WHO ARE THE UKRAINIANS? - Part Two, from the Polish partitions to 1860 (Emancipation of the Serfs in Russia and reform of the Habsburg monarchy)
Essay by Peter Brooke first published in *Church and State*, No.148, April-June, 2022

RUTHENIANS IN AUSTRIA

Prior to the partitions of Poland which began in 1772 the people who were to become 'Ukrainians' mainly held in common their refusal to exchange the Eastern rite in Church Slavonic for the Western, Latin rite that the Polish/Lithuanian government wished to impose on them. They were divided between the Orthodox and the 'Uniates' - those who, keeping the Eastern rite together with a married clergy, nonetheless were willing to accept the authority of the Pope and the distinctive doctrines of the Catholic Church. The Orthodox Metropolitan of Kiev, however, had, in 1679, placed himself under the Patriarchate of Moscow, a decision ratified by Constantinople in 1686, so that even the west bank Orthodox, still under Polish rule, were, ecclesiastically, subject first to the Patriarch of Moscow then to the 'Holy Synod' established by Peter I. Pospielovsky, whom I used as a main source of my previous article, gives the impression that the Orthodox were in a strong position since they were guaranteed protection by Peter the Great after he had saved the Polish Commonwealth, submerged by a Swedish invasion, at the Battle of Poltava.[1] But according to the account of Barbara Skinner, Associate Professor of History, Indiana State University:

'by 1710, continued conversions of other Orthodox bishops in the Commonwealth to the Uniate faith left only one Orthodox hierarch, the Bishop of Mohylew [Mogilev] in Belarus, in the entire Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth ... Becoming in 1685 subordinate to the Russian patriarch (rather than to Constantinople), the Kievan Metropolitan's attention was now focused eastward, on Kiev's new role as the Orthodox cultural and educational center in the Muscovite state, not to the impoverished parishes across the Polish border. The Orthodox population there had no sense of belonging to a diocese at all, and their religious life was in shambles. Most commonly, vagrant priests and monks ordained in Moldavia came into the right-bank parishes. They were poorly educated and barely capable of administering parishes.'

Pospielovsky, himself Orthodox and very hostile to the Uniates, argues that the situation of the Uniates, lacking Russian protection, was even worse than that of the Orthodox and that it was further worsened by its reorganisation in the Synod of Zamosc, which approved the essentially hostile policy of the Polish government, thus provoking a massive turn towards Orthodoxy. Skinner, however (and I'm inclined to believe her) argues the opposite:

'Meanwhile, the Uniate Church in the Commonwealth began a process of self-strengthening, particularly following its Council of Zamosc in 1720 that prescribed more regulated parish and diocesan administration and better training for priests reminiscent of the Catholic Church's Council of Trent ... In the face of ineffective Orthodox Church organization in the eastern palatinates at this time, Polish

---

[1] Dimitry Pospielovsky: The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia, Crestwood NY, St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1998, p.101.

landlords resettling the area for the most part installed Uniate priests brought from adjacent Uniate dioceses and built Uniate churches, resulting in the gradual conversion of the peasantry in right-bank Ukraine to the Uniate faith. In just a few decades, then, the Uniate Church made dramatic progress in expanding its jurisdiction eastward until the eastern border of the Uniate faith essentially coincided with the new Dnepr River border between the Commonwealth and the Russian Empire. Official church registers reveal that the number of Uniate parishes in right-bank Ukraine increased from about 150 in 1730 to nearly 1900 by 1764, while at the same time the number of Orthodox parishes shrank to several dozen.' [2]

Pospielovsky has it that *'By 1795, over 2,000 Orthodox Parishes of the Right-Bank* [West bank - PB] *Ukraine had returned to Orthodoxy.'* He presents this as a continuous process prompted by the Latinising policies of the Polish government and the Synod of Zamosc. But he neglects to mention the Koliivshchyna rebellion which broke out in 1768. According to Skinner it took the form of a large scale Orthodox massacre of the Uniates, as well as of Poles, Catholics and Jews, resulting eventually in the partitions, which greatly facilitated the conversion of Uniates to Orthodoxy in the territories taken by Russia.

In Galicia, by contrast, once it came under Austrian rule in the partition of 1772, the situation of the Uniates was greatly improved. Though in a stronger position than the Orthodox under Polish rule, they were still regarded as very much second class Catholics without the same political rights as Roman Catholics (in this context the terms 'Roman' Catholic refers to those using the Latin rite). But once under Austrian rule, according to the Canadian-Ukrainian historian, John-Paul Himka: *'Perhaps in no process of nation-building did the institution of the church play as great a role as in that of the Ukrainians of Austrian Galicia.'*[3]

He continues (pp.428-430):

'In June 1774 [the Austrian Empress - PB] *Maria Theresa announced her intention "to do away with everything that might make the Uniate people believe they are regarded as worse than the Roman Catholics." In the next month she decreed that henceforth the term Uniate was to be banished from private as well as public usage and replaced by the term Greek Catholic. Joseph II* [Maria Theresa's son and successor - PB] *curbed the Basilian order* [4] *by claiming as the imperial prerogative the right to appoint bishops from either the black or white clergy and by subordinating the Basilian monks to the Greek Catholic hierarchy. He also took measures to improve the economic status of the parish clergy. Crucial educational institutions were established by the Habsburgs: the seminary for Greek Catholics attached to St. Barbara's Church in Vienna (the so-called Barbareum), founded in 1774 and replaced by a*

---

[2] Barbara Skinner: 'Borderlands of Faith: Reconsidering the origins of a Ukrainian tragedy', *Slavic Review*, Vol.64, No.1 (Spring 2005), pp.97-8

[3] John-Paul Himka: 'The Greek Catholic Church and nation-building in Galicia, 1772-1918', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol.8, No.3/4 (December 1984).

[4] The Synod of Zamosc had put all Uniate monasteries under the control of the Basilian order which had been formed in the sixteenth century on the model of the Jesuits, as a Counter-Reformation initiative to combat Orthodoxy and facilitate the polonisation of the Ruthenians. The 'black' clergy is the monastic, therefore celibate, clergy. The 'white' clergy could be married. The requirement that Bishops should come from the ranks of the unmarried clergy was a point the Uniates had in common with the Orthodox.

general seminary in Lviv in 1783, and the imperial seminary residence (Convict) for Greek Catholics, founded in Vienna in 1803. The culmination of the Austrian reforms was the reestablishment, in 1808, of the Galician metropolitan see ...

'The Habsburgs, especially Joseph II, saw the role of the clergy as promoters of secular enlightenment; that conception struck deep roots in the newly reborn (and grateful) Greek Catholic church. The enlightened monarchs had not only established the institutions that revitalized the Greek Catholic Church, but had implanted an ideal code of behavior in Greek Catholic clergymen that admitted no contradiction, or even strong distinction, between the propagation of the faith and of secular knowledge, between the nurture of good Christians and of good citizens.'

