



ARTICLE

Enlightened and Counter-Revolutionary: Revisiting the Origins of Galician Ruthenian Nation-Building

Tomasz Hen-Konarski 

Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland
Email: then@ihpan.edu.pl

Abstract

This article offers an alternative focus for the study of the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) nation-building in early Austrian Galicia. It portrays elite Greek Catholic churchmen who made political claims about a self-standing Ruthenian nation already in the first decade of the nineteenth century. It argues that their political innovations were enabled by the ambitious state-building projects implemented in the second half of the eighteenth century by the Austrian government, most importantly new seminaries that cultivated an ethos of state service among Catholic clergymen. The early Ruthenian nationalism espoused by Greek Catholic prelates neither aspired to mobilize masses nor ascribed much importance to language rights, the kernel of nationalist struggles in later periods. It was rather a polemical device deployed to legitimize their rejection of the Polish national allegiance, associated with dynamically evolving republican traditions. By locating the Galician Ruthenian case in a regional comparative perspective, the article outlines the broader significance of this interpretation, interrogating some received wisdoms about the so-called non-historical nationalisms of Central and Eastern Europe.

Keywords: Greek Catholic Church; nationalism; Poland; Ukraine; Galicia; Enlightenment; Josephinism

A dozen years ago, Polish was the dominant language among educated Ruthenians. Did they all love us because of this? If you know the works of Harasiewicz, Zubrzycki, and others, which were written at the time when the Ruthenian priests spoke Polish and yet teem with hatred of all things Polish, you must agree that the Polish language will not guarantee us the friendship of the Ruthenians.

Walerian Kalinka, Lviv, 1883¹

In this article, I sketch a new interpretation of the origins of Galician Ruthenian nation-building. Rather than following tradition and focusing my account on the young awakeners that walked onto the stage in the late 1830s, I deal here with the elite churchmen and their conservative understanding of the Enlightenment coming into shape in the last decades of the eighteenth century. My protagonists are not completely absent from the available historiographical picture, but they typically occupy only tertiary roles as elements of the necessary background to the well-known Romantic heroes of the high nineteenth century. Extending our perception of the nation-building process several decades back in time is important, but I also wish to offer a less deterministic way of conceptualizing the beginning of modern Ruthenian nationalism in Galicia, one that allows for more historical contingency but also freedom of choice for individual actors.

I could start my story in a number of places: Lviv, Przemyśl, Rome, Vienna, Warsaw, and Zamość. Yet, this article begins in the village of Senechiv in the Carpathian Mountains, in June 1809.² At that

¹Walerian Kalinka, *Pisma pomniejszych. Część IV* (Minor writings. Part IV) (Cracow, 1902), 44.

²Unless there is an established and uncontroversial English form, like Warsaw or Vienna, place names are given in the official language of the states to which they belong nowadays, hence Przemyśl (Polish) but Lviv (Ukrainian). The only deviation from

time, Senechiv was situated in the mountainous frontier between Galicia and Hungary. Both countries belonged to the Austrian Monarchy and in that particular region Ruthenian highlanders populated either side of the border, but in the spring and summer of 1809 Galicia was occupied by the army of the Duchy of Warsaw, one of Bonaparte's satellite states, whereas Hungary remained under the control of the Habsburg military.³ The situation along the contact line must have been tense. Amid uncertainty and suspicion, two strangers were intercepted in Senechiv and sent to the town of Stryi, about two days away, for interrogation by Warsaw's provisional authorities in occupied Galicia. The men in question were Antonii Anhelovych (1756–1814), recently promoted as Galicia's first Greek Catholic Metropolitan, and his vicar general and most trusted confidant Mykhailo Harasevych (1763–1836).⁴

Were they plotting something ominous against Warsaw's occupying forces, perhaps passing vital intelligence to the Austrian side? Did they try to cross the mountains to the Habsburg-controlled zone? Should we see it as a Galician re-enactment of Louis XVI's ill-fated flight to Varennes in June 1791 or maybe a prefiguration of Pius IX's successful escape to Gaeta in November 1848?⁵ Or was it all just a terrible misunderstanding resulting from the anti-Ruthenian prejudice inherent in the post-Commonwealth nobiliary culture?⁶ Were the two prelates simply enjoying a short countryside repose from the stressful atmosphere of occupied Lviv? Available testimonies are conflicting and we will probably never know for sure, but the Austrian government remained steadfast in its belief that both prelates espoused exemplary loyalty in that difficult situation and should be rewarded accordingly. Anhelovych, who was noble by birth and had already been elevated as Metropolitan of Galicia, was granted the Grand Cross of the Order of Leopold, whereas Harasevych was named commander of the Order of Leopold and ennobled as Baron von Neustern.⁷ As I explain below, we can

this principle is for the localities radically renamed in the twentieth century, hence Prešporok for Bratislava. Cyrillic is rendered with the help of the simplified romanization of the Library of Congress (without diacritics and primes).

