galicians. The number of Roman Catholics includes small number of Catholic Czechs and Germans. The rapidly changing portion of Greek Catholics and Roman Catholics in the

the province, Eastern Galicia,⁵ Greek Catholics were the majority (66.53 percent in 1857),⁶ although the representative landed class, *szlachta*, usually regarded itself as a part of Polish noble *natio*.

John-Paul Himka rightly comments that "religion, or rather rite, was one of the most constant factors differentiating Ukrainians from Poles."⁷ For the most part of the nineteenth century, the history of Galician Ruthenians could be written as the history of the Greek Catholic Church in a province that traced its origin to the Church Union of Berestia (1596). Greek Catholics in Galicia had a long history of struggle for equal rights with the Roman Catholics. Since the Greek Catholic secular clergy could marry and have children who, in turn, often became priests, many Greek Catholic "dynasties" were formed that cultivated a certain sense of corporate, if not cultural-national, Ruthenian separateness. As early as in the first half of the nineteenth century, a noticeable part of Greek Catholic clergy in Galicia stressed the link between Ruthenian national tradition and a distinctly "Ruthenian" confession (*ruska vira*). The Greek Catholic rite in the mid-nineteenth century was generally recognized as having a specific "Ruthenian," "Greek Ruthenian," "Greek Slavonic," or "Catholic Ruthenian" character.⁸ The church rite was the primary source of ethno-confessional identification for the masses of East Galician inhabitants.

However, it would be oversimplification to state that confessional lines clearly divided the population of Galicia into Poles, Ruthenians, Jews, Armenians, Germans and others. The Polish-Ruthenian line, in particular, was often blurred. In spite of the differences in rite, the clergy and faithful of both Catholic confessions in Galicia interacted quite intensively on an

province was due to the fluctuating character of ethno-confessional identifications in the early 1860s, and probably to the inconsistency of the contemporary statistical calculations.

5. Eastern Galicia was administratively differentiated as an entity from 1848 through 1867. It consisted of twelve circles (Berezhany, Chortkiv, Kolomyia, L'viv, Peremyshl', Sambir, Sanok, Stanislaviv, Stryi, Ternopil', Zhovkva, Zolochiv), and between 1859 and 1861 it also included Bukovyna.

6. This percentage includes small number of Armenian Greek Catholics (numbering around 2,000 people in all Galicia). Two other large religious groups, Roman Catholics and Jews comprised 21.44 percent and 11.25 percent respectively of the total Galician population. All other religious groups had less than 1.00 percent. In Western Galicia Roman Catholics totaled 88.71 percent, Jews 6.75 percent and Greek Catholics 4.04 percent. See Zamorski, *Informator statystyczny do dziejów społeczno-gospodarczych Galicji. Ludność Galicji w latach 1857-1910*, pp. 88-89.

7. John-Paul Himka, "The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Building in Galicia, 1772-1918," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8, no. 3-4 (1984): 434.

8. That is how the Galician Greek Catholics were referred to in Vatican letters from the 1850s. See Athanasius G. Welykyj OSBM, ed., *Litterae S.C. de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam catholicam Ukrainae et Bielarussiae spectantes*, vol. 7: 1790-1862 (Rome: P. P. Basilioni, 1957), pp. 256, 264.

everyday level. Till mid-nineteenth century there were many cases of personal change of rite. Most commonly, people left the Uniate Church for the Latin one. Very often it was connected with intermarriage and change of social position. In the middle of the 1860s, nationally-minded Ruthenians complained that as soon as a Ruthenian villager settles in a town he stops speaking Ruthenian and attending the Greek Catholic Church because he sees it as incompatible with the urban way of life⁹.

The complicated history of the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia resulted in its intricate identity. As John-Paul Himka comments, "the Greek Catholic had an Orthodox face, Roman Catholic citizenship and [. . .] an enlightened Austrian soul."¹⁰ But in fact, this "face" was not purely Orthodox. The Latinization of Eastern Christian Church rituals of the Ruthenian Uniates prior to the middle of the nineteenth century took various forms. Some innovations were normalized by the decision of the Council of Zamostia (1720), while some penetrated Uniate ritual practices later. On the eve of the 1860s even the outward appearance of a Uniate priest differed greatly from a typical Orthodox clergyman and was almost identical with the Roman Catholic: he was normally beardless, abandoning specific Eastern head covering [*kolpak*], and wearing the usual Catholic soutane. Several changes affected church interiors: iconostases were often made similar to the Latin altar decorations (for example in the main St. George L'viv Cathedral) or completely abolished, while "Latin" benches, organs and pulpits were introduced. Sung [*spivani*] liturgies were often replaced by much shorter and allegedly more understandable, recited [*chytani*] ones. There were many other important liturgical changes that sometimes interfered with the nuances of Eastern Christian spirituality.¹¹

In the first half of the nineteenth century Ruthenian language seemed less important as a marker of national identity than church ritual, due to assimilationist processes and polyglot practices, the spread of Polish and Latin and then of German as the languages of administration and secular literature. A significant part of educated Ruthenians used Polish in everyday life as an indication of their superiority to the Ruthenian-speaking peasantry, and turned to vernacular Ruthenian only for communication

9. "Dopysy. Iz mista (K podnesen'iu nashoho obriada)," *Slovo*, no. 10, Febr. 15, 1865: 3.

10. Himka, "The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Bulding in Galicia, 1772-1918," 438.

11. Włodzimierz Osadczy, *Kościół i cerkiew na wspólnej drodze. Concordia 1863. Z dziejów porozumienia między obrządkiem greckokatolickim a łacinskim w Galicji Wschodniej* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUB, 1999), pp. 113-19.

with peasants.¹² Even the Greek Catholic clergy was deeply assimilated with the Polish culture of Galician nobility and urban dwellers.¹³ Ruthenian literary language developed in close connection with Church Slavonic, the sacral language of liturgy and church books in *Slavia Orthodoxa*. The knowledge of literary Ruthenian was diminishing to the extent that even the Greek Catholic priests often did not master its rules.¹⁴ In general, in the first half of the nineteenth century, the existing Ruthenian literary tradition was too weak, too isolated from oral culture, and still not codified. Simplifyingly one can state that there were two separate (peasant and ecclesiastical) Ruthenian cultures in Galicia, and an underdeveloped secular one. Cultural assimilation with the Poles was the dominant tendency among educated Galician Ruthenians of that time. Most of them called themselves Ruthenian and were quite aware of being of separate church rite and cultural tradition. But this feeling did not lead automatically to Ruthenian national aspirations. A significant part of educated Ruthenians sympathized with the Polish political cause, spoke Polish, and considered contemporary Polish secular culture as their own.

Under the impact of Romanticism in the 1820s-40s, linguistic preferences of some educated Ruthenians changed in favor of the folk idiom. Yet the issue of to what extent vernacular could be used in Ruthenian literary language remained open for many decades. A radical attempt by the famous group of Romantic writers, *Ruska Triitsia* (Markian Shashkevych, Iakiv Holovats'kyi and Ivan Vahylevych), to develop a new Ruthenian literature based on local vernacular was rejected as subversive by local Greek Catholic authorities, and did not have wider public resonance till the revolution of 1848.

During the revolution of 1848, when the Greek Catholic hierarchy, under the protection of imperial authorities, succeeded in mobilizing the Ruthenian political movement and securing support of the East Galician peasants, educated Galician Ruthenians began an intensive search for adequate cultural backing for their national claims. Not surprisingly the dif-

12. Anatol' Vakhniianyn, *Spomyny z zhyttia* (L'viv: Pechatnia Shyikov's'kola, 1908), p. 37. Another educated Ruthenian, Izydor Iakymovych recalled that as a child he communicated with his parents and relatives in Polish, and that Ruthenian was spoken only "with servants, or peasants [...] or near the church." See *Holos na holos dlia Halycyny* (Černivci, 1861), p. 2.

13. This assimilation was stimulated by the elevation of the educational level of Greek Catholic clergy in the first half of the nineteenth century, and its entrance into Galician "educated society". See Himka, "The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Building in Galicia, 1772-1918," pp. 435-36.

