

O D K I J O W A D O R Z Y M U

Z dziejów stosunków Rzeczypospolitej ze Stolicą Apostolską i Ukrainą

pod redakcją M. R. Drozdowskiego, W. Walczaka, K. Wiszowatej-Walczak

Białystok 2012

Frank Sysyn

EDMONTON

The Ukrainian Populist Clergy and the Habsburgs: The Conflicted Vision of Father Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi

In his recent monograph *The Idea of Galicia*, Larry Wolff has directed our attention to the Habsburgs as the creators of the concept of Galicia.¹ Of all the institutions of Galicia, few had reason to be as indebted to the creativity of the Habsburgs as the Greek Catholic Church. On the most fundamental level, the Habsburgs had saved the Uniates of the province from the fate of persecution and dissolution that awaited their coreligionists in the other lands of the partitioned Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth that were annexed by the Russian Empire. Vienna's influence with Rome led to the erection or restitution of a Galician Uniate metropolitanate in 1807. But long before that, the policies of Maria Teresa had raised up the despised Uniate Church of the Polish times by renaming it the Greek Catholic Church and granting it equality with the Latin or Roman Catholics. The establishment of the Barbareum in Vienna in 1774 and the later foundation of the Greek Catholic seminary in Lviv in 1783 through which seminarians were educated at university courses recast the clergy as an educated stratum connected to major centers of learning. Even the intrusive and heavy-handed reforms of Joseph II that shaped the Church and the clergy into shock troops of the enlightened absolutist

¹ Larry Wolff, *The Idea of Galicia: History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture*, Stanford 2010.

state were not resented by the Greek Catholic clergy, who unlike their Roman Catholic counterparts were little likely to have the social position or a formulated clerical world view that tied them to the old order.²

To the very end of the Empire, the Habsburgs had much to recommend themselves to the Greek Catholic clergy. As World War I and the Russian occupation authorities' attempts to convert the Galician Ruthenians demonstrated, Habsburg rule had protected the Greek Catholics from their religious foes. For the Ukrainophile or populist clergy, the reasons to be thankful to Vienna were even more fundamental. The Viennese government of the early nineteenth century had mandated a place for the Ruthenians and their culture in the educational and linguistic spheres of Galicia. As the Russian Empire pursued an increasingly aggressive persecution of Ukrainian language and culture in the late nineteenth century, Habsburg rule provided a refuge where that language and culture could develop. Seeing the abrogation of cultural rights in Russia, Ukrainian activists could all the more value Austrian constitutionalism. The attachment of the Ukrainophiles to the common folk (the *narod*) gave the Ukrainian populist clergy reasons to applaud the Habsburgs who had regulated the harsh conditions of Polish serfdom in the late eighteenth century and fully freed the peasantry in 1848, often against the wishes of the Polish landowning strata. The crosses of freedom that dotted the Galician countryside and the religious services Greek Catholic clergy conducted at them were a lasting tribute to the Habsburgs.³

Yet despite the many services of the Habsburgs to the Greek Catholic Church and the Ukrainian movement, the Ukrainian clergy of the late nineteenth century were often critical of the Habsburg order, especially for its perceived preference for the Poles. They lamented the failure of the Habsburgs to divide the province in 1848 into a Polish West and a Ruthenian East and they condemned the increasing Galician autonomy after 1867 under circumstances of civic inequality that ensured the domination of Polish conservatives. For those Ukrainian populist clerics who were attracted to concepts of democracy and social equality, the Empire seemed more and more an anachronism. As the Ukrainian people became their primary political loyalty, the interests of nation prevailed over those of empire and state.⁴ In many ways the

² On the position of the Uniate Church during and after the partitions, see Larry Wolff, *The Uniate Church and the Partitions of Poland: Religious Survival in an Age of Enlightened Absolutism*, "Harvard Ukrainian Studies" 26, no. 1–4 (2002–2003): 153–244.