³More precisely, Galicia was still a theater of war, where Austrian, Polish, and Russian armies vied with each other, but Polish forces held Lviv. For the Senechiv episode, see Vadym Adadurov, "Virnopiddanyi sluha Ioho Tsisar's'koi Velychnosti': svit politychnykh pohliadiv vladyyky Antoniiia Anhelovycha" (The Most Loyal Servant of his Imperial Majesty: The worldview of the bishop Antonii Anhelovych) in *Impers'ki identychnosti v ukrains'kii istorii XVIII – pershoi polovyny XIX st. (Imperial Identities in Ukrainian History of the First of the Eighteenth Through the First Third of the Nineteenth Century)*, eds. Vadym Adadurov and Volodymyr Sklokin, 217–24 as well as Michael Harasiewicz, *Annales ecclesiae ruthenae, gratiam et communionem cum s. Sede Romana habentis ritumque Graeco-Slavicum observantis cum singulari respectu ad dioeceses ruthenas Leopoliensem, Premisliensem et Chelmensem* (Annals of the Ruthenian Church in communion with the Holy Roman See . . .), ed. Michael Ritter von Malinowski (Lviv, 1862). For an overview of the whole 1809 campaign, see Kazimierz Krzoz, *Z księciem Józefem w Galicji w 1809 roku* (With Prince Joseph in Galicia in 1809) (Warsaw, 1967); Bronisław Pawłowski, *Lwów w 1809 r.* (Lviv in 1809) (Lviv, 1909); and Bronisław Pawłowski, *Wojna polsko-austriacka 1809 r.* (Polish-Austrian war of 1809) (Warsaw, 1999).

⁴As I intend to locate this article within the historiography of Ukrainian nation-building, I render all names of Galicia's Greek Catholic clergymen in modern Ukrainian forms. This is a somewhat anachronistic practice, as in the available written sources we find them in Polish, Latin, German, or Church Slavonic, for example, Michał Harasiewicz (Polish), Michael Harasiewicz (German and Latin), and Mikhail Garasevich (Ruthenian Church Slavonic). For personal names, I use a simplified romanization of the Library of Congress (with primes but without diacritics)

⁵For these two iconic episodes of European history, see Timothy Tackett, *When the King Took Flight* (Cambridge, MA, 2003) and Hubert Wolf, *Der Unfehlbare: Pius IX. und die Erfindung des Katholizismus im 19. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2020).

⁶I use the terms "Commonwealth" and "Poland-Lithuania" to refer to the early modern republican polity that ceased to exist in 1795 similarly to how the present-day Slovak distinguishes between *Uhorsko* and *Uhri* (polyethnic Kingdom of Hungary as a whole and all its inhabitants) and *Madarsko* and *Madari* (today's Hungary and ethnic Hungarians). I also tend to use "Austria" for the whole of the Habsburg monarchy, not only its predominantly German-speaking lands.

⁷For the basic biographical information on Anhelovych and Harasevych, see two footnotes in Kyrylo Studyn's'kyi's introduction to *Ukrains'ko-rus'kyi arkhiv: Materialy do istorii kul'turnoho zhyttia v Halychyni v 1795–1857 rr. Zamitky i teksty* (Ukrainian-Ruthenian archive: Materials on the history of cultural life in Galicia 1795–1857. Notes and texts), vol. xiii–xiv (1920), v–vi; J. Umiński's entry in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (Polish Biographical Dictionary), vol. 1 (Cracow, 1935), 112; entry on Anhelovych in *Wurzbach*, vol. 1, 39–40; Amvrozii Androkhovych, "L'viv's'ke 'Studium Ruthenum,'" (Lviv "Ruthenian Study") *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka*, vol. 146 (1927), 46–53 and 68–75; Amvrozii Androkhovych, "Videns'ke Barbareum. Istoriia Korolivs'koi General'noi Hreko-katol. Semynarii pry Tserkvi Sv. Varvary u Vidni z pershoho periodu ii isnuvannia (1775–1784)" (Viennese Barbareum. History of the Royal General Seminary at the Church of St. Barbara in Vienna in its first period of existence, 1775–1784) in *Hreko-katolyts'ka Dukhovna Semynariia u L'vovi. Materialy i rozvidky. T. 1* (Greek Catholic Clerical Seminary in Lviv. Materials and Studies), ed. Iosyf Slipyi (Lviv, 1935), 186–87 and 206–7. Vienna's confidence in Harasevych and Anhelovych can be seen for example in AVA Inneres

easily understand why the pro-French Polish leaders viewed Anhelovych and Harasevych with so much suspicion. It is more challenging to reconstruct the choices and motivations of the two Ruthenian prelates. The exploration of this problem will be the narrative engine of the present text.