14. Oleh Turii, "Natsional'ne i politychne polonofil'stvo sered hreko-katolyts'koho dukhovenstva Halychyny pid chas revoliutsii 1848-1849 rokiv," *Zapysky NTS* 228 (1994): 186-88.

ferences between "Ruthenian" and "Polish" church rituals were seen by many Galician Ruthenians with increasing patriotic sentiments in 1848. Discussion around the "ritualist" issues intensified again in 1851-1855, but under the political conditions of neo-absolutism it was limited to a circle of Galician bishops of both rites and mostly confined to their correspondence.¹⁵

The confessional identity of the Galician Greek Catholics, like the national one, was still in the making in the middle of the nineteenth century. As a Ukrainian scholar, Oleh Turii comments, "the clergy and faithful of the Greek Catholic Church [. . .] depending on circumstances could stress their "Orthodox origins" or not less convincingly prove their "Catholic affinity."¹⁶ Already in the late 1840s there were two separate groupings within the Church with a vacillating majority in between. Those who favored integration with the Catholic Church opposed the pro-Orthodox inclinations of their opponents and vice versa. Orthodox schismatic in contemporary Catholic wording) sympathies were kept under careful surveillance of Church authorities and sometimes scornfully revealed. The "Latinization" of the Greek Catholic Church in turn met with the disapproval of a significant part of Ruthenian clergy who stressed the pre-Uniate history and statutes of their Church. With the beginning of the age of nationalism, the argumentation of both sides became increasingly nationally charged: the opposing sides accused each other of pro-Russian or pro-Polish tendencies.

The vague confessional identification of Galician Ruthenians corresponded to the vague understanding of the meaning of Rus' as a historical concept. For many it stressed the pre-Polish historical past of Galicia, and its membership in the historical tradition of Kyivan and later Galician-Volhynian Rus' principalities (tenth-fourteenth centuries). Yet the understanding of Rus' remained indefinite in regard to whether it included other Eastern Slavs that claimed Kyivan Rus' heritage as their own, namely "Muscovites" (the ancestors of present-day Russians). This ambivalence was one of the reasons for the changing instability of national identification of the Ruthenian inhabitants of Eastern Galicia. The traditional ethnonyms "Rus'" or "Little Rus'" ("Little Russia") could be interpreted in various ways and did not contain a clear answer to the question of Ruthenian national identity.

15. Włodzimierz Osadczy, *Kościół i cerkiew na wspólnej drodze. Concordia 1863. Z dziejów porozumienia między obrządkiem greckokatolickim a łacinskim w Galicji Wschodniej*, pp. 105-06.

16. Oleh Turii, "Konfesiino-obriadovi chynnyk u natsional'nii samoidentyfikatsii ukrainsiv Halychyny v seredyini XIX stolittia," *Zapysky NTSh* 233 (1997): 74.

During the period of “constitutional experiments” in Austria (1860-1867), the national activities in Galicia acquired public forms for the second time, and Ruthenian intelligentsia more clearly split into Old Ruthenian, Russophile and Ukrainophile groupings. It was caused by the fact that the emerging public sphere provided new venues for debate over the question of national identity, and new possibilities to reformulate and re-codify existing traditions appeared. Along with the Polish, some new Ruthenian newspapers and journals were founded in the early 1860s. The Ruthenian press of the 1860s did not concentrate so much on informing the public about the most recent news, rather it provided educated Ruthenians with a possibility to debate issues related to their nationality.

Almost all Galician Ruthenian periodicals began their opening editorials with the question “what nation are we?” The responses varied. Traditionally, the feeling of affinity with a pre-modern Rus’ culture that derived from the cultural heritage of Kyivan Rus’ and Galician-Volhynian Rus’ was typical for those educated Ruthenian clerical elites that rejected assimilation to the Polish culture. In the early 1860s also the Ukrainian Cossackophilism began to dominate the public moods. At the same time, most of the patriotic educated Ruthenians for various reasons felt loyalty to Catholic Church and imperial dynasty. They thus had to adjust Ruthenian cultural affinity with a pro-Catholic and Habsburg imperial-religious stance. Those, whose sense of Catholic and Habsburg loyalty dominated over Ruthenian cultural affinity, manifested their views in semi-official and conservative Viennese *Vistnyk*. The definition of Paul Robert Magocsi of Old Ruthenians as of those “whose national, political, and religious loyalties did not extend beyond the boundaries of the Austrian Empire” applies to this group.¹⁷ Those who, in spite of political and ecclesiastical borders, felt stronger affiliation with a pre-modern Ruthenian (or rather East Slavic) culture that derived from the cultural heritage of Kyivan Rus’ and Galician-Volhynian Rus’, turned mostly to the more liberal L’viv-based by-weekly *Slovo* that since January 1861 became the leading Ruthenian political periodical. The latter attitudes may lead to more definite Ukrainophile (stressing Ukrainian/Little Russian separateness from all neighbors) or Russophile (stressing cultural relatedness of all branches of Rus’) identities. Therefore, in the beginning *Slovo* had an ambivalent character. The position of early Ukrainophiles in the Galician public debates in the first half of the 1860s was also articulated through their own periodical journals *Vechernytsi* (1862-1863) and *Meta* (1863-1865). Yet, the main line of dis-

17. Paul Robert Magocsi, “Old Ruthenianism and Russophilism: A New Conceptual Framework for Analyzing National Ideologies in Late-Nineteenth-Century Eastern Galicia,” in Ejuds, *The Roots of Ukrainian Nationalism: Galicia as Ukraine's Piedmont* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2002), p. 105.

discussion in 1861-63 was not between *Slovo* and the Ukrainophile press, but instead between *Vistnyk* and *Slovo*. Only later, over the course of time, more and more contributors to *Slovo* opposed the views of the Ukrainophiles, and it became the main organ of Galician Russophilism.

Besides constitutional reforms, the growth of the contacts with Ukrainian and later also Russian pan-Slavist activists from the Romanov Empire was another factor that stimulated shaping of competing Ukrainophile and Russophile trends. In the first half of the nineteenth century only the main cultural figures of Galician Ruthenian revival were informed about the modern Ukrainian and Russian literatures to a some extent.¹⁸ After 1848, there were first attempts to re-publish the literary works of Ukrainian writers, Hryhorii Kvitka-Osnovianenko and Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi in Galicia, yet they still were read in narrow circles of patriotic friends. At that time only a small circle of people personally connected with the first Galician-Ruthenian "awakeners" had read Taras Shevchenko's poetry.¹⁹ (In the early 1860s there was real influx of Ukrainian publications from the Russian Empire into Austrian Galicia.)

Regular transfer of Ukrainian literary works into Galicia was established in the 1860s. As is well known, in the spring of 1862, Mykhailo Dymet, a Ruthenian merchant from L'viv, carried a parcel of books on his way back from Kyiv with 1860 St. Petersburg Platon Symyrenko's edition of Taras Shevchenko's *Kobzar*, and quickly sold them all. The book-trade suddenly proved to be profitable for Dymet, thus during the next years he brought more and more poems of Shevchenko from the Russian Empire. All of them met with a tremendous interest and enthusiasm from a significant part of Galician Ruthenian students.²⁰ Together with the taste for East Ukrainian literary production many of them developed admiration of the Cossack past and interest in the Ukrainian national movement. In 1862-1864 they formed a network of semi-secret circles under the name of *hro-*

18. Mykhailo Vozniak, "Pohliad na kul'turno-literaturni znosyny halyts'koi Ukrainy ta rousis'koi v I pol. XIX v.," *Nedilia*, no. 43-44 (1911): 3-10.

19. Kyrylo Studyns'kyi could number only five Galician Ruthenians who, as he assumed, knew Shevchenko's verses well enough before 1861 (Kyrylo Studyns'kyi, *Do istorii vzaiemyn Halychyny z Ukrainoiu v rr. 1860-1873, Ukraina* 27, no. 2 (1928): 13). See also Bohdan Zahaikevych, "Kul't Shevchenka v Halychyni do Pershoi svitovoi viiny," *Zapysky NTSh* 176 (1962): 254; M. I. Dubyna, *Za pravdu slova Shevchenka. Ideologichna borot'ba navkolo spadshchyny T.H. Shevchenka v Zakhidnii Ukraini (1842-1939)* (Kyiv: Vyscha shkola, 1989), pp. 7-11.

