

# Obtaining History: The Case of Ukrainians in Habsburg Galicia, 1848–1900

ANDRIY ZAYARNYUK

THE GOLDEN AGE OF HISTORY as an academic discipline was the era of nationalisms, because modern social science history was created in the form of national historical narratives.<sup>1</sup> This is particularly true of Ukrainian nationalism and Ukrainian history. Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, who created the most compelling Ukrainian grand narrative, did it under the influence of late-nineteenth-century social theory, and he is still considered to be the greatest Ukrainian historian.<sup>2</sup> Modern history appeared in the nineteenth century not just as an academic discipline, but also as part of the identity of the modern individual; therefore, it figured prominently in all projects aimed at the creation of stable collective identities. Ukrainian history was entailed in the construction of a Ukrainian national identity, and had to respond to the challenges this construction faced.

---

Center for Austrian Studies

*Austrian History Yearbook* 36 (2005): 121–47.

The author is Junior Research Fellow at the Institute of Historical Research, Ivan Franko Lviv National University, Lviv, Ukraine.

<sup>1</sup>Saying this, I do not mean that history written in the form of national historical narratives was the best possible history. “Golden age” refers not to the quality of the historical work, but to history’s ability to convince people of the veracity of its “findings.” Subscribing to the idea that nationalism was a modern project, I believe that the interconnectedness of history and modernity can be extended to history and nationalism. See, for example, Keith Jenkins, *Why History? Ethics and Postmodernity* (London, 1994). For some discussion of these connections in postcolonial criticism, see Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton, 1993); and Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, 2000).

<sup>2</sup>On the sociological influences on Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, see Omelian Pritsak, “Istoriosofia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho” (Historiosophy of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi), preface to Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy* (History of Ukraine-Rus') (Kiev, 1991), xl–lxxiii. The year of Ukrainian independence, 1991, was also the year when the great publishing project of reprinting Hrushevs'kyi’s magnum opus started; ongoing publication of the same work in English has been the only historical monograph translated from Ukrainian into English since Ukraine’s independence.

There are some studies of how contemporary national histories, especially those found in school textbooks, are infused with stereotypes and project a nationalist vision of the world back in time.<sup>3</sup> Usually, the nationalist perspective on the past is explained by the ideology imposed by the nation-state—national history faithfully serves the nation-state's interests. In this article, I will try to investigate how Ukrainian national history appeared in nineteenth-century Galicia in the absence of a nation-state, and look at its meanings and uses and its role in the construction of the Ukrainian nation. This article will also try to find out how nationalist history became a plausible, viable, and lasting explanation of the past with heavy implications for the present.

For this second task, I will also try to compare briefly the history generated by the Ukrainian national project and the history created by that project's major competitor, the Russophiles.<sup>4</sup> Tracing the trajectories of the construction of history in these two projects and paying close attention to their transformations, we shall better our understanding of the differences between Ukrainian and Russian orientations among Galician Ruthenians and define the specificity of the Ukrainian national project. The concern of this article is not historiography, but history as an integral part of the modern experience. Therefore, the analysis will concentrate not on the production of history in academic institutions, but on the historical discourse in general, especially on history transmitted to lower classes in speeches, popular publications, newspaper articles, belles-lettres, and other similar sources.

In 1885, the popular Ukrainian newspaper *Bat'kivshchyna* (Motherland) published a "tale" that encapsulated all of Ukrainian history in a single article. The tale ran as follows: There were three brothers, Kazimierz (who symbolized the Poles), Danylo (Ukrainians), and Vania (Russians). At first, Danylo was better off than his two brothers, but a gang of bandits (Mongols) plundered his household. Before he could recover, his brother Kazimierz had taken over his farm, and Danylo found himself forced to work for both Kazimierz and himself. At first it was bearable, but after a while Kazimierz started abusing Danylo. Danylo rose up and accepted Vania's help. However, it soon appeared that Vania was not much better than Kazimierz. Vania also oppressed Danylo, and, plotting together with Rudolf (Austria) and Friedrich (Prussia), divided Kazimierz's household, leaving him there merely as a manager. Kazimierz's son Stanisław behaved even worse while managing what used to be his father's estate. One of Danylo's sons, Nykola, joined Stanisław as a servant, and another, Ivan, joined Vania's son Alexander.

---

<sup>3</sup>On Poles and Poland in Ukrainian school textbooks, see, for example, Natalia Iakovenko, "Pol'shcha ta poliaky v shkil'nykh pidruchnykakh istorii, abo vidlunnia davniho i nedavniho mynuloho" (Poland and Poles in the school textbooks of history or echoes of ancient and recent past), in idem, *Paralelnyi svit. Doslidzhennia z istorii uiaвлен' ta idei v Ukraïni XVI–XVII st.* (Parallel world: Studies in history of imagination and ideas in Ukraine of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) (Kiev, 2002), 366–79.

<sup>4</sup>"Russophile" here is used to differentiate from "Russian," as related to the Russian Empire, and to indicate the "indigenous" Galician roots of the project. Usually, scholars distinguish among Polish, Galician-Ruthenian, Ukrainian, and Russian options.

Only Danylo's middle son remained loyally at home. He "did not care that his brothers ridiculed him, comparing their lordly livery with his peasant jacket, and called him *khlop* and *khakhol*."<sup>5</sup>

The tale draws obvious parallels between the nation and the peasant household. The word used in Ukrainian for motherland was the one used to define peasant patrimony, and was also the title of the newspaper for peasants, in which the tale was published: *Bat'kivshchyna*. Second, the tale suggests that authentic Ukrainians are peasants, the social group that has not betrayed the nation through service to greedy lords and foreigners. Peasants should not be ashamed of their simple coats; rather, they should be proud of the straight and stubborn character of their ancestors, hoping that one day they will recover their ancestral household from the hands of these "parasites." This parable contains both a social commentary and a vision of temporal continuity between past and present obvious to anyone educated in modern historical narratives. However, if we compare this tale with Ruthenian historical narratives from the period around 1848, we shall see the freshness of both components of the parable.

Although the first texts of the Ruthenian national revival that appeared in the 1830s started "uncovering" a national past,<sup>6</sup> Ruthenian intellectual activity almost stopped in the mid 1840s, and there is no direct continuity between the works from the 1830s and the tidal wave of historical texts created in the framework of the Ruthenian movement in 1848. While the 1830s did not produce any systematic historical narrative, in 1848 and its aftermath, we encounter a great number of popularized versions of history together with scholarly historical works. These histories appear to be united by similar ideas about the meaning of history, the attention to specific historical periods, events, and figures, and the particular mode of explanation employed. All of this allows us to speak about a distinct Ruthenian historical narrative that appeared in 1848.

In the "Memorandum of the Ruthenian Nation in Galicia to Clarify Its Position," published in German in Lviv in 1848, the peculiarities of Ruthenians were listed in the following way: "Ruthenians are different from Poles by language, script, habits, customs, and church rite."<sup>7</sup> If we take away the ephemeral "habits and customs," we are left with language, script, and church rite. These differences were traditionally used to differentiate between ethnic Poles and Ruthenians. Since the end of the eighteenth century, Austrian authorities had legitimized and developed these markers of ethnicity. The rite was better institutionalized, having acquired its own archdiocese and metropolitan, as well as the new designation, Greek Catholic. The language fared worse, being limited only to the elementary schools and the theological faculty. Thus, in 1848, differences did not have to be

---

<sup>5</sup>*Khlop* literally means *peasant*, but it has pejorative connotations; *khakhol* is pejorative for *Ukrainian* in Russian. "Kazka o trekh bratiakh" (The tale about three brothers), *Bat'kivshchyna* (Motherland) 47 (1885).

<sup>6</sup>I am referring here to the work of the so-called Ruthenian Triad: Markiiian Shashkevych, Ivan Vahylevych, and Iakiv Holovats'kyi.

<sup>7</sup>"Denkschrift der ruthenischen Nation in Galizien zur Aufklärung ihrer Verhältnisse" (Lviv, 1848).

invented; only the history of these differences had to be constructed and new meanings attached to them.

In 1848, to legitimate their own claims to a nationhood separate from the Poles, Galician-Ruthenians invoked long-gone princely times. A great national entity was discovered in the past, and nineteenth-century Ruthenians were but its scattered remnants. The already cited “Memorandum of the Ruthenian Nation” stated: “Once we also were an independent, strong nation under our own princes from the tribe of Volodymyr the Great.”<sup>8</sup> The rule of the mighty ancient Rus’ princes was represented as the golden age of the Ruthenian nation and proof of this nation’s ability to exist independently. Moreover, the histories from the 1848 era complied very well with Galicia’s being part of the Habsburg Empire. The incorporation of Galicia was legitimated by dynastic rights; its titular designation referred to the medieval principality (kingdom) of Halych and Volhynia. It was precisely this principality that was at the center of Ruthenian historical narratives referring to the princely times of ancient Rus’.<sup>9</sup>

In the published version of the speech made by Reverend Iosyf Levyts’kyi at the opening of the Ruthenian Council in Drohobych in 1848, one can find a list of Ruthenian princes that goes on for almost two pages. The existence of this principality of Halych and Volhynia was used by Reverend Levyts’kyi to prove that Ruthenians were the autochthonous population of Galicia: “The great and glorious Ruthenian nation living in East Galicia and Volodymyriia is the primordial nation of the Galician land; it did not arrive here from somewhere else.”<sup>10</sup> After the golden age of the Galician princes, the dark ages came. History fell into an abyss; there were no Ruthenian names, no dates, until the Habsburg dynasty recovered the principality and took the Ruthenian nation under its patronage.<sup>11</sup>

These references to princely times were not limited to political speech, but enjoyed a larger public resonance. Genealogical tables of the Ruthenian princes were printed and hung on the walls in the homes of the Greek Catholic parish

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>[Rudolf Mokh], *Slovo do naroda halytsko-ruskoho, holosyv Rudolf Mokh, sekretar Rady Ruskoj Ounevskoi, parokh z Lahodova v chasi Narodnoho Sobraniia dnia 12 Oktovriia/30 septembriia 1848* (A word to Galician-Ruthenian people, spoken by Rudolf Mokh, Secretary of the Univ Ruthenian Council, parish priest from Lahodiv, during the People’s Meeting on 12 October/30 September 1848) (Lviv, 1848). Petro Lozynskii, *Slovo v chas torzhestvennoi Sluzhby Bozhoi odpravlennoi z postanovleniia Holovnoi Rady Ruskoj z prychny vstupleniia na tron Tsisarstva Avstriiskoho Eho Velychestva Kesaria i Korolia Frantsishka Iosyfa I-ho v tserkvi Lvovskoi misttskoi obr. hr. k...* (A word during the ceremonial liturgy, served according to the resolution of the Supreme Ruthenian Council on account of the accession to the throne of Austrian Empire of his majesty Emperor and King Francis Joseph I, in Lviv’s local church of the Greek Catholic rite...) (Lviv, 1848). Hryhorii Shashkevych, *Besida pod chas festynu narodnoho ruskoho v Stanislavovi dnia 30 maia 1848, hovorena...* (Speech during the Ruthenian national festivity in Stanislaviv on 30 May 1848, Given...) (Lviv, 1848).