The immediate effect in the early nineteenth century was the emergence of an educated clergy able to mix in high (meaning at the time, Polish) society and therefore that much further removed from the normally illiterate and uneducated Ruthenian peasantry, but by mid-century, the clergy had begun to engage in a work of popular education. Himka again (p.431): *'Characteristic of the mentality of Greek Catholic episcopal enlighteners was a regulation* [the Uniate Metropolitan - PB] *Levyts'kyi issued for his seminarians in 1831: it made attendance at agronomy classes compulsory, because pastors would be expected to introduce their parishioners to better farming techniques.'*

The Greek Catholic Church, rather than using the vernacular spoken by the Ruthenian peasantry, had developed a language of its own - *'a curious hotchpotch known as* yasychie, *a compound of Church Slavonic and Ukrainian with some admixture of Polish and Russian.'*[5] The 1830s, though, saw the emergence of the 'Ruthenian triad', making the first effort in Galicia to develop a sense of the distinctiveness of Ruthenian culture not based on religion and using the native language:

'Their programme was exclusively cultural. It called for recognition of the cultural unity of all the Ukrainian lands and of the folk language as the basis of a new national literature, and it asserted the separate identity of this language and literature within the Slavonic family. It stressed the historical link between the present and the glorious past as exemplified in Kievan Rus' and the Cossacks, and it pointed to the peasantry as the most valuable element in the contemporary national community.' (Brock: Vahylevych, p.156).

It was all on a very small scale, though, and though the 'triad' - Markiian Shashkevych, Iakiv Holovats'kyi, and Ivan Vahylevych - were all trainee priests based in Lviv, their efforts were

---

[5] Peter Brock: 'Ivan Vahylevych (1811-1866) and the Ukrainian national identity', *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, Vol.14, No.2, 'UKRAINE' (Summer 1972), p.155. I regret the use of the word 'Ukrainian' in discussing Galician at this time. According to Himka it wasn't until the end of the nineteenth century that Galicians began to describe themselves as Ukrainian. He admits that when he himself uses the term to talk about this period he is being anachronistic: 'At least until the turn of the century, the Eastern-rite, Ukrainian-speaking inhabitants of Austria-Hungary referred to themselves as "Ruthenians" (rusyny) and to their conationals across the Russian border as "Ukrainians" (ukraintsi). As of 1900, nationally conscious Ukrainians in Galicia shunned this distinction and began referring to themselves, too, as "Ukrainians." The formulation of the goal of national statehood contributed to the terminological reorientation. For the purposes of this article I have retained the original terminology only in quotations from sources; otherwise I make use of a commonly accepted anachronism and call the "Ruthenians" "Ukrainians."' - 'Young Radicals and Independent Statehood: The Idea of a Ukrainian Nation-State, 1890- 1895', *Slavic Review*, Vol.41, No.2 (Summer, 1982), p.221, fn.

strongly discouraged by the church authorities, more for linguistic than cultural or political reasons. The church stood by its own language, based on Church Slavonic and remote from the vernacular spoken by the peasantry, as an appropriate vehicle for a Ruthenian literary culture. Nor were the triad at the time particularly political-minded. Indeed they never showed an interest in national separation:

'Shashkevych was to die unexpectedly early in the next decade, while Holovats'kyi and Vahylevych set out on divergent paths, which would lead in Holovats'kyi's case to the exchange of Ukrainian identity for Russian nationality and in Vahylevych's case to close identification with the cause of Polish political nationalism.' (Brock: Vahylevych, p.158)

UKRAINIANS IN RUSSIA

The territory taken by Austria in 1772 had been a relatively stable part of Poland. It still had a Polish majority with substantial Jewish and Ruthenian minorities. Ruthenian peasant discontent had taken the form of an exodus eastward to join the tumultuous Cossacks in the area West of the Dnieper, which was to be taken by Russia in the 1790s. Insofar as it was organised - meaning insofar as it as organised by the Greek Catholic Church - the Ruthenian society left in Galicia was strongly pro-Austrian. It was only after 1848 that other possibilities - Polish integration, Russian integration, or independent statehood - began to develop on a large scale.

The area taken by Russia in the 1790s, by contrast, was extremely unstable. It had been devastated by the 'haidamaky' uprisings which began in 1734 and culminated in the Koliivshchyna rebellion of 1768. This had been provoked by the Polish nobility's formation of the 'Confederation of Bar' in opposition to the influence Russia was exercising on the last King of Poland, Stanislaw II August. Barbara Skinner argues also that, in addition to the Polish Catholic/Cossack Orthodox conflict there was also a raw conflict between Orthodox and Uniate, that is between two groups who could be called 'Ukrainian', prompted by Orthodox efforts at conversion in the area West of the Dnieper and a Uniate pushback. The Orthodox Cossacks believed they had Russian support - there was a forged *ukaz* from Catherine II, the 'Golden Decree', calling on the Cossack leader Zalizniak and his followers "to enter the lands of Poland ... and slay, with the aid of God, all the Polish and Jewish blasphemers of our holy religion" (Skinner: Borderlands, p.109). But in the event it was the Russian army, in alliance with the Royal Polish army that eventually suppressed them. The Bar Confederation regrouped with Ottoman support and thus the Polish confrontation overlaps with the Russo-Turkish confrontation that finally gave Russia Crimea and access to the Black Sea.

Thus the Russians were faced with a huge task of repopulating areas that had been devastated by conflict, and managing new populations - Poles, Jews, 'Little Russians' (the Orthodox peasants previously under Polish domination) and Tatars, all of whom disliked each other intensely.[6]

---

[6] The problem with respect to the Jews is discussed in an earlier article in this series - 'Two Centuries Together - The Derzhavin Memorandum', *Church and State*, No.133, July-September, 2018, accessible on my website at http://www.peterbrooke.org/politics-and-theology/solzhenitsyn/derzhavin/

Nikolai Gogol, in his novel *Taras Bulba*, refers to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as *'those turbulent troubled times when the struggles and battles for the union of Russia and Ukraine were beginning'*[7] and that of course was the official Russian view of the matter, continuing well into the Soviet era, when, in the celebrations marking its 300th anniversary, the Khmelnitsky rising was represented as a struggle to achieve the reunion of the Russian peoples. Gogol wrote in Russian but his *Evenings on a farm near Dikenka* (1831-2) and *Taras Bulba* (1835) were nonetheless presenting the cultural peculiarities of his own 'Little Russian' people as something which, however attractive they might be, were nonetheless exotic and foreign to his 'Great Russian' readers. An Irish equivalent might be William Carleton. Pavel Svin'in, who published his first story, *Bisavriuk or the Eve of St. John the Baptist* in 1830, introduced him saying: 'Malorossiiane [Little Russians] *more than* Velikorossiiane [Great Russians] *resemble the magnificent Asian people. They look like Asians..., but do not have such an ungovernable character...; their phlegmatic carelessness protects them from blustering emotions, and often the fiery and audacious European intellect sparkles from their bushy eyebrows; ardent love of the Motherland... fills their breasts.'* Travelogues and literary texts of the 1810s-1830s generally represented Ukraine as a *'violent and often degenerate place that constitutes the limits of civilisation and the boundary with Asia - a zone of dangerous cultural confrontation and mingling.'*[8]