³ On the church in this period, see John Paul Himka, *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine: The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement in Galicia*, Montreal 1999. On the clergy in this period, see Bernadetta Wójtowicz-Huber, *"Ojcowie narodu": Duchowienstwo greckokatolickie w ruchu narodowym Rusinów galicyjskich (1867–1918)*, Warsaw 2008.

⁴ On relations between the national movement and the clergy, see John Paul Himka, *The Greek Catholic Church in Galicia, 1848–1914*, "Harvard Ukrainian Studies" 26, no. 1–4(2002–2003):

Habsburg reforms of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century ensured the creation of a stratum, the Greek Catholic clergy, that ultimately propagated political and social ideas and movements that had no place for the emperor and the Empire, at least as they functioned in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

In order to explore the relationship of the Ukrainian clergy to the Empire in its last decades, it is useful to examine the writings of Father Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi (1856–1919) on Austria, Vienna, and the Empire. A leading Ukrainian populist priest and a member of the Ukrainian National Democratic Party, the progressive Zubryts'kyi may be argued to be atypical. Indeed he was so in that he was a village priest, far from the centers of political and cultural life, who achieved membership in the Shevchenko Scientific Society. He wrote scores of articles on Ukrainian ethnography, history, and folklore, and he collected and published voluminous sources. He was even more atypical in having published hundreds of newspaper articles on numerous facets of Galician life. That atypicality provides us with an ample source base on what one major figure thought and propagated.⁵

First it is best to address how the Empire failed Zubryts'kyi in life, and then let him off lightly. On September 7, 1914, the pastor of Berehy Dolne (Berehy Dolynshni) in the the Ustryki Dolne(Ustryki Dolynshni) region abutting the Lemko area was called to court, arrested, and dispatched to the internment camp at Thalerhof.⁶ Thalerhof has become a symbol of martyrdom for the Russophile movement of Galicia and for Lemkos, especially those who do not adhere to Ukrainian identity. It is therefore worthy of note that the strong Ukrainian patriot Father Zubryts'kyi was caught up in the chaotic accusations of pro-Russian sentiments at the onset of the First World War, which often also included machinations by some Poles against Ukrainian activists. Certainly Zubryts'kyi recounts that the accusations against him

245–260 and Andrew Sorokowski, *The Lay and Clerical Intelligentsia in Greek-Catholic Galicia, 1900–1939*, “Harvard Ukrainian Studies” 26, no. 1–4(2002–2003): 261–90.

⁵ Many of his writings may be found in the footnotes to Hryhorii Dem'ian, *Malovidomi storinky zhyttia i naukovoï pratsi Mykhaila Zubryts'koho*, “Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni T. Shevchenka” (hereafter “Zapysky NTSh”) 223 (Lviv, 1992):172–196. Dem'ian compiled a bibliography of Zubryts'kyi's works (343 items) that is being edited by Vasyl Sokil for publication. On Zubryts'kyi's biography, see Roman Horak, “Fenomen sil'skoho sviashchenyka,” “Dzvin” 2001, no. 9, pp. 117–129. Also see the tributes to him in *Boikiushchyna. Istoriiia ta suchasnist'. Materialy istoriko-narodoznachoi konferentsii “Mynule i suchasne Boikiushchyny,” iaka vidbulasia u m. Sambori 6 bereznia 1996 roku z nahody 140-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia Mykhaila Zubryts'koho*, Lviv, 1996, pp. 1–9. Zubryts'kyi's writings are frequently cited in Andrii Zaiarniuk, *Idiomy emansypatsii: “Vyzvol'ni” proiekty i halys'ke selo u seredyni XIX stolittia*, Kyiv 2007.

⁶ On this incident see Zubryts'kyi diary and the retelling of his son Volodymyr's explanation of the events in H.V. Dem'ian, L. D. Kantsedal, *Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi i ioho slovens'kyi shchodennyk, Pytannia tekstolohii: Dozhovtneva ta radianska literatura. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*, Kyiv, 1989, pp. 212–216.

that he had stated it would be better under the “Moskal” than under the Habsburgs were readily disproven as the purported witness denied he had alleged this. Yet Zubryts’kyi was nevertheless dispatched toward Thalerhof. He lists the numerous Ukrainian patriots who were arrested simultaneously or alongside him and sent there, among them his son Volodymyr, who was incarcerated from September 17 to November 12.