<sup>10</sup>[Iosyf Levyts’kyi], *Besida hovorena dnia 22 Maia 1848 roku v Drohobychy pry osnovanii Komiteta Ruskoho* (Speech given on 22 May 1848 in Drohobych at the founding of a Ruthenian committee) (Przemyśl, 1848).

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

clergy.<sup>12</sup> Their names were invoked in discussions and their “portraits” printed. However, nowhere in 1848 could one come across pictures of Cossack hetmans. While in the 1830s the Cossack myth had been part of the heritage as imagined by early Ruthenian romantics, in 1848, the Cossacks were dismissed to the margins of Ruthenian intellectual efforts.<sup>13</sup> Feodosii Steblii has shown that the attention paid by the so-called Ruthenian Triad to the Cossack period in the 1830s was shared by readers connected to the Triad up to 1847.<sup>14</sup> But in 1848 the Cossack themes were marginalized in the public discourse, and no history of them had yet been written.

Ruthenian history in 1848 and its immediate aftermath was produced only for educated members of Ruthenian society. There was very little attempt to spread this vision of common Ruthenian history down to “simple people,” the absolute majority of whom constituted former *robot* peasants. Ruthenian activists neither possessed the means to approach these people, nor believed this to be their task. Ruthenian history was popularized among Ruthenian higher society consisting largely of Greek Catholic priests and their families, but no one tried to write a popular history or address the Ruthenian peasants. The state did not think that peasants needed any history either. Textbooks for village schools, even those published in 1848, included some elements of the sacral Christian history, but they had no mention of the secular one.<sup>15</sup>

Ruthenian historians from the 1848 generation usually produced strictly regional Galician-Ruthenian histories concentrating on the princely period. These historians typically ended their accounts in the fourteenth or fifteenth century, and when some of them dared to venture further in time, their histories largely turned into a pile of facts and had a narrow regional focus. Thus, these historians successfully avoided the Cossack period and other “pan-Ukrainian” topics. Among the scholarly works of the period, one must mention histories by Denys Zubryts’kyi, Anton Petrushevych, and Izydor Sharanevych.<sup>16</sup> Rarely mentioned today, they

---

<sup>12</sup>[Volodymyr Barvins’kyi] Vasyľ Barvinok, *Skoshenyi tsvit (vyimok z halys’kykh obrazkiv)* (A cut leaf [an excerpt from Galician pictures]) (Kolomyia, 1910), 126–28.

<sup>13</sup>In terms of usage, Cossack terms appeared only in vaudevilles by Rev. Ivan Vitoshyns’kyi or in attempts to translate Austrian military ranks and commands into Ukrainian; the heritage of ancient Rus’ proved to be too ancient for this latter purpose. Translation examples include: *hetman* was used for *army commander*, *bulava* for *staff*, *vataha* for *corps*, *desiatnyk* for *sergeant*, *polkovnyk* for *colonel*, *sotnia* for *company*, *sotnyk* for *captain*, and *khoruhov* for *standard*. See “Vypys z rukovodstva do vpravy dlia strazhy narodnoi” (Excerpt from the manual for the exercise of national guard), *Zoria Halys’ka* (Galician star), Supplement to issue 25, 1848.

<sup>14</sup>Feodosii Steblii, “Derzhavnyts’ki aktsenty v diial’nosti ‘Rus’koi Triitsi’” (Statist accents in the activity of “Ruthenian triad”), in *Shashkevychiana*, ed. Feodosii Steblii, vols. 3–4 (Lviv, 2000), 22–41.

<sup>15</sup>*Knyzhka do chytaniia dlia druhoi kliassy uchylshch sel’skykh v c. k. avstriiskykh Derzhavakh* (Reader for the second grade of the village schools in k. k. states) (Vienna, 1848).

<sup>16</sup>Denis Zubritskii, *Istoriia drevniago galichsko-russkago kniazhestva* (History of the ancient Galician-Ruthenian principality), vols. 1–3 (Lviv, 1852–85); Izydor Sharanevych, *Istoriia Halysko-Volodymyrskoi Rusy vit naidavniishykh vremen do roku 1453* (History of Galician-Volodymyrian Rus’ from the most ancient times to the year 1453) (Lviv, 1863). An example of the history of more modern times is Anton Petrushevych, *Svodnaia halysko-russkaia litopys’ s 1600 po 1700 hod*

represent the first attempts to write Galician-Ruthenian history after the events of 1848. The difference between these historical narratives from 1848 and the tale of the three brothers published in the 1880s was not limited to the periods depicted. This difference was in the very understanding of what history was about, and what history's place in the individual's experience should be.

One of the greatest scholarly achievements of the 1848 generation was Izydor Sharanevych's *History of Galician-Volodymyrian Rus' from the Most Ancient Times to the Year 1453*.<sup>17</sup> The author planned another volume that would cover the period from 1453 to 1772, but, characteristically, it was never written. In the preface to this work, the author explains his views on the meaning of history and its pedagogical uses:

Sending this history out into God's world, I do not intend with my true description of the ancient expressions and forms of Ruthenian national life to invoke a longing for them, as if they were better and happier than contemporary ones; I do not want to multiply the number of dreamers! Now in Europe society rests on a different foundation, and our past belongs to scholarship and reflection. Our knowledge of Ruthenian history should serve as the source of our love for this land, etched with the actions and sufferings of our ancestors and rich in historical legends; our knowledge of Ruthenian history should fortify our love of the Ruthenian language, in which our ancestors lived intellectually and communicated with each other as well as with courts and kings, and it should strengthen us to better carry out the church rite, with which they communicated with the Supreme Being.<sup>18</sup>

This fragment shows that, for Sharanevych, the only connection between history and patriotism was the ability of the former to prove the antiquity of the key elements of the latter. Historical consciousness appears as awareness of the existence of a rich Ruthenian past, but it is devoid of immediate self-identification with that past. The great "Other" of this history was the Poles, who had taken over the territories of ancient Rus', and whose first victim had been Galician Rus'. But there was no "Self" with which to identify. There was the land whose history these historians had been writing, and there were great people, whose actions propelled history, but no nation as a historical actor of its own.

In 1848, the Polish version of Ruthenian identity also seemed to be a viable option. Many Polish activists of that period were Greek Catholic and thus Ruthenians by birth, but Poles by choice; the pro-Polish Ruthenian Assembly was created to counter the Main Ruthenian Council, and many Greek Catholic priests joined Polish councils throughout the province. In connection with these activities, a certain version of Ruthenian history was also propagated in various leaflets and popular brochures. These brochures emphasized the inclusive character of Poland, which was the motherland for many ethnic groups: Ruthenians, Ukrainians,

---

(Composite Galician-Ruthenian chronicle) (Lviv, 1874), which was added to multiple times in subsequent editions.

<sup>17</sup>Sharanevych, *Istoriia Halytsko-Volodymyrskoi Rusy*.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., v.

Mazurians, and Lithuanians. This history also tried to justify the division into peasants and landlords in old Poland, explaining that this division was a matter of pure convenience—some people had to labor, and others had to defend.<sup>19</sup>

The Polish national movement and “Polish-Ruthenians” proposed a counter-narrative of Ruthenian history. According to this story, the Rus’ lands came under the control of King Kazimierz the Great voluntarily. The king started hiring brave men to fight the Muscovites, Germans, and Tartars. These brave men came from everywhere, including the reader’s own community. For their service to the king and country, they were awarded noble status. The nobles then lent their lands to the peasants and, in exchange, asked them to work several days for the rightful owners of the land. In compensation for this, peasants were exempted from military duty. The narrative contrasts this situation to Austrian times: back then, peasants did not have to pay any taxes, and they had free salt and tobacco.

According to this interpretation, in Polish times, “the peasant with land was not called a subject but an owner, a villager (*włościanin*), from the word ‘power’ (*vlast*) [a speculation about Polish-Ruthenian linguistics]—power that he enjoyed as a result of an agreement with the landlord. He was his landlord’s neighbor and friend.” This continued as long as there were good Polish kings. However, these kings died out, and a king from the Saxon dynasty had to be hired. This king brought to Poland vodka and many other misfortunes as well. To curtail his powers, the Constitution of 3 May was accepted. Neither the Muscovites, nor Prussia, nor Kaunitz liked it, and that is why they attacked Poland. “Since that time the Polish government ceased to exist, and a new government was created; it is difficult to describe this government in our Ruthenian language; this was the government of *bureaucracy*.” This government introduced excise, taxes, stamps, and expensive tobacco and salt without alleviating *robot*.<sup>20</sup>

The significant difference between the Polish and Ruthenian narratives of Ruthenian history in 1848 was the attempt of the former to take into account and explain social tensions between the peasants and their landlords. The Ruthenian movement did not yet talk about social conflict in its history, trying to emphasize only the enslavement of a nation and to downplay the plebeian character of the Ruthenian nation. It hoped that the Ruthenian peasantry, after turning from landlords’ subjects into citizens, would achieve civic and national self-consciousness, and the Ruthenian nation would become a “normal” one. For purely tactical reasons, it preferred to use peasants for countering the accusations that the Ruthenian movement was a clerical intrigue, and to represent them as secular members of the Ruthenian nation.

