Jaroslav Hrytsak, L'viv

History of Names: A Case of
Constructing National Historical Memory in Galicia, 1830–1930s[*]

Recent theories of nationalism reveal an evident shift from social to more cultural approaches. This new trend has transformed the idea of what constitutes a nation and how nations are made. It was believed formerly that so-called national characteristics – language, territory, historical memory, popular folk traditions – existed long ago *per se*, and only later, with the coming of nationalism, they were used to coin modern nations. Now it is considered that those characteristics were themselves constructed by national leaders. Following this line of argument, the main focus turns to myth- and symbol-making, on "the uses of imagery", and on historical invention carried out by particular groups in modern societies to meet the needs of a national movement.[1]

Although such approaches might be very productive, few case studies have been done. This is especially true in the Ukrainian case.[2] One possible explanation is that prevailing postmodernist models are of a highly theoretical and abstract nature. Historians often declare interest in novel and theoretical approaches, while their studies continue to follow traditional lines.[3] On the other hand, the fashionable approaches themselves have become targets of criticism. Without denying the constructed character of national identities, critics point to the fact that such constructions are limited by different factors. National identities, they argue, cannot be conjured out of thin air, but are constructed on the basis of genuine building blocks. Moreover, not all constructed identities had equal chances of lasting success and popular acceptance. The more continuous they are with the living memories and beliefs of the people who are to compose the nation, the greater their popular resonance. Therefore, it would be interesting not only to study how collective identities have been manipulated, but also to research the limits beyond which those manipulations were ineffective or experienced total failure.[4]

[1] For a general overview see: Becoming National. A Reader. Ed. Geoff Eley, Ronald G. Suny. New York, Oxford 1996.

[2] For a few successful exceptions see: JOHN-PAUL HIMKA The Construction of Nationality in Galician Rus': Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions, in: Intellectuals and Articulation of the Nation. Ed. Ronald G. Suny, Michael D. Kennedy. Ann Arbor 1999, pp. 109–164; SERHIY YEKELCHYK Creating a Sacred Place: The Ukrainophiles and Shevchenko's Tomb in Kyiv (1861–ca. 1900), in: Journal of Ukrainian Studies 20 (Summer-Winter 1995) 1–2, pp. 15–32; ROMAN SZPORLUK Ukraine: From an Imperial Periphery to a Sovereign State, in: Daedalus. Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Science 126 (Summer 1997) 3, pp. 85–119.

[3] See, for example: LOUIS JACKSON Identity, Language, and Transformation in Eastern Ukraine: A Case Study in Zaporizhzha, in: Contemporary Ukraine. Dynamics of Post-Soviet Transformation. Ed. Taras Kuzio. Armonk, New York, London 1998, pp. 99–113.

[4] ANTHONY D. SMITH The Nation: Invented, Imagined, Reconstructed? In: Reimaging the Nation. Ed. Majorie Ringrose, Adam J. Lerner. Buckingham, Philadelphia 1993, pp. 9–28.

This paper confronts these conflicting interpretations with a very specific case: the emergence of new naming practices in Greek-Catholic Ruthenian[5] families in Austrian (1772–1919) and Polish (1919–1939) Galicia. The main argument is that these practices reflected conscious efforts by local national activists to impose a broader Ukrainian identity on the Galician Ruthenians. A crucial part of the process was identification with a territory that laid beyond their own historical region (i.e., Galicia), and with historical processes that by modern times exercised only marginal effects on their political and cultural development.

The Names of Kyivan Rulers

As one central historical symbol of the new identification, the names of the three early medieval Kyivan rulers – Ol'ha (Ol'ga), Volodymyr (Vladimir)[6] and Jaroslav – were chosen. All three epitomized the most significant and glorious moments in the history of the Rus' state: Ol'ha and Volodymyr introduced Christianity (972? and 988) and during the reigns of Volodymyr (978–1015) and Jaroslav (1015–1054) the Rus' empire reached the height of its political and military might, and it was at this time that Galicia was incorporated into the Kyivan Rus' realms. The historical significance of these rulers is underlined by the fact that Ol'ha and Volodymyr were later canonized as Orthodox saints, and that Volodymyr and Jaroslav were popularly referred to as "the Great" and "the Wise."

The reigns of Ol'ha, Volodymyr, and Jaroslav witnessed the coexistence and mixing of indigenous East Slavic ("rus'koi", or Ruthenian) and imported Scandinavian (Varangian), Byzantine ("Greek"), and Eastern (Hebraic, Armenian, and Muslim) cultural traditions. This multiculturalism was in part reflected in a sequence of names in the ruling house: its legendary founder Rurik and his son Ihor (Igor) had Scandinavian names, Ihor's wife Helga became known under a slavicized form of her name (as Ol'ha), and her grandson and his son had original Slavic names, Volodymyr and Jaroslav. The latter names belong to a group of so-called Slavic indigenous personal composite names. Along with other names of this group (*Bohdan, Liubomyr, Sviatoslav et al.*) the names Volodymyr and Jaroslav were connected with pre-Christian pagan practices: they were shortened from a formulaic wish for a new-born child ("*volodity myrom*", i.e. to govern the world; "*bohom danym*", i.e. to be given by the God). In choosing such names, parents allegedly secured the pagan gods' life-long protection for the child.

With the Christianization of Rus', the Church sought to introduce new Christian names instead of Slavic and Scandinavian ones. The tendency toward replacing "Ruthenian" names

---

[5] The term "Ruthenian" (Rus'ky) derives from "Rus'" which origins is very obscure (some believe that this was original name of Varangians). Depending on circumstances, it might mean 1) the lands of early medieval Eastern European state with capital in Kyiv 2) the territory under jurisdiction of Orthodox metropolitanate; 3) Orthodox population of the *Rzecz Pospolyta*; 4) the territory and the population of the Moscovite tsardom; 5) Eastern Slavic groups that later evolved in Ukrainians and Belorussians; 6) Eastern Slavic groups of the Austrian empire. It might well become a ethnonym for contemporary Ukrainians, but in the XIX-beginning of the XX century it was consistently refuted for the more modern term "Ukraine" and "Ukrainians" (for a recent treatment see: JEVHEN NAKONECHNYJ Ukradene imja. Chomu rusyny staly ukrajinciamy. L'viv 1998; see also: OMELJAN PRITSAK Kiev and All of Rus': The Fate of a Sacral Idea, in: Concepts of Nationhood in Early Modern Eastern Europe. Ed. Ivo Banac and Frank E. Sysyn (= Harvard Ukrainian Studies 10 [1986] 3/4, pp. 279–300). In this article the term Ruthenian is used in all of those meanings to reflect the controversial character of "nationalizing" efforts to construct a historical memory on Kyivan Rus'.