Modern literature in the Ukrainian language begins with a joke - Ivan Kotliarevsky's burlesque version of Virgil's *Aeneid*, written in the peasant language of Poltava, an oblast on the east bank of the Dnieper. The first three parts were published in 1798. A fourth part appeared in 1809 but the whole work in six parts was only published in 1840, after his death in 1838. Poltava had been part of the 'hetmanate' founded by Bogdan Khmelnitsky and had therefore been under an increasingly tight Russian suzerainty since the Treaty of Andrusovo, signed in 1667. Ukraine - like Russia, but unlike, say, England, Wales, Scotand, Ireland, France - had very little vernacular written culture other than for religious purposes prior to the eighteenth century, but it did have a rich oral tradition - stories of heroic deeds of the Cossacks recited by a 'kobzar' (travelling singer) accompanied by a multistringed lute-like instrument, the 'bandura', or 'kobza'.

This was material that was very much sought after in the days following James Macpherson's *Ossian*, Bishop Percy's *Reliques*, together with the work of the Brothers Grimm in Germany and Vuk Karadzic in Serbia. In 1813, the great Polish collector, Z.D.Chodakowski began his four years wandering among the Slav peasantry, starting in the ethnically Ruthenian/Ukrainian Podolia, Volhynia and the Russian Ukraine, only moving into indigenous Polish territory in 1817. He collected several thousand songs. He died almost unknown in 1825 at the age of forty-one, but his essay *On prechristian Slavdom*, first published in Warsaw in 1818, became after his death a manifesto for the revival of interest in the Slav peasantry as bearers of a Pan-Slav culture older than Christianity.[9]

---

[7] Leonard Kent (ed)" *The Complete Tales of Nikolai Gogol*, Vol II, University of Chicago Press, 1985, pp.24-5.

[8] Yuliya Ilchuk: 'Nikolai Gogol"s Self-Fashioning in the 1830s: The Postcolonial Perspective', *Canadian Slavonic Papers* , Vol.51, No.2/3 (June-September 2009), THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF NIKOLAI GOGOL'/MYKOLA HOHOL' (1809-1852), p.206.

[9] Peter Brock: 'Z.D.Chodakowski and the discovery of folklife: a chapter in the history of Polish nationalism', *The Polish Review*, Vol.21, No.1/2 (1976), pp. 3-21.

The first published collection of Ukrainian folk songs was Mykhailo Maksymovich's *Little Russian Songs*, published in Moscow in 1827, followed in 1834 by *Ukrainian Folk Songs* and *A collection of Ukrainian songs*, published in Kiev in 1849. Maksymovich also engaged in an intensive philological research into different Slav languages, developing a distinctive system of Ukrainian orthography which was to be particularly influential in the Austrian territories, though it is no longer used.

Neither Kotliarevsky's comic writing nor Maksymovich's folk songs were seen as threatening the predominance of Russian as the language of culture. Kotliarevsky was artistic director of the Poltava Free theatre which mounted his operetta *Natalka from Poltava* and the vaudeville*The Muscovite Sorcerer*. The Encyclopedia of Ukraine praises his *'racy, colourful, colloquial Ukrainian'*, and Taras Shevchenko, whom we shall be encountering shortly, wrote a poem in his honour. According to the Australian Ukrainian writer Marko Pavlyshyn: *'Ivan Kotliarevs´kyi's play,* Natalka Poltavka (Natalka from Poltava, 1819), *a sentimental comedy in the spirit of the Enlightenment, had made the point that the natural wisdom of ordinary people, expressed in their own clear and coherent language, was superior to confused thought expressed in the jargon of affected learning.'* Nonetheless, comparing him to the later Nikolai Kostomarov whose writing in Ukrainian was seen - more by literary critics of the time than by the government - as dangerous, he says: *'the difference separating Kostomarov's use of such 'colourful' language and the burlesque language use of Kotliarevs´kyi's imitators ... was fundamental. Unlike his predecessors, Kostomarov was not holding up the Ukrainian language itself to be observed by its audience; he was showing them the action, character and ideas of his play through the Ukrainian language, arguing thereby that it was a normal, legitimate literary language, a vehicle for the high-culture business of tragedy ... It was as appropriate in* [Kostomarov's play] Sava Chalyi *for the Pole Konets´pol´s´kyi to speak Ukrainian as it was for Schiller's Joan of Arc to speak German.'*[10]

Maksymovich was sufficiently well respected to be appointed professor of Russian Folk Literature, and first rector of the University of Kiev which was founded in 1834 on the recommendation of Count Sergei Uvarov. Uvarov is best known as having formulated the doctrine of 'official nationalism' under the insecure disciplinarian Nicholas I - 'Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality.' According to an account by James T. Flynn, Maksymovich *'believed deeply in the promise of the Russian empire and meant to foster the principles of "Official Nationality" not as repression but as the path to a happier future for all inhabitants of the empire ... As rector, Maksimovich worked very hard, trying to foster in his students the love for the Russian language and literature which he felt himself.'*[11]

LANGUAGES OF CULTURE

---

[10] Marko Pavlyshyn: 'For and against a Ukrainian national literature: Kostomarov's *Sava Chalyi* and its reviewers', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol.92, No.2 (April 2014), pp.206 and 216-7. *Sava Chalyi* was published in 1838. As Pavlyshyn comments in contrast to Kotliarevsky's very popular work, it was never performed.

[11] James T. Flynn: 'Uvarov and the 'Western Provinces': A Study of Russia's Polish Problem', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol.64, No.2 (April 1986), p.221.

It should be said, however, that the claim of Russian to be a language of culture was at the time not much stronger than the claim of Ukrainian. After all, Pushkin, the first writer in the Russian language to excite any great interest outside Russia, only died in 1837. Prior to the eighteenth century both among Russians and Ukrainians, there was little idea of the possibility of culture outside the church. From the seventeenth century onwards the most advanced centre of church culture was the Kiev Academy founded by Peter Mogyla. In the Kiev Academy the languages of culture were Latin and Polish but the academy had been established by the Cossacks in imitation of what had already long been established in Catholic Poland. The Cossacks spoke Ukrainian and Ukrainian was the language used when texts were translated for their benefit. Peter I, much concerned with the low level of culture among the Russian clergy, turned to the relatively sophisticated and westernised Kiev Academy. The reorganisation of the Russian Church - the suppression of the Moscow patriarchate and creation of the 'Holy Synod' - was planned by Theophan Propokovich, formerly Prefect, then Rector of the Kiev-Mogila Academy. As well as theology and philosophy Propokovich taught 'poetics', basing his teaching on Polish models. The Orthodox theologian George Florovsky regarded Peter Moghila as promoting within Orthodox an essentially Catholic theology, and Propokovich an essentially Protestant one (*'Theophan wasn't close to the Protestant theology of the eighteenth century, he was an integral part of it'*[12]). Nickolai Lossky in his *History of Russian philosophy* says:

'The centuries of Tatar domination and then the isolationism of the Moscow state prevented the Russian people from becoming acquainted with Western European philosophy. Not until Peter the Great had "cut a window into Europe" was Russian culture introduced to the western culture on a wide scale.'[13]

But the Ruthenians in Galicia and the Ukrainians in 'Little Russia' had been under Polish domination for at least three hundred years. They already had their 'window into Europe.'