20. Iaroslav Hordyns'kyi, *Do istorii kulturnoho i politychnoho zhyttia v Halychyni u 60-tyh rr. XIX v.* (L'viv: NTSh, 1917), pp. 40-43.

mada (*hromady* in plural, which can be literary translated as “community” or village commune) across Eastern Galicia.²¹

Some contemporaries and scholars attributed the interest in Shevchenko exclusively to the import of *Kobzar* from the Russian-ruled Ukraine. In fact, the greatest Ukrainian poet’s cult was introduced into Galicia even before Dymet’s merchandise arrived in Galicia. Galician-Ruthenian periodicals spread information on Shevchenko a year before his texts actually reached the readers. In 1861 *Slovo* commented several times on the death of Shevchenko. In these articles Shevchenko was praised as the greatest “prophet, artist and bard-nightingale” of Little Russia whose truly Ruthenian heart (*shchyro-ruskaia hrud'*) was full of love for the steppes of his native Ukraine.²² *Slovo* also stated the L'viv Ruthenians sympathized with this great loss of Ukraine.²³ Another obituary, written by Volodymyr Bernatovych, an Ukrainophile activist from Right-Bank Ukraine, was published in July 1861. Bernatovych’s article, with information on Shevchenko’s funeral and funeral speeches, was representative of the populist rhetoric on Shevchenko already developed in Russian-ruled Ukraine. Bernatovych emphasized the poet’s deep devotion to his native Ukraine and his martyrdom. The relationship of Kyiv students with Shevchenko was characterized as similar to that between children and their father. This reference to Shevchenko as “our father” [*bat'ko*] became a recurrent expression in the letters “from Ukraine” published in *Slovo* and was soon accepted by the Galician Ukrainophiles.

All this was quite new for the Galician Ruthenian educated public, who felt the need to “discover” and honor the poet so significant for the “Little Russians”. Already on the first anniversary of Shevchenko’s death in early March 1862, before Dymet made his famous trip to Kyiv, the first requiem mass for Shevchenko was organized in L'viv. This event had tremendous public resonance. Thus, the birth of the cult of Shevchenko, which soon became a crucial element of Galician Ukrainophilism, was stimulated by, amongst other factors, the changes in Ruthenian Greek Catholic religious sphere and its wider opening to the East. This process will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Before being overwhelmed with secular Ukrainian literary production, a significant part of Ruthenian educated elite turned to their own church-based cultural tradition, and attempted to imbue traditional religious prac-

21. On the early *hromady* network in Eastern Galicia and their initiational function in shaping sacrificed sense of nationality among Ruthenian students, see my article “Hromady rannikh narodovtsiv u Skhidnii Halychyni (60-ti roky XIX st.),” published in *Ukraina: kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'* 9 (2001): 378-92.

22. *Slovo*, no. 15, March 15, 1861.

23. “Vspomyinka o Shevchenku,” *Slovo*, no. 27, May 11, 1861: 156.

tices with an ideological and national meaning. Attention to the rituals and to the clerical sphere in general was quite obvious since it was an important part of the spiritual and intellectual life of all educated Galician Ruthenians. Since 1861 the differences between "Latin" and "Ruthenian" Church rituals were brought to the fore of public attention by the editors of *Slovo*. Within two years, *Slovo* managed to combine the patriotic feelings and anti-Catholic sentiments of some Greek Catholics, mostly parochial clergy and lay intelligentsia, into a visible public movement. For many Greek Catholic priests, who did not think in modern national terms, the Ruthenian identity was based upon the externals of the religion, and they expressed it by defending their ritual tradition. However, this "tradition" had to be re-invented and in many aspects it contradicted with the "real" tradition expressed by everyday church practices. Such issues as kneeling and ringing small bells during the liturgy, the use of a sponge for chalice, adding hot water for the Eucharist, the use of side altars, the priestly clothes and beards were at the center of the Ruthenian public debate. Various Greek Catholic Church practices, particularly processions connected with Julian religious holidays, were increasingly seen as "Ruthenian national" manifestations.²⁴

The articles published in *Slovo* by two leading figures in the ritual-purification movement, Fathers Vladymyr Terlecki and Ioann Naumovych, provided the ritual-purification movement with the concepts that owed much from national and Romantic thinking. A lengthy piece by Father Terlecki²⁵ entitled "Something about the Ruthenian nationality" was published in *Slovo* in April-July of 1861. It endowed the ritual-purification movement with a universal mission. The author argued that full preservation of Orthodox liturgy and ritual culture by the Uniates would convince other Orthodox Slavic nations that it was possible to preserve church ritual and Slavic culture while being part of the Catholic Church. The mission of Rus' and particularly of the Ruthenian Uniates (because of their providential location in the center of the Slavic world) was to restore church unity and convince the Orthodox Slavs to accept a union with Rome. Terlecki

24. See, e.g., the descriptions of the Theophany (*Bohoiavlennia*) processions and rituals in L'viv and Peremyshl' in 1862: *Vistnyk*, no. 4, Jan. 25, 1862: 14. The tradition of public *Bohoiavlennia* procession in L'viv was interrupted in the mid-18th century and then renewed in 1789 by the Greek Catholic Bishop of L'viv Petro Bilians'kyi. Yet the sermons delivered there and its descriptions were done in Polish. Vasył Shchurat, "Iordan u L'vovi 1789 r.," *Nedilia* 3 (1911): 1-2.

25. On his colourful personality see Ivan L. Rudnytsky, "Hipolit Vladimir Terlecki," in Ivan L. Rudnytsky, *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), pp. 143-72; and Ostap Sereda, "Aenigma ambulans: o. Volodymyr (Ippolyt) Terlets'kyi i 'rus'ka narodna ideia' u Halychyni u 60-kh rokakh XIX st.," *Ukraina moderna* 4-5 (2000): 81-104.

wrote in quite a liberal spirit, greeting the democratization of the Habsburg Monarchy and the introduction of liberal freedoms there. He argued that religious culture was an inevitable part of national culture, and since only simple Ruthenian people preserved the spiritual virtues of Slavdom, their church ritual was of great cultural importance.²⁶

Father Naumovych in an article "About the things basic for Rus'" stated that the "Greek ritual" was important for Catholic Church aspirations to universality and therefore, should be preserved in purity and in accordance with the original spirit of Byzantine liturgy. He argued that under the then current state of affairs, a non-educated faithful copied rituals without deeper thought, though these rituals were corrupted by Latin influences and deprived of their initial meaning. To avoid this situation and strengthen the belief and morality of the "simple people," the external side of Greek Catholic liturgy should be restored in accordance with Eastern Christian spiritual religiosity. His argumentation was also heavily imbued with Ruthenian national patriotism. The Latin admixtures in the Uniate Church were explained as the result of a conscious Polish policy of assimilation and oppression against the Ruthenians.²⁷

The Polish press actively responded to what was called the schismatic agitation. The ritual-purification activists, who as a rule contributed articles in Ruthenian to *Slovo*, were opposed mostly by the Greek Catholic priests who wrote in Polish to the Polish press (*Tygodnik Katolicki*, *Dziennik Polski*, *Gazeta Narodowa*). Thus, the "ritualist" discussion obtained a Polish-Ruthenian character. While the ritual-purification activists pictured a return to a more Eastern form of liturgy as a liberation from Polish domination and assimilation, their opponents argued that if all ritual differences between Greek Catholics and the Orthodox would be eradicated, then Ruthenians of Galicia could easily be persuaded by Russian Orthodox agitators. They argued that ritual changes had preceded the abolition of Uniate Church in the Russian monarchy, and warned about the "terrible consequences" that the purification of ritual could lead to. The anti-"ritualists" did not value Eastern Christian spirituality highly (the Uniate Church was seen as progressing from the backward schismatism to the civilized state of the West) and argued that exaggerated attention to the externals of the religion, some of which were allegedly incompatible with the modern hygienic standards, underplayed the more important aspects of theology. Discussion also touched upon such matters as the character of

26. Vladymyr Terlets'kyi, "De-neshcho o ruskoi narodnosti," *Slovo*, no. 24, April 27, 1861: 1-2; no. 25, May 1, 1861: 137; no. 37, June 15, 1861: 212-15; no. 40, June 29, 1861: 233; no. 41, July 3, 1861: 240; no. 42, July 5, 1861: 243-44; no. 43, July 10, 1861: 249-50.