[6] Since I am dealing with the case of the Ukrainian national revival, I use the names not in their more common Russian/English version (Olga, Vladimir), but in their Ukrainized form (Ol'ha, Volodymyr), i.e., as it was used by the Ukrainian national leaders.

with "Greek" ones (i.e., Biblical names imported to Rus' from Byzantium after Kyiv's Christianization) remained dominant in all East Slavic lands after the disintegration of Kyivan Rus' in the middle of the 13th century. Old Slavic names did not totally disappear, however. Well into modern times there was a tradition of endowing a child with two names, one Christian and one pagan (Slavic). Such double-naming was believed to be an expression of so called "*dvoeverie*", i.e., a superimposing and symbiosis of the Orthodox tradition with some pagan beliefs and practices. In this manner, a newborn child received double protection, both from the Christian and pagan gods. This tradition is well documented in numerous sources, and is still preserved among those ethnic groups of the former Soviet Union which were relatively late in adopting Christianity, such as the Yakuts. The second, Slavic name often evolved into a family name. Of course, this process was neither linear nor irreversible. Sometimes Slavic names continued to occupy a dominant position. Thus, the Ukrainian Cossack hetman Khmel'nyts'kyi had a Church-Christian name *Zynovij*, but was commonly known under his Slavic name *Bohdan*. Still, onomastic studies that cover different Eastern Slavic regions reveal a common tendency: Ruthenian names ceased to be used as first names by the 18th century.[7]

The gradual elimination of "Ruthenian" names coincided with the fading away of the historical memory of old Rus'. Of all the former Kyivan appanages, in the long run only the Volodymyr-Suzdal' princedom managed to preserve its independence, evolving into the Muscovite tsardom. Still, Edward Keenan revealed that on a list of three thousand upper-class Muscovite male names from the second half of the 16th century, there was not a single *Igor'* (*Ihor*), *Sviatoslav*, or *Mstyslav*, that fewer than 1 per cent of were called *Vladimir* (*Volodymyr*), and only three Gleb (*Hlib*). He concluded that "a Muscovite courtier of Ivan's time was more likely to be called Temir or Bulgak than Vladimir or Vsevolod."[8] This kind of historical amnesia does not seem to be a peculiarly Muscovite phenomenon. It covered also the most western part of the former Kyivan state, Galician Rus', which after having been a separate Galician Volhynian principality, was annexed by the Polish kings in the middle of the 14th century. Already in the 16th century the names of the canonized Kyivan princes Borys and Hlib were rare compared to "Greek" names such as *Ivan*, *Hryhorij*, *Mykhajlo*, or *Andrij*, among Ruthenian burghers in L'viv, the former capital of the Galician Volhynian principality.[9] The Orthodox Byzantine legacy worked in a paradoxical way on the historical memory of the Eastern Slavs in the late medieval times: the local historical chronicles of the 11th and 13th centuries were subsequently replaced by the "Lives" of saints and the "Patricon." In contrast to the Catholic world, where a secular awareness of a national past developed, among the Orthodox the interest in the political past of a territory and its people was almost completely lost by the end of the 16th century.[10]

---

[7] M. O. DEMCHUK Slovians'ki avtokhtonni osobovi vlasni imena v pobuti ukrayintsiv XIV–XVII st. Kyiv 1978, pp. 13–33; V. K. CHICHAGOV Iz russkikh imen i otechestv i familij. Moskva 1959, p. 11–28; DANIEL H. KAISER Naming Cultures in Early Modern Russia, in: Кажень Краєжгъльнъ. Essays presented to Edward Keenan on his sixtieth birthday by his colleagues and students. Ed. Nancy Shields Kollman, Donald Ostrowski, Andrei Pliguzov, Daniel Rowland. = Harvard Ukrainian Studies 19 (1995) pp. 271–291.

[8] EDWARD L. KEENAN On Certain Mythical Beliefs and Russian Behaviors, in: The Legacy of History in Russia and the New States of Eurasia. Ed. S. Frederic Starr Armonk, NY, London, England 1994, p. 21.

[9] IVAN KRYPJAKEVYCH L'vivs'ka Rus' u pershij polovyni XVI st.: doslidzhennia i materialy. L'viv 1994, p. 11.

[10] OMELJAN PRITSAK Kievan Rus' and the Sixteenth-Seventeenth-Century Ukraine, in: Rethinking Ukrainian History. Ed. Ivan L. Rudnytsky. Edmonton 1981, p. 6.

The Rus'-Orthodox Revival of the 16th and 17th Centuries

An interest in the past emerged with the coming of the Counter-reformation in the Polish state (*Rzeczpospolyta*), as a by-product of bitter religious conflict between Catholics and Orthodox. The resistance against Catholicization took the form of Orthodox cultural revival. To strenghen their own position, the local Ruthenian elites borrowed intellectual weapons of their Catholic rivals: they introduced Jesuit curricula into Orthodox schools in L'viv, Vil'no, Luts'k and in the Mohyla Academy in Kyiv, or promoted printing books – a new cultural tradition that emerged and was widely spread in the Catholic West. In the same way, a "revival" of historical memory took place under the direct impact of the contemporary Polish historiography, i.e., chronicles of Marcin Kromer, Maciej Miechowita, and Maciej Stryjkowski. It was the reading of those chronicles that revealed to Orthodox readers the forgotten image of Kyivan Rus'.[11]

The Rus' Orthodox revival at the end of 16th and beginning of 17th century and following the Khmel'nyts'kyi revolution (1648–1657) profoundly changed the political and cultural landscape of Eastern Europe. It halted the gradual erosion and Polish assimilation of the local Orthodox (Ruthenian) elites of the Rzeczpospolyta. On the other hand, it undermined the possibility for a common Belarus-Ukrainian (Ruthenian) nation to emerge: the Belarus lands did not strongly experience the impact of the Khmel'nyts'kyi revolution, and therefore the Cossack myth never became a constituent element of Belarus' national identity, as it was in Ukraine. Born in the wake of the revolution, the Cossack state (Hetmanate) preserved its autonomy long after its incorporation into the Muscovite tsardom (1654). It presented a model of an early modern Ukrainian nation. Still, despite ambitious plans of Cossack leaders, this state never included Galicia, which until 1772 remained under Polish rule. The local Orthodox population in the 17th–18th centuries was converted to the Uniate (Greek-Catholic) church which accepted the supremacy of Vatican. It has been suggested that if the Cossack state had managed to survive until modern times, on the contemporary Ukrainian ethnic lands there would most likely be two separate nations – one "Eastern Ukrainian" and one "Western Ukrainian," similar to the Holland-Flamand case.[12] From a social perspective, the Ukrainian Cossack nation evolved along the typical estates' model, with membership restricted to Cossack elites. But as those elites and their descendants in the 18th–19th centuries were integrated on a mass scale into the Russian imperial nobility, the very notion of "Cossack Ukraine" faded away.[13]

The incomplete character of the early modern Ukrainian national building had an ambiguous impact on the revived historical memory of Kyivan Rus'. On the one hand, new generations of Ruthenian Orthodox leaders emphasized a direct historical link between Cossack Ukraine and the "nation of Volodymyr." The intellectual milieu of the Mohyla Academy compared the activity of its founder, Petro Mohyla (as Metropolitan of all Rus') to the activ-

---

[11] OLEKSIJ TOLOCHKO "Rus'" ochyma "Ukrajiny": v poshukakh samoidentyfikatsiji ta kontynujitetu ["Rus'" in eyes of "Ukraine": in search of self-identification and continuity], in: Druhyj mizhnarodnyj konhres ukrajinistiv. L'viv, 22–28 serpnia 1993. Dopovidi i povidomlennia. Ed. Jaroslav Isajevych, Jaroslav Hrytsak. 1. L'viv 1994, pp. 68–75; FRANK SYSYN Cultural, Social and Political Context of Ukrainian History-Writing: 1620–1690, in: Europa Orientalis 5(1986) pp. 290.