Both Anhelovych and Harasevych were born under Polish-Lithuanian rule before the first partition, belonging to a church whose leaders had always been loyal to the Commonwealth and for good reason: Poland-Lithuania was the cradle and protectress of the Ruthenian Uniates.⁸ Yet, at least since the second half of the 1790s, both prelates proved vocal and constant supporters of the Austrian government; Anhelovych had even published a few polemical brochures denouncing Bonaparte's conduct in European politics (mostly in Polish).⁹ After the arrival of the Duchy of Warsaw's troops in Galicia, they made a consistent effort to avoid meeting the demands of the occupation authorities, such as swearing allegiance to Bonaparte or substituting his name in Galicia's Greek Catholics' prayers for that of the Austrian emperor. Even if neither of the two prelates did anything actively hostile toward the French-sponsored forces, they were clearly unhappy about Warsaw's takeover of Galicia. In January 1810, the Duchy's Council of Ministers concluded that the Metropolitan Anhelovych was "hateful of the Polish name" (*nienawistny imieniowi Polaków*).¹⁰

Why did they not follow tradition and obey the representatives of the Duchy of Warsaw who fashioned themselves as restorers of Poland-Lithuania's independence? In order to understand the two men's political trajectories and the socio-cultural process that enabled them, we need to bring together several threads, each of which is quite well developed in historiography, but functions in isolation from the others: (1) the construction of a unified Austrian state; (2) Habsburg church policies; (3) the evolution of the Uniate Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; and finally, (4) the French Revolution and its impact on Europe as a whole.

Traditionally, the history of Galicia's Greek Catholic Church is approached either as a chapter of Ukrainian nation-building or an episode in the efforts to recreate the unity of European Christians. This is not necessarily wrong and scholars working within these traditions have made significant contributions. My central concern in dealing with this topic is in fact the question of nation-building, but I believe that in order to get it right, we need to be able to look beyond it. My proposal here is to reconstruct the social and cultural dynamics of Galicia's Greek Catholics, first and foremost, in their Habsburg context. Thus, in the second section, I will sketch the situation of the Uniate Church in Poland-Lithuania during the eighteenth century and then move on to explain the relevant policies of the Austrian monarchs. This will serve as a basis from which to offer my interpretation of how these state-imposed innovations changed the circumstances and the sense of belonging of the Ruthenian ecclesiastic elite. Lastly, I will locate my argument in a regional comparative perspective

PHSt 28/g: Angellowicz, Anton, österreichfreundliches Verhalten während der polnischen Insurrektion and AVA Adel HAA AR 339.18.

⁸Andrzej Gil and Ihor Skochyliias, *Kościół wschodnie w państwie polsko-litewskim w procesie przemian i adaptacji: metropolia kijowska w latach 1458–1795* (Eastern Churches in the Polish-Lithuanian Polity in the Course of Changes and Adaptations: Kyiv Metropolitanate 1458–1795) (Lublin, 2014); Ludomir Bienkowski, "Organizacja Kościoła Wschodniego w Polsce" (Organization of the Eastern Church in Poland), in *Kościół w Polsce, II: Wieki XVI–XVIII* (Church in Poland, II: Sixteenth-Eighteenth Centuries), ed. Jerzy Kłoczowski (Cracow, 1969), 781–1049; Edward Likowski, *Dzieje Kościoła unickiego na Litwie i Rusi w XVIII i XIX wieku: uważane głównie ze względu na przyczyny jego upadku. Cz. 1* (History of the Uniate Church in Lithuania and Rus' in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries: Observed from the Vantage Point of its Fall) (Warsaw, 1906); Iulian Pelesh, *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart. Bd. 2, Von der Wiederstellung der Union mit Rom bis auf die Gegenwart (1598–1879)* (Vienna, 1880); Antoni Korczok, *Die griechisch-katholische Kirche in Galizien* (Leipzig, 1921), 1–22.