Nonetheless, Polish attempts to appeal to the peasants with popular brochures and their own version of history were not successful. Despite the fact that some popular brochures appeared, the memories of the bloody 1846 uprising and the

---

<sup>19</sup>[Michał Popiel], *Ogłoszenie Mychaila Popela do WSICH RUSYNIW wo Samborskoj radi na 25 (hreczysk. kal. 13) maja 1848 r. po Chr.* (Announcement of Mykhail Popel’ to all Ruthenians in the Sambir Council on 25 [13 of Greek Calendar] May 1848 AD) (Lviv, 1848).

<sup>20</sup>Baltazar Szczucki, *Widkie sia wzięła Slachta, Pany, Panszczyzna i piddani* (From where gentry, gentlemen, serfdom and subjects came into being) (Lviv, 1848).

fear of peasants remained strong among Polish political activists in 1848. For the Polish project, it was increasingly difficult to accommodate Ruthenians inside the constructed Polish nation. Images of the barbaric peasant hordes present in Polish discourse since 1846 were projected on Ruthenians, and the Polish nation was being consolidated against them. Finally, with the establishment of the province's autonomy and the landowning gentry's hegemony in the province's politics, peasants disappeared from the agenda of Polish politicians, just as peasant deputies disappeared from the diet. Even oppositional democratic parties were seeking their popular basis in the cities and towns, not in the villages. This meant that the claims the Ruthenian movement started making to "their" peasants went unchallenged. By the time Polish organizations and activists interested in the mobilization of peasants appeared, the Ruthenian movement had been able to establish firm inroads into the countryside.

In the 1860s and 1870s, the Ruthenian movement, which by that point had been able to accommodate various identity orientations, split into two different camps, Russophiles and Ukrainians. Both camps established their own political organizations, cultural institutions, and societies for the enlightenment of the "simple people." The Kachkovskii Society was a Russophile enlightening organization, and Prosvita (Enlightenment) a Ukrainian one. This split also meant the end of the Ruthenian historical narrative as created in 1848. Significantly, this crystallization of national identity orientations occurred simultaneously with the appearance of populism. During the late 1860s and 1870s, both Russophiles and Ukrainians elaborated on the need of going to the people and devised tools for doing so. The single most important tool that could be employed at the moment by both camps was the development of popular publications.

Ukrainian popular publications, which sprouted up under the aegis of Prosvita at the end of the 1860s, differed from the histories written in the 1848 era in several crucial aspects: they emphasized not a local tradition, but the larger context of world civilization; they looked not for the whims of history and decisions of individuals, but for general laws and the logic of the development that they believed were present in history. These concepts of history appeared within the Ruthenian national movement and were associated with the Ukrainian orientation. The very first book published by Prosvita described the advancement of humanity from the "wild" to the "civilized" stage. In this scheme, language had not only a particular moral value reflecting the "spirit of the nationality," but also represented a tool by which humanity became civilized. While the appearance of writing helped humankind to overcome its primitive condition, the invention of the printing press helped it to move to the higher stage of machine civilization.<sup>21</sup> In this narrative, the printing press was presented as the main agent of modernization, fostering the democratization of politics and the transformation of legal systems on the basis of the equality of individuals.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>"Deshcho pro pysmenstvo" (Something about literature), *Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei* (Star: Readings for peasant people), Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita" (Prosvita society's publications), 1 (Lviv, 1869), 3.

<sup>22</sup>"Deshcho pro knyzhky i hazety" (Something about books and newspapers), *Zoria. Chytanochka dlia sel'skykh liudei*, ed. Volodymyr Shashkevych, Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," 5 (Lviv, 1871), 5.



However, this advance of humankind toward a higher civilization was uneven; there were different kinds of humans advancing at different speeds. Humanity was divided into five races or species, and it was emphasized that the Ruthenians belonged to the best, the white race. It was stressed that the white species of humans had subdued all the others.<sup>23</sup> While the species were ordered hierarchically, there also appeared to be a pluralist reality among white people, who were divided into language families and nations.<sup>24</sup> In this vision of humanity, the “customs” of nations were represented as being something more than just habits. They were different ways of organizing nations’ lives. Reflecting national character, they were connected more with the general rules of the advancement of civilization, dividing nations into groups more and less fit for participation in the race of progress.

A reading anthology for peasants asserted that order among humans and society itself began with the introduction of private property. This was also the starting point for the various social divisions within humanity. One of the first social divisions was the division of humankind into agricultural and nomadic populations, the former being virtuous and the latter wicked.<sup>25</sup> In yet another story, the Ruthenian nation was juxtaposed against this world of wild and nomadic peoples. Thus, the more general history of humankind became concretized into national Ruthenian history: the Ruthenians were presented as a people facing barbaric nomads from Asia and defending civilization. Ruthenians belonged to the white, settled, agricultural nations that qualified as civilized.

A description of the Ruthenian land and nation in this article informed its reader that, “as far back as the written memory of our area reaches, Ruthenians were always living in joyous and quiet cities, villages, and hamlets, loving the fields and raising bees, a free nation. Our nation was agricultural from the very beginning.” The nation enjoyed a joyous and quiet life. Rus’-Ukraine was well known in foreign countries for its balanced development. But at a certain point, the joyous development of this Eden was broken by the deluge of the “Other”: the Tartars.<sup>26</sup> So while the historical discourse of 1848 was concerned with an immediate Polish “Other,” the Ukrainian discourse had this new, nomadic “Other,” which was introduced not to strengthen some concrete animosity, but to position Ruthenians among civilized and more developed nations. In this new version of history, ancient Rus’ is attractive not because of its glorious princes, but because of its glorious civilization. National history in these narratives was described as part of a global history, but this only reinforced the national project.

Belonging to the better part of humanity objectively or at a certain point in past was, however, insufficient for keeping pace with progress. Describing contemporary Ruthenians, popular brochures represented them as being not much

---

<sup>23</sup>Anatol’ Vakhniyanyn, “Deshcho pro liudei” (Something about people), in *Zoria*, 1:18.

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>25</sup>[Volodymyr Barvins’kyi], “Deshcho pro pershykh liudei—ta pro vsiaki narody” (Something about first people and about various nations), in *Zoria*, ed. Shashkevych, 21–24.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, 34.

better than the “wild” nations. Ruthenians needed to become “human,” enlightened and wise, just as their ancestors were in the bygone golden days of ancient Rus.<sup>27</sup> This meant that Ruthenians, although belonging objectively to the white race and civilization, still needed to make a substantive effort not to slide into barbarity and inferiority. Effort was needed to overcome ignorance and apathy, to introduce and sustain reform. This is where collective agency appeared in accounts of Ruthenian history.

Nationalist discourse postulated diversity; the first Ukrainian publication talked about world and not national history. Prosvita’s publications stated that there were some natural and unsurpassable divisions in the world, such as those based on climatic differences.<sup>28</sup> Different peoples have different customs and differ from each other just as individuals do. This diversity meant the absence of some universal recipe applicable to everyone, except for some general principles: “There is a need for a nation to understand the common good and attend to it; for people to become enlightened, they need to understand how to govern themselves and to value the common good higher than the good of the individual.”<sup>29</sup> This is where a significant difference between the histories found in the popular brochures from the 1870s and 1880s, and texts written by the 1848 generation, looms large. Historical writings from 1848 lack the framework, the larger vision of humankind’s organization and its movement along the road of progress. For them, there is only individual agency, no teleology, and as a consequence no narrative of reform.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>Ivan Barvins’kyi, “Khto my? Chy narod svitlyi, chy mozhe taky liude dyki” (Who are we? Either enlightened nation, or, perhaps, wild people), *Nyva. Chytanochka dlia selian i mishchan* (Cornfield: Readings for peasants and townsmen) (Lviv, 1872).

<sup>28</sup>[V. Barvins’kyi], “Deshcho pro pershykh liudei,” 31–32.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>30</sup>For the connection between reform and teleology, see Geoff Eley, “The Meaning of ‘Reform’ in Wilhelmine Germany,” paper presented at the conference of the German Studies Association, Washington, D.C., 4–7 October 2001. It is interesting that this early Ukrainian popular cultural production still emphasized ancient Rus’ and glorified princely times, in line with the discourse from 1848. This focus on Kyivan Rus’ is seen even in the tale about the three brothers published in *Bat’kivshchyna*. However, we know that the authors of these popular publications belonged to student groups of national populists as early as the beginning of the 1860s. They had been styling themselves as heirs of the Cossack tradition, wore “Cossack dress,” and considered Cossack times to be the focal point in the development of the Ukrainian nation. These self-appointed teachers probably believed that simple people were not yet ready for the exposure to the democratic Cossack tradition and first had to be imbued with the ideas of proper civilization and culture. These popular versions of history were published along with literature on self-help, temperance, and entrepreneurial skills, which aimed at teaching peasants proper attitudes toward the new economic and political system. For an example of the glorification of ancient Rus’ as late as the 1870s, see Vinok. *Chytanochka dlia selian i mishchan* (Wreath: Readings for peasants and townsmen), Vydannia tovarystva “Prosvita,” 44 (Lviv, 1877). For Cossackophile attitudes of national populists in the 1860s, see Ostap Sereda, “Hromady rannikh narodovtsiv u skhidnii Halychyni (60-i roky XIX stolittia)” (Communities of early National-Populists in eastern Galicia), in *Ukraina: kulturna spadshchyna, natsional’na svidomist’, derzhavnist’. Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu Feodosii Stebliia* (Ukraine: Cultural heritage, national consciousness, statehood. Jubilee collection in honor of Feodosii Steblii) (Lviv, 2001), 378–92.