[12] FRANK SYSYN The Khmelnytsky Uprising and Ukrainian Nation-Building, in: Journal of Ukrainian Studies 17 (Summer-Winter 1992) 1–2, pp. 141–170.

[13] ZENON KOHUT Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy. Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate 1760s–1830s. Cambridge, MA 1988; IDEM The Development of a Little Russian Identity and Ukrainian Nationbuilding, in: Concepts of Nationhood pp. 291–292; IHOR ŠEVČENKO Ukraine between East and West. Edmonton 1996, pp. 559–576.

ity of Volodymyr the Great and Jaroslav the Wise. On the other hand, Petro Mohyla himself, while pleading to Moscow for financial help, persuaded the Muscovite tsar that it was he, the Muscovite ruler, who was the legitimate descendent of Volodymyr the Great and Jaroslav the Wise. Similarly, in 1705 Feofan Prokopovych, professor of the Kyiv Mohyla Academy, praised the Ukrainian Cossack hetman Ivan Mazepa as "a great successor" and a mirror image of Volodymyr. But the very next year, he praised the Russian tsar Peter the Great on his visit to Kyiv as the descendant and successor of Volodymyr, Jaroslav, and other Kyivan princes.[14] Both of these schemes could be traced in Ukrainian historical writings to the second half of the 17th and early 18th centuries: secular (Cossack) chronicles stated a continuity between the Kyivan Rus' and the Hetmanate, while the "Synopsis" that emerged in the milieu of the Kyivan Orthodox clergy made a direct connection between Volodymyr the Great and the Muscovite Tsardom.[15]

This revived historical memory, however, did not take deep roots. It did not influence the contemporary culture of naming in the Ukrainian ethnic lands. In the Cossack register of 1649 among 39,500 listed males, only 5 (0,00013%) had names that derived from *Volodymyr* (Volo[t]ko, Volod[k]o, Volots'ko).[16] This part was thousand (!) times less than the frequency of Volodymyr's (Vlodimer) name (0,13% in 1612–1622) among the population of the Russian Don Cossackdom – a territory that, unlike the Ruthenian lands of the Rzeczpospolyta never experienced a cultural revival. And in neither case was there a Jaroslav.[17]

Ukrainian Cossack chronicles testify to how little was remembered about the Khmel'nyts'kyi revolution by the beginning of the 18th century, i.e., only fifty years after the events.[18] It is safe to assume that the Kyivan Rus' occupied an even less significant place in contemporary historical memory. In general, by the time of the liquidation of both the Hetmanate (1764) and the Rzeczpospolyta (1795) and the integration of western and eastern Ukrainian lands into the Austrian and Russian empires respectively, the national identity of the local population remained unresolved – just as it had been before the Orthodox revival at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th centuries. According to cultural and linguistic conjuncture,[19] the nation-building of the local East Slavs could have evolved along several scenarios: they could 1) form a unified East Slavic (Belarusian-Ukrainian-Russian) nation, 2) be assimilated into the newly-emerging Polish or Russian nations, 3) assert separate national identities as larger groups (Belarussian, Ukrainian, Russian) or smaller groups (e.g., Galician Ruthenians), or 4) coin mixed (e.g. Belarussian-Ukrainian) identities.

National Scenarios Among the Ruthenians in Galicia

Each of the above scenarios revealed itself in the intellectual discourse of Galician Ruthenians under Austrian rule. Throughout a long period, local elites could not resolve the issue of their national identity. In Vasyl' Podolyn'skyj's "Word of Warning," he wrote that

[14] PRITSAK Kiev pp. 291–292; ŠEVČENKO Ukraine pp. 182–183.

[15] SYSYN The Cultural passim; KEENAN On Certain passim.

[16] Reyestr Vijs'ka Zaporiz'koho 1649 roku: Transliteracija tekstu. Kyiv 1995, pp. 513–516.

[17] L. M. SHETININ Russkije imena (Ocherki po donskoj antroponomii). 3rd rev. and exp. edition, [no place] 1978, pp. 210–242.

[18] FRANK SYSYN The Cossack Chronicles and the Development of Modern Ukrainian Culture and National Identity, in: Adelphotes: A Tribute to Omeljan Pritsak by his Students, in: Harvard Ukrainian Studies 14 (1990) 3/4, p. 602.

[19] See: JOHN A. ARMSTRONG Myth and History in the Evolution of Ukrainian Consciousness, in: Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter. Ed. Peter J. Potichnyj, Marc Raeff, Jaroslaw Pelenski, Gleb N. Zekunin. Edmonton 1992, pp. 129–130.

there were four orientations among Galician Ruthenian intellectuals during the Revolution of 1848: pro-Ukrainian, pro-Polish, Austrian-Ruthenian, and pro-Russian.[20] The juxtaposition of those four orientations was still evident at the beginning of the 20th century, as may be seen from later publications.[21] In addition, among the first generations of national activists (1810–1830s) there was a fifth, though not clearly articulated, orientation toward building a separate "Ruthenian" nation of Greek Catholic Eastern Slavs (the former Orthodox of the Rzeczpospolyta and future Belarussians and Ukrainians, distinct from both Catholic Polish and Orthodox Russian nations).[22]

Most Galician Ruthenian activists agreed that they were not "Poles of Uniate [Greek-Catholic] rite," as they were quite often referred to by their opponents from the local Polish national camp. Historical arguments were critical in proving that Galicia – or Galician Rus' – was not a Polish territory, and by implication, that Polish nationalism could not claim political rights to this territory. "Whose are the Carpathians, whose are the San, Buh, and Dniepr with the Dniester, and all the fertile territory with those rivers and their tributaries? Which princes made their capitals in Kyiv, this mother of Ruthenian cities, in Cherven, Volodymyr, Peremyshl, Halych? How many names, how many tokens holy and dear to a Ruthenian heart?", wrote rhetorically one of the first Galician Ruthenian historians, Antin Petrushevych, in response to Polish historical writings.[23]