⁹*Kto jest stroną zaczepiającą Austrya czy Francya* (Who is the aggressive side, Austria or France?) ([Lviv], 1805); *List pasterski do duchowieństwa i ludów dycezyów przemyskiej, samborskiej, sanockiej, lwowskiej, halickiej i kamienieckiej, tudzież chałmskiej, belskiej i brzeskiej* (Pastoral letter to the clergy and peoples of the dioceses of Przemyśl, Sambir, Sanok, Lviv, Halych, Kam'ianets', Belz, and Brest) ([Lviv], 1805); *Uwagi patrioty austriackiego nad niektórymi artykułami umieszczonemi w zagranicznych gazetach* (Remarks of an Austrian patriot on some articles published in foreign newspapers) ([Lviv], 1805); *Observations d'un patriote Autrichien sur divers Articles insérés dans les Gazettes étrangères* ([Lviv], 1805); there existed also a German-language version of the latter.

¹⁰Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie (henceforth AGAD), Akta Rady Ministrów Księstwa Warszawskiego, 66, 141.

to illuminate the broader significance of my points. First, however, a cursory picture of the relevant historiographical landscape is in order.

Historiographical Landscape

Although we seldom care to admit it, the way in which we construe the nation-building trajectories of the so-called small or non-historical nations of Central and Eastern Europe is heavily dependent on the self-celebratory narratives honed by nationalist intellectuals in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. According to them, their nations had existed continuously since at least the Middle Ages, even if most of them had subsequently lost their political independence and their nationally minded elites, falling into a centuries-long slumber. Then, the awakeners walk onto the stage in the nineteenth century to launch national movements and thereby resurrect the sleeping beauties. Initially, they focus on cultural activities, especially those concerning spoken vernaculars, but with the passage of time, they switch to more explicitly political struggles.¹¹

Various scholars and public intellectuals had been challenging such narratives since at least the 1880s, the most successful among them, the so-called modernists who gained the upper hand in the academic debates at the turn of the 1970s and 1980s. For them, nations are epiphenomena of capitalism and modernization, which can be presented in a simplified formula as “rotary printing press + railway = nation-building.” Hence, for these scholars the long history of dormant nations makes no sense whatsoever, as nations by definition could not have existed before the nineteenth (or at best eighteenth) century.¹² A marxist historian from Hungary exclaimed in the second half of the 1970s: “The sense of nationality . . . was only just emerging. It had not slumbered in Eastern Europe; it had not existed!”¹³

Most modernists saw themselves as constructivists questioning “self-evident” wisdoms about the objective existence of nations throughout history.¹⁴ They tried to show that nations came into being

¹¹For a bird’s eye overview of the awakeners, see Balázs Trencsényi, Maciej Janowski et al., *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe. Volume I: Negotiating Modernity in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 2016), 168–81. For Galician Ruthenian examples, see Iakiv Holovats’kyi, *O pervom literaturno-umstvennom dvizhenii rusinov v Galitsii so vremen avstriiskogo vladeniiia v toi zemle* (On the First Literary-Intellectual Movement of the Ruthenians in Galicia from the Time of Austrian Rule in that Land) (Lviv, 1865); Kyrylo Studyns’kyi, *Pol’s’ki konspiratsii sered rus’kykh pytomtsiv i dukhoven’stva v Halychyni v rokakh 1831–1846* (Polish Conspiracies Among Ruthenian Seminararians and Clergymen in Galicia 1831–1846) (Lviv, 1908); Kyrylo Studyns’kyi, “Prychynky do istorii kul’turnoho zhyttia Halyts’koi Rusy v litakh 1833–1847” (Provisional Observations on the Cultural Life in Galicia 1833–1847), in *Korespondentsiia Iakova Holovats’koho v litakh 1835–1849* (Iakiv Holovats’kyi’s Correspondence 1835–1849), ed. Kyrylo Studyns’kyi (Lviv, 1909), i–civ; Mykhailo Vozniak, *Iak probudylosia ukrains’ke narodnie zhyttia v Halychyni za Avstrii* (How the Ukrainian National Life was Awakened in Galicia under Austria) (Lviv, 1924); Mykhailo Tershakovets’, *Markiian Shashkevych ta ioho idei na tli ukrains’koho vidrozhennia* (Markiian Shashkevych and his Ideas Against the Background of the Ukrainian Rebirth) (Lviv, 2021).