27. Ivan Naumovych, "O dilakh dlia Rusi osnovnykh," *Slovo*, no. 69, Oct. 9, 1861: 357-58; no. 70, Oct. 12, 1861: 361; no. 71, Oct. 16, 1861: 365-67.

Catholicism, its pluralism and relationship to the Orthodox Church. Both sides based their arguments on the works of renowned Catholic writers: the "ritualists" used the ideas of Russian Catholics, who at that time had established contacts with the Galician Greek Catholics,²⁸ particularly Prince Ivan Gagarin, their opponents – the anti-Orthodox rhetoric of de Maistre.²⁹

Those criticizing ritual-purification reforms did not hide their Polonophile sentiments and accused "ritualists" of provoking anti-Polish hatred, which was alien to the ideal of Christian brotherly love. In the political atmosphere of the early 1860s, inflamed by the Polish patriotic demonstrations in Warsaw that often had religious character, loyalty to the Roman Catholic Church was easily conflated with support of the Polish cause.

There were also many Greek Catholic priests who saw the main instrument of promoting their interests in stubborn loyalty to Vienna and Rome and who were fearful of losing their reputation of the "Tyrolians of the East." They may have sympathized with the ritual-purification cause but suspected that the whole issue was provoked by the Polish side that wanted to compromise Ruthenians as schismatics in the eyes of Austrian government and Rome.³⁰ The semi-official Viennese *Vistnyk* adopted a different perspective from *Slovo*. Its authors always stressed loyalty to the dynasty and the Catholic Church. The attitude to the "ritualism" of the higher hierarchy of the Greek Catholic Church was also ambivalent.³¹ Metropolitan Hryhorii Iakhymovych attempted to keep ritual-purification agitation under control; he therefore disciplined Father Naumovych in February 1862,³² and removed Father Terlecki from L'viv to a remote Hoshiv mon-

28. In 1861, Father Ivan Martynov visited Metropolitan Hryhorii Iakhymovych and discussed the possibility of erecting a Russian Catholic Jesuit Church in L'viv. Bohdan Didytskiy, *Svoezhyttievyy zapysky*, vol. 1 (L'viv: Pechatnia Stavropigiiskoho instituta, 1908), p. 55.

29. See most manifest examples of the ritualist discussion from 1861-1862 published in [Jan Boliński], ed., *O obrzędach grecko-unickich jako kwestyi czasów dzisiejszych w Galicyi Wschodniej* (Lwów: Druk. Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolinskich, 1862).

30. "Prymichaniia o otnoheniiakh Halytskoi Rusy k Rymovy," *Slovo*, no. 19, March 19, 1870: 2.

31. Some of the Polish Galician politicians had no doubts that Metropolitan Iakhymovych "considers the only redemption for Rus' in Russia, secretly promotes *schyzma* and most likely is paid by Moscow" (Biblioteka Czartoryskich, manuscript division, *rkps.* 5688 III, *str.* 677). Father Terlecki claimed that Metropolitan gladly received him in L'viv but was not sure whether ritual can be really changed back to its original purity. L'vivs'ka Naukova Biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy, manuscript division, *fond* 1 (*Naukove tovarystvo im. T. Shevchenka opys* 1, *od.zb.* 438/10, *ark.* 1 *zv.* (V. Terlets'kyi to I. Leshchyns'kyi, Sept. 12, 1862).

32. Kyrylo Studyns'kyi, *Z pozhovklykh lystkiv (Zamitky i studii)* (L'viv: Drukornia A. Goldmana, 1917), pp. 28-41.

astery in May of the same year. In January 1862, Metropolitan Hryhorii Iakhymovych issued a pastoral letter in which he prohibited self-willed changes in the ritual but at the same time promised to convene a church *Sobor* that would establish the principles of ritual reform and present them to the Vatican.³³ These plans, if implemented, might have resulted in the previously unseen national forum of Galician Ruthenians, similar to that held already by other clergy-led nationalities in the empire such as the Romanians and Serbs. The Metropolitan suddenly passed away on April 29, 1863, his death slowing down the ritual-purification movement. Also, the Vatican became more involved in resolving the confessional tensions in Galicia (among other measures it reprimanded Father Terlecki several times) and stimulated Polish-Ruthenian rapprochement on the question of personal changes of the church rite.³⁴

Were the early Ukrainophiles in any way involved into the “ritualist” debate? In fact, for a while, this issue also obtained primary significance for them. Those who formed the Ukrainophile *hromady* were among the most sympathetic supporters of the ritual-purification movement. At this time they viewed Orthodoxy as the faith of their fathers, for which Cossacks fought with the Poles.³⁵ At a later stage, several Ukrainophiles spoke favorably about the ritual purification of the 1860s as a justified undertaking.³⁶ This was underlined already by several contemporaries and later by scholars. Ostap Terlets’kyi, an active participant in the Ukrainophile movement of the 1860s, commented that due to the paramount position of clergy among the educated Ruthenians, church issues played a major role in all Galician-Ruthenian endeavors, and thus “all educated Rus” [*usia pys’mennna Rus*]. were engaged in the purification of the church ritual.³⁷ The Pre-Soviet Ukrainian scholar Iaroslav Hordyns’kyi, although critical of the “ritualists” as potential Russophiles, acknowledged on the basis of the correspondence that young Ukrainophiles supported leading “ritualists” as national patriots.³⁸ Another Ukrainian scholar of pre-Soviet epoch, Kyrylo Studyns’kyi noticed that no other issue managed to unite people so

33. [Jan Boliński], ed., *O obrzędach grecko-unickich jako kwestyi czasów dzisiejszych w Galicyi Wschodniej*, pp. 88-95.

34. See letters of the Vatican Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* from 1860-1862 published in P. Athanasius G. Welykyj OSBM, ed., *Litterae S.C. de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam catholicam Ukrainae et Bielarussiae spectantes*, vol. VII: 1790-1862, pp. 311-12, 317-18, 322-325, 327-32.

35. “Hadky,” *Vechernytsi*, no. 18, May 31, 1862: 141.

36. Anatol’ Vakhniayn, *Spomyny z zhyt’ia*, p. 59.

37. Ostap Terlets’kyi, “Halyts’ko-rus’ke pys’menstvo 1848-1865 r. Uvahy i spomyny,” *Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk* 24/11 (1903): 85-86.

38. Iaroslav Hordyns’kyi, *Do istorii kul’turnoho i politychnoho zhyt’ia v Halychyni u 60-tykh rr. XIX v.*, p. 75.

different by age and national views as the ritualist one. Old and young, Russophiles and Ukrainians removed the small bells from the churches, did not kneel down, curtained the Royal Doors at the minute of the transformation of bread and wine into the Christ's body and blood, received communion standing with crossed hands (instead of kneeling), and disputed with Poles on the ritualist subjects.³⁹

The young generation even wanted to be more consistent in confessional issue than majority of Greek Catholic priests. Ostap Terlets'kyi recalled later that the young people did not pay attention to church traditions and convictions of contemporary Galician clergy, that were Uniate to the core, but considered the issue from a patriotic position, and from this position they raised the question: why shall not we take consequences that are offered by history to a Ruthenian patriot, and try resolutely to free the Ruthenian people from the Polish influence, why do not we leave all the Union and come back to Orthodox religion?⁴⁰

In a letter of "young Galicians" to "brothers-Ukrainians," published in *Slovo*, the "ritualist question" was described as the most important issue in contemporary Galicia, and supported by all young Ruthenians.⁴¹ Both Fathers Terlecki and Naumovych, proscribed to that or another extent by the church hierarchy, were highly respected at that moment in the Galician Ukrainophile circles as devoted Ruthenian patriots. In a public letter written by 40 Ruthenian university lay students, Naumovych was called "father" [*bat'ko*] and praised for "purification of our fatherly Greek Catholic faith from the foreign to our Ruthenian spirit, and alien to the development of Ruthenian nationality harmful influences." The letter was published in *Slovo* at a time when the Metropolitan Hryhorii Iakhymovych disciplined Father Naumovych.⁴² In February 1863, the Ukrainophiles petitioned the Metropolitan to let Father Terlecki stay in Galicia after the Austrian government requested his dismissal.⁴³

Ruthenian patriotically-minded students considered a public demonstration of sympathy with the Orthodox Church as an indicator of individual freedom. Future Ukrainophile and Greek Catholic priest, Emanuil Ly-

39. Kyrilo Studyns'kyi, *Z pozhovklykh lystiv*, p. 28.

40. Ostap Terlets'kyi, "Halyts'ko-rus'ke pys'menstvo 1848-1865 r. Uvahy i spomyny," *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* 24/11 (1903): 80.