Another important difference between this historical narrative and one from around 1848 was the fact that, unlike the 1848 version, this one was transmitted to the peasants. Up to the 1880s, when reading clubs appeared as in-village organizations linked with the national movement, the almost exclusive vehicle for these histories was popular publications. In the absence of history in the curricula of the elementary schools, these popular publications became almost the exclusive source of historical texts available to the peasantry. Discussions of readings always involve the question of readership. We have very little in terms of the explicit statements of peasant readers about how they understood the texts they read. But we can be sure that these texts were indeed read.

The 1869 anthology *Zoria*, the first popular book published by Prosvita, sold out its printing of 2,000 copies in two weeks. A leading Russophile populist of that time, Reverend Naumovych, confirmed the success of this publication.<sup>31</sup> The whole edition was distributed in only two weeks, and no one got it free of charge—which was often the case with later popular publications, when membership in the society automatically included a subscription to the popular series.<sup>32</sup> The society's surveys showed that "economy" brochures with practical advice on how to conduct farming enjoyed lesser popularity than fiction, popular accounts of history, and geography.<sup>33</sup> Between 1869 and 1888, Prosvita published 114 popular books, amounting altogether to 711,915 copies.<sup>34</sup>

Prosvita's reports show that most popular books in the mid 1870s were sold in numbers approaching 2,000 copies a year.<sup>35</sup> Sales of the most popular titles throughout the second half of the 1870s ranged between 4,000 and 5,000 copies.<sup>36</sup> We do not have comparable data for the 1880s, because, starting with that decade, most copies of books published in popular series were distributed to those paying membership dues.

It has already been shown that the Ukrainian version of Ruthenian history was also codified and taught in the Ruthenian gymnasium textbooks starting with the 1870s.<sup>37</sup> The Polish landowning gentry who dominated the province's politics used Ukrainians to combat Russophile influences and therefore handed preparation of these textbooks to them. These textbooks codified Ukrainian national

<sup>31</sup>Mykhailo Pavlyk, *Pro rus'ko-ukrains'ki narodni chytal'ni* (On Ruthenian-Ukrainian people's reading clubs), *Naukova biblioteka* (Scientific library), 2–3 (Lviv, 1887), 97.

<sup>32</sup>Ivan Belei, *Dvadtsiat' i piat' lit istorii tovarystva "Prosvity"* (Twenty-five years of the society Prosvita), *Vydannia "Prosvity"*, 166 (Lviv, 1894), 32.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, 50.

<sup>34</sup>Stepan Pers'kyi, *Populiarna istoriia tovarystva "Prosvita"* (Popular history of the society Prosvita), *Naukovo-populiarna biblioteka tovarystva „Prosvita"* (Scientific-popular library of Prosvita society), 4, *Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita"*, 780 (Lviv, 1932), 129.

<sup>35</sup>*Spravozdanie richne z diiatel'nosti vydilu t-va "Prosvita" za chas vid 27 Maia 1875 do 15 chervnia 1876* (Report on the activities of the presidium of the society Prosvita from 27 May 1875 to 15 June 1876) (Lviv, 1876).

<sup>36</sup>*Spravozdanie z diial'nosti vydilu tovarystva "Prosvita" z 1.09.1879 do 31.12.1880* (Report on the activities of the presidium of the society Prosvita from 1.09.1876 to 31.12.1880) (Lviv, 1881).

<sup>37</sup>Ostap Sereda, "Shaping of a National Identity: Early Ukrainophiles in Austrian Eastern Galicia, 1860–1873," Ph.D. diss., Central European University, 2003, 325–36.

culture in terms of which writers and themes were included. Elementary school textbooks were published by Old Ruthenians and Russophiles longer than those for gymnasia, but the content of these elementary texts had not changed much in comparison with 1848.

While there was an elementary textbook on biblical history, there were no special textbooks on secular history for elementary schools throughout the Austrian period.<sup>38</sup> The only place where pupils of these schools could find some information on history were anthologies for reading in Ruthenian. Ruthenian reading anthologies (*chytanky*) for the first and second grades of elementary schools did not provide any information on events in secular history and limited themselves to moral stories and poems. Historical information was only in the textbooks for the third and fourth grades, while most schools in the villages were limited to one or at most two grades.

Starting in 1859, the textbooks for the third grade were composed by Bohdan Didyts'kyi, later one of the more prominent Russophiles. These books included stories from world and Austrian history, composed biographically, and some information on the composition of the Austrian Empire. Slavs figured there as a people divided into branches, and these branches were divided into further branches. Emphasis was made on Slavic unity, and the separate nations composing the Slavic people were not discussed individually. Galician-Ruthenians figured there as a branch of Slavs, but this branch's relationship with others was never clearly stated.<sup>39</sup>

The first Ruthenian textbook for elementary schools that included a separate block of texts on Ruthenian history was that for the fourth grade, and it appeared only in 1872. What is even more significant, this textbook was composed by Ukrainophile Ostap Levyts'kyi, and it followed the narrative that had been codified several years earlier by more prominent Ukrainophiles in the Ruthenian gymnasia textbooks.<sup>40</sup> This textbook in its fourth, historical chapter included thirteen texts on Ruthenian history. The first text of that chapter was entitled "What Does History Teach," and it said that history provides clues about the reasons behind the rise and fall, and strengths and weaknesses of peoples as well as of people. It told the story of Ancient Rus' from its beginnings to the downfall of the Galician-Volhynian principality, then it jumped to stories about the Zaporozhian Cossacks, Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi, and fights with the Tartars. The final section was on "ancient L'viv." It claimed the Ruthenian character of the city, describing the city's history from its founding to the mid fourteenth century as that of a typical Ruthenian city.

---

<sup>38</sup>*Istoriia bybliina staroho i novoho zavita dlia shkil narodnykh* (Biblical history of Old and New Testaments for the elementary schools) (L'viv, 1877).

<sup>39</sup>This textbook, for example, defined Czechs as a branch of Slavs, which in turn consisted of three further branches: Bohemians, Moravians, and Slovaks. *Ruska vtora chytanka dlia tretioho otriadu shkil holovnykh i horods'kykh v Tsisarstvi Avstrii* (Second Ruthenian reader for the third grade of the main and city schools in the Empire of Austria) (L'viv, 1869).

<sup>40</sup>Ostap Levytskii, *Chytanka ruska dlia chetvertoi klasy shkil narodnykh v Halychyni* (Ruthenian reader for the fourth grade of the elementary schools in Galicia) (L'viv, 1872).

This textbook took care to state that, since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, southern and northern Rus' constituted two different nations. Northern Rus', "acquiring other totally alien peoples, had to take something from them and through this admixture became different from the Ruthenians of the southern Rus'." The Galician-Ruthenian principality—especially during the reign of Danylo Romanovych—was described as "our Rus'." Chapters on Cossacks betrayed the Cossackophile sympathies of the author. While the conflicts between Cossacks and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were downplayed, their role as the bulwark against the Tartar and Turkish world was emphasized. But what the author admired among Cossacks most was their self-government: "The big man was the community among them, they governed and judged themselves, and they decided all their affairs themselves."<sup>41</sup>

With this textbook, the Ukrainophile version of Ruthenian history entered the upper grades of Galician elementary schools. It was further elaborated in textbooks by the better known Ukrainophile activists Iulian Romanchuk and Omelian Partyts'kyi.<sup>42</sup> Of these two, Romanchuk was a leading national populist, and Partyts'kyi was the editor of *Prosvita's* first popular reading anthologies for peasants. These were the textbooks to which the more educated members of the village communities were exposed in school, and those exposed to the Ukrainophile narrative in school brought it back home to their villages. Nonetheless, it seems that school textbooks played a lesser role in bringing peasants to historical self-consciousness than popular publications. In 1872, there were 136 schools in the Sambir school district, and only four had four grades and two had three grades. Of 20,251 children of school age, only 959 attended the third grade, and 264 attended the fourth—and these were the numbers for both Polish and Ruthenian schools.<sup>43</sup>

Four-year schools as a rule were attended by those preparing to enter gymnasias and were situated in larger cultural centers. Illia Hmytryk, born in 1852, attended such a school maintained by the Basilian monastery in Lavriv in the 1860s. He recalled that back in Lavriv, a teacher-monk showed his pupils a map of Europe on which Great Rus' was divided into four parts: Great, Little, White, and Galician. In the first grade at the Sambir gymnasium, Hmytryk used this knowledge to counter a Polish student, who was showing him how big Poland was in comparison with Rus'. Hmytryk insisted that European Russia was also Rus' and not the land of some foreign "Muscovites."<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>*Ruska chytanka dlia chetvertoi kliaasy shkil narodnykh v Halychyni* (Ruthenian reader for the fourth grade of the elementary schools in Galicia) (Lviv, 1876).

<sup>42</sup>Omelian Partytskii, *Ruska chytanka dlia tretioi kliaasy shkil narodnykh* (Ruthenian reader for the third grade of the elementary schools) (Lviv, 1879); Iulian Romanchuk, *Ruska chytanka dlia chetvertoi kliaasy shkil narodnykh* (Ruthenian reader for the fourth grade of the elementary schools) (Lviv, 1879).

<sup>43</sup>Tsentrāl'nyi Derzhavnyi Istorychnyi Arkhiv Ukrainy u Lvovi (Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Lviv; hereafter cited as TsDIAL), fond (hereafter, f.) 178, opys (hereafter, op.) 2, sprava (hereafter, spr.) 279, arkush (hereafter, a.) 26.

<sup>44</sup>Ivan Fylypchak and Roman Lukan', *Ts. K. Okruzhna Holovna shkola v Lavrovi 1788/89–1910/11. Istorychna Monohrafiia* (K. K. Circle Main School in Lavriv 1788/89–1910/11: A historical monograph) (Lviv, 1936), 123, 164.

The turn to people and to the people's role in history, evident in the Ruthenian elementary schools' textbooks, was something that similar Polish textbooks at that time lacked. In 1875, an attempt to introduce a "people's" history of Poland into the sixth grade of the few diet-funded urban schools was severely criticized for a departure from the biographical method, for reliance on mythical evidence, for overlooking examples worth following, and for an anti-gentry bias, which blamed the gentry alone for the decline of the motherland.<sup>45</sup>

In this context, one should reconsider the tale of three brothers published in the popular newspaper in the mid 1880s. This tale can now be understood as part of the more general national framework. In this framework, the nation was seen as the most important character on the world stage, and history, from simply producing a set of examples, became the very way the nation developed and partook in the world's advance. This kind of history was the experience of the nation, which must be shared by nation's members; it constituted the link between the individual and the national collective, and it was constitutive of these two poles of modernity. The following episode will show how this connection between history and modernity became evident for one particular person.