¹²Classics of modernism include: Józef Chlebowczyk, *On Small and Young Nations in Europe: Nation-forming Processes in Ethnic Borderlands in East-Central Europe* (Wrocław, 1980); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983); Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford, 1983); Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations* (Cambridge, 1985); Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge, 1990). The idea that nations are a fundamentally modern phenomenon has been present, if not necessarily dominant, in European scholarship since at least the second half of the nineteenth century. See: Ernest Renan, *Qu’est-ce que’une nation* (Paris, 1882); I. Snitko [Stanisław Herburt-Heybowicz], *Zarys pojęć o narodzie* (A Sketch of Conceptions Concerning Nation) (Lviv, 1901); *Verhandlungen des zweiten deutschen Soziologentages vom 20.–22. Oktober 1912 in Berlin* (Berlin, 1913); Volodymyr Starosol’s’kyi, *Teoriia natsii* (Theory of Nation) (Vienna, 1922); Marcell Handelsman, *Rozwój narodowości nowoczesnej* (Development of Modern Nationality), 3 vols. (Warsaw, 1924, 1926, 1937); Walter Sulzbach, *Imperialismus und Nationalbewusstsein* (Frankfurt am Main, 1959); Timothy Snyder, *Nationalism, Marxism, and Modern Central Europe: A Biography of Kazimierz Kelles-Krauz, 1872–1905* (New York, 2018). For a brief discussion of this longer history of debates on nations and nationalism, see Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism*, 1–5.

¹³Emil Niederhauser, *The Rise of Nationality in Eastern Europe* (Budapest, 1982), 44.

¹⁴Joseph Stalin’s definition is perhaps the best-known example of the objectivist essentialism questioned by constructivists: “A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture,” Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question* (London, 1936), 8, quoted after Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism*, 5.

as political constructs promoted by specific interest groups in nineteenth-century Europe. The contribution of these scholars is substantial: most importantly, they created a new momentum of critical scholarship, reinvigorating academic debates, and undermining the “commonsensical” essentialist view of nations. At the same time, modernists had difficulty formulating consistently constructivist interpretations focused on the agency of historical actors, as they moved within the framework of modernization theory or Marxism, both strongly deterministic. Consequently, they reproduced several normative tropes resembling the earlier nationalist historiography that they had tried to overcome: they espoused a static vision of “pre-modern” and rural communities, akin to Romantic fantasies and neglectful of the now well-documented alternative channels of communication;¹⁵ their narratives privileged movements focused on language rights; they struggled with conceptualizing the role played by the political traditions and institutions with roots going back to the early modern period; they gradually ceased to research the period before the nineteenth century, transforming it into a sort of prologue or a necessary *mise-en-scène* section for the study of truly modern nationalisms;¹⁶ and perhaps most importantly, they presented nation-building as a seemingly inevitable process predetermined by the expanding forces of modernity and unfolding in clear-cut stages, such as the ones sketched by Miroslav Hroch.¹⁷

With the passage of time, historians started to grapple with some of the problems listed above. In a seminal article published toward the end of the twentieth century, John-Paul Himka explored the contingencies of Galician Ruthenian nation-building in a truly magisterial fashion, but even there he could not avoid the vocabulary of stadial history, mentioning “a larval stage” and “a protonational sense of community.”¹⁸ Soon after, Gary Cohen, Jeremy King, Pieter Judson, and Tara Zahra transformed Habsburg Bohemia into a laboratory for the study of nation-building in a new key: instead of arguing about the actual moment when the real modern nations came into being, they focused on the ways in which local actors appropriated, inflected, and resisted hegemonic lexicons of liberal nationalism for their own purposes.¹⁹ At the beginning of the second decade of the twenty-first century, Andriy

¹⁵For a Romantic-like picture of the pre-modern world see chapters 2, 4, and 5 in Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, e.g., the assertion: “Agrarian man can be compared with a natural species which can survive in the natural environment” (51). For important disclaimers see Eric Hobsbawm, “Peasants and Politics,” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 1, no. 1 (October 1973): 1–9 and the exchange with Philip Corrigan, “On the Politics of Production: A Comment on ‘Peasants and Politics’ by Eric Hobsbawm,” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 2, no. 3 (April 1975): 341–51. For the broad and deep circulation of information in Europe before the nineteenth century see: Emanuel Rostworowski, *Legenda i fakty XVIII w.* (Legends and facts of the eighteenth century) (Warsaw, 1963), 145–94, 465–86; T. C. W. Blanning, *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture: Old Regime Europe 1660–1789* (Oxford, 2002), 103–82, 356–441; Filippo de Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice: Rethinking Early Modern Politics* (Oxford, 2007); Robyn Radway, “Brief Notes on the Long War in the Early Modern News Cycle,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 50 (2019): 17–33. For a perspective that focuses on the change from the struggles of mid eighteenth century to those of the nineteenth, see Charles Tilly, “Contentious Repertoires in Great Britain, 1758–1834,” *Social Science History* 17, no. 2 (Summer, 1993): 253–80. For the difficulty of clearly delimiting modern politics from the “traditional” resistance, see Mykhailo Drahomanov, *Novi ukrains'ki pisni pro hromads'ki spravy (1764–1880)* (New Ukrainian songs about the social issues 1764–1880) (Kyiv, 1918); Eric Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movements in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Manchester, 1959); Maitrii Aung-Thwin, *The Return of the Galon King: History, Law, and Rebellion in Colonial Burma* (Athens, OH, 2010); Andriy Zayarnyuk, *Framing the Ukrainian Peasantry in Habsburg Galicia, 1846–1914* (Toronto, 2013), 76–176.