The problem was that the Galician Ruthenian activists could not provide an unambiguous answer to the questions put by Petrushevych. Galician history provided enough historical material to construct several identities. The local Ruthenian intellectuals might refer to the Galician-Volhynian princedom's historical precedent as the Ruthenian part of Austrian Galicia – and this was exactly the argument that the Habsburgs used to legitimize their claim to this part of the former Rzeczpospolyta during the first (1772) partition of Poland. Potentially this scheme could be expanded to the adjacent Eastern Slavic territories under Austrian rule, i.e. Bukovyna and Transcarpathia (Hungarian Ruthenia). Such an Austro-Ruthenian version of national history was the safest, since, in contrast to others, it did not question the territorial integrity of the Habsburg monarchy. Ruthenian intellectuals could equally accept the concept of "historical Poland," according to which this territory originally belonged to the Polish crown, later was annexed by the Kyivan prince Volodymyr the Great, and was then re-conquered by the Polish king Kazimierz the Great. Or, they could join Ukrainian intellectuals from Kyiv and Kharkiv, who claimed a continuity of their national history from Kyivan Rus' to Cossack Ukraine and then into the 19th century. Finally, they might be attracted to a more ambitious project of regarding their territory as a part of the historical legacy of the Russian Empire, whose ruling family, the Romanovs, claimed to be the legitimate heirs of Kyivan Rus' due to the preservation of dynastic links connecting them to the Kyivan Rurikides.

Not all of these versions had equal chances of winning. The possibility of constructing a broader Polish identity (along the lines of "*gente Rutheni, natione Poloni*" from Ruthenian descent, but Poles by nation) was rather limited, since there was a strong confessional and

---

[20] H. B. PODOLIŃSKI Słowo przestrogi. Sanok 1848, p. 21–22.

[21] See: O. A. MONCHALOVS'KYJ Svjataja Rus'. L'viv 1903, p. 4.

[22] See: H. JU. HERBIL'SKYJ Rozvytok prohresyvnykh idej v Halychyni u pershij polovyni XIX st. (do 1848). L'viv 1964, pp. 58, 91.

[23] ANTIN PETRUSHEVYCH Słów kilka napisanych w obronie ruskiej narodowości. Lwów 1848, pp. 47–48. Citing from: O. JU. TURIJ Hreko-katolyts'ka tserkva v suspil'no-polytychnomu Zhytti Halychyny, 1848–1867. Dysertatsija napysana na zdobuttia naukovoho stupenia kandydata istorychnykh nauk. L'viv 1994, p. 131 (fn. 230).

social distinctiveness separating Polish and Ruthenian societies. The pure "Ruthenian" scenario could not satisfy psychologically Galician-Ruthenian activists. What they needed was an identification with a large national community which could stand comparison to the Polish nation both in size and in historical grandeur. Both the Cossack Ukraine and tsarist Russia met those criteria – since at some point in their history each had not just successfully opposed the Polish national aspiration, but even defeated them efficiently (as during the Khmel'nyts'kyi revolution, or the suppression of the Polish uprising of 1830–1831).

Naturally, an identification with either of the two latter versions brought with it problems of logical inconsistency. For example, Galician-Ruthenians had to downplay some moments of their regional history which came into conflict with larger Ukrainian or Russian schemes. Markian Shashkevych (1811–1843), the most influential Galician Ukrainian national activist of the 1830s, wrote verses on Khmel'nyts'kyi's siege on L'viv (1648), praising the besieger as the leader of the Ukrainian revolution against Poles. He did not mention, however, that according to historical records, Orthodox Ukrainian Cossacks committed atrocities during this siege against the inhabitants of L'viv, although they shared a community of both religion and language.[24] In the same way, it was not that easy for Galician-Ruthenians to reconcile the poetry of Taras Shevchenko (1814–1861), the greatest Ukrainian poet, with their Greek-Catholic identity.[25] After all, as Ernest Renan put it, "[f]orgetting, I would even go so far as to say historical error, is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation [...]."[26]

With the coming of nationalism both as a new ideology and as new social and cultural practices, traditional Christian names could no longer meet the needs of the first national patriots, who emphasized their connection to the historical tradition of the people whom they sought to "awaken" and to "revive" as a nation. One of the most interesting episodes has been told by Jakiv Holovats'kyi, a leading figure at the initial stage of national revival among Galician Ruthenians. In the early 1830s, he and two other young intellectuals, Markian Shashkevych and Ivan Vahylevych, formed the "Ruthenian Triad" (*Rus'ka Trijcia*). He wrote later in his memoirs:

> "We came upon a common agreement that anyone chosen by us to join our organization had to take an honest oath that he would work throughout his life for the benefit of his people and for the revival of Ruthenian popular literature. To make this oath sacred, we accepted Slavic names: Shashkevych became *Ruslan*, Vahylevych became *Dalibor*, and I became *Jaroslav*. Then there appeared Lopatyns'kyi as *Velymyr*, Il'kevych as *Myroslav*, my brother Ivan as *Bohdan*, Bulvinskyi as *Rostyslav*...; there also appeared *Vsevolods*, *Mstyslavs*, *Volodars* and others."[27]

It is worth underlining that according to those memoirs, for the young urban intellectuals of Ruthenian origins, the Slavic names *Volodymyr*, *Jaroslav* and *Bohdan* sounded as bookish as *Velymyr*, *Dalybor*, or *Ruslan*. The "naturalization" and "normalization" of those names were the result of a process which took several generations to accomplish.

This process had a dramatic character. Suffice if to say, that among "the Ruthenian Triad" only Markian Shashkevych remained true to his initial Ukrainian orientation, while Jakiv

---

[24] ŠEVČENKO Ukraine p. 124. MARKIJAN SHASHKEVYCH, IVAN VAHYLEVYCH, JAKIV HOLOVATS'KYJ Tvory [Works]. Kyiv 1992, p. 30.

[25] See: JAROSLAV HRYTSAK Poshyrennia poemy "Marija" v Halychyni, in: Radians'ke literaturo-znavstvo 3 (1986) pp. 51–64.

[26] ERNEST RENAN What Is a Nation? In: Becoming National, p. 45.

[27] Quoted after: "Rusalka Dnistrova". Dokumenty i materialy. Kyiv 1989, p. 298. It should be noted that after the oath-taking Jakiv Holovats'kyj was commonly referred by other member of the Ruthenian Triad's milieu as *Jaroslav*.

Holovats'kyj evolved into Russophile tendencies, and Ivan Vahylevych adhered to the Polonophile camp.

Until the end of the 19th century national consciousness was not yet formulated into mutually exclusive concepts. Several schemes of the national history could peacefully coexist in one's historical memory. In "The Elementary History of Rus' From the Very Beginning to Modern Times" (1868), Bohdan Didyts'kyi, a leading Galician Ruthenian intellectual, started his narrative with Kyivan Rus' and its princes, continued it with the period of Rus' appanages including the Galicia and Suzdal' (later Moscow) princedoms, and concluded by retelling stories of the Muscovite tsars Ivan III and Vasilii' Ivanovich. Twenty years later, in his "Ruthenian Chronicle for Ruthenian People in Galicia" (1885) he provided a substantially different historical scheme, in which Kyivan princes were followed by the Ukrainian Cossack hetmans Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and Ivan Mazepa instead of the Muscovite tsars. It is disputable whether this new turn in a historical narrative mirrored a shift in the author's national orientation, or was merely the result of his opportunism. In the context of our discussion, however, it is important to note that a reader of Didyts'kyi's popular books could identify Volodymyr the Great and Jaroslav the Wise as either Russian or Ukrainian (not to mention Ruthenian) princes.