In the late 1870s, Mykhailo Zubryts'kyi, a peasant's son and future priest, worked during the summer as a wage laborer on the Boryslav oil fields. The international environment of the oil fields exposed Zubryts'kyi not so much to social questions, but to the significant differences between the historical consciousnesses of Western European and Ruthenian common people. Laboring together with workers from Germany, especially from Saxony, Zubryts'kyi had noticed a great knowledge of history among them. He says that every German worker knew much about Saxon princes and Martin Luther; "I was greatly surprised and compared them with our peasants working in the same oil wells."<sup>46</sup> Such a comparison strengthened Zubryts'kyi's conviction that the enlightenment of Ruthenian peasants should include national history as one of its key elements.

The story of national history published in *Bat'kivshchyna* also reflected the turn to the social occurring in the Ukrainian movement in the 1880s. The movement began speaking the language of social classes, inequalities, and struggle; the solution to social problems became an integral part of the Ukrainian project, and the whole Ukrainian project could be seen as a particular solution to underdevelopment. In the 1870s, under the influence of Ukrainian intellectuals from the Russian Empire, such as Mykhailo Drahomanov, the first Ruthenian socialists appeared in Galicia. But the impact of "socialist ideas" went far beyond the narrow circle of young socialists, and it reached the wider audience of Ruthenian students and future national populists. This was the case with Evhen Olesnyts'kyi, who, being a member of *hromada* ("community," secret societies of Ukrainian

---

<sup>45</sup>TsDIAL, f. 178, op. 2, spr. 1228.

<sup>46</sup>Viddil Rukpysiv L'vivs'koi Naukovoï Biblioteky Natsional'noi Akademii nauk Ukrainy imeni Vasylia Stefanyka (Manuscript division of L'viv Vasyl' Stefanyk Library of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine; hereafter cited as LNB NANU), collection "Vasyl' Shchurat," spr. 922, papka (hereafter, p.) 27, a. 10.

gymnasium students), read Ukrainian socialist brochures and found them totally compatible with the Christian ethics he professed.<sup>47</sup> For this generation, the nation meant first of all the “common people,” the exploited and impoverished masses, for whom national and social exploitation, as well as struggles against these exploitations, concurred with each other. This new generation believed in the agency of the masses, who were supposed to liberate themselves.

In the 1870s, the Ukrainian movement was searching for an appropriate history of Rus’ to convey this important national experience to people, but there was no text that could satisfy its demanding requirements. In fact, there were problems even with texts covering key moments in the national narrative. For example, in 1876, *The Life and Activity of Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi*, a biography of the key figure in the Cossack period, was submitted to Prosvita’s executive board for publication approval. Despite being written on the national populists’ pet topic, this history was rejected on the grounds “that the author takes a false position in understanding history in general; he ascribes various movements to single individuals and not to the nation (people).”<sup>48</sup>

In 1879, in its popular book series, Prosvita started publishing *The History of Rus’*. The first two volumes of this history were written by Ivan Nechui-Levyts’kyi, a Ukrainian writer from the Russian Empire. The task was continued by Oleksandr Barvins’kyi, who brought the history up to the Union of Lublin in 1569 with volumes published between 1880 and 1884. The assessment of the Cossack period once more encountered tremendous obstacles, the most important of which was the lack of adequate scholarship that could be reinterpreted and popularized.

The accounts of history by Galician-Ruthenians usually avoided the Cossack period, and those who tried to approach it were not up to the task, as was the case with Nehrebets’kyi, the author of the Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi biography. Therefore, Ruthenian society had to satisfy itself with short accounts of Cossack leaders and overviews of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Cossack history usually written by Ukrainians from the Russian Empire.<sup>49</sup> These publications, as well as numerous historical articles in the popular press—including the one with which this article started—can be seen as a laboratory for the creation of a new national narrative. Besides the publication of popular historical accounts outlining and testing the national historical narrative, the movement was actively soliciting a scholarly version of this narrative.

While many popular historical accounts were being published in newspapers and brochures, a more respectable series of books called the Ruthenian Historical Library was established by Oleksandr Barvins’kyi. Although this series targeted the educated strata of Ruthenian society, excerpts from its books were reprinted

<sup>47</sup>Evhen Olesnyts’kyi, *Storinky z moho zhyttia* (Pages from my life), vol. 1 (L’viv, 1935), 93–94.

<sup>48</sup>LNB NANU, collection “Mykhailo Pavlyk,” 46, p. 2, a. 35.

<sup>49</sup>[Oleksandr Konys’kyi] K. Js., K. Odovets’, *Istoriia Ukrainy za chasiv Petra Velykoho i Kateryny II* (History of Ukraine in the times of Peter the Great and Catherine II), Vydannia tovarystva “Prosvita,” 89 (L’viv, 1886); [Danylo Mordovets’] *Sahaidachnyi; Opovidanie* (Sahaidachnyi: A story), Perepoviv pislia Mordovtsia K. K. (Retold after K. K. Mordovets’), Vydannia tovarystva “Prosvita,” 102 (L’viv, 1887).

in various popular brochures and newspapers. The first book published in this series was *A Short History of Rus'* by Stefan Kachala. Originally, it was the historical part of Kachala's larger polemical book entitled *The Politics of the Poles toward the Ruthenians*, which was first published in Polish. The historical part of the book was translated into Russian and published in the journal *Kievskaiia Starina* (Kievan antiquity) as "An Outline of the History of Southwestern Rus'." This Russian version was subsequently translated into Ukrainian and published in 1886 in Ternopil' under the title *A Short History of Rus'*, and it opened the newly established series.<sup>50</sup> Parts of this work also appeared in Russophile publications.<sup>51</sup>

This story signals the beginning of an amalgamation of the historical scholarship practiced by the Ukrainian patriots in the Russian Empire with the political practice of the Ukrainian movement in Galicia. The series was important not only for its contribution to the formation of a modern Ukrainian historical narrative, but also for the establishment of this narrative's "proper" vocabulary. In this series, the adjective *Ukrainian-Ruthenian* (*Ukrain's'ko-Rus'ka*) and the noun *Ukraine-Rus'* (*Ukraina-Rus'*) acquired connotations of designating the united space of both Galicia and Russian Ukraine, and became widespread to end confusion about the difference between Ruthenian and Russian (*Rus'kyi* or *Ruskyi* and *Russkii*).<sup>52</sup> The series provided a medium for Ukrainian scholars from the Russian Empire to reach a wider public, while the Ukrainian reading public in Galicia was supplied with respectable histories. In the context of this series' publication, the search for an adequate standard and a "complete" history of Ukraine ended with the creation of a much-needed text.

Having edited the series, Oleksandr Barvins'kyi was able to write and publish his own *History of Ukraine-Rus' from Ancient Times to Our Own...* in 1890, a task he undertook at the behest of Prosvita.<sup>53</sup> It was to remain the most popular Ukrainian history until *An Illustrated History of Ukraine* was published by Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi in 1910. Just as interwar Ukrainian village reading clubs were stocked with Hrushevs'kyi's history, Barvins'kyi's history could be found in reading clubs at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The book's illustrations were printed in Vienna, and they were far superior to anything published in Ruthenian in Galicia; it also contained maps. Six thousand copies were printed, far exceeding the usual size of editions of Prosvita's popular brochures. The most popular

---

<sup>50</sup>Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, "Spomyny z moho zhyttia" (Memoirs from my life), *Ruslan*, 1913, No. 175.

<sup>51</sup>*Vinok. Chytanka dlia selian i mishchan*, Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Kachkovskoho (Kachovskii Society's publications) (L'viv, 1879).

<sup>52</sup>Up to that time, the term *Ukrainian-Ruthenian* was used to designate Ukrainians living in the Russian Empire and emphasize their relation to the Galician-Ruthenians. Sereda, "Shaping of a National Identity," 293. See also the example from Prosvita's popular publications: Omelian Ohonovs'kyi, *Zhytie Tarasa Shevchenka. Chytanka dlia selian i mishchan* (Life of Taras Shevchenko: Readings for peasants and townsmen) (L'viv, 1876), 9.

<sup>53</sup>Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, *Iliustrovana istoriia Rusy vid naidavnishykh chasiv pislia ruskykh i chuzhykh istorikov: Z dvoma istorychnymy kartamy Rusy i 40 iliustratsiiamy* (Illustrated history of Rus' from the most ancient times after Ruthenian foreign historians. With two historical maps of Rus' and 40 illustrations), *Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita"*, 125 (L'viv, 1890).



Prosvita publication, the “Illustrated Calendar,” was published in only 3,500 copies in 1886.<sup>54</sup> Prosvita’s second edition of Barvins’kyi’s history came out in 1904 in 12,000 copies. The same year, Barvins’kyi also published a brief popular edition in 40 pages “for those who do not have the time to delve into voluminous readings about our past.”<sup>55</sup> Both full and abbreviated versions were also published on the American side of the ocean, in Winnipeg, in 1914 and 1920, respectively.<sup>56</sup>

In his introduction, Barvins’kyi gave a picture of a world consisting of nations. He stressed that state borders do not coincide with the borders of nations: “Neither wide rivers nor high mountains have enough force to divide the nation. People divide land into smaller and bigger countries, states, and kingdoms, and draw borders between them, but a nation remains a nation, even if divided into two or three states or kingdoms.”<sup>57</sup> Barvins’kyi wrote that history was supposed to teach people to love their motherland and avoid the misfortunes of the past. His history also integrates the social component of the new Ukrainian discourse. The periods are evaluated as better or worse, not only in respect of the existence or nonexistence of the Ukrainian state, but according to the degree of social oppression. The book states that there was not much class differentiation in ancient Rus’. Nevertheless, the first villages of dependent people had already emerged, and the prince was the sole owner of the land, thus making a far from rosy overall picture of the period. The Cossack period was portrayed as one in which the peasant masses became the most important actors. Cossacks were represented as runaway serfs heavily oppressed by the Polish nobility. All the Cossack disturbances were represented as the mass movements of an enslaved Ukrainian nation. This period became the time most promising for the Ukrainian nation, which was not simply strong, but also democratic and egalitarian.