¹⁶For the power of nationalist messages in the eighteenth century, see David Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680–1800* (Cambridge, MA, 2001); Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (London, 2003); Blanning, *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture*, 184–356.

¹⁷See for example such characteristic statements in Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*: “Nationalism as such is fated to prevail, but not anyone particular nationalism” (47); and “the principle of nationalism . . . is itself in the least contingent and accidental” (56). Caspar Hirschi, *The Origins of Nationalism: An Alternative History from Ancient Rome to Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge, 2012), 1–33 offers a constructivist critique of the 1980s’ modernism. See also the discussion in Umüt Özkırmlı, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction* (Basingstoke, 2010), 72–142, 190–219.

¹⁸John-Paul Himka, “The Construction of Nationality in Galician Rus’: Icarian Flights in Almost All Directions,” in *Intellectuals and the Articulation of the Nation*, eds. Ronald G. Suny and Michael D. Kennedy (Ann Arbor, 1999), 111, 125, 126.

¹⁹Jeremy King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848–1948* (Princeton, 2002); Pieter Judson, *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, MA, 2006); Gary Cohen, *The Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague, 1861–1914*, 2nd ed., rev. (West Lafayette, 2006); Tara Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900–1948* (Ithaca, 2008). We

Zayarnyuk and Michał Łuczewski implemented a similarly flexible and localized way of seeing things in the Galician context.²⁰ Although I focus here on an earlier period and a very different set of actors, their work is a major source of inspiration for my research.

Still, the bulk of available scholarly literature on Galician Ruthenian nation-building remains under the sign of normative stages of lineal development. Although many historians sketch the early Austrian period as an indispensable background, they focus on the 1830s as the crucial turning point and take for granted that language issues constitute the kernel of nationalist activities (because of this many also explore the work of Ivan Mohyl'nyts'kyi and the Przemyśl circle in the 1810s).²¹ This is a standard story of Romantic *völkisch* belles lettres and liberal populist politics.²² There is little place in it for conservative elite churchmen, like Harasevych or Anhelovych, not even as nation builders' antagonists, because in this perspective, all relevant conflicts need to be easily translatable into ethnonational differences. In other words, the enemies of Ruthenian national activists should be Polish, although it is not even clear what exact criteria one can use to delimit the two nations in the first half of the nineteenth century. According to the logic of objectively given ethnic essence, the main litmus test is language use, but in an environment in which all even vaguely educated actors were bi- or plurilingual, determining every individual's "mother tongue" proves a hopeless pursuit. In practice, the national difference between Poles and Ruthenians is most often mapped onto the opposition between Latin and Greek Catholics.²³

People like Harasevych or Anhelovych easily defy both modernist and nationalist assumptions. Although it is justifiable to suppose that they had a good command of the vernacular Ruthenian spoken in Galicia (what we would classify today as one of southwestern Ukrainian dialects) and it cannot be excluded that this was indeed the first language they had mastered at home (although nothing certain can be known about it), they clearly preferred to use German, Latin, and Polish in their professional lives. As I will argue later, my protagonists made significant claims about their Ruthenian nationality and their not belonging to the Poles, yet it would be far-fetched to reconstruct their identities beyond their public personas. Their nationalism was indeed entangled with the dynamic social transformations kicked off by the Austrian government in the late eighteenth century, a process one

could add to this Bohemian list Alexander Maxwell's *Choosing Slovakia: Slavic Hungary, the Czechoslovak Language and Accidental Nationalism* (London, 2009). For an archeology of this situational actor-focused approach see Pieter Judson, "A 'Deák School of History,'" *Journal of Austrian-American History* 7, no. 1 (2023): 9–17.

²⁰Michał Łuczewski, *Odwieczny naród: Polak i katolik w Żmijącej* (Primordial Nation: Being Polish and Catholic in the village of Żmijąca) (Toruń, 2012); Zayarnyuk, *Framing the Ukrainian Peasantry*. Keely Stauter-Halsted, *The Nation in the Village: The Genesis of Peasant National Identity in Austrian Poland, 1848–1914* (Ithaca, 2001); and Yaroslav Hrytsak, *Ivan Franko and His Community* (Edmonton, 2018) (Ukrainian original published in 2006) are transitional cases, combining the rigid mode of conceptualizing nation-building and a more contingency-focused practical approach.