Yet if Austria’s chaotic administration and preference for those who dominated the Ruthenians resulted in Zubryts’kyi’s false arrest and sentencing, its chaos saved him from the camp. According to his son Volodymyr, his father’s good acquaintance “Karasins’kyi” from Dobromyl’, commissioner of the Austrian *starostvo* in Przemyśl(Peremyshl’), saw him among the arrested at the train station and was able to arrange a false document declaring that he was being evacuated rather than deported, allowing him instead to go to Slovenia. But this case of Habsburg betrayal of the Ruthenians and Austrian *Schlamperei* occurred after the writings that we are examining and cannot be seen as influencing the vision of Austria that we shall construct from Father Zubryts’kyi’s writings.

Central to the Empire was the figure of the emperor and the imperial family. The Habsburg rulers had tried to ensure the loyalty of the populace to the monarch and stories abound about “naïve monarchism” among the peasantry. Certainly the Habsburgs had sought and received the support of the Greek Catholic hierarchy during the revolutionary period of the early nineteenth century as Zubryts’kyi pointed out in discussing the career of Bishop Ivan Snyhurs’kyi of Przemyśl.⁷ Yet one finds little evidence of piety toward the emperor in the writings of Father Zubryts’kyi. There is indeed one piece of evidence of what might be seen as the tradition of monarchical intervention that Zubryts’kyi retells, though it is of a slightly more plausible nature that the legends of incognito emperors intervening in simple folks’ lives. Zubryts’kyi recounts a story told him by Father Volodyslav Ilnyts’kyi, the pastor of Iasinka and the son of the niece of Bishop Ivan Snihurs’kyi of Przemyśl. Ilnyts’kyi maintained that during the Congress of Vienna, Tsar Alexander I wished to pray in a Slavic church on Easter. The Emperor Francis I attended St. Barbara’s with him and the pastor Father Snyhurs’kyi invited the rulers afterward to an Easter breakfast. The tsar was so impressed with Snyhurs’kyi that he wanted to take him

⁷ Zubryts’ky described Snyhurs’kyi as standing firmly by Austria during the Polish disturbances and as having reminded priests how much they had to thank Austria for. *Piatdesiata richmytsia smerty bl. p. epyskopa Yvana Snihurskoho*, “Dilo” 1897, no. 102.7/19 May, pp. 1–2; no. 103 8/20 May, pp. 1–2; no. 105. 10/22 May, pp. 1–2. See also his discussion and document publication of the Viennese authorities’ contacts with the Greek Catholic clergy in this period. *Prychynky do istorii rus’koho dukhovenstva v Halychyni vid 1820–1853 r.*, “Zapysky NTSh” (1909), vol. 88, bk.2: 118–150.

back with him to Russia but the emperor insisted that he needed him in his empire. The tsar advised the emperor to keep the pastor in mind. The emperor fulfilled this in nominating Snyhurs'kyi to the Przemyśl episcopacy at the very moment the cathedral chapter was about to turn down the pastor for joining it.⁸

In his own thinking, Zubryts'kyi was far from any cult of loyalty to the emperor. He ridiculed attempts to use loyalty to the emperor as a means of undermining the Ruthenians' rights. He described a school inspector's visiting a village school in which there were no Latin-Rite Catholics.⁹ The village had asked not to be forced to observe Latin-Rite holy days. When the school inspector failed to convince the *viit* to withdraw this request, he finally insisted: *Latin holy days must be observed in the school because the emperor observes these holy days*. Zubryts'kyi ironically calls him a "glorious pedagogue" and insists that in the Galician context, there were not Latin holy days but rather Polish holy days.¹⁰

But in Zubryts'kyi's writings from the 1880s to the First World War, the current emperor, the famed Franz Joseph, so popular in portraiture for Habsburg nostalgists, plays no significant role. If one wishes to see a hero for Zubryts'kyi in the imperial family, one might best look to Joseph II. Zubryts'kyi praised Maria Teresa, and still more Joseph, for having tried to improve the lot of the Ruthenians, a task he calls difficult given the "Aegean stables" that they had inherited from Poland. His description is a panegyric to the emperor:

That monarch, defending monarchical principles, met with the resistance of the recently all-powerful potentates, and in order to break their strength and significance, he turned to their most resolute enemies, to the popular masses. To this purpose he abolished the serfdom of the enserfed corvée villein, issued many other humane and just instructions, demanded that the officials exactly fulfill his orders and when himself visiting his lands witnessed whether they [the officials] fulfilled his will. But all that was too little. He needed to give the benighted masses knowledgelearning.

He recounts Joseph's attempts to raise the educational level of the Ruthenian clergy as a means of raising the Ruthenians' general educational level.¹¹ He saw

⁸ *Do biohrafiï I. Snihurskoho*, "Zoria" 1886, no.4 15/27 February, p. 67.

⁹ *Z nashoho sbkil'nystva*, "Dilo" 1894, no. 127. 8/20 June.p.1; no. 128. 9/21 June.p.1. Unsigned

¹⁰ He further argues for equality pointing out that in areas of mixed population schools observe only the Polish holy days. In the same piece, he points out that while the bureaucrats were called Austrian, they were in fact Polish.

¹¹ *Piatdesiata richnytsia smerty bl. p. epyskopa Yvana Snihurskoho*, "Dilo" 1897, no. 102.7/19 May, pp. 1-2; no. 103 8/20 May, pp. 1-2; no. 105. 10/22 May, p. 1-2.

Joseph's premature death as one of the reasons more benefit did not come to the Ruthenian clergy and the peasantry (the long war that followed and the intellectual and material strength of the enemies of the Ruthenian people being the other reasons). For Zubryts'kyi, Joseph's great modernizing project was worthy of praise. The Habsburgs' role in overthrowing the regressive legacy of the Commonwealth and ensuring rights for the Ruthenians were the yardsticks by which he measured Joseph's successors and generally found them wanting.

Zubryts'kyi called the dissolution of the Polish state:

*[...] the salvation of the Ruthenian people because under the rule of the Austrian emperor Rus' could breath more easily, from slaves the heavy shackles slowly began to be removed.*¹²

In resisting Polish attempts to control Ruthenian historical memory, he declared:

*thanks be to God, we live in a free state under the Austrian emperors, where we are still free at this time to mention long ago, bygone years, to recall the feats of our ancestors, and to gather courage and the will to work in the interest of the Ruthenian people.*¹³

For Zubryts'kyi the greatest benefit of Austria was that it was a constitutional state and the greatest flaw that it was not living up to the norms.¹⁴ His most ample discussions of Austria and its constitution came in his speeches when running for office in the provincial parliament. Here he sought to make comprehensible to a broader and not always welleducated public his vision of political rights and duties. Thus in a speech delivered on November 2, 1894 in Staryi Sambir, Zubryts'kyi addressed the question of: *Our State Structure/Administration and the Land Parliament*.¹⁵ He described to his listeners Austria before 1848 in which the monarch had all rights and could issue orders that might not be to the liking of his subjects in his vast domain, in which his officials who operated in his name often did so without his knowledge of their activities. He maintained that in Galicia peasants were little likely to protest because Austria had offered them a better

¹² *Rusyny suproty Poliakiv i Moskaliv*, "Ba'kivshchyna" 1895, no.14. 28 Aug., pp. 105–107.

¹³ *Ibidem*.