Florovsky admits, albeit regretting it, the domination of Ukrainian culture in the early eighteenth century:

'In the history of the Russian school, the Petrine reform literally amounted to a Ukrainisation. For its Great Russian pupils this school [the Academy of the Saviour, established in 1700/01 on the model of the Kiev Academy in the Monastery of the Icon of the Saviour in Moscow] *seemed doubly foreign: Latin and Ukrainian. Znamensky in his remarkable work on religious schools in the eighteenth century says that "For the students, all these teachers were really foreigners, coming from a different country with their own customs, their own way of thinking, their knowledge, their way of talking which was bizarre and barely comprehensible to the ear of a Great Russian. Not only did they not wish to secure the sympathy of the young people entrusted to them, but they despised the Russians, whom they considered to be savages, ridiculing everything which was different from Little Russian whose superiority they asserted constantly." We know that many of these immigrants never spoke Russian well and continued to use Ukrainian. It was only under Catherine that the situation changed ...'*

---

[12] Georges Florovsky: *Les Voies de la théologie russe*, Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1991, p.134. Florovsky's book is available in an English translation but I only have it in French. This is my translation from the French.

[13] N.O.Lossky: *History of Russian Philosophy*, New York, International Universities Press Inc, 1951, p.10.

It isn't however clear what is meant by the 'Ukrainian' language. There were, it appears, three languages in question. One was the Ukrainian version of Church Slavonic which gave way to the Russian version of Church Slavonic. The second was the version of 'Ruthenian', apparently heavily inflected with Church Slavonic used by the Cossacks as an administrative language. We might guess that this bore some resemblance to *yasychie* - the language favoured by the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia. It seems fairly obvious that the very fact that the Little Russians were so instrumental in the administration both of church and state under Peter I would lead to the languages of both church and administration giving way to the languages used in the Russian state as a whole and this is what is said - I think almost reluctantly - by two writers who obviously regret it from Ukrainian nationalist point of view:

'Having succeeded in the 'Ruthenization' of Muscovy by the late seventeenth century, the Ukrainians as a result of a subsequent russification of their Church and Cossack administration together with the educational system in the eighteenth century, lost impetus to break new ground in their own cultural tradition. Since they still felt themselves to be co-creators of the common Russian literary language which was, ultimately, imposed on them by decrees, bans, and career opportunities, they reluctantly accepted Great Russian as a kind of substitution for a missing member in the former bilingual opposition between Ukrainian Church Slavonic and Ruthenian (prostaja mova - *'plain language'*).[14]

There is, however, little reason to believe that these civil and ecclesiastical administrators had any notion of breaking new ground in their own cultural tradition or that they were at all reluctant to accept the use of Great Russian to pursue what they would probably have thought of as a civilising mission. 'Church Slavonic' was the language, apparently closest to Bulgarian, used by SS Cyril and Methodius to translate the Greek liturgical texts for the use of the Slavs. It had no particular Ukrainian association. The Ruthenian language would probably have seemed to them little more than a means of communicating with their Cossack overlords, who were themselves becoming incorporated into the Russian system. The languages of culture would still be Polish and German.[15] Indeed, it seems that at the end of the eighteenth century, the Kiev Academy itself played a role in the formalisation of the Russian language as a language of culture.[16]

---

[14] Andrii Danylenko (Pace University, New York, USA) and Halyna Naienko (Taras Ševčenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine): *Linguistic russification in Russian Ukraine: languages, imperial models, and policies*, article published online at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329757165_Linguistic_russification_in_Russian_Ukraine_languages_imperial_models_and_policies Not paginated

[15] Ryszard Łużny and Paulina Lewin: 'The Kiev Mohyla Academy in Relation to Polish Culture', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol.8, No.1/2, The Kiev Mohyla Academy: Commemorating the 350th Anniversary of its Founding (1632) (June 1984), pp. 123-135: 'Stefan Iavors'kyi, the Ukrainian poet who became came "curator of the patriarch's seat" of the Russian Orthodox Church owned almost exclusively Latin and Polish books ... ' Iavors'ky, 'the only writer from the Kiev Academy to be called *poeta laureates*', wrote in Latin and Polish (pp.126 & 133)

[16] *'Even the famous Kiev Academy - which up to this time provided a general education for members of all social groups - was revamped into a standardized imperial seminary. Metropolitan Myslavs'kyi* [Metropolitan of Kiev - PB] *launched a campaign at the academy to maintain the purity of the Russian language. Despite these efforts, some of the academy staff confessed to the metropolitan that they were "unable to rid themselves of their Little Russian manner of speech.'* - Zenon E. Kohut: 'The Problem of Ukrainian Orthodox Church Autonomy in the Hetmanate (1654-1780s)', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol.14, No.3/4 (December 1990), p.375.

What was left as distinctively Ukrainian was the language of the peasantry and of the oral folk tradition. Danylenko and Naienko call it the *'new literary Ukrainian'*, pioneered as such by Kotliarevsky. This was the language that was to be seen later in the century as dangerous, at first by literary critics, notably the best known literary critic of the 1840s, Vissarion Belinsky. A key figure in this development was the 'Ukrainian national poet', Taras Shevchenko.