At this point—around 1890—we encounter a full-fledged national historical narrative created not so much on the basis of, but against the dominant Ruthenian narratives from the 1848 era. The differences between these two narratives can be seen in an imaginary dialogue between a Ukrainian national populist and a priest from the 1848 generation. The dialogue is from a novel by Volodymyr Barvins’kyi, one of the leaders of Ukrainian national populism. His character, the Ukrainian national populist, says:

In my opinion, our thousand-year-old history does not speak in favor of princes. What was their time if not the time of quarrels, inundating our land with brotherly blood,

---

<sup>54</sup>Serhii Zvors’kyi, ed., *Vydannia “Prosvit” Halychyny. Knyhy ta arkusheva produktsiia (1868–1938). Bibliohrafichnyi pokazchychk (Publications of the Prosvita of Galicia: Books and prints production [1868–1938]: A bibliographic index)* (Kiev, 1996), 57.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*, 94.

<sup>56</sup>Oleksandr Barvins’kyi, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy (z obrazkamy)* (History of Ukraine-Rus’ [with illustrations]) (Winnipeg, 1914); and *idem*, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy* (History of Ukraine-Rus’) (Winnipeg, 1920). These publications prove the importance of Barvins’kyi’s book for the whole Ukrainian national project, not only for the Ukrainian population of Galicia. These editions also testify to the popularity of Barvins’kyi’s book even after other popular narratives of Ukrainian history became available.

<sup>57</sup>Barvins’kyi, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy (z obrazkamy)*, 3.

and what was left after them but ruins and burned land? And what did Rus', in which they ruled, do? Did not townsmen rise against princely petulance and request their rights? Did not people rise later in Cossackdom for their freedom, faith and life?—It seems to me that the further we go into our history, the more visible is the people's might, the more its feeling widens, the better the tales of our past become, because more and more of human thought and feeling of humanity develops in our people.... Thus on what should we draw now, when rising to a new life—on the princes who are no [longer] and will not return, or on people who with their lives preserved for us our land, our language, our nationality?<sup>58</sup>

Besides seeing the nation as the most important historical actor, this new Ukrainian history constantly emphasized the ideals of humanism, democracy, and social equity, which were presented as the only proper tools for building relationships between the nation's members on the basis of individual rights, freedoms, and obligations. While histories of the 1848 era to a large extent were histories of the heroic deeds of individuals, the new Ukrainian history's task was to create a rational and enlightened modern subject of its reader.

When transmitting this historical narrative to peasants, the Ukrainian movement emphasized the contemporariness of this history; Ukrainian history ought to be part of the lived experience. The analysis of popular Ruthenian calendars published between 1848 and 1880 has shown that Ukrainophile calendars in the 1870s made a decisive break with older calendars, which centered on church history and ritual and introduced a particular national past in a separate "national chronology."<sup>59</sup> From the very beginning, Prosvita's "Illustrated Calendar," first published in 1880, included a "Ruthenian Chronicle." This chronicle consisted of the dates the editors thought to be of particular importance for Ruthenians.<sup>60</sup> Besides the conventional dating scheme based on the year of Christ's birth, this chronicle had a countdown indicating the number of years that separated listed events from the present. The closer to the present, the denser historical time was, with events accruing almost every year. Peasants, who constituted the bulk of the calendar's readers, were made to feel history and become conscious of their role in making history.

The "Ruthenian Chronicle" for 1885, for example, included numerous fresh important dates, such as the founding of student societies, the founding of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the deaths of local patron of enlightenment Mykhail Kachkovskii and politician Iulian Lavrovs'kyi, the founding of the newspapers *Bat'kivshchyna* and *Dilo* (Cause), the first Ruthenian People's *Viche* (general meeting; the term is borrowed from the allegedly democratic meetings of townsmen in ancient Rus') in 1881, the founding of the economic-industrial society in Stanislaviv, the death of Volodymyr Barvins'kyi, the Second Ruthenian People's *Viche*, the Jesuit takeover of the Basilian Order, and the founding of

<sup>58</sup>V. Barvins'kyi, *Skoshenyi tsvit*, 130–31.

<sup>59</sup>Sereda, "Shaping of a National Identity," 278–97.

<sup>60</sup>*Kalendar' Prosvity na rik perestupnyi 1880* (Prosvita's calendar for the next year 1880) (Lviv 1880).

the Narodna Torhivlia (People's Trade) and Zoria (Star) associations.<sup>61</sup> Bygone things were no longer of the foremost concern; current events took precedence instead. The past was seen as the prologue to the present, and the present became full of reincarnations from the past. Instead of providing a set of model historical heroes, this kind of history made historical heroes of its readers. The revival of the terms *Cossack*, *Haidamaka* (eighteenth-century social rebels in Right-Bank Ukraine closely connected with Zaporozhian Cossacks), *Sich* (Zaporozhian Host), and numerous others, applied to and used by Ukrainian peasants, should be understood in light of history's new significance.<sup>62</sup>

Popular brochures continued to supply images from national history. Even books dealing with relatively recent historical events obligatorily carried clear and simple accounts of general historical background taken from the national narrative. For example, Danylo Taniachkevych's biography of Joseph II starts with the time of ancient Rus'. After describing how glorious the princely times of ancient Rus' were, and how these times still lived on in the popular memory—that is, in wedding customs—Taniachkevych modifies this idyllic picture according to the new interpretation by the Ukrainian national movement: “[H]owever, there was no human respect for simple people, for breadmakers, back then; they were called *smerdy*.” (Here Taniachkevych implies the association with the verb *smerdyty*, that is, “to stink.”) The lesson was clear: the princes who showed no respect for the simple people ruined the Ruthenian land.<sup>63</sup>

In this Ukrainian narrative, the golden days of Ruthenian statehood did not appear all that golden, and the decline of ancient Rus' was almost predestined by social conflict. Accordingly, the “dark age of slavery” did not begin with the annexation of the Old Rus' principalities. Polish and Lithuanian rule at first did not appear that bad, but worsened when the nobility came to dominate the state: “Beyond [the nobility], nonnoble people were not heard; people did not have a free voice or the right to manage [their own affairs] according to their own needs.”<sup>64</sup> In this kind of narrative, the “Dark Age” began in the sixteenth century, coinciding with the imposition of serfdom. The times are “dark” not so much because of the disappearance of Rus's own princes, but because of the oppression or enslavement of the common people under serfdom.

Taniachkevych wrote that only after becoming a part of the Austrian state did “our new, merrier tale begin.”<sup>65</sup> This new situation was merrier for Ukrainians

---

<sup>61</sup>*Iliustrovanyi Kalendar' tovarystva "Prosvita" na rik zvychainyi 1885* (Prosvita's illustrated calendar for the usual year 1885) (Lviv 1884).

<sup>62</sup>I refer to the practices of Sich, the peasant firefighting and gymnastic organization; to the popular songs written at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, in which Galician Ukrainians appeared as Cossacks and Haidamakas; and to the popular plays in which peasants eagerly played historical figures from the Cossack past.

<sup>63</sup>Danylo Taniachkevych, *Tsisar' Iosyf II i narid ruskii. V stolitnu pamiatku vstuplenia na tron avstriiskii seho nezabutnogo tsisaria* (Emperor Joseph II and Ruthenian people. On the hundredth anniversary of the accession to the Austrian throne of the unforgettable emperor), *Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita,"* 58 (Lviv, 1880), 10.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid.*, 16.

not just because there were more rights for the Ruthenian language and peasant economic conditions had improved; it was merrier because the reforms of enlightened absolutism signaled a return to civilization and were grounded on the principles of the Enlightenment. At first, peasants were transferred from the jurisdiction of *dominia*, or manors, to the state district courts “to protect the peasants from their landlords’ violence and abuse.... In a year after this, the abolition of servitude [*piddanstvo*] came, meaning the recognition of the peasant as a human.”<sup>66</sup> Taniachkevych explains what it meant to be human. Peasants received rights of which they were deprived during servitude: the rights “to own land, to marry, or to life,” in other words, property, a private life, and legal and social protection.<sup>67</sup>

Thus, the approach to ancient Rus’ was twofold. On the one hand, there were attractive aspects, including communal self-government and elections. On the other hand, there was the self-will of the princes and the formation of a social elite around princely courts—the elite that readily betrayed Rus’ by becoming Polish in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russian in the Russian Empire. It was no longer the princes that had to be praised in the history of ancient Rus’, but the people. According to this logic, the “foreign” Austrian state appears to be more attractive than “native” Ancient Rus’.

In respect of these basics of national history, there was no difference between the national populist and radical wings in the Ukrainian movement. In his popular brochures, the radical Ivan Franko emphasized the democracy of ancient Rus’ and the glorious past of the *viches* and self-governed communities, just as national populists did.<sup>68</sup> Mykhailo Pavlyk, another founder of the radical movement and a disciple of Mykhailo Drahomanov, also believed that “the spirit of Ruthenian-Ukrainian history [was] the spirit of freedom and equality.”<sup>69</sup>

The modification of the description of the princely period coincided with the transfer of the pivotal point in Ukrainian history in the 1880s from ancient Rus’ to the period of great mass movements. This was the so-called Cossack period, with which the national movement identified most and onto which it projected its desired experience. United, not torn by social conflict, Cossack and peasant masses smashing the yoke of Polish landlords so much resembled the imagined Ukrainian nation where national and social boundaries coincided, delimitating

---

<sup>66</sup>*Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*, 19–21.