41. "Molodiy Halychane. De-shcho na otvīt bratiam ukraintsiam," *Slovo*, no. 70, Sept. 17, 1862: 277.

42. "Prepodobnomu Ottsu Yvanovy Naumovychu, Prykhdnyku Korostna y Perymshlian," *Slovo*, no. 6, Jan. 20, 1862: 22. This support for Father Naumovych clearly contrasted with the critical attitude of the Ukrainophile students of the 1870s also expressed in a public letter. See "Otvertyi lyst ruskykh akademikov do ottsia Naumovycha, vydavatelja 'Nauky'," *Pravda*, no. 2, Febr. 27, 1873: 89-92.

43. "Moloda Rus' v rokakh 1860-66," *Dilo*, no. 29, Febr. 18, 1892: 1-2.

synets'kyi recalled later that in 1862 Ruthenian *gymnasium* students of L'viv were inspired by the articles of Naumovych in *Slovo*. Before "the year of ritualism" (*rik obriadovshchyny*) the only Orthodox Church in L'viv that belonged to Bukovynian bishopric was seen as a "Greek" one. The church was normally attended only by the soldiers from Bukovyna who were stationed in L'viv. Suddenly, *gymnasium* students discovered that church service was, besides in Romanian, also in Ruthenian, due to the initiative of local priest, Father Kharanevych. From then on, they frequented these Orthodox services and enjoyed "the purity of the liturgy of the Eastern Church." Father Kharanevych was married to the daughter of a German official from Bukovyna, Leopoldine Laterne, and conversed with her in German. However, as soon as his church became the focus of Ruthenian national interest, he "acquired Ruthenian patriotism," and changed his colloquial language. The admiration of the students grew when in 1862 Father Kharanevych celebrated his first requiem mass in honor of Taras Shevchenko.⁴⁴

At that time the church requiem was used as a public national manifestation: for example, in 1862 such a mass was organized in honor of the Galician Ruthenian historian Denys Zubryts'kyi.⁴⁵ But Shevchenko was Orthodox, and it provoked a public scandal. The fact that patriotic gatherings of the Ruthenian public took place in the Orthodox Church was disreputable in the eyes of conservative Greek Catholics and Poles,⁴⁶ but attracted all those who supported the ritual-purification movement. The requiem mass was numerously attended by many *gymnasium* and university students, a few dozen ladies and several prominent Ruthenians. Some had not heard of Shevchenko until the moment when the posters with the three-barrow "Orthodox" cross announcing the event were posted across the city (see Illustration 1). Some attended the requiem service for the sake of sympathy with the Orthodox Church.⁴⁷ Father Emanuil Lysynets'kyi, who

44. Vasyli' Shchurat, "S'viatkovanie rokovyn smerty Shevchenka v Halychyni (1862-1870) zi spomynamy o. E. Lysynets'koho i st. rad. T. Revakovycha," *Nedilia* 11-12 (1911): 10.

45. *Vistnyk*, no. 10, Febr. 13, 1862: 38.

46. In 1863 the Polish *Gazeta Narodowa* qualified this "requiem in schismatic L'viv church" as one of the main anti-Polish actions organized by Ruthenians. It was especially alarmed by the "young Rus'" attraction to the schismatic ritual. Ksiądz obrządku słowiańskiego, "Gdzieniec w sprawach naszych domowych," *Gazeta Narodowa*, no. 40, March 31, 1863: 1-2.

47. On the symbolic importance that the three-barrow crosses, commonly associated with Orthodoxy, acquired in Galicia in the next decade, see John-Paul Himka, *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine: The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement in Galicia, 1867-1900* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1999), pp. 64-67. On the posters announcing Shevchenko's first requiem service, see Ivan Verkhrats'kyi,

in 1862 was a *gymnasium* student in L'viv, recalled later that because of the general favorable attitude to the ritual-purification issue, the requiem service in the Orthodox Church for Shevchenko announced through the posters attracted "[. . .] many devout Uniates, young and old Ruthenians. At this time Rus' from *Narodnyi Dim* [main national institution] honored Shevchenko differently [than now]. Old Zubryts'kyi just passed away at this moment, otherwise he would follow all others. All lay Ruthenians as many of them were in L'viv, without few officials and professors, with devotion (not formally) listened to the church service."⁴⁸

The excited contributor to *Slovo* (probably Volodymyr Shashkevych, one of the intellectual leaders of early Ukrainophilism in Galicia and son of Markian Shashkevych⁴⁹) called this first Shevchenko's requiem service the beginning of a "New Era" that would succeed the previous "Dark Age." He proudly stated that numerous participants showed that they "were not afraid to pray for Orthodox Taras in an Orthodox church," and proved that they have a "true Little Russian heart."⁵⁰ For a moment Ukrainophilism merged with the ritual-purification mood of Ruthenian activists.⁵¹

Those Greek Catholic priests who objected to the ritual-purification reforms scornfully criticized the requiem masses for Shevchenko. They argued that such a public manifestation of sympathy for the "schismatic liturgy" gives reason to suspect the participants of sympathy with Orthodox religious principles. Valuing the confessional sense of identity over the national, they argued that the Catholics could not pray for Shevchenko since

"Perve pomynal'ne bohosluzhenie za upokoi Tarasa Shevchenka 1862 roku u L'vovi," *Zapysky NTSh* 108 (1912): 145-47.

48. Vasyl' Shchurat, "S'viatkovanie rokovyn smerty Shevchenka v Halychyni (1862-1970) zi spomynamy o. E.Lysynets'koho i st. rad. T.Revakovycha," *Nedilia* 11-12 (1911): 6.

49. Kyrylo Studyns'kyi, "Do istorii vzaiemyn Halychyny z Ukrainoiu v rr. 1860-1873," p. 18.

50. "Pomyvky Tarasa Shevchenka," *Slovo*, no. 17, March 12, 1862: 68.

51. It is interesting how in this light the first Shevchenko's requiem mass was perceived by some of the participants, for example by Zenovii Zaval'nyts'kyi, the church singer from Peremysliany, a small town near L'viv where Ivan Naumovych served as local priest. In a letter to *Slovo*, prompted probably by Naumovych, he acknowledged that before he had no idea that Shevchenko already "sang Ruthenian songs for the glory of our poor Ruthenian nation [*spivav rusky pisny na slavu nashoho bidnoho ruskoho naroda*]." He read some information about him and the planned requiem mass in this newspaper. However, the lengthy article was devoted not to Shevchenko's poetry, but to impressions of the Orthodox Church service, and was obviously used as an opportunity to describe it publicly in detail. Zaval'nyts'kyi tried to convince *Slovo* readers that the Orthodox Church was also a Ruthenian Church with Ruthenian icons and Ruthenian priest. See *Slovo*, no. 18, March 15, 1862: 72.

he did not belong to the Catholic Church, and there is no spiritual connection with him.⁵² Also, most conservative Old Ruthenians were afraid of loosing their loyalist reputation.⁵³ Their views were often expressed in *Vistnyk* that also debated with Ukrainophiles on the wide range of cultural and political issues. Among other things, contributors to *Vistnyk* attempted to preserve their control over the development of Ruthenian language in Galicia and to ignore the national-political message of Shevchenko. Thus, those who participated in the Shevchenko's requiem masses clearly felt that they were transgressing established cultural borders and considered the attendance of the Orthodox Church as an act of civic courage.⁵⁴