Shevchenko was born in 1814 as a serf. He became personal valet to his master who recognised and tried to develop his talents as a painter, taking him first to Warsaw then, after the Polish rebellion of 1830, to St Petersburg. There his talent was recognised by the Russian poet, Vasily Andreyevich Zhukovsky, tutor to the Empress, Alexandra Feodorovna, wife of Nicholas I, and to the heir apparent, the future Alexander II. On the initiative of the Empress, a raffle was held to buy him out of serfdom, enabling him to become a pupil of the painter Karl Briulov whose painting *The Last Day of Pompeii* had created a sensation, widely regarded as the first Russian masterpiece, in 1834 (Gogol wrote an essay in praise of it). In 1840, while still in St Petersburg, Shevchenko published his first collection of poems - *Kobzar*. Written in the native language it was hugely successful in Ukraine where he made *'an almost triumphal return of one who had left his native village in the corduroy of a page boy.'*[17]

He obtained a post in the Archaeological Commission in Kiev. *'Here he found himself surrounded by the younger generation which had already, certainly under the influence of his poetry, formed a secret society under the name of the "Brotherhood of St Cyril and Methodius" with the clearly expressed aim of educating the people and abolishing serfdom.'* (Franko, p.113)

The most important of Shevchenko's poems from the point of view of Ukrainian nationalism was probably *Haidamaky*, his celebration of the last of the great risings against the Poles, the Koliivshchyna rebellion of 1768. According to George Grabowicz, President of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in the US: *'Discussions and polemics around the poem, especially by Polish and in time more so by Ukrainian critics, continued well into the 20th century and ultimately marked out the canonic Ukrainian perpective on Shevchenko; in effect* Haidamaky *became his best known, most often cited and defining work, that which made Shevchenko Shevchenko.'*[18]

It's hardly surprising that Polish critics should have taken an interest in it since the Koliivshchyna rebellion was after all a massacre of Poles. The poem comes in fourteen parts and I've only been able to read six of them in translation[19] so this account will be very incomplete but the main theme, here as in many other of Shevchenko's poems, is nostalgia for a past when

---

[17] Ivan Franko: 'Taras Shevchenko', *The Slavonic Review*, Vol.3, No.7 (June 1924), p.113. Franko was a leading Ukrainian writer, poet and political theorist, in the late nineteenth/early twentieth century. An oblast in modern Ukraine - Ivano-Frankivsk - is named after him.

[18] George G.Grabowicz: 'Taras Shevchenko - the making of the national poet', *Revue des études slaves*, Vol.85, No.3, Taras Ševčenko (1814-1861) Création culturelle et conscience nationale (2014), p.425.

[19] Accessible at https://taras-shevchenko.storinka.org/taras-shevchenko-poem-haidamaki-english-translation-by-john-weir.html

Cossacks were free and self-governing and there was no serfdom, together with regret that this past glory is forgotten by a weak and servile generation.

And yet the glory in question is the glory of massacring Polish Catholics, described with great verve but also occasional notes of regret:

> In Cossack graves our grand-dads lie,
> Their grave mounds dot the plain.
> What of it that the mounds are high?
> Nobody knows they're there,
> Or whose the bones that 'neath them lie,
> Nobody sheds a tear.
> As it blows through, the wind alone
> A gentle greeting says,
> The dew alone at break of dawn
> With tender teardrops laves.
> The sun then turns its rays on them,
> It dries and makes them warm;
> Their grandsons? Oh, they're not concerned -
> For lords they're growing com!
> They're numerous, but ask if one
> Knows where is Gonta's grave -
> Where did the tortured martyr's bones
> His faithful comrades lay?
> Where's Zaliznyak, that splendid soul,
> Where sleeps that manly heart?
> It's hard to bear! The hangman rules,
> While they forgotten are.
> A long, long time the clamour dread
> Resounded through Ukraine,
> A long, long time the blood ran red
> In streams across the plains.
> O'er all the earth it cast a pall;
> This horror day and night
> Was ghastly, yet when we recall
> Those deeds, the heart is light.

The climax of the poem comes when Gonta, the Cossack leader, finds himself obliged to kill his young sons because they admit to being Catholic:

> From Kiev to Uman the dead
> In heaping piles were laid.
> The Haidamaki on Uman
> Like heavy clouds converge
> At midnight. Ere the night is done

The whole town is submerged.
The Haidamaki take the town
With shouts: "The Poles shall pay!"
Dragoons are downed, their bodies roll
Around the market-place;
The ill, the cripples, children too,
All die, no one is spared.
Wild cries and screams. 'Mid streams of blood
Stands Gonta on the square
With Zaliznyak together, they
Urge on the rebel band:
"Good work, stout lads! There, that's the way
To punish them, the damned!"
And then the rebels brought to him
A Jesuit, a monk,
With two young boys. "Look, Gonta, look!
These youngsters are your sons!
They're Catholics: since you kill all,
Can you leave them alone?
Why are you waiting? Kill them now,
Before your sons are grown,
For if you don't, when they grow up
They'll find you and they'll kill...."
"Cut the cur's throat! As for the pups,
I'll finish them myself.
Let the assembly be convened.
Confess — you're Catholics!"
"We're Catholics.... Our mother made...."
"Be silent! Close your lips!
Oh God! I know!" The Cossacks stood
Assembled in the square.
"My sons are Catholics.... I vowed
No Catholic to spare.
Esteemed assembly!... That there should
Be no doubt anywhere,
No talk that I don't keep my word,
Or that I spare my own....
My sons, my sons! Why are you small?
My sons, why aren't you grown?
Why aren't you with us killing Poles?"
"We will, we'll kill them, dad!"
"You never will! You never will!
Your mother's soul be damned,
That thrice-accursed Catholic,

The bitch that gave you birth!
She should have drowned you ere you saw
The light of day on earth!
As Catholics you'd not have died —
The sin would smaller be;
Such woe, my sons, today is mine
As cannot be conceived!
My children, kiss me, for not I
Am killing you today —
It is my oath!"
He flashed his knife
And the two lads were slain.
They fell to earth, still bubbling words:
"O dad! We are not Poles!
We ... we...." And then they spoke no more,
Their bodies growing cold.
"Perhaps they should be buried, what?"
"No need! They're Catholic ...'

Gonta does in fact, secretly and sorrowfully, bury his sons, still cursing their mother.

If *Haidamaky* does occasionally express regret that Slavs should be killing each other ('The heart is sore when you reflect/That sons of Slavs like beasts/Got drunk with blood. Who was to blame?/ The Jesuits, the priests!') there is no such regret in another, much shorter poem, *The Night of Taras*:

Before the dawn a slaughtered host
Upon the meadow lies.
"Like a red, twisting serpent,
The Alta bears the news,
To bid the ravens of the fields
A feast of Poles to use.
Black ravens to that noble meal
Came flying, ranks on ranks;
While the assembled
Cossack troops
Gave the Almighty thanks.
The ravens screamed, and plucked and ate
The corpses' eyeballs bright,
While the bold Cossacks raised a song
To celebrate that night,
That sombre night that dripped with blood
In bringing glory deep

To Taras and his Cossack troop,
While Poles were lulled to sleep.[20]

AND *TARAS BULBA*

In this case the subject is a rising that occurred in the 1630s which I think is probably the inspiration behind Gogol's *Taras Bulba*.[21] In Shevchenko's poem the rising is prompted because the Orthodox are deprived by Catholic (Polish and Polonised Ukrainian) landlords of access to their churches which are often held by landlord's agents who are often Jews:

Unbaptised up to manhood grow
The children of our race,
For out of wedlock men must live;
Without a priest they die;
Our faith to Jewry has been sold
And locked our churches lie!
Like blackbirds covering a field,
The Poles and Uniates
Come swooping down.