The victory of the Ukrainian historical scheme came as a result of the activity of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi (1866–1936), dean of modern Ukrainian historiography, and his L'viv historical school. Raised in the milieu of Kyivan Ukrainian intellectuals, he moved from Kyiv to take a position at the L'viv University. In L'viv, he wrote his magnum opus – a multivolume "*Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy*" (History of Ukraine-Rus') which, according to John Armstrong, served as a "superb intellectual legitimization of the national myth."[28] The choice of the title was of programmatic importance: with it, Hrushevs'kyi integrated the history of Kyivan Rus' into Ukrainian national history on the one hand, and Galician Rus' with Russian Ukraine, on the other. In addition, by connecting "Rus'" with "Ukraine," he undermined the dubious Russian monopoly on the legacy of the Kyivan Rus'. The new scheme implied that Volodymyr the Great and Jaroslav the Wise were not just the most famous Kyivan princes, but also ruling monarchs of an ancient Ukrainian state.[29]

Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine to what extent Hrushevs'kyi's work was read in Galicia. It is safe to assume that the new historical scheme would have been more influential had it been available in popularized publications "for the people," rather than in its academic version. Still, even an analysis of mass publications, if available, could not provide an adequate idea of how this scheme was received by Galician burghers and peasants. The number of texts that reflected mass attitudes and identities was comparatively small and unrepresentative.

This lack of written sources, however, can be overcome by analyzing a rather peculiar historical source – the names that were given to newborn children. The emergence of a new tendency to choose names of national heroes (e.g., Kyivan princes, Cossack hetmans, national awakeners) instead of traditional Christian names can be regarded as proof that parents were becoming "nationalized" in adherence to a national scheme of history.

[28] ARMSTRONG Myth p. 129.
[29] FRANK SYSYN "Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy" Mykhajla Hrushevs'koho ta tvorennia natsional'noji istoriohrafiji, in: Mykhajlo Hrushevs'kyj i ukrajins'ka istorychna nauka. Materialy naukovykh konferentsij prysviachenykh Mykhajlovi Hrushevs'komu. Ed. Jaroslav Hrytsak, Jaroslav Dashkevych. L'viv 1999, p. 11. On Hrushevs'kyj's interpretation of Volodymyr the Great and Jaroslav the Wise see: NATALIA JAKOVENKO Osoba jak dijach istorychnoho protsesu v istoriohrafiji Mykhajla Hrushevs'koho, ibidem pp. 89–91, 93.

Traditions of Naming

Traditionally, names given at baptism were derived from the Bible or later Church practice, i.e., the names of canonized saints. Among all saints only those who had feast days were normally used. Therefore the choice of a name most often was predetermined by the Church calendar: if a boy was born within a few days of Saint Dymytrij's feast day, he most likely would be baptized as Dymytrij – thus it was considered that a child indirectly chose his or her own name. Since there were several names for each day, priest and parents had certain, though very limited, choices. Most often, they chose a name which stood at the beginning of the list for the date in question. Thus, in Galicia, the most common male names were *Ivan*, *Stefan*, *Mykola*, *Petro*, *Vasyl'*, *Hryn'ko*, *Mikhal*, *Fedio*, *Oleksa*, *Semko*, *Andrukh*, *Pavlo*, *Myter*, *Yurko*, *Matvij*, *Il'ko*, *Tymko*, while females were given the names of *Marija*, *Anna*, *Anastasia*, *Kateryna*, *Paraskevija*, *Pavlina*, *Jevka*, *Ahafija*, and so on. The exception to this rule dealt with illegitimate children. They were given rare and sometimes strange names such as *Mojsej*, *Amroz*, *Makryna*, and so on – names that would brand them for the rest of their lives. There were many irregularities and deviations, however. For example, in certain localities, parents tried to avoid some Christian names, since they were believed to bring bad luck. The choice of a name might become a subject of negotiations between the two sides involved. In exchange for an additional payment from parents, a priest could give a "normal" name to an illegitimate child. Or, on the contrary, he might burden a legitimate child with a rare name, if he was in conflict with its parents, or considered the payment insufficient.[30]

Naming practices might differ among various social groups or become subject to temporary fashion. Metrical books of the 19th century reveal a certain divergence between rural and urban practices. In the countryside, the distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children by choice of name was observed much more strictly than in cities. Thus, in Rechychany village (Horodok district), which has metrical books preserved for the longest period (from 1791 to 1944), the first illegitimate boy and girl with "normal" names (Ivan and Anna) are listed under the dates of 1858 and 1864, respectively. Before that, all illegitimate children were given such rare and unusual names as *Kalistrat*, *Kunigunda*, *Ursula*, *Nykyfora*, *Maksym*, etc.[31] In contrast, in two L'viv Greek-Catholic churches – St. George and St. Nicholas – records of illegitimate children with "normal" names are found already in the 1820s. Besides that, many legitimate children were baptized with "Latin" (Catholic) names *Adamus*, *Adolphus*, *Cecilia*, *Elizabeta*, *Emilia*, *Valentius*, *Victoria*, *Magdalena*, etc. It was not uncommon to endow a child with two *(Adrianus-Alexander, Eduardus-Antonius, Antonius-Marceli)* or even three names *(Stanislaus-Gregorius-Antonius)* – but here, too, at least one was of "Latin" character.[32]

Starting in the middle of the 19th century, Greek-Catholic metrical books in L'viv reveal the emergence of a new tradition: ancient Slavic names were revived, among them the names

---

[30] VASYL' HRABETS' Z buval'shchyny Novoho Sela kolo Chesanova v Halychyni 1826–1944 = Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka. Ukrajins'kyj arkhiv 18. New York, Paris, Sidney, Toronto 1967, p. 11; MYKHAJLO ZUBRYTS'KYJ Imena, nazvy i prozvyshcha u selian s. Mshantsia, Starosambirs'koho povita, in: Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Shevchenka 79/5 (L'viv 1907) pp. 142–143; S. P. PAVELKO Tradytsija i religija jak motyvy vyboru imeny u hutsuliv, in: Zapysky z onomastyky. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' 1. Odesa 1999, pp. 22–28; Ukrajins'ka istorychna ta dialektna leksyka [Ukrainian historical and dialect leksyka]. Kyjiv 1985, pp. 137–144.

[31] Tsentral'nyj Derzhavnyj Istorychnyj Arkhiv Ukrajiny u L'vovi (TsDIA u L'vovi), fond 201, opys 4a, sprava 4798, pp. 86, 87, 94; spr. 4799, pp. 12, 23, 42 rev.; spr. 4800, p. 88.