<sup>68</sup>[Ivan Franko] Myron, *Rozmovy v Dobrovil’skii chytal’ni. Rozmova pro hroshi i skarby. Z predmovoiiu o zalozheniu dobrovil’skoi chytal’ni* (Talks in the Dobrovolia Reading Club: Talk about money and hordes. With a preface on the founding of the Dobrovolia Reading Club) (Lviv, 1883), 12–14. Only socialists had a different view of history, sometimes even rejecting its usefulness at all. In the 1870s, when the first group of socialists appeared, quite often they voiced their protests against the idyllic images of the national past created by national populists. Starting in the 1880s, with the turn away from Marxist theory and toward the reality of an overwhelmingly peasant society, Ukrainian radicals, as well as the Ruthenian Ukrainian Radical Party they created in 1890, used narratives of national history in which the social aspect was firmly established.

<sup>69</sup>Pavlyk, *Pro Rus’ko-Ukrains’ki*, 180–81.

a perfect harmonious body whose protection and liberation would be on the agenda of any emancipation project.

The history of the Ukrainian peasantry was written in perfect harmony with the national narrative outlined above, and this history's culmination was 1848, the year of emancipation. In 1897—the year of the “bloody” Badeni elections—Ivan Franko finished the book *Serfdom and Its Abolition in Galicia*, whose purpose he described as follows: “For a long time, I wished to present to our peasantry the history of the peasant estate, told clearly, accessibly, and without too much [pseudo-]learning.”<sup>70</sup> About the abolition of *robot* he wrote, “The more our people will attain the consciousness of their rights and interests, the more majestically will they celebrate the memory of the day that gave them the opportunity for development and gave them human and economic freedom.”<sup>71</sup> Then followed the story of serfdom, which was presented as the enslavement of the peasantry by the nobility, accomplished with the support of state authorities through the legal system of the Polish state: “[T]his was a terrible hell. And it was increasing, not decreasing.” Cossacks and *haidamaks* in this new Ukrainian history appeared as defenders of the simple people and the nation at the same time. The sufferings and victories of the peasantry were the sufferings and victories of the nation.

The mode in which these historical texts were received had also begun to change in the 1880s. This was the decade when the national movement's activity in the countryside became based on village reading clubs. In the 1890s, Prosvita itself changed into the umbrella organization for these reading clubs. Popular histories were read in these institutions, staged in amateur performances, and embodied in reading clubs' decorations. National history was used as an example even in the correspondence of Prosvita's executives with the village reading clubs.<sup>72</sup> In the 1890s, possession of the *History of Rus'* was represented as a sure sign of a village's advancement and loyalty to the national cause.<sup>73</sup> Historical books, especially Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi's biography and the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, figure among peasants' favorites in the reports from village reading clubs.<sup>74</sup>

Publishers and distributors of popular history, themselves active in the national movement, observed their reading public and its tastes closely. Even at the very first stage of popular publishing, when peasants did not understand the difference between the real and the fictional and did not pay any attention to the

---

<sup>70</sup>Ivan Franko, “Peredmovna do pershoho vydannia *Panshchyna ta її skasuvannia 1848 r. v Halychyni*” (Preface to the first edition of *Serfdom and Its Abolition in Galicia in 1848*), in idem, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh* (Collected works in fifty volumes), vol. 47 (Kiev, 1986), 8.

<sup>71</sup>Ivan Franko, “Panshchyna ta її skasuvannia 1848 r. v Halychyni” (*Serfdom and its abolition in Galicia in 1848*), in idem, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, 47:8.

<sup>72</sup>TsDIAL, f. 348, op. 1, spr. 3890, a. 36–39.

<sup>73</sup>See, for example, Stupnytskii, K., “Z-pid Sambora” (From near Sambir), *Dilo* (Cause) 63 (1893). “Skazhim sobi pravdu!” (Let's tell ourselves the truth!), *Poslannyk* (Messenger) 4 (1899).

<sup>74</sup>And it did not matter if this was a radical reading club or reading club run by the local priest. Compare, for example, reports from Kornalovychi and Mshanets' in the Sambir district. TsDIAL, f. 348, op. 1, spr. 3928, a. 14; f. 348, op. 1, spr. 3039, a. 37.

aesthetic qualities of the text, they liked history.<sup>75</sup> In Prosvita's early publications, explanations of the social world, history being part of it, went together with an explanation of the material world, with some basics of geography, physics, and biology. Articles on the nation went hand in hand with the articles "On Air" and "On Water." At the same time, no strict difference was maintained between "scientific" histories and historical fiction. Historical biographies resembled historical fiction published in popular brochures. Only around 1900 did a visible differentiation emerge between the two, and this was connected with the observed increasing ability of the reading public to discriminate between various genres.

Around 1900, the reformers from the national movement stopped being afraid of giving the peasants the old stories and apocryphal legends, which they had been fighting against several decades earlier. In 1901, several apocryphal legends were republished from eighteenth-century books. It was said that they were published not because of the truth one could find there, but as a vehicle for expressing the thoughts, views, beliefs, and attitudes that were current back then.<sup>76</sup> A popular history of Russia translated from Russian was published in the Prosvita series.<sup>77</sup> Among the novels and novellas on Ukrainian history, the majority concentrated on Cossack times, especially on the times of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi.<sup>78</sup>

While Ukrainian histories in the 1870s and 1880s made this qualitative leap forward in comparison with the 1848 narratives, Russophiles failed to do so. They continued to write in the tradition of 1848, concentrating on dates and rulers while lacking the sense of purposeful development and participation in history that figured so prominently in Ukrainian publications. There were attempts to bring some figures from the Russian pantheon down to the local peasantry. For example, in 1879, a biography of the Muscovite prince Dmitrii Ivanovich, who defeated the Tartars on Kulikov Field in 1380, was published, thus turning him into one of the first historical figures celebrated in Russophile publications. The brochure called for the celebration of the five hundredth anniversary of the battle on Kulikov Field. However, the cult of St. Dmitrii never got off the ground in Galicia, and the planned commemoration did not happen.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>75</sup>Cited in Ivan Kryp'iakhevych, "Knyzhka na seli" (Book in the Village), *Dilo* 32 (1908).

<sup>76</sup>Volodymyr Hnatiuk, *Starokhrystyians'ki liegendy. Iz knyhy "Narodovishchaniie"* (Old Christian tales: From the book *Tales for People*), Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," 259 (Lviv, 1901), with a foreword by Ivan Franko.

<sup>77</sup>M. Blahovieshchens'kyi, *Istoriia Moskovshchyny do Petra Velykoho* (History of Muscovy to Peter the Great), Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," 264–65 (Lviv, 1902).

<sup>78</sup>V. Shch., *Bohdaniv synok* (Bohdan's son), Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," 271 (Lviv, 1902). Others like this include M. N., *Het'mans'ki svaty* (Hetman's matchmakers), Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," 281–82 (Lviv, 1903); N. M., *Smert' Tymosha* (Death of Tymish), Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," 286 (Lviv, 1904); Za Mykoloiiu Kostomarovym, *Dvi oblohy Lvova. Pereiaslavs'ka uhoda* (Two sieges of Lviv: The Agreement of Pereiaslav), Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," 304–5 (Lviv, 1905); N. Tykhyi, *Oleksii Popovych. Opovidanie z kozats'kykh chasiv* (Oleksii Popovych: Tale from Cossack times), Vydannia tovarystva "Prosvita," 291 (Lviv, 1904).

<sup>79</sup>[Dmytrii Vintskovskii], *Pamiaty slavnoykh liudei* (To the memory of famous people), *Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Mykhaila Kachkovskoho v Kolomyi*, 49 (Lviv, 1879). It seems that this insistence

Back in the 1870s, Russophiles as a rule maintained a strict distinction between pragmatic advice on subjects such as farming, credit, and hygiene and history, which, together with religious stories and aphorisms, would enrich peasants spiritually.<sup>80</sup> Even at the beginning of the twentieth century, history with an emphasis on the agency of people—history glorifying the masses and their movements—was for them too revolutionary.<sup>81</sup> An important problem for Russophiles was the fact that histories of Little or Southwestern Russia, which they saw as the territory and population closest to Galician-Ruthenians in terms of ethnographic composition and historical experience, were written in Russian, but by Ukrainian patriots. As Anna Veronika Wendland has noted, the popular historical production of Russophiles unwittingly had much in common with the Ukrainian version of history.<sup>82</sup> But she does not notice the important differences between the modes in which the same themes were discussed and explained in Ukrainian and Russophile publications. This difference was the consequence of the Russophiles' conservatism, which Wendland has analyzed. The appearance of "Ukrainian themes" in Russophile publications also seems to be a response to the success and popularity of the Ukrainian version of Ruthenian history.

The first Russophile popular history, Didytskii's *People's History of Rus'*, published in 1866–68, never made its way down to the peasants because of its sheer size and inaccessible style. It ended with the death of Bohdna Khmel'nyts'kyi in 1657. Russophile histories targeting peasants appeared again only in the 1880s. As a prelude, we can take Evgenii Zgarskii's *History of Galician Rus'*, which appeared in the series of Russophile popular brochures; the first part was published in a reading anthology in 1877 and the second one in 1881. The book covered only the princely period until the eleventh century and consisted of biographies and a colorful description of events with little explanation of any larger meanings or developments.<sup>83</sup> Bohdan Didytskii's more accessible version of Ruthenian history appeared in 1885, followed by his *Ruthenian Chronicle* in 1887.

Didytskii's new versions of history include events primarily from Galician Rus', but also from greater Ukraine, such as the anti-Polish Cossack wars. He argues that he had to include events from "Ukrainian Rus'" because they touched upon Galicia as well, and "many Galicians joined Cossacks and resettled with

---

on the celebration of St. Dmitrii Day was the idea of only the author of this text, whose name was also Dmytrii, and who was among the most prolific authors of the Russophile popular publications.

<sup>80</sup>"Iz Sambora" (From Sambir), *Slovo* (Word) 64 (1878).

<sup>81</sup>Radical, sometimes secret, student organizations at the beginning of the twentieth century even in their leaflets were using this notion. See, for example, the leaflet by an unknown organization that said, "History teaches that without revolution no nation can liberate itself... We should not be just a litter (*pidstylka*) of history, we should create it consciously." Oddział Rękopism Biblioteki Jagiełłońskiej (Manuscript division of the Jagiellonian Library), Cracow, sygn.8109/III.