²¹The work of the orthodox Soviet Marxist Hryhorii Herbil's'kyi's can serve as an illustration. In his *Peredova suspil'na dumka v Halychyni* (Progressive Social Thought in Galicia) (Lviv, 1959) after an introductory mise-en-scène chapter he jumps immediately to the activists of the 1830s. Five years later, in his *Rozvytok prohresyvykh idei v Halychyni u pershii polovyni XIX stolittia* (Development of Progressive Ideas in Galicia in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century) (Lviv, 1964) he adds a short chapter on Ivan Mohyl'nyts'kyi and some other figures of his generation, emphasizing two themes: their language work and their interest in Russian scholarship (53–71). Still, the 1830s and 1840s clearly dominate (132–246).

²²Ivan Franko, "Zhyttia Ivana Fedorovycha i ioho chasy" (Life of Ivan Fedorovych and his Times) in Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh. Tom 46: Knyha I: Istorychni pratsi (1883–1890)* (Full Collection of Works in Fifty Volumes. Vol. 46: Book I: Historical Works), eds. Iaroslav D. Isaievych and Vitalii H. Sarbei (Kyiv, 1985), 9; Handelsman, *Rozwój narodowości* 3, 60–97; Ivan L. Rudnytsky, "The Role of Ukraine in Modern History" and "The Ukrainians in Galicia Under Austrian Rule," in Ivan L. Rudnytsky, *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* (Edmonton, 1987), 11–36, 315–52; Jan Kozik, *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia: 1815–1849* (Edmonton, 1986); Timothy Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999* (New Haven, 2003), 122–32; Hrytsak, *Ivan Franko*, xiii–xxiii, 77–120; Andriy Zayarnyuk and Ostep Sereda, *The Intellectual Foundations of Modern Ukraine: The Nineteenth Century* (Abingdon, 2023), 43–44, 62–64. Even Himka in "Icarian Flights," 115, asserts that the actual nation-building starts only in the 1830s or, at best, 1820s. For an inspiring attempt at offering an alternative interpretation focused on the revolutionary politics and the internationalist ideals of the Vormärz period see Anna Procyk, *Giuseppe Mazzini's Young Europe and the Birth of Modern Nationalism in the Slavic World* (Toronto, 2019).

²³For the difficulty of finding universally valid markers of nationality in the nineteenth century, see Zayarnyuk and Sereda, *Intellectual Foundations of Modern Ukraine*, 108–9.

could attempt to classify as modernization, but it had very little to do with capitalism or mass politics, let alone with liberalism.

Old-school nationalists described such elite ecclesiastics as members of the Ruthenian nation simply by virtue of their belonging to the Greek Catholic Church and their vaguely documented command of the vernacular. No additional explanations were needed, because historians of this tradition took the existence of the dormant Ruthenian nation for granted. At the same time, nationally minded scholars active in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century judged the churchmen of Anhelovych's cohort as imperfect Ruthenians who had failed to pursue opportunities for national awakening, most importantly by neglecting the development of a Ruthenian vernacular.²⁴ Because of this, older historians considered them marginal in comparison with the real heroes of the awakening who happened conveniently to be more marketable as selfless young liberals. For the modernists, similarly, Josephinist prelates may serve as a background story to the actual nineteenth-century nation-building, a sort of preface.²⁵ The only historian who actually focused his whole research on the first generations of Greek Catholic clergymen educated in Austrian schools and the resulting social transformation was Amvrosii Androkhovych (a disciple of Kyrylo Studyns'kyi's), but his high-quality work has fallen into oblivion: to the best of my knowledge his last monograph, devoted to the Greek Catholic General Seminary of Lviv, survives in one copy kept in the Library of the Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv.²⁶ Androkhovych is the invisible giant on whose shoulder this article is perched.