[32] TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 3271, p. 1 rev., 2 rev., 8 rev., 15, 18, 53 rev., 62, 64 rev.; spr. 3393, p. 9–9 rev., 19 rev.

of Kyivan princes. In the St. George Church, the first *Volodymyr* and *Jaroslav* were baptized in 1849, while the first *Ol'ha* can be found in the records for the following year. During the next three decades, the 1850s until the 1870s, the frequency of these names remained rather low. Only in the 1880s were they used on a more regular basis, indeed on a massive scale.[33] Since the St. George Church was the Greek Catholic Cathedral, and the seat of Greek-Catholic Metropolitan, its records might not be fully representative. Since it was attended by the highest strata of Ruthenian society, its role may be regarded as one establishing new norms and practices. This is confirmed by the St. Nicholas Church, which was situated in a less prestigious place, on the outskirts of the city. Here examples of choosing princes' names remained rare until at least the end of the 1880s, but unfortunately the lack of data for 1888–1925 makes it impossible to trace the period when emerging trends became established practices.[34]

The Growing Use of Volodymyr, Jaroslav and Ol'ha

The data provided by metrical books are indirectly corroborated by membership lists in national organizations in the period 1830–1919. Among the first generation – that of the Ruthenian Triad and of the 1848 Revolution – Slavic names can be found only in the list of Ruthenian Union (*Rus'kyj Sobor*). Its list mentions 1 *Boleslaw*, 1 *Wladimierz*, 1 *Wladyslaw*, 2 *Rostyislaws*, 2 *Stanislaws* in a list totalling 60 individuals. Still, the pro-Polish character of the organization and the Polish forms of the names suggest that the bearers of those names were Poles or Polish assimilated Ruthenians ("*gente Rutheni, natione Poloni*"). The 148 names in the lists of the Ruthenian Triad and the Union of Ruthenian Scholars demonstrate explicitly different practices among anti-Polish Ruthenian patriots. Since this was the first generation of the Ruthenian patriots, it is natural to assume that their names reveal the "pre-national" state of mind of their parents.

The picture gradually changed among later generations of national patriots. In the list of 399 persons from 1860s–1870s there were 13 *Volodymyrs*, 2 *Volodyslavs* but no *Jaroslav*. The list of 577 persons for 1890–1919 includes 1 *Bronyslav*, 36 *Volodymyrs*, 4 *Viacheslavs*, 3 *Liubomyrs*, 1 *Myroslav*, 2 *Stanyslavs*, and 5 *Jaroslavs*. Of course, part of the increase can be contributed to the fact that the second list is much longer. Still, the frequency of *Volodymyr* rises from 3,3% in the second list to 6,2% in the third list. This suggested not mere coincidence, but reflected changes in naming practices.

This is further corroborated by the list of 680 members of national student organizations in L'viv (1870–1882). Here we have 56 *Volodymyrs* and 6 *Jaroslavs*. The two eldest were born in 1852. In this list, *Volodymyr* made up 8 per cent, and *Jaroslav* ca. 1 per cent of names. In terms of their frequency, *Volodymyr* was second only to the most popular name, *Ivan* (70 cases); and *Jaroslav* occupied the 24th place among all 107 positions.[35] The same proportion was preserved until the beginning of the 20th century. Among 470 members of the "Ukrainian Student Union," 37 *Volodymyrs* and 3 *Jaroslavs* were listed.[36]

[33] TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 3411, p. 143, 160 rev., 181; spr. 6827, p. 79, 80 rev.; spr. 6830, p. 1, 2–2 rev., 5, 31, 44, 48, 96, 99, 134.
[34] TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 3271, passim.
[35] List of members of "Druzhnij lykhvar" and "Akademichnyj kruzhok", 1870–1882, compiled by Victoria Sereda.
[36] Zvit z dijal'nosti tovarystva "Ukrajins'kyj Students'kyj Sojuz" u L'vovi za chas vid 1 padolysta 1911 do 30 zhovtnia 1912 r. L'viv 1912, passim.

It is difficult to identify the parents of the first *Jaroslavs* and *Volodymyrs*. Still, in those cases where the fathers' identity has been firmly established, they fall into the category of "national awakeners." The father of Volodymyr Shashkevych was the famous Markian Shashkevych, Jaroslav Ilnyts'kyi's father, Vasyl', was a known Ukrainian patriot and the director of the L'viv Ruthenian Academic gymnasium. The father of Jaroslav Lutsyk was Theodor Lutsyk, a head of the Kachkovs'kyi society in Zolochiv and founder of the first village reading house in Galicia.[37]

This tendency was also apparent in metrical books. The father of the boy who was the first to be baptized as *Jaroslav* at the St. George Church in March, 1849, (this was also the first case of choice of a "Ruthenian" name) was the famous Yakiv Holovats'kyi. His second child, born in 1850, was also the first girl baptized *Ol'ha* . In 1849 another national activist, Mykhajlo Kuzems'kyi, was the godfather of the first child named *Volodymyr* (Prokopovych) – and he was also a godfather of the first *Jaroslav* (Holovats'kyj). Two other Galician-Ruthenian "national awakeners", Denys Zubryts'kyi and Mykhajlo Malynovs'kyi, were chosen as godfathers at the baptisms of the first *Ol'ha* (Holovats'kyj), and the first *Vsevolod* (Lepkyj, the latter was baptized at the St. Nicholas church) respectively.[38]

Starting in the 1870s, it becomes more difficult to identify parents whose children were baptized with Slavic names. They were clerks, railway officials, postmen, workers, janitors, etc.[39] Judging by historical records, these parents left no significant trace in the political and cultural life of the Galician Ruthenians. This leads to the assumption that they were recipients, rather than inventors, of the new tradition and, that the spread of the new naming culture in this milieu testifies to a "nationalizing" of larger groups of Ruthenian urban dwellers.

Viacheslav Budzynovs'kyi – a national activist from the end of the 1880s – wrote later that "with the coming of the national revival every literate Galician named his first son Volodymyr and his first daughter Ol'ha. In this way he recorded his aspiration to live under an all-Ukrainian ruler in Kyiv. When the Galician had a second son, he gave him another name, but very often it was the name of another representative of United Ukraine, or one linked to Ukrainian political thought: Jaroslav, Danylo, or Bohdan."[40] This statement is clearly an exaggeration. Still, generally speaking, it correctly emphasizes the connection between the spread of princes' names and the development of national consciousness. This is reflected by another tendency revealed by the analysis of genealogical trees of several Galician Ruthenian/Ukrainian families: by the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, in a family in which one child had a prince's name, his or her siblings most frequently had "national" names as well. Thus, the three children of Volodymyr Bilyns'kyj (1869–1918) were named *Natalka, Jaroslava* and *Taras*. In the fifth generation of the Sonevyts'kyis' genealogical tree (end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th century) there were three families whose children had the names *Jaroslav – Rostyslav-Ihor*; *Jaroslava-Ol'ha* (double name) *– Jaroslav*; *Roman – Volodymyra – Jaroslav–Nestor – Nadija-Rostyslava* (double name) *– Nestor-Volodymyr* (double name); in the sixth generation (1920s–1930s) a family had three children named *Jaroslav – Roman – Oleh*. In families like these, if a child was given a double name, sometimes both parts of that name bore the "national" imprint:

[37] L'vivs'ka Naukova Biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrajiny, Viddil rukopysiv, fond Ivana Levyts'koho, spr. 1998, p. 1–4.