<sup>82</sup>Anna Veronika Wendland, *Die Russophilen in Galizien. Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Rußland 1848–1915* (Vienna, 2001), 311.

<sup>83</sup>Evgenii Ia. Zgarskii, *Istoriia Galitskoi Rusi* (History of Galician Rus'), Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Mikhaïla Kachkovskogo, 63 (Mart, 1881).

them in free Ukraine.”<sup>84</sup> His line of Ruthenian heroes includes St. Vladimir, Danylo, Lev, Khmel’nyts’kyi, and the nineteenth-century Greek Catholic Metropolitan Iakhymovych, thus combining Ukrainian elements with largely local history. According to Didytskii, the purpose of “historical self-consciousness” was in feeling the connection between past and present, and in the concrete situation of the Ruthenian peasantry—in realizing that the Ruthenian people were a historical nation in Galicia, that is, an older nation able to claim the land as its motherland.<sup>85</sup> In his *Chronicle*, Didytskii mentions fewer contemporary events than the Ukrainophiles, and of them, those connected with church and ritual figure prominently—for example, the founding of the Stanislaviv diocese and the consecration of the cathedral in Przemyśl.<sup>86</sup>

The Ukrainian version of history was more appealing and enjoyed popularity even among peasants who were under the influence of the Russophile Kachkovskii Society. And, perhaps, the inability of Russophiles to provide a viable historical narrative contributed to the victory of the Ukrainian identity orientation among the Ruthenian peasantry. A case in point is Pavlo Dumka, a peasant from Kupchyntsi and a member of the Kachkovskii Society, who in the 1890s became a member of the Ruthenian-Ukrainian Radical Party.

In 1884, Pavlo Dumka sent a letter to the executive board of the Kachkovskii Society, including a poem he had written and dedicated to the leaders of the society. In this poem, he wished them well-being and immortality in the people’s memory, saying that Ruthenian children would learn about them for generations. He compared the anticipated glory of these leaders to the glory of Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi, Severyn Nalyvaiko, and Petro Doroshenko—three Cossack hetmans from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—“and the one loved by us ... Taras Shevchenko.”<sup>87</sup> At least one of these heroes, Petro Doroshenko, was a totally Ukrainian figure, incompatible with the heroes of Russian history, and all of them together formed a clearly Ukrainian pantheon. Perhaps the leaders of the Russophile society were not too happy with Dumka’s simile.

The source of Dumka’s historical knowledge becomes clear in a letter written to Oleksandr Barvins’kyi, at that time the editor of the Ruthenian Historical Library, by several members of the reading club in Kupchyntsi, Pavlo Dumka being one of them and, perhaps, the actual author of the letter. This letter is from the early 1880s and says the following:

As far we have found, publishing the history of Ukraine-Rus’ is a cause of great importance, which sums up our past, shows [to us] the footsteps of our parents’ path, where they slipped and where we should step now in order not to die without a trace and to find a more or less decent position in the world.

---

<sup>84</sup>Bohdan A. Didytskii, *Litopys’ Rusi* (Chronicle of Rus’), Izdaniia Obschestva imeni Mikhaïla Kachkovskogo, 134 (Lviv, 1887), 75.

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., 5.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., 49.

<sup>87</sup>TsDIAL, f. 182, op. 1, spr. 6, a. 2–3.



Honor and glory to you for your great labor, may God reward you a hundred times more. Accept our small contribution, and if God wills, each of us will donate separately [more], because this is our bible and law, which should be in every house, and then we shall be a nation as others are, because we shall know ourselves....

Sincere thanks for the already published books, and may God reward this labor a hundred times more and make it sweeter and help "Khmel'nyts'kyi" to emerge into the world from the publisher's slavery, and [may God make people to] greet him in as great numbers as possible so that our hero will appear in every corner [of our land].<sup>88</sup>

In 1925, the reading club of the small, three-hundred-person village of Morozovychi near Sambir, not having fully recovered from the damage inflicted by World War I, had in its library seventy books. The club had been founded in 1892, and the majority of its library's holdings were published before 1914. Of these seventy books, twenty-eight were either popular histories or historical fiction dealing almost exclusively with Ukrainian topics. Of these twenty-eight books, fifteen were on the Cossack period.<sup>89</sup>

In the end, some Russophiles were forced to abandon the Russian version of Ruthenian history and accept the basic scheme of the Ukrainian national narrative. In 1868, the Russophile historian Bohdan Didyts'kyi published his *Elementary History of Rus' from the Beginning to Modern Times*. In this book, he closely follows Karamzin's narrative of Russian history, and after discussing the princely times, he moves on to the struggle of the Muscovite princes Ivan III and Vasiliu Ivanovich against the Poles and centers his narrative on Muscovite/Russian princes, tsars, and emperors (empresses). This history was deemed unfit for Galician purposes. It has never been republished. When in 1885 Didyts'kyi published his *Ruthenian Chronicle for the Ruthenian People in Galicia* (here "Ruthenian" could also be understood as "Russian"), he gave up following Karamzin and presented the version of history resembling that of the Ukrainians. After the discussion of the princely period, the book turns to the Cossacks, Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, and Ivan Mazepa.<sup>90</sup>

A popular version of the Russophile historical narrative was Teodor Ripets'kyi's *Illustrated Popular History of Rus'*, the preface of which acknowledges that Didyts'kyi's books were inaccessible to the masses of the Ruthenian people.<sup>91</sup> Ripets'kyi's history also accepts the basics of the Ukrainian narrative, from the decline of ancient Rus' to the Cossacks and the Cossack wars, and from there to the revival of the nineteenth century, with attention to popular movements and masses. However, in this account, shorter summaries of the events in "Great

<sup>88</sup>O. Barvins'kyi, "Spomyny z moho zhyttia."

<sup>89</sup>TsDIAL, f. 348, op. 1, spr. 3890, a. 11.

<sup>90</sup>Jaroslav Hrytsak, "Iakyykh-to kniaziv byly stolytsi v Kyievi?...: do konstruiuvannia istorychnoi pam'iaty halyts'kykh ukrainsiv u 1830-1930-ti roky" ("Capitals of which princes were in Kiev?...": Toward the construction of the historical memory of Galician Ukrainians in the 1830s-1930s), *Ukraina moderna* (Modern Ukraine) 6 (2001): 86.

<sup>91</sup>Teodor Ripets'kyi, *Iliustrovanaia narodnaia istoriia Rusy* (Illustrated people's history of Rus') (L'viv, 1905), 4-5.

Russia” are given, and all the pro-Russian figures in Ukrainian history become positive, while those who were anti-Russian are portrayed negatively. Both Didyts’kyi’s and Ripets’kyi’s books can be seen as precursors of the post–World War II Soviet Ukrainian historical narrative. I am not claiming that there was any continuity between the two, but rather I am suggesting that they constituted a similar response to the Ukrainian national history and its powerful popular appeal. The Ukrainian model could no longer be simply rejected; it had to be accommodated.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, many Russophiles also felt a need to delimitate clearly their own and the Ukrainian versions of history. One of these attempts was Dmytrii Vintskovskii’s *Our History in Questions and Answers*. It stated the unity of all three branches of eastern Slavs in one Russian nation and rejected the idea that Ukraine had any historical right to separate nationhood. It describes the transfer of Russian (Ruthenian) statehood from the southern Rus’ to the northern Rus’ and the reunion of the southern Russians with the great Russians in 1654 under the leadership of Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi. Characteristically, Vintskovskii sees recent Ukrainian social radicalism as the further development of an intrigue by Russia’s enemies, aimed at splitting up the nation.<sup>92</sup>

To conclude, the viability of the nationalist historical construction outlined in this article was determined by the viability of the larger nationalist project of which it was constitutive, and by which it was constituted. The task of this nationalist history was not limited to “othering” an enemy and building a set of plausible oppositions between “us” and “them.” To be experienced, this history had to resonate with the more general project of modernity in which it was partaking. The nationalist project not only imagined national history as opposed to the other’s history, this project also imagined itself as a necessary part of a world history, which consisted of the plurality of national histories. Nationalist history imagined nations, or peoples, to be the most important historical actors, and thus it was constitutive of the “pluralist realities” of the modern world. The nationalist myth was not set up once and forever; it did not constitute a set of beliefs or ideas, an irrational and distorted image of a world inhabited by friends and foes. To understand the nationalist myth, we must approach it as political practice, as a complex project of negotiation correlating itself with actual political and social problems, as one of the many “enchantments” of modernity.<sup>93</sup> The nationalist myth made history one of the modern “authentic” experiences necessary for a strong and exclusive identity.

From this point of view, the origin of great nationalist histories should be sought within the larger field of nationalist practice, in which the histories were not only cultural capital, but the tool with which individuals obtained modern identity and experienced the nation. Therefore, Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyi’s rewriting

---

<sup>92</sup>[Dmytro Vintskovskii], *Nasha istoriia v voprosakh i otvetakh* (Our history in questions and answers), *Izdaniia Obshchestva imeni Mikhaïla Kachkovskoho*, 330–31 (Lviv, 1903).

<sup>93</sup>Katherine Verdery, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change* (New York, 1999).

of the history of Eastern Europe should be evaluated not only in the context of historical scholarship and of history as an academic practice, but also in the context of the larger nationalist project entailing modern history. From this perspective, Hrushevs'kyi's "Copernican turn"<sup>94</sup> in the history of Eastern Slavdom—from the history of Rus' dynasties and states to the history of East Slavic peoples—can be seen as a logical consequence of the development of the Ukrainian historical narrative, as constructed and tested in Ukrainian popular publications in Galicia.

---

<sup>94</sup>It is with these words that some Ukrainian historians refer to Hrushevs'kyi's article, "Zvychna skhema "russkoi" istorii i sprava ratsional'noho ukladu istorii Skhidniogo Slov'ianstva" (Usual scheme of "Russian" history and a problem of the rational structure of history of eastern Slavdom), *Stat'i po slav'ianovedeniiu* (Articles in Slavic studies) 2 (1904): 298–304.