¹⁴ *Z staromis'koho povitu: (Iak menshi uriady shanuiut' nash iazyk! Pryhoda na poshti v Starim Misti)*, "Dilo" 1892, no. 103. 7/19 May. P. 2. Unsigned

¹⁵ *Nash ustrii derzhavnyi ta soim kraievyyi (Z promovy o. Mykhaila Zubrytskoho na peredyborchyykh zborakh v Starom-misti dnia 2. padolysta 1894)*, "Ba'kivshchyna" 1894, no. 24 (1/13 December) and 25 (16/28 December).

situation than they had endured in “Nobiliary Poland” and they did not want a return of the “old yoke”. He then described the shaking of the foundation of the state that other strata had carried out in 1848 in Vienna, Hungary, Bohemia, Galicia, and Italy. He recounted that the present monarch had issued a missive in Olomouc when taking up the throne in 1848 to the peoples of the Austrian state in which he declared that all citizens were equal before the law and that laws were to be enacted by the decision of representatives of the people. The emperor also declared, according to Zubryts’kyi, that Austria was to become a spacious home for all the tribes of various languages, and that this building would not buckle under any future storm.¹⁶

Much of Zubryts’kyi’s discussion of Austria may be seen as a critique of why Austria failed in enacting the promise of 1848 in ensuring national rights for the Ruthenians and social rights for the peasantry. For Zubryts’kyi the monarchy could be criticized for weakness such as in his account of Count Agenor Gołuchowski’s introducing Polish in schools in 1848 against the will of the monarch.¹⁷ He also saw the legal position of Ruthenian schools as being better in 1848 than it was in 1900. Zubryts’kyi viewed Austria’s turning away from the Ruthenians under the influence of the Polish nobles after 1848 as having opened the path for Russophile thought and activists.¹⁸ Central to his critique was the disillusionment with the Habsburgs and Vienna for the granting of an autonomy in Galicia that had turned the province over to the Polish nobility and conservatives.

In a discussion refuting the attacks on Austria by Walerjan Kalinka that were first published in Paris in 1853 and reprinted in Galicia at the end of the nineteenth century, Zubryts’kyi asserted that he did not intend a defence of Austria and that she had things on her conscience in the past. However unlike Kalinka, who maintained that the Austria of the early nineteenth century had been little interested in the education of the masses, Zubryts’kyi asserted that the Austrian state had exerted itself considerably in this effort. He published substantial documentation to prove his contention. Zubryts’kyi did see fault in Austria, but largely for her failings in the late

¹⁶ “*cherez shcho Avstriia stanes’ prostornoiu khatoiu dlia vsikh riznoiazychmykh plemen.*” Franz Joseph issued manifestos on December 2, 1848 and March 4, 1849. In the March 4 manifesto, he proclaimed: In dem Manifeste von 2. Dezember hatten Wir die Hoffnung ausgesprochen, dass es Uns mit Gottes Beistand und im Einverständnisse mit den Völkern gelingen werde, alle Lande und Stämme der Monarchie zu einem grossen Staatskörper zu vereinen. “*Allgemeines Reichs-Gesetz-und Regeirungsblatt für das Kaiserthum Österreich*”, Jg. 1849 p. 148 as cited in <http://www.verfassungen.de/at/verfassung49.htm>, May 6, 2011.

¹⁷ *Do istorii ruskoho sbkil’nystva v 1848 rotsi*, “Dilo” 1900, 11/24 May. P. 2.

¹⁸ *Dobrodiistva pol’skoi shiakhy dlia ruskoï tserkvy I ruskoho dukhovenstva*, “Dilo” 1902, 10/23 Dec., 11/24 December.

nineteenth century. He saw on her conscience having given Galicia over to the nobles and asserted that Austria could expect little good from this policy. He declared the period of autonomy as bringing Galicia to bankruptcy.¹⁹ Zubryts'kyi did see Austria as offering some safe haven so that Ruthenians could protect themselves against Polonization, but he made clear that their situation was far from ideal: *At the present sort of (tak-siak) freedom in Austria we can resist [Polonization] and Ruthenians can take care of themselves and strive.*²⁰ In criticizing the province's Polish administration, he pondered: *What would it come to in our Austria* if all officials behaved in a manner similar to that of the imperial and royal starosta of Turka, who had taxed Ruthenians to pay for the organ in a Latin Catholic church.²¹