Similarly, after Taras Bulba has stirred the Cossacks to action against the Tatars simply through love of warfare, despite a peace that has been agreed with them, they hear the fate of Ukrainians West of the Dnieper at the hands of Poles and Jews:

'"Such times have come that now even the holy churches are not ours."

"How do you mean, not ours?'

"Nowadays they are leased out to the Jews. If you don't pay a Jew beforehand, you cannot serve mass."

"What are you talking about?"

"And if a Jewish dog does not put a stamp with his unbaptised hand on the Holy Easter Cake, one cannot consecrate the cake."

"He is lying, comrades; it cannot be that an unbaptised Jew puts a stamp on the Holy Easter Cake."

"Listen! I've more to tell you: and the Catholic priests are driving now all over Ukraine in their two-wheeled cars. And the trouble is not that they ride in their carriages, but that the Orthodox Christians and not horses pull them. Listen! There's more to tell: they say the Jewesses are making themselves petticoats out of the priests' vestments. These are the things that are going on in the Ukraine, comrades!"' (pp.52-3)

---

[20] https://taras-shevchenko.storinka.org/taras-shevchenko-kobzar-translated-by-andrusyshen-and-kirkconnell.html

[21] A footnote in Kent: The complete tales of Nikolai Gogol, p.22 attributes it to the fifteenth century and says it has a number of anachronisms but it seems to me to fit the 1630s reasonably well.

The position of the Jews is ambiguous since there are Jewish tradesmen attached to the camp, largely selling alcohol. The story of what is happening in the West prompts a pogrom:

'"Hang all the Jews!" was heard from the crowd. "Don't let them make priests' vestments into petticoats for the Jewesses! Don't let them put stamps on the Holy Easter Cakes! Drown them all, the heathens, in the Dnieper!" These words uttered by someone in the crowd flashed like lightning through the heads of all and the crowd rushed to the outer village, intending to cut the throats of all the Jews.

'The poor sons of Israel, losing what little courage they had, hid in empty vodka barrels, in ovens, and even crept under the skirts of their wives; but the Cossacks found them everywhere. [...]

'They seized the Jews by their arms and began flinging them into the water. Pitiful cries rang out on all sides, but the hardhearted Cossacks only laughed at the sight of the Jews' legs in slippers and stockings kicking in the air.' (pp.53-4)

Later in the story, Taras Bulba has need of the services of one of the Jews who had been in the camp:

'This Jew was our friend Yankel. By now he had rented a bit of land and kept a little tavern; he had by degrees got all the gentry and nobility of the neighbourhood into his hands, had gradually extracted almost all their money, and the presence of this Jew was having a profound influence in the district. For three miles in every direction there was not a single hut left in decent condition; they were all tumbling down and falling into ruins; everything was being squandered in drink, and nothing was left but poverty and rags; the whole countryside was laid bare as though by fire and pestilence. And if Yankel had stayed there another ten years, he would certainly have laid bare the whole province.' (p.113)

Gogol describes the punishment of the Poles with much the same relish as Shevchenko:

'they laid out their comrades' bodies with respect and scattered fresh earth upon them that the crows and fierce eagles should not peck their eyes. But the bodies of the Poles they bound by dozens to the tails of wild horses and set them loose to race over the plain, and for a long way pursued them, lashing them all the time. The frantic horses galloped over ridges and hillocks, across the hollows and watercourses, and the dead bodies of the Poles were battered on the earth and covered with blood and dust.' (p.89)

SHEVCHENKO AND RUSSIA

Shevchenko's ire is not confined to Poles, Jews and Uniates. In his poem *The Excavated Mound*, he blames Bogdan Khmelnitsky for signing the Treaty of Pereyaslav (1654) which started the process of bringing east bank Cossacks under the control of the Russian government:

> There was a day I knew delight [It is Ukraine who is speaking - PB]
> In this vast world of ours.
> My joy was great...
> But oh, Bohdan,
> You unwise son of mine!

Look at your ancient mother now,
Ukraine, of stock divine,
Who as she cradled you, would sing
And grieve she was not free;
Who, as she sang, in sorrow wept
And looked for liberty!...
O dear Bohdan, if I had known
That you would bring us doom,
I would have choked you in your crib,
Benumbed you in my womb!
For now my steppes are meted out
To Germans and to Jews;
My sons now toil in alien lands
Where foreign lords abuse;
The Dnieper they are drying up;
The loss will break my heart;
And my dear mounds the Muscovite
Is shattering apart.

The context of Shevchenko's complaining against the excavation of burial mounds is rather poignant given that he was a member of the Archaeological Commission. Though he wasn't a member for very long. In 1847 he came under suspicion for his association with the clandestine Brotherhood of SS Cyril and Methodius. Unpublished poems of his were found, notably *A Dream* and *Caucasus*, which were taken as directly offensive to the Tsar, Nicholas I, and the Empress (who had arranged the raffle that freed Shevchenko from serfdom). As a result he was condemned to military service for life, without promotion, and with the express prohibition of all writing or drawing. The other members of the Brotherhood received relatively light punishments and some of them, notably Nicolai Kostomarov, went on to very successful careers.

The Caucasus is dedicated to a friend of Shevchenko's, an artist and poet, who died as part of Russia's 'civilising mission' in that part of the world. The circumstances are described in Pat Walsh's book *Great Britain against Russia in the Caucasus*.[22] In Shevchenko's eyes Moscow was doing to the free Muslims what it had already done to the free Cossacks in the Ukraine:

Come, learn from us! We'll teach you what
The price of bread is, and of salt!
We're Christian folk: with shrines we're blest,
We've schools, and wealth, and we have God!
Just one thing does not give us rest:
How is it that your hut you've got
Without our leave; how is it we

---

[22] Pat Walsh: *Great Britain against Russia in the Caucasus - Ottoman Turks, Armenians and Azerbaijanis caught up in geopolitics, war and revolution*, Offenbach am Main, Germany, Manzara Verlag 2020, pp. 91-7. I would reckon Shevhchenko's friend died in the course of the Shamil revolt, 1841-4, discussed on pp.94-5.

To you, as to a dog a bone,
Your crust don't toss! How can it be
That you don't pay us for the sun!

And that is all! We're Christian folk,
We are not heathens — here below
We want but little!... You would gain!
If only you'd make friends with us,
There's much that you would learn from us!
Just look at all our vast domains —
Boundless Siberia alone!
And prisons — myriads! Peoples — throngs!
From the Moldavian to the Finn
All silent are in all their tongues
Because such great contentment reigns!

[...]