²⁴This judgment originated with Havrylo Rusyn [Iakiv Holovats'kyi], *Zustände der Russinen von Galizien: Ein Wort zur Zeit* (Leipzig, 1846), 8–11. Holovats'kyi's account is full of vitriol but is not inaccurate. In 1797, Harasevych as a lecturer of the Lviv Studium Ruthenum was reprimanded for teaching in Polish instead of Ruthenian, Androkhovych "Studium Ruthenum," 73. Except for one pastoral letter, reproduced by Harasevych in his work, I know of no Ruthenian-language texts issued by Anhelovych, Harasiewicz, *Annales*, 787–90, whereas, for example, we do have a bilingual pastoral letter of Petro Bilians'kyi *Poslanie pastyrskoe do dukhovenstva i liudu dietsezii lvovskoi i peremyskoi/List pastoralny do duchowieństwa i ludu diecezji lwowskiej i przemyskiej* (Pastoral Letter to the Clergy and People of the Dioceses of Lviv and Przemyśl) (Lviv, 1795). Two negative assessments formulated by nationalist historians against the prelates of Anhelovych's cohort will suffice here. Iulian Okhrymowych, *Rozvytok ukrains'koi natsional'no-politychnoi dumky (vid pochatku XIX stolittia do Mykhaila Drahomanova)* (Development of the Ukrainian National-Political Thought from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century until Mykhailo Drahomanov) (Lviv, 1922), 30: "Galician clergymen . . . had no national ideals, demanded nothing, but instead accepted anything that was given to them with servile thanks" (this author uses also the derogatory term *rutenstvo*, which can be compared to the pejorative use of the label "Little Russian" across the Zbruch). *Vozniak, Iak probudylosia ukrains'ke zhyttia*, 10–21 briefly describes the activities of such church leaders as Skorodyns'kyi, Anhelovych, and Harasevych, repeatedly deploring their neglect of the national language, treating it as tantamount to disrespect to the national cause (even though he has some sympathy for Harasevych). Kozik, *Ukrainian National Movement*, 26 reproduces this language-centric approach, albeit without the nationalist undertone: "The Ukrainians' ready resignation from the Ruthenian language at Lviv University is also proof that, at least until 1809, there was no awareness of a national problem in Galicia." See also Herbil's'kyi, *Peredova suspil'na dumka*, 32–34 and his *Rozvytok prohresyvnnykh idei v Halychyni*, 5–6, 56–57, 71.

²⁵Examples of this attitude include: Michael Hrushevsky, *A History of Ukraine* (New Haven, 1941), 469–74, 487–93; Ivan Kryp'yakevych et al., *Velyka istoriia Ukrainy* (A Large History of Ukraine) (Winnipeg, 1948), 663–94; Dmytro Doroshenko, *Narys istorii Ukrainy* (Sketch of the History of Ukraine) (Munich, 1966), 298–303; John-Paul Himka, "The Greek Catholic Church and Nation-Building in Galicia, 1772–1918," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8, no. 3/4 (December 1984): 426–52; Rudnytsky, *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*, 315–23; Iaroslav Hrytsak, *Narys istorii Ukrainy: Formuvannia modernoi ukrains'koi natsii XIX-XX stolittia* (Sketch of the History of Ukraine: The Formation of the Modern Ukrainian Nation) (Kyiv, 1996), 41–53; Paul R. Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine* (Seattle, 1996), 385–405; Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History* (Toronto, 2000), 213–25, 237–42. Paul R. Magocsi, *The Roots of Ukrainian Nationalism: Galicia as Ukraine's Piedmont* (Toronto, 2002), 50 even concluded in a programmatic article first published in 1989 that all the work of the late eighteenth century was in vain, so "the Ukrainian national revival had to start again from scratch." Characteristically, Kyrylo Studyns'kyi titled his study of the Lviv General Seminary, the single most important institution for the reproduction of the Greek Catholic clergy, *Lvivs'ka dukhovna Semynaryia v chasakh Markiiana Shashkevycha (1829–1843)* (Lviv Clerical Seminary in the Time of Markiian Shashkevych, 1829–1843) (Lviv, 1916). Thus, even in studying this topic, he reinforced the centrality of the national awakening embodied in the heroic leader of the Ruthenian Trinity.

²⁶Amvrosii Androkhovych, "Istoriia hreko-katolyts'koi General'noi Dukhovnoi Semynarii u L'vovi 1783–1810" (History of the Greek Catholic Clerical Seminary in Lviv, 1783–1810) in *Hreko-katolyts'ka Dukhovna Semynariia u L'vovi. Materialy i rozvidky. T. 3* (Greek Catholic Clerical Seminary in Lviv. Materials and Studies), ed. Iosyf Slipyi (Lviv, 1935), 61–505. For an overview of Androkhovych's work, see Serhii Olenych, "Istoriia osvity u doslidzhenniakh Amvrosiia Androkhovycha (1879–1942)" (History of Education in the Research Works of Amvrosii [sic] Androkhovych), *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk: zbirnyk*

Nevertheless, two contemporary historians based in Lviv, Mar'ian Mudryi, and Vadym Adadurov, did not shy away from studying these figures in the context of nation-building. I will focus here on the latter, as he devoted a number of his publications to Antonii Anhelovych and the politics surrounding his elevation to the post of Galicia's Greek Catholic Metropolitan. Among others, Adadurov tackled the topic of the elite ecclesiastics' national identity.²⁷ Inevitably, his work must serve as a recurring point of reference