Zubryts'kyi maintained that there was a level of disorder in elections in late nineteenth-century Galicia unimaginable before the Polish caste had come to dominance.²² As he spoke to largely peasant electors, he described the Austrian electoral order in Galicia as defective because of the curial system that gave the landowning nobility disproportionate representation in the provincial parliament.²³ In the early 1890s he advocated the universal male suffrage that was only finally enacted in 1907. In his political speeches and writings he condemned conservatism as a block to progress and insisted that the very Poles who called themselves conservatives were accepting innovations in economic affairs as a means of entrenching their dominance.²⁴ To his electors he praised democracy as a political system, hardly an affirmation of a monarchical order.²⁵ Most important, and in a way that may seem to reflect Polish National Democracy, he insisted that the Ruthenians and the peasantry could only survive if they adapted and modernized, a program that would place them at odds with the decentralized monarchy of the late nineteenth century.²⁶

¹⁹ *Kartyna do istorii shkil'nytstva v Halychyni na pochatku XIX viku*, "Dilo" 1900, 21 January/12 February. pp. 1–2.

²⁰ *Visty z kraiu. Z Staromishchyny (Dbaimo o chystotu nashoi besidy)*, "Bat'kivshchyna" 1895, no. 4, pp. 53–54.

²¹ *Z povitu Turetskoho: Pered kil'koma litamy [Kornylo Chaikovs'kyi]*, "Dilo" 1895, no. 251, 9/21 November. p. 2, unsigned.

²² *Strawne zhandarmam za wybory*, "Dilo" 1896, no. 58. 13/25 March. p. 1

²³ *Nash ustrii derzhavnyni ta soim kraievyni (Z promovy o Mykhaila Zubrytskoho na peredyborchyykh zborakh v Starom-misti dnia 2. padolysta 1894)*, "Bat'kivshchyna" 1894, no. 24 (1/13 December) and 25 (16/28 December).

²⁴ M.Z., *Shcho se take konservatysty, a shcho postupvtsi?*, "Bat'kivshchyna" 1894, no. 22 (16/28 November), pp. 172–175.

²⁵ M.Z., *Shcho se take arystokraty, a shcho demokraty*, "Bat'kivshchyna" 1894, no. 20 (16/28 October) pp. 156–158.

²⁶ M.Z., *Shcho se take arystokraty, a shcho demokraty*, "Bat'kivshchyna" 1894, no. 20 (16/28 October) pp. 156–158.

Zubryts'kyi did see that the early Austrian reforms had not been uniformly positive for the Ruthenian cause. In commenting on a chronicle of notations carried on by the clergy of the Annunciation Church in Przemyśl in the eighteenth century, he pointed out that the notations were written in Ruthenian from 1705 to 1779 and only the last notes, beginning in 1793 down to 1796, were in Polish.²⁷ He speculated that it may have been just at this time the Ruthenian spirit began to decline among the Ruthenian clergy. He saw the Austrian reorganization as having alienated them from their sacred traditions (*sviatoshchi*). He suggested a mere smattering of education and the:

[...] *unfortunate division of the clergy after Latin and Ruthenian studies, with condescension (lekovazhenie) and even disdain for the Ruthenians, and the deadliness of the lecturing in what was supposedly the Ruthenian tongue*

caused them to accept foreign customs and visages. He saw this tendency to deprecate one's own and glorify the foreign as a problem of that time and his own. But while he admonished his people to hold to its own, he at the same time advocated that it fully embrace education, progress and modernization. Hence he was not rejecting the Austrian modernization program of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, but questioning how it had been enacted, above all on the issue of the failure to use the living Ruthenian/Ukrainian language. In his campaign speeches, he depicted the state as a well-working machine that would respond to those who knew how to manipulate its levers and wheels, and he called on Ruthenians to learn how to utilize this machine though electoral gains.²⁸

The late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Habsburg state was an entity in which Zubryts'kyi could see elements of progress, even when he saw negative outcomes of its policies. As a proponent of education, he approved of Austria's introduction of schooling and insistence that the Greek Catholic clergy become involved in these efforts. Yet as an advocate of vernacular languages, he saw the use of a bookish Slavono-Ruthenian as sterile and the insistence that much education be in a foreign tongue, German, as counter-productive. Still as to Austria's introduction of German, he maintained *Austria did that which every other state would have done*. He quickly turned to the inconsistency of the Polish position that criticized Austria's use of German for pupils who did not speak the language but approved of introducing

²⁷ *Zapysky v sluzhenyku pechatanim 1666 roku*, "Zoria" 1889, no. 13–14. 1/13 July, pp. 232–234.