Some of Galician Ukrainophiles did not want to obey the restrictions of Catholic Church authorities and still tried to make Uniate priests and monks pray for him. Interestingly enough, in 1861, just after *Slovo* published first information on his death, somebody wrote his name in the memorial book of the monastery in Pidhirtsi.⁵⁵ One of the Ukrainophiles recalled that the *gymnasium* students in Stanislaviv often ordered Greek Catholic requiem service for "father Taras" pretending he was the real father of one of them.⁵⁶

Galician Ukrainophiles also began to include readings of Shevchenko's poetry into the public "declamational evenings" organized since 1862 by a newly founded Ruthenian social club in L'viv, *Ruska Besida*. Normally such evenings combined the elements of Austrian loyalty, local Galician Ruthenian patriotism and an interest in Cossack Ukraine. For example, the evening on February 26, 1862, held on the first anniversary of the February Patent, was opened by the speech of *gymnasium* professor Maksym Iskryts'kyi who thanked the emperor for freedom and constitution, followed by a choir singing the Austrian anthem. During the artistic part, *gymnasium* professor Oleksii Torons'kyi recited a poem of the Galician Ruthenian poet Antin Mohyl'nyts'kyi *Skyt Maniavs'kyi*, another *gymnasium* professor Ievhen Zhars'kyi delivered a short lecture on Ukrainian writer Kvitka-Osnovianenko, prominent Ukrainophile publicist Ksenofont Klymkovych recited Shevchenko's *Ivan Pidkova*, and a certain Kulchyts'kyi recited Cossack historical *duma* on Samilo Kishka. Poems by local Ukrainophile authors, Volodymyr Shashkevych and Iurii Fed'kovych,

52. [Jan Boliński], *O obrzędach grecko-unickich jako kwestyi czasów dzisiejszych w Galicyi Wschodniej*, pp. 98-99.

53. *Vistnyk*, no. 19, March 21, 1862: 74-75.

54. "Moloda Rus'," *Dilo*, no. 29, Febr. 18, 1892: 1-2.

55. V. Hishchyns'kyi, "Vasyliany vymoliuiut' dlia Shevchenka rai," *Vysoky Zamok*, March 8, 2002.

56. Viktor Petrykevych, *Istoria kul'tu Shevchenka sered gimnazial'noi molodizhy* (Peremysl' 1914), p. XLIV.

were also read.⁵⁷ Smaller declamational evenings were held in some provincial towns of Eastern Galicia with the participation of both "old" and "young" Rus'.⁵⁸ However, attempts to hold a commemorative evening on the day of Shevchenko's death were blocked since 1863 by the directors of *Besida* who were afraid that it would be perceived as the second, civic part of an Orthodox requiem mass. The refusal of the directors of *Ruska Besida* caused the first open public manifestation of Ukrainophiles against the "Old Rus'." The former decided to boycott the following declamational evenings in *Besida* in protest.⁵⁹ Accordingly, in 1863 the directors of *Ruska Besida* decided to remove Shevchenko's portrait from the walls of the institution that were also the walls of Ruthenian *Narodnyi Dim*. It turned into a public scandal and was treated by Ukrainophiles as a sign of open discord with the "old Rus'."⁶⁰ Interestingly enough, the caricaturist of the Viennese Ruthenian satirical journal *Strakhopud* still saw this conflict in terms of the ritual-purification struggle (see Illustration 2). For him, Shevchenko was removed from *Besida* as a *schyzmatyk*, in spite of his fame in the whole Rus'.⁶¹

Until the mid-1860s the Orthodox requiem services for Shevchenko, regularly organized in L'viv on the anniversary of his death, were the main public form of manifesting admiration of the poet. They turned into a newly-established tradition and important patriotic event for many educated Galician Ruthenians irrespective of national preferences, Old Ruthenians and Russophiles included. Within a couple of years, a special ritual emerged according to which the Ruthenian public celebrated the memory of Shevchenko. It followed the basic rules of the Eastern Christian ritual and some folk customs, however there were some essential additions. The *tetrapod* was decorated with the lithographic and later painted portrait of the poet decorated by laurels and two transparent glass pyramids with lyre and three-barrow cross on both sides. Twelve young students dressed in

57. *Slovo*, no. 14, March 1, 1862: 56; no. 18, March 15, 1862: 71. The next "declamational evening," held on May 15, 1862, the anniversary of the abolition of serfdom, started with a thankful speech by Zhars'kyi on the liberation of the peasants, and ended with a recitation by Volodymyr Shashkevych of Shevchenko's passionate Cossackophile poem *Rozryta mohyla*. See *Vistnyk*, no. 52, May 22, 1862: 206-07.

58. On declamational evenings in Sambir, see letters of the local *hromada* members to Taniachkevych: L'vivs'ka Naukova Biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy, manuscript division, *fond 1, od.zb.* 560, *ark.* 18-23.

59. *Vistnyk*, no. 29, April 29, 1863: 114-15; no. 31, May 6, 1863: 122. See also Mykhailo Vozniak, "Narodny kul'tu Shevchenka v Halychyni," *Nedilia* 11-12 (1911): 4.

60. "Moloda Rus' v rokakh 1860-66'. Z rukopysy z roku 1866," *Dilo*, no. 29, Febr. 18, 1892: 1-2.

61. *Strakhopud*, no. 3, June 28, 1863: 15.

Cossack costumes and mourning scarves stood at both sides of the *tetrapod* with lighted candles in their hands.⁶²

In general, the ritual-purification movement caused a certain shift from the religious sphere of thinking to the national one. It created a specific mood among educated Galician Ruthenians that facilitated transconfessional intellectual contacts with the East Ukrainian or Bukovynian Ruthenian activists and made everything connected with Rus' Orthodox heritage (Cossacks including) attractive. For a moment, the growing cult of Ukrainian poet, Orthodox Taras Shevchenko was also one of the signs of Ruthenian "ritualism". As one can see, young Ukrainophiles were not non-interested passive observers of the "ritualist" debates but active participants.

The ritual-purification movement slowed with the death of Metropolitan Hryhoriï Iakhymovych and the direct intervention of the Vatican in settling inter-confessional relations in Galicia. Still, up to this date it had not lost its appeal for a considerable part of the Ukrainian Greek Catholics. Its immediate results in the 1860s cannot be limited to the growth of political and religious Russophilism in Galicia. In fact, its consequences were much broader. One consequence was the so-called *Concordia* of 1863 – an agreement between the Greek Catholic and Roman Catholic prelates of Galicia initiated by the Vatican. *Concordia* strictly regulated the procedure of the change of ritual affiliation and made it exceptional from widespread practice.⁶³

After the *Concordia* was publicly announced, the attention of Greek Catholic clergy shifted from the purification of rituals to the regulation of changes of the rite, and then, in 1864-1865, to the situation in the neighboring Chełm Greek Catholic eparchy, the only one left under the Russian monarchy. The so-called "Chełm affair" became important for educated Galician Ruthenians, mostly young priests and teachers, because in 1864 many of them were recruited by the Russian government to settle there in attractive material conditions. After the defeat of the Polish January uprising, in which many Chełm Uniates (unlike Galician Ruthenians) supported the Polish cause, the Russian government decided to combat Polish influences among them. It tried to make the ritual practices in the Chełm Uniate eparchy uniform with those of the Russian Orthodox and to prohibit the use of Polish in the church life. As John-Paul Himka comments, Galician Ruthenian activists possessed all the qualities that made them attractive assistants for the Russian government: they hated the Poles, attempted to bring ritual practices closer to the Orthodox standard,

62. Viktor Petrykevych, *Istoria kul'tu Shevchenka sered gimnazial'noi molodizhy*, XXXVIII; "Pomyvky Tarasa Shevchenka," *Slovo*, no. 17, March 12, 1862: 68.