[38] TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 3273, p. 17; 3398, p. 42 rev., 47, 62; spr. 3406, p. 40.

[39] TsDIA u L'vovi, spr. 3411, p. 143, 160 rev., 181; spr. 6827, p. 79, 80 rev.; spr. 6830, p. 1, 2–2rev., 5, 31, 44, 48, 96, 99, 134.

[40] VIACHESLAV BUDZYNOVS'KYI Ishly didy na muky. Vvedennja v istoriju Ukrajiny. New York 1958, pp. 21–22.

Jaroslav-Nestor (b. 1898), *Jaroslav-Volodymyr* (b. 1919), and *Jaroslava-Ol'ha* (b. 1919) in the fifth generation of the Sonevyts'kyi's geneological tree.[41]

The spread of new naming practices was possible only after the dominance of religious traditions had been undermined. The Greek-Catholic Church not only lost its monopoly over the choice of names, and had to accommodate itself to these new practices. Most telling was the revival of the names *Volodymyr* and *Ol'ha*. While both of them were regarded as saints by the Church, until at the end of the 1850s they were not included in the religious calendar from which priests and parents could choose a name. Those names began to appear in that calendar only in the 1860s, *Ol'ha* listed on July 23, and *Volodymyr* on July 27 (according to the new calendar style).[42] A further innovation was that by the beginning of the century, along with the canonized Kyivan princes *Borys, Hlib, Volodymyr* and *Ol'ha*, even the uncanonized *Jaroslav* the Wise appeared listed under the date of his death (February 19),[43] which signified a serious break with Church tradition. Another break was that under new circumstances neither priest nor parents followed the Church requirements: children were baptized as *Volodymyrs, Jaroslavs,* or *Ol'has* by choice, not according to the dates suggested by *Misiatseslov*.

Until World War I, the use of princes' names was largely an urban phenomenon. Galician villages were barely touched by this new fashion. In a list of 394 peasant activists of the 1880s compiled by John-Paul Himka, there are only 4 *Volodymyrs*, 1 *Vladyslav*, and 1 *Bohdan* – which is hardly comparable with the frequency of those names in the lists of urban national activists.[44] An analysis of several village metrics providing data on the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries[45] reveals a single exception that confirms a general tendency: in the only village where peasants had Slavic names – the village Belzets' (Sokal region), it was a local priest who was responsible for establishing the new tradition. The first *Volodymyr* mentioned in the village *metryka* under year of 1856 was the priest's own son. The baptism was turned into a social gathering of all local elites. The child was baptized by a local deacon, and in commemoration of the unique character of this event there were 4 pairs of godparents, including a landlord, a school director, a neighboring priest, and a village school curator with their wives. In the next fourteen years (1856–1870) there were 13 *Volodymyrs* and 23 *Ol'has*

[41] Z. SLUZHYN'SKA Rid Bilyns'kykh [Bilyns'kyi family]. L'viv 1998 passim; record of the Sonevyts'kyj's geneological tree is preserved in the Society of St. Volodymyr (Tovarystvo im. sv. Volodymyr, L'viv). Using the opportunity, I would like to thank Adriana Ohorchak and late Roman Krypjakevych for making those geneological materials available for me.

[42] Peremyshlianyn Mesiatsoslov na god 1859. Peremyshl' 1863, p. 12; Vremennik Instituta Stavropigiskogo s Mesiatsoslovom na god prostyj 1866. L'vov 1865, p. 28.

[43] Vremennik Instituta Stavropigiskogo s Mesiatsoslovom na god vysokosnyj 1904 (L'viv, no year), pp. 46–50.

[44] JOHN-PAUL HIMKA Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century. Edmonton 1988, pp. 257–317.

[45] There were analyzed metrics of following villages and for following years: Belzets', Sokal' district (1853–1870; TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 177); Velyki Didushychi, Stryj district (1870–1928; TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 6519); Dobrivliany, Dobriany, Putiatychi, Stryj district (1873–1869; TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 1597); Drahanivka, Ternopil' district (1836–1867; TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 1710); Nezhaniv, Zolochiv district (1876–1944; TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 6943), Rechychany, Horodok district (1791–1944; TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 7077); Rudnyky, Sambir district (1870–1907 pp.; TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 7108); Rudno, L'viv district (1780–1900; TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 7110); Riasna Pol'ska (1837–1869, TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 4968); Tatarynivka, Sambir district (1925–1938; TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 5546); Udniv (Odniv), Zhovkva district (1842–1903; TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 7289).

listed in the metric as names of peasant children.[46] In Rechychany's metrical book, the first *Volodymyr* was noted in 1861 and the first *Ol'ha* in 1880; both were children of local priests. In contrast, the first peasant offspring with those names appeared in the *metryky* only in 1903 and 1908 respectively.[47]

An idea of the popularity of the prince's name in cities and countryside before the First World War can be gleaned from the list of Ukrainian sharpshooters who made up a Galician Ukrainian national volunteer unit of the Austrian-Hungarian army. That list contains 20 *Volodymyrs* born in cities and 17 *Volodymyrs* and 6 *Jarolavs* born in villages. The whole cohort belonged to a generation born between 1885 and 1899.[48] Those statistics run counter to the belief that the tradition of endowing children with princes' names emerged in the Galician countryside only during the interwar period (1919–1939).[49] On the other hand, it is quite possible that those differences reflected regional patterns in the spread of the naming practices. It would be risky to draw general conclusions on the basis of this fragmentary data.

Beyond dispute, however, is the fact that during the interwar years this tradition became as deeply entrenched in villages as it had in cities by the last decades of the 19th century. This was a result of the deliberate efforts of national activists. Still, in contrast to the previous period, the names of the Kyivan princes at that time were used overwhelmingly in the context of the Ukrainian national scheme. This implies that the issue of national identity was finally resolved in favor of an Ukrainian orientation. Characteristically, the L'viv executive of the Ukrainian sport society "Sokil" suggested to members of its village *filia*: "While reading Ukrainian history, pay particular attention to the brilliant moments of our past. Thus, in the princely period, it has to be explained how our princes gathered the Ukrainian lands, sought unity, how they strove to build a great state, which would not be afraid of anybody." According to further suggestions, the princely period had to be followed by the Cossackdom with stories about Khmel'nyts'kyj, Mazepa and *haidamaks*, and then continued by the history of the Ukrainian national revival of the 19th century and the Ukrainian national revolution of 1917–1920.[50]

National organizations encouraged Galician peasants to place pictures of Cossack hetmans, Shevchenko, and other Ukrainian national leaders in their homes along with religious icons. The choice of name for a newborn child was considered to be a national issue. A Ukrainian newspaper in the 1930s claimed that "every nation has its own proper names". Therefore it suggested that parents were to choose the names of national heroes, such as *Bohdan, Borys, Vsevolod, Zynowij, Ihor, Jaroslaw, Lew, Markijan, Motria, Myroslaw, Myroslawa, Natalka, Nestor, Ol'ha, Oksana, Rostyslav, Sviatoslav, Taras,* or *Jarema.* The list comprised also names that personified national aspirations such as *Wira, Nadija,* and *Liubov* (that is Faith, Hope, and Love).[51]

In the inter-war period, a cult around Jaroslav the Wise emerged. As some memoirs suggest, it was particularly popular in the Berezhany region.[52] It is difficult to determine

---

[46] TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 177.