²⁸ *Nash ustrii derzhavnyi ta soim kraievyyi (Z promovy o. Mykhaila Zubrytskoho na perydyborchyykh zborakh v Starom-misti dnia 2. padolysta 1894)*, "Bat'kivshchyna" 1894, no. 24 (1/13 December) and 25 (16/28 December)

Polish for Ruthenian pupils who did not speak it. He ended his discussion with irony that made his view of the Austrian policy somewhat inconsistent: *Poles should be thankful to her [Austria] because they learned much from her and succeeded in very successfully applying her system to Ruthenians*. Unlike Austria before 1867 however, he did not accept the legitimacy of the Polish quasi state of the autonomy period. Zubryts'kyi also could see that the Josephinian reforms had often placed improper demands on the clergy, though his admiration for Joseph's reforms of Galician society, including the Church, outweighed any criticism.²⁹

At times Zubryts'kyi the scholar would present material that indicated that the Habsburg system was not a benefit to the population over the old Polish system he so profoundly condemned in his political statements. In writing about the introduction of military service in Galicia in 1788, he documented the woe and suffering it brought to the peasantry. He even pointed out that in the villages that did not have private landlords the peasants had not suffered such onerous *corvée* and that for the youths who now were subject to military service the new order was much more burdensome.³⁰ This rare divergence from his usual condemnation of all aspects of the old Polish order in contrast to the new Austrian illustrated his care as a scholar, but did not cause him to in any way change his overall evaluation of the difference between the Polish and Austrian rule.

In Zubryts'kyi's political formation Viennese, Austrian, and all- imperial influences joined with Ukrainian radicalism and populism, Polish national thought, and Russian progressive writing. In his specifically religious life, Habsburg influences dominated. He studied at the Lviv Greek Catholic seminary and the Theology faculty of Lviv University that were the creation of the Habsburgs. For all the Ukrainian patriots of his time, that university, despite its Polonization beginning in the 1860s, was considered to have been founded only at the end of the eighteenth century (1784) and not as Polish circles maintained by Jesuits in the seventeenth. Indeed this foundation date was all the more true in marking the Greek Catholic clergy's relationship with the institution and their transformation under the Habsburgs.

In Zubryts'kyi's writings on contemporary affairs, one of the major issues he debated was the *Congrua*, or the system of clerical payments and fees that had been established by Joseph II but was becoming increasingly inadequate in the late nineteenth century. But if in Vienna and in the clerical publications that Zubryts'kyi had available in the excellent seminary library in Lviv the issue was one of funding

²⁹ *Piatdesiata richnytsia smerty bl. p. epyskopa Yvana Snihurskoho*, "Dilo" 1897, no. 102.7/19 May, pp. 1–2; no. 103 8/20 May, pp. 1–2; no. 105 10/22 May, pp. 1–2.

³⁰ *Prychynky do istorii rekrutchyny v Halychyni pry kintsii i do polovyny stolitia Materialy i zamitky*, "Zapysky NTSh" (1901), vol. 42, book 4: 1–18.

centered on attitudes toward the Church and clergy and their position in society, in Galicia the question took on a national overtone.³¹ In discussing the inadequacy of the payments instituted by his favorite emperor, Zubryts'kyi argued that the attacks on the Ruthenian clergy's attempts to change the schedule were coming from Polish political forces who sought to undermine the Ruthenian movement and who did not criticize the Roman Catholic clergy for similar efforts. Zubryts'kyi also criticized other aspects of the Habsburg ecclesiastical order. He above all objected to the landlords' right in nominating clergy as deleterious to patriotic Ruthenian priests.³² Indeed Zubryts'kyi's writings even included musings that Ruthenians regretted that bishops were not selected by the adherents of the Greek Catholic Church instead of by imperial Habsburg authorities and Rome with whom the nobility had greater influence.³³