63. Włodzimierz Osadczy, *Kościół i cerkiew na wspólnej drodze*, 107-10, 163-68.

and were becoming pro-Russian.⁶⁴ As a result of the mass campaign, around 500 Galicians moved to Russia (according to the estimation of Studyns'kyi).⁶⁵ Not surprisingly, *Slovo* commented favorably on the Russian policy in the Chełm eparchy (in 1864 around 40 articles were devoted to this issue). The tone of publications was becoming more pro-Orthodox and anti-Uniate. Some of Galician Ruthenian leaders, as Iakiv Holovats'kyi, engaged in the Russian nationalist discourse on "Polish question," contributing various materials on "the subjugation of Russian Slavs by the Roman Church" to Russian periodicals.⁶⁶ Obviously, the active involvement of Galician Greek Catholic public in the "ritualist" discord in the Chełm eparchy was seen by many scholars as a logical continuation of the ritual-purification movement, especially taking into account that Father Markel Popel', one of the leading "ritualists" from early 1860s, played a paramount role in the conversion of Chełm eparchy to Orthodoxy in 1875.

From the perspective of Galician Ukrainophiles, who until the mid-1860s crystallized into a separate ideological movement, the Chełm campaign clearly promoted Russian imperial interests. A new concept was introduced into the public debates in 1863 by *Meta* – the idea that Russian Orthodox clergy subordinated to imperial bureaucracy is "the strongest factor of the Moscowfication [*moskovshchennia*] of Rus'." The creation of a new Ukrainian national narration of Greek Catholicism was begun in an attempt to save the Union (as the only possible Ukrainian national institution) from the unfavorable attitudes that dominated among the "young Rus'." Together with a developing anti-Russian political program, Ukrainophiles changed their attitude to the Uniate Church. *Meta* admitted that "Union was a great misfortune for Rus' and that Ruthenian people hated the Union until recently," but stressed that the abolition of Union under the Russian monarchy resulted in the Russification of Ukrainians.⁶⁷ Thus, the concept of the "lesser evil" appeared: taking into account the situation in Russian-ruled Ukraine, Galician Ruthenians should defend their Greek Catholic character and combat Orthodox influences. In general, Ukrainophiles adopted many of the ritual-purification rhetoric and emphasized an understanding of the church as a social institution representative of their nation. They focused on receiving church autonomy from Rome as a precondition of resolving the "ritualist" question. In 1865, *Meta* stated that "the recent failure of so-called ritualist issue was caused by the fact that

64. Himka, *Religion and Nationality*, p. 34.

65. Kyrylo Studyns'kyi, *Z pozhovklykh lystkiv*, p. 71.

66. See, for example, "Materialy dlia istorii pravoslavliia v Galitsii," *Vestnik Iugo-Zapadnoi i Zapadnoi Rusi* 4/31 (1863): 29-34.

67. "Rus'ke pytannia," *Meta* 3 (Nov. 1863): 210-18.

instead of raising the question of church autonomy the “ritualist” question was raised, which was contained within [the problem of] autonomy and did not need a decision from Rome.” *Meta* also stressed that the autonomy “of our national church [*narodna tserkva*]” was the main precondition of its union with Rome.⁶⁸

Compared with the early 1860s, on the eve of *Ausgleich* Ukrainophiles clearly changed their attitude to the ritual-purification movement and confessional issues in general. They aspired to build Greek Catholicism into a Ruthenian national church with its own self-ruling institutions, but at the same time declared that the confessional differences with Russian Ukrainians would not handicap cooperation with them. The informal leader of the *hromady* network, Danylo Taniachkevych, proclaimed in 1867, “we are for the Uniate Church, because we consider it as something better than a Moscow Jesuit Orthodoxy, with its autocratic synod.”⁶⁹ At the same time, he incorporated some important elements of Father Terlecki’s program, namely the demand for the creation of a patriarchate for the Austro-Ruthenian dioceses. If among the Galician Ukrainophiles in the early 1860s there existed a certain longing for confessional and spiritual uniformity with the bulk of Ukrainians (Orthodox by religion), in the second half of the 1860s the relations with the Ukrainians from the Russian Empire were clearly seen from an anti-Russian perspective, and a national-political solidarity was valued higher than a confessional one. Galician Ruthenians were to stay Greek Catholics but co-operate with Orthodox Ukrainians.⁷⁰ The Church was, as much as possible, to become national and autonomous.⁷¹

The growing reserve on the Ukrainophile’s side towards the ritual-purification issue, and the Old Ruthenian/Russophile annoyance with the cultural and political radicalism caused by Shevchenko’s influence, plus the restrictions of the Catholic authorities combined together, resulted in the gradual disappearance of the “invented tradition” of Shevchenko’s commemorative church requiems. Already in 1865 the contributors to *Meta* felt the need to clarify that Shevchenko’s requiem mass in the Orthodox Church was not a ritual demonstration or anti-Catholic action.⁷² A

68. “Ohliad politychnii,” *Meta*, no. 2, Febr. 28, 1865: 60-61.

69. Fedor Chornohora [Danylo Taniachkevych], *Pys'mo narodovtsiv rus'kyh do redaktora politychnei chasopysi "Rus'" iako protest i memoriial* (Vienna: Tyskom Sommera, 1867), p. 14.

70. “Iak my postupaly dosi i iak by nam dal'she postupaty,” *Rus'*, no. 21, June 9, 1867: 2-4.

71. See the analysis of the ecclesiastical part of Taniachkevych’s pamphlet in Himka, *Religion and Nationality*, pp. 52-53.

72. *Meta*, no. 2, Febr. 28, 1865: 61-64; “Zakazanie Mety,” *Meta*, no. 3, March 15, 1865: 72.

year later Ukrainophiles in Vienna did not want to associate the celebrations of Shevchenko with the religious demonstrations and restrained from organizing and participating in requiem services.⁷³ The cult of Shevchenko became then associated not with the revival of an ancient Orthodox Church ritual as with the introduction of populist (*narodnyts'kyi*) principles into the Ruthenian language. "All announcements and invitations were printed according to the Kulish's spelling, and, therefore, the older Rus' did not really participate in this event," complained *Slovo* in 1869.⁷⁴ Only Bohdan Didyts'kyi, the editor of *Slovo*, regularly attended Shevchenko celebrations in accordance with his own concept of Ukrainian literature.⁷⁵ Also, school authorities alarmed by such "ritualism," prohibited students from attending the Orthodox Church.⁷⁶ Shevchenko's requiem masses continued into the 1880s, but attracted fewer people. The situation was not saved by the fact that a prominent Bukovynian Ruthenian writer, Father Hryhori Vorobkevych, a good friend of Galician Ukrainophiles, became an Orthodox priest in L'viv at the end of the 1860s. He noticed in 1869 that while only a few attended church requiem services, many more (including around 200 ladies) came to the evening concert devoted to Shevchenko.⁷⁷

When the tradition of the requiem church services vanished, a new institution of Shevchenko's yearly commemorative "evening" (*vechir* or *vechernytsi*) again evolved from the irregular musical-poetical concerts organized by *Ruska Besida* in 1862-1863. For the first time Ukrainophiles organized separate "evening" devoted to the memory of Shevchenko in Peremyshl' on March 10, 1865.⁷⁸ It consisted of public readings of his po-

73. L'vivs'ka Naukova Biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy, manuscript division, *fond 1, opys 2, od. zb. 175, ark. 541-541 zv.* In 1867, Volodymyr Shashkevych even claimed that Shevchenko's requiem services in the Orthodox Church were secretly inspired by St. Petersburg in order to promote pro-Russian feelings among the Ruthenians. See [Volodymyr Shashkevych], "Iak my postupaly dosi i iak nam dal'she postupyty," *Rus'*, no. 21, June 9, 1867: 3-4.

74. *Slovo*, no. 18, March 13, 1869: 4.

75. Bohdan Didytskyi, a prominent Galician Russophile, believed that the works of Ukrainian writers made Galician Ruthenians lose the habit of stressing words in a Polish-like way and, notwithstanding the use of vernacular Ukrainian, introduced "Russian syllabic system" into Galicia. He highly valued Shevchenko, but insisted that Ukrainians and Russians should in future create common literature and culture. See Bohdan Didyts'kyi, *Svoezhyttievyy zapysky*, vol. 1, p. 31.

76. See the complaining articles in *Meta* on the prohibitions: *Meta*, no. 1, Febr. 17, 1865: 32.

77. "Materyialy do istoriyi znosyn Halychan z Bukovyntsiamy," *Ruslan*, no. 183, Aug. 26, 1908: 3.