[47] TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 201, op. 4a, spr. 4799, p. 30; spr. 4800, p. 22 rev.; spr. 4801, p. 38 rev., 88.

[48] Ukrajins'ki sichovi stril'tsi 1914–1920. L'viv 1935, pp. 145–155.

[49] HRABETS' Z buval'shchyny p. 11.

[50] TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 312, op. 1, spr. 517, p. 121 rev.

[51] Quoted after: STANISŁAW STĘPIEŃ Ukraińcy i ich działalność społeczno-kulturalna w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej w latach 1918–1939. Kraków 1988, p. 493.

[52] Interview with Vasyl' Fanga, August 25, 1997. Audiotape and transcription of the interview is preserved at the Archive of Oral History, Institute for Historical Research, Lviv National University named after Ivan Franko.

whether this cult had currency throughout Galicia, or was limited to certain regions. It can be stated with certainty, however, that at the least in Berezhany, this cult was introduced by national organizations. In 1935–1936 the central, L'viv based, organization "Prosvita" ("Enlightenment") sent to that region 1200 copies of a portrait of Jaroslav the Wise, and 1000 copies with a portrait of Jaroslav Osmomysl, a Galician prince. From the total number, 804 copies of the first and 499 of the second portrait were actually distributed.[53]

Peasants who were drafted into the army during the First World War served as intermediaries in the introduction of the new naming practices. Later, due to vicissitudes of war, they participated in the Ukrainian national revolution in Russian Ukraine. One of the cases is very telling. The Galician peasant Hryhorij Skazkiv was moved to Russian Ukraine as an Austrian prisoner of war. There, he was raised to the rank of a captain of the Ukrainian National Army during the revolution. A self-educated person, he liked history very much, and once even taught Ukrainian history in a Poltava gymnasium. After the fall of the last Ukrainian government he returned to his native village and became a local leader of the Ukraine cooperative movement. In 1921 he married a young Ukrainian peasant woman. The wedding took place secretly in L'viv, at the St. George cathedral. Before the wedding he made a contract with his future wife. They agreed that they would have four children, and two of them would be named *Jaroslav* and *Halyna, Halyna* being a name that he heard in Ukraine.[54]

For former Galician Ruthenians, spread of the new names became a symbol of sacrificing their smaller identities for the sake of a larger, national identity. It would appear that Galicia was the only Ukrainian region where embracing a pan-Ukrainian identity took such a radical form. This was reflected in the fact that in contemporary Ukraine the name *Jaroslav* has a special regional popularity. Among 23 *Jaroslavs* and *Jaroslavas* mentioned in "Who is Who in Ukraine" and "Who is Who in Ukrainian politics" in 1996–1997, 17 were born in the L'viv, Ivano-Frankivs'k and Ternopil' regions, i.e., in former Galicia. In two of the other cases, the Ukrainian historians Jaroslav Pelens'kyj and Jaroslav Isayevych, although their birthplaces were outside of Galicia, their families were of Galician origin and therefore they can be added to the list of Galician Jaroslavs. If so, then 19 of 23 Jaroslavs (82,3%) are Galicians by origin, and more then half of them were born in the countryside.[55]

Conclusion

These data show explicitly that Ukrainian national consciousness in Galicia, at least in one of its major components – "[a] heroic past, great men, glory [...] that is the social capital upon which one bases a national idea"[56] – was created and developed by several generations of national activists. The "re-emergence" of historical memory was not merely the recollecting of events that occurred long ago. Events had to be selected and organized in a particular scheme to confirm and support a specific national orientation, be it Ukrainian, Polish, Russian, or merely Galician"Ruthenian."

On the other hand, the data reveal that not every intellectual construction had equal chances for success. It is relatively easy to understand why so many parents followed the

[53] TsDIA u L'vovi, f. 348, op. 1, spr. 6742.

[54] VICTOR SUSAK Zhyva istorija Berezhan ta okolyts' 1930-kh–1945 rokiv: intervju z Halynoju Skaskiv [Live history of Berezhan and vicinities 1930-s–1945 years: Interview with Halyna Skaskiv], in: Ukrajina moderna 2–3 (L'viv 1999) p. 281.

[55] Khto je khto v ukrajins'kij politytsi. Dovidnyk [Who is who in Ukrainian politics. Reference book]. Kyiv 1996 passim; Khto je khto v Ukrajini [Who is who in Ukraine]. Kyiv 1997 passim.

[56] RENAN What is p. 52.

example set by Jakiv Holovats'kyi, who chose for himself and for his son the name of *Jaroslav*, but not that of his colleague Ivan – *Dalybor* – Vahylevych. For them *Jaroslav* was associated with a real historical person, who evoked a heroic historical moment, while the latter name was purely intellectually constructed. In the same vein, among the two names chosen by Markian Shashkevych for himself and his son, *Ruslan* contained no message, compared to *Volodymyr*, which was a symbol of past national greatness.

The success of the national project depended on external conditions. The cult of the Kyivan princes had emerged among the Ruthenian/Ukrainian elites already in the 17th and 18th centuries. It did not take deep roots, however, due to the domination of a church tradition that strictly regulated the choice of names. Only in the second half of the 19th century, when the church was starting to lose its hegemony and yield to secular ideologies and practices, was the cult of *Volodymyr, Jaroslav*, and *Ol'ha* firmly established in Ruthenian, by that time already largely Ukrainianized society. At the same time, names which had earlier been considered symbols of ignominy fit only for illegitimate children, now became "national" and were considered desirable by parents (as in the case of *Maksym*).

To be sure, a celebration of the Kyivan princes as Ukrainian heroes is no longer a Galician peculiarity. Suffice it to say that the highest official reward in post-Soviet independent Ukraine is called *Orden Jaroslava Mudroho*, The Order of Jaroslav the Wise. Still, what is definitely missing in Ukrainian ethnic territories outside of Galicia is the kind of long-lasting and organic work – both in terms of intellectual efforts and their practical implementation – that characterized the local Ukrainian national movement in Austrian Galicia and interwar Poland.