In Zubryts'kyi's attitudes on the relation of Church and society, a significant role was played by the thinking of Father Josef Scheicher, professor of the St. Pölten Seminary, and later a major figure in the Austrian Christian Social movement, which he accessed through the Linz *Quartalschrift*.³⁴ Zubryts'kyi affirmed Scheicher's message that the Church must be open to the rich and the poor, but that since it was the poor who primarily needed help the Church should stand on their side. While Scheicher and many of his Austrian colleagues were struggling to stop the alienation of the working class and urban groups from the Church, Zubryts'kyi used the traditional Biblical citations on the poor for more than just a justification of his support of peasant causes and his efforts to improve their material and civil rights situations. He maintained that since the Ruthenian people were de facto the poor, the Church should support the Ruthenian cause.³⁵

³¹ On the seminary library, see Zubryts'kyi's article, *Chytal'nia v rus'kim seminary u Lvovi vid osny 1879 do 1883*, "Dilo" 1900, no. 145(30 June/13 July), no. 146(July 1/14), no. 147 (July 3/16), no. 148 (July 4/17).

³² Unsigned. *Pravo pryzynty sviashchennykiu*, "Bat'kivshchyna" 1895, nos. 11–12(16/28 June).

³³ See his discussion of the terms of selecting Metropolitan Sylvester Sembratovych, though here he deals with a case in which external pressure may have worked in the populists' interest and he is willing to say that no one knows if the Ruthenians would make better choices. *Epokhal'na prykliuchka moskofiliv*, "Dilo" 1902, 6/19 July.

³⁴ *Kil'ka sliv z nahody stati 'Dila' p.z. 'Lytsemiry'*, "Dilo" 1901, 17/30 March, pp. 1–2. He cites Scheicher's writing appearing some years earlier in the *Quartalschrift*. Until 1893, Scheicher wrote frequently in the Linz *Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift*, especially under the rubric, "Zeitläufe." On Scheicher and the Christian Social movement, see John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna. Origins of the Christian Social Movement 1848–1897* (Chicago and London), chp. 3, esp. 140–43.

³⁵ *V istoriyi neraz deshcho povtoriuie sia: (Pysimo z kruhiv dukhoventsva)*, "Dilo" 1902, 29 May/11 June.

Long before Father Zubryts'kyi was arrested and deported by the Habsburg authorities as the Habsburg house began to buckle, he had demonstrated that the Habsburg realm was increasingly alienated from his political vision and world view. While he was fully aware how much his people and his clerical stratum owed to the Habsburgs, he saw the imperial order as having failed them by the political, national, and social system established after 1867. His avowed ideology was a democratic message that did not fit the imperial order. He called himself a progressive and yet he found little progress now emanating from Vienna. His support of the peasantry meant that he was suspicious of liberalism in its Austrian form, since it did not protect the poor.³⁶ Most important Austria had failed to deliver the promise of 1848 to become a spacious home for all the tribes speaking various languages. In essence his political loyalty was based in the rights and needs of the Ruthenian or as he increasingly called them, the Ukrainian people. He and the Ukrainian populist clergy like him who had been formed by the Habsburgs had used the position and educations that the Habsburgs had endowed them with to serve a new master, the people that Joseph has ordered them to serve. What now waned was their service to emperor, state, and Empire.

³⁶ Zubryts'kyi saw the Austrian form of liberalism as benefitting the well-off. Like many of the populists he saw Jewish commercial interests as inimical to the peasants' betterment and entering the world of the money economy as well as supportative of the unjust social-political order. See his discussion in *Shcho se take konservatysty, a shcho postupovitsi?*, "Bat'kivshchyna" 1894, no. 22 (16/28 November), pp. 172–175. In criticizing the Austrian political and social arrangements autonomy he maintained: The state administration in Vienna does not care about Galicia, has given all into the hands of the lords and the Jews. Unsigned, *Muzhyts'ki hanazdy (Dopys' z Starosambirskoho)*, "Dilo" 1902, 3/16 April.