And you, my good Yakov, you also were driven
To die in those mountains! Your life you have given
For your country's hangmen, and not for Ukraine,
Your life clean and blameless. 'Twas your fate to drain
The Muscovite goblet, the full, fatal draught!
Oh friend good and noble, who'll be never forgot!
Now wander, free spirit, all over Ukraine
And with the brave Cossacks soar over her coast,
Keep watch o'er the grave mounds on her spreading plains,
And weep with the Cossacks o'er all of her woes

A Dream, subtitled 'A comedy', is even more savagely directed against the Russian domination of Ukraine. In the dream he imagines himself to be flying high over the whole of the Russian lands:

Goodbye, O world, O earth, farewell,
Unfriendly land, goodbye!
My searing pain, my tortures cruel
Above the clouds I'll hide.
And as for you, my dear Ukraine,
I'll leave the clouds behind
And fall with dew to talk with you,
Poor widow-country mine.
I'll come at midnight when the dew
Falls heavy on the fields;
And softly-sadly we will talk
Of what the future yields.
Until the rising of the sun

We'll talk about your woes,
Until your infant sons are grown
And rise against the foes.

From the sky he sees a host of woes throughout the Empire, for example the suffering of people working in the Russian goldmines in the Far East. But the poem comes to a climax when he flies to St Petersburg and contrasts the vulgar display of splendour with the misery on which it was built. He sees the equestrian statue of Peter I (subject of Pushkin's nightmarish short story *The Bronze Horseman*) with its inscription 'From the Second [Catherine II who commissioned it] to the First' and then evokes the hetman Pavlo Polubotok, who died in the Peter and Paul fortress in 1724:

I see a steed
A-gallop and his flying hooves
The granite seem to cleave!
The rider, bareback on the horse,
In something like a cloak,
Is hatless. His bare head's adorned
With leaves, perhaps of oak.
The steed rears up as though it means
To leap across the sea,
And he extends his arm as though
He coveted to seize
The whole, whole world. Who is that man?
I read the message terse
Inscribed upon the mound of stone:
"The Second to the First."
I understand right well what's meant
By those laconic words:
The First was he who crucified
Unfortunate Ukraine,
The Second — she who finished off
Whatever yet remained.
Oh, butchers! butchers! cannibals!
And did you gorge and loot
Enough when 'live? And when you died
What did you take with you?
A heavy weight pressed on my heart.
It was as though engraved
Upon that granite I could read
The story of Ukraine.
I stand... And then I faintly hear
A melancholy strain,
From ghostly lips a mournful song:
"From Hlukhov-town at break of dawn

The regiments withdrew
To build abutments on the line.
I, with a Cossack crew,
As acting hetman of Ukraine
Due northward took my course —
Up to the capital. Oh God!
Oh wicked tsar, accurst!
Oh crafty, evil, grasping tsar,
Oh viper poison-fanged!
What did you with the Cossacks do?
Their noble bones you sank
In the morass and on them built
Your capital-to-be,
On tortured Cossack corpses built!
And me, a hetman free,
You threw into a dungeon dark
And left in chains to die
Of hunger... Tsar! We'll never part.
We are forever tied
Together by those heavy chains.
E'en God cannot untie
Those bonds between us. Oh, it's hard
Eternally to bide
Beside the Neva! Far Ukraine
Exists, perhaps, no more.
I'd fly to see if she's still there,
But God won't let me go.
It may be Moscow's razed the land,
And emptied to the sea
Our Dnieper, and our lofty mounds
Dug up — so none may see
The relics of our former fame.
Oh God, please pity me."

The poem also features grotesque caricatures of Nicholas and his Empress together with scorn for a Ukrainian flunkey who has abandoned his language for Russian and German, and for the tribe of civil servants who

hasten next
Their office desks to man,
To scribble — and to rob the folks
Of everything they can.
Among them here and there I see
My fellow-countrymen.
They chatter in the Russian tongue

And bitterly condemn
Their parents that when they were small
They didn't teach them how
To jabber German — that's the cause
They've no promotions now!
Oh leeches, leeches! It may be
Your father sadly sold
His last remaining cow that you
The Moscow tongue should know.
My poor Ukraine! My poor Ukraine!
These are your hapless sons,
Your youthful blossoms, splashed with ink,
In German reared salons,
On Moscow's silly-potions fed
Until they are inane!...
Oh weep, my childless widow-land!
Unfortunate Ukraine!

Having read all that it's difficult to agree with Sergei Glazyev when he says *'a self-evident thing for Shevchenko is integration of the entire Slavic world under the sceptre of the Russian Emperor!'*[23] Shevchenko was indeed a supporter of the Pan-Slavic idea, but hardly under the sceptre of the Russian Emperor.

POLES, UNIATES AND GALICIA

I find it quite surprising that the censor, apparently, had no problems with *Haidamaky* in 1842, or indeed with Gogol's *Taras Bulba* in 1835. Since 1815, when they took control of the 'Kingdom of Poland' (Napoleon's 'Grand Duchy of Warsaw'), the Russians had responsibility for a large Polish Catholic population - in addition to the Poles already taken through the partitions. There had already been a major unsuccessful Polish revolt in 1830 and, to quote the historian James T. Flynn (Russia's Polish problem, p.213):

'If Poland could not be permitted independence, what policies could be devised to offer Poles an acceptable way of life within the empire? This was the horn of the dilemma which faced government officials. Historians and publicists could analyse, with varying degrees of heat and light, the roots and dimensions of the problem. It fell to government officials to try, with varying degrees of courage and responsibility, to find ways to promote the integration of a Polish population into the life of the Russian empire.'

Flynn is also a specialist in the history of the Uniates and has written a comparison between the policies of the Uniate Bishop Lisovskii, trying to establish an independent Uniate seminary in Polock, Belarus, in 1806, and Archbishop Troy of Dublin, establishing Maynooth in Ireland in

---

[23] Sergei Glazyev: *The Last World War. The U.S. to Move and Lose.* ("The Izborsk Club Collection"). – Moscow, Knizhny Mir Publ., 2016, p.165.

1795.[24] Despite Catherine II's promise of freedom to practice their religion at the time of the partitions, the Uniate church was suppressed in 1839, against a great deal of opposition, everywhere in the Russian domains except the Kingdom of Poland, where it was suppressed in 1875. This concerns more the history of Belarus than Ukraine but it is interesting to see that, while a distinct Ukrainian national consciousness was developing in the Dnieper area, celebrating Cossack hostility to Catholics, with Uniates regarded as traitors to the Orthodox cause, it was on the basis of the Uniate 'Greek Catholic' Church that a distinct Ruthenian national consciousness was developing in Galicia, in the Austrian Empire.