78. This first Shevchenko commemorative evening was organized, nevertheless, with some assistance from the church authorities. The "evening" was held in the hall belonging

etry, poetry devoted to the poet, a commemorative speech by Danylo Taniachkevych (which became the model for such speeches for the next decade⁷⁹) and of several musical performances including a choral singing of *Shche ne vmerla Ukraina*. The concluding part of the evening had a clear “resurrectionist” message. Ksenofont Klymkovych read the poem which stated that although “our great nation” still did not enjoy freedom, with the effort of patriotic Ukrainians, it would resurrect from the ashes as a phoenix; then the motto “Ukraine is not dead yet” (ascribed to Shevchenko) was repeated by the choir.⁸⁰

In a similar fashion, the Galician Ukrainophile students organized Shevchenko’s commemorative evenings in 1866 in Vienna. In 1868-1871 through the efforts of *Ruska Besida*, which finally passed in 1870 into the hands of Ukrainophiles, after a certain interlude these evenings were again held in L’viv.⁸¹ At that time, the Old Ruthenians and Russophiles boycotted all activities of the Ukrainophiles and did not let them in the *Narodnyi Dim*. Thus, the “evenings” in 1869-1871 took part in the hall of the Sharpshooters’ society (*L’vivska Strilnytsia*) controlled by the Poles.⁸² At that time Galician Ukrainophiles tried to reach a compromise with Galician Polish politicians that received upper hand in the province. The latter were interested in using the former against the Russophiles. In 1872, the L’viv Ukrainophiles could use the hall of L’viv city council, what was seen as a clear sign of Polish support for their undertakings. In 1873-1874 the Shevchenko commemorative evenings again took place in the L’viv city council hall, and were attended by the Galician Viceroy Count Agenor Gołuchowski and the speaker of the Diet Prince Leon Sapieha.⁸³ Tyt Revakovych, an Ukrainophile activist, who deliberately came to L’viv to take part in the 1872 evening, noticed with satisfaction that “by the unusual great number of participants [500 according to the estimations of Ukrainophile journal *Osnova*], one could see the unceasing growth of

to the Greek Catholic cathedral chapter, and the entrance fee was collected for the building of another Greek Catholic Church (*na Bloniakh*) in Peremyshl’. Anatol’ Vakhnianyn, *Spomyny z zhyt’ia*, pp. 66-67.

79. Viktor Petrykevych, *Istoriya kul’tu Shevchenka sered gimnazial’noi molodizhy*, pp. XLVIII-LII.

80. “Vechemytsi v pamiat’ Tarasa. Dopys’ z Peremyshlia,” *Meta*, no. 3, March 15, 1865: 79-88.

81. In 1868, the tradition of choral singing of Shevchenko’s *Zapovit* on the music of Mykola Lysenko was introduced (*Pravda*, no. 8, Nov. 30, 1868: 95-96). See the description of other Shevchenko’s evenings in *Pravda*, no. 9, March 8, 1869: 83-84; *Pravda* 3 (1870): 144-45; *Osnova*, no. 19, March 17, 1871: 181-82.

82. *Pravda*, no. 7, Febr. 22, 1869: 64.

83. *Slovo*, no. 25, March 11, 1873: 3; *Pravda*, no. 3, March 27, 1873: 134-37; “Novynky,” *Pravda*, no. 4, March 13, 1874: 139-41.

Shevchenko's cult in Galicia."⁸⁴ Those members of provincial *hromady* who could not take part personally in the Shevchenko's evening sent greeting telegrams. A similar public Shevchenko evening was held in 1872 in Peremyshl'. In the second half of the 1870s and early 1880s, such evenings started to be organized in other provincial towns of Galicia: Stanislaviv (1877), Kolomyia (1880), Ternopil' (1882), then in Zbarazh, Sudova Vyshnia, Kalush, and later even in the countryside.⁸⁵ They became an important element of the emerging cult of Taras Shevchenko in Galicia and with the course of time obtained the character of national tradition.

In the 1870-80s, along with the officially sanctioned public celebrations of Shevchenko, the members of *hromady* continued to organize their own secret yearly evenings. The pre-Soviet Ukrainian scholar Viktor Petrykevych, attempting to catch the mood of these events, commented: "secrecy [. . .] surrounded them with the nimbus of the devotion to the idea. All felt as one family, all were aware that they were united by the single idea."⁸⁶

The commemorative "evenings," devoted to Shevchenko, obtained many ritualistic features, since they recalled "the divine pattern" of poet's life. The life and poetry of Shevchenko were often associated in Ukrainian Galician national discourse with the sacrifice and message of the Savior or an Apostle. Even the rhetoric of worshipping Shevchenko, employed both in public and private texts, was directly borrowed from church practices. Sometimes the members of *hromady* wrote about themselves as about the followers of the "Apostle Taras [Shevchenko]."⁸⁷ In the correspondence of Ternopil' *hromada* members with Volodymyr Shashkevych in 1865, Shevchenko was named "immortal Father," and his verses celebrated as "the sacral words of our immortal Prophet."⁸⁸ This crypto-religious side of Shevchenko's cult in Galicia was probably reinforced by the fact that his cult was introduced first in religious form, as a part of the ritual-purification movement.

* * *

84. Vasyli' Shchurat, "S'viatkovanie rokoyv smerty Shevchenka v Halychyni (1862-1870) zi spomynamy o. E. Lysynets'koho i st. rad. T. Revakovycha," *Nedilia* 11-12 (1911): 6; *Osnova*, no. 17, Febr. 29, 1872: 1-2.

85. Viktor Petrykevych, *Istoryia kul'tu Shevchenka sered gimnazial'noi molodizhy*, pp. XXXIX-XLI.

86. *Ibid.*, pp. XLV-XLVIII.

87. L'vivs'ka Naukova Biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy, manuscript division, *fond 1, od. zb. 560, ark. 72.*

88. L'vivs'ka Naukova Biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy, manuscript division, *fond 2, opys 2, od.zb. 175, ark. 483-484, 536.*

Interestingly enough that for short but crucial period of the early 1860s the ritual-purification movement on the one hand and on the other Cossackophilism were two principal attempts of Galician Ruthenian intellectuals to find a "useful past" for modern national discourse. Both stimulated educated Ruthenians to think beyond the limits of Habsburg and Catholic loyalties, and both were inspired by the anti-Polish stance typical for a part of Galician Ruthenians since 1848. Galician Ukrainophiles initially played an important role in both endeavors, since they accented their affiliation with the East Ukrainians. This explains why "Orthodox" Ukrainian writers and historical heritage became so popular among the Greek Catholic Galician Ruthenians. Interest in Eastern Church ritual prevailed at the beginning of the 1860s, as a sign of solidarity with pre-modern Rus', and served as the basis for both cultural Russophilism and Ukrainophilism. Paradoxically, the cult of Shevchenko and the Cossacks appeared in Galicia not in spite of the fact that they were seen as Orthodox figures, but precisely because they were. With the course of time the Galician Ukrainophiles reformulated their position in the confessional question, becoming less interested in ritual reform, but focusing instead on the national autonomy of the Greek Catholic church.

In general, the endeavors of the early Ukrainophiles in 1860s and early 1870s resulted in the "cultural revolution" that profoundly influenced the national identity of Galician Ruthenians. One could hardly overestimate the effects of their activities. During the 1860s and early 1870s Galician Ukrainophiles accomplished several important cultural projects, crucially transforming the culture of the educated Ruthenian public, which then became the main factor that united educated Galician Ruthenians with Ukrainians from the Russian Empire.

Illustration 1. Poster for the First Shevchenko Requiem Mass, 1862.



Source: Ivan Verkhrats'kyi, "Perve pomynal'ne bohosluzhenie za upokoi Tarasa Shevchenka 1862 roku u L'vovi," *Zapysky NTSh*, 108 (1912): 145.

Illustration 2. Cartoon Presenting the Attitude of *Ruska Besida* to Shevchenko, 1863.



Source: Source: *Strakhopud*, no. 3, June 28, 1863: 15.

“Yurets [St. Georgian]: What is it? . . . Aha! – It is Shev – chen – ko.

Yurets [upside down]: Did you not hear – about a poet – he is so famous throughout all of Rus’?”

Yurets: Hmm! Hmm – this *Schyzmatyk* – this is not for us.”