This became obvious in the revolutionary year 1848. As a result of the failure of the 1830 revolt in the Kingdom of Poland, large numbers of Polish refugees arrived in Austrian Galicia. There was an attempt at revolution in 1846, fostered by the Polish Democratic Society, inspired by the French revolutionary ideals that had been established in the Duchy of Warsaw. According to the account by Antony Polonsky, specialist in Polish-Jewish history:

'Wild rumors circulated that the nobility intended to slaughter the peasants. Uncertain of the ability of the Austrian government to protect them, peasants began to form themselves into bands for the purpose of self-defence ... Thus when the noble revolutionaries in Galicia proclaimed their insurrection, the peasants in the areas of Tarnów, Rzeszów, Wadowice, Nowy Sacz, and Sanok turned on them savagely, killing some and handing others over to the Austrian authorities. Everywhere they proclaimed their intention of acting on behalf of the emperor and that their action was directed solely against the landlords and their agents. There seems to have been very little anti-Jewish activity ... The rising was almost entirely confined to the Polish-speaking western areas of Galicia. Some peasants in mountainous areas, where labor services were not a source of conflict, did in fact support the insurrection. In all, perhaps 1,100 people were killed, 3,000 were arrested, and 430 manor houses were burnt.'[25] (p.451)

As a result, when 1848 came along:

'the revolutionaries in Galicia lacked any real faith that they could achieve their objectives on their own, and the progress of the revolution there was almost entirely dependent on events elsewhere in the monarchy, above all in Vienna. In March, following Metternich's flight from Vienna, Polish liberals and revolutionaries, including some members of the Democratic Society, met in Lviv and on 14th April set up a Central National Council (Rada Narodowa Centralna), which was to be both a representative and an executive body. Its members agreed on a common program, which was notable in that it only called for the autonomy of Galicia and did not mention Polish independence. In addition, they demanded the abolition of Labor services [the 'corvée' associated with serfdom - PB].

'The relative weakness of the revolutionary upsurge, partly the result of the widespread fear among landowners of a new 1846, left the initiative in the hands of the new Austrian governor Franz von Stadion. He displayed unusual political skill, appealing for support to the now increasingly nationally

---

[24] James T. Flynn: 'Contrasting Similarities: Bishops Troy and Lisovskii in Ireland and Belorussia in the Age of the French Revolution', *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol.87, No.2 (April 2001), pp. 214- 228.

[25] Antony Polonsky: 'The Revolutionary Crisis of 1846-1849 and Its Place in the Development of Nineteenth Century Galicia', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol.22, Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe (1998), p. 451

conscious Ukrainian[26] *majority in the eastern part of the province. This policy had been initiated already in February 1847, when the Austrian government proposed to divide Galicia into its eastern and western parts. In February of the following year, Stadion gave permission for the publication of a Ukrainian newspaper. He also attempted to secure Jewish support by calling on the Austrian authorities in April 1848 to abolish all special taxes paid by Jews. In addition, and most importantly, he did what had not been done in the aftermath of the 1846* jacquerie*: he managed to persuade the imperial government on 23 April to abolish labor dues, which effectively pacified the countryside in the Austrian interest. As a result, he was able to reestablish Austrian control in Cracow in April and in Lviv in November.'* (p.454)

Among the Ruthenians:

The strongest force at this time was Austro-Slavism, which was supported by the Greek Catholic hierarchy, including the Greek Catholic bishop-coadjutor of Lviv, Hryhorii [presumably Ukrainian for Gregory - PB] *Iakhymovych, and the Metropolitan Mykhailo Levyts'kyi. It was organised in the Supreme Ruthenian Council [Holovna Rus'ka Rada), which was established in 2 May to act as a counterweight to the Polish National Council. Its organization was encouraged by Stadion and it undertook widespread political agitation, collecting thousands of signatures in support of its objectives, the most important of which was the division of Galicia along the San River into two administrative entities. The degree of political mobilization was considerable. Nearly 200,000 people signed a petition advocating such a division. In addition, 25 Ukrainian deputies sat in the lower house of the parliament established on 25 April. In a resolution of 10 May published in* Zoria halyts'ka*, one of the Ukrainian newspapers established in 1848, the Supreme Ruthenian Council asserted:*

'"We Galician Ruthenians belong to the great Ruthenian nation, which speaks the same language and numbers fifteen million. of whom two and a half million live on the land of Galicia. This nation was once independent, it had its own literary language, its own laws, its own princes, in a word, it lived in prosperity, was wealthy and powerful."' (p.456)

John Paul Himka takes up the story,[27] saying that *'After the defeat of the revolution, during the decade of neo-absolutism, political life came to a standstill. Such Ruthenian political representation as existed in the 1850s was limited to the higher clergy of the Greek Catholic Church in Lviv.'* But they were not inactive. *'During the 1850s, the Greek Catholic clergy also established hundreds of Ruthenian parish schools, where cantors provided peasants with a primary education.'* Politics revived in 1860, when *'the Habsburg monarchy sought to reform itself in the wake of defeat in the Italian war of 1859.'* In the reform programme of 1861 a bicameral central parliament was established with provincial diets, including a Polish dominated Galicia. The Ukraine Encyclopedia (entry for 'Galicia') complains that *'Even though the Ukrainians constituted half the population of Austrian Galicia, their share in the diet was never more than a third and often much less, owing to Polish control of the provincial administration and to electoral manipulation.'* But to continue with Himka's account:

---

[26] See my earlier footnote complaining against the use of the word 'Ukrainian' for this period in the history of Galicia.

[27] John-Paul Himka: 'The Greek Catholic Church in Galicia, 1848-1914', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol.26, No.1/4, Ukrainian Church History (2002-2003), pp.246-7.

'One symptom of the new order was a revival of the Ruthenian press in Galicia. The newspaper Slovo *began to appear in January 1861. At first it enjoyed the moral and financial suport of Metropolitan Iakhymovych, but his attitude cooled to the paper when it began to criticize the Greek Catholic higher clergy. Electoral politics was also revived, and a number of Greek Catholic priests acquired seats in the Galician diet ... The great issue of the 1860s was the restructuring of the monarchy. The Ruthenian leadership, which was concentrated in the Lviv consistory, submitted a series of (ultimately fruitless) memoranda to the emperor and his ministers reiterating the Ruthenians' desire to see Galicia partitioned, stressing their loyalty to the central government, and importuning the government not to favor the Poles.*

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

With the end of the rule of Nicholas I in Russia and the arrival of the reforming Tsar, Alexander II, on the eve of the emancipation of the serfs in 1860, Shevchenko himself had returned from exile in 1857. Somewhat oddly he came to St Petersburg, where he died, broken in health, in 1861. He was still writing poetry and, despite the prohibition, had written several stories (in Russian) while in exile but it is still in the poems written in the 1840s that his importance for Ukrainian nationalism is mostly based.

Neither in Galicia nor in Little Russia was there as yet much evidence of a substantial tendency towards national separatism. But in Galicia, a distinct people with its own church, its own education system and its own language was in the process of formation. The distinct quasi-national culture that had existed in Little Russia under the Cossacks was by now little more than a romantic memory. In particular, the intellectual life of the Polish oriented Kiev-Moghila Academy was, it seems, despite the continued existence of the institution, entirely forgotten. Even those who could be called Ukrainophiles, with the large exception of Shevchenko, could be said to be engaged in the great project of creating an essentially new all-Russian culture.

But both in Austria and in Russia this was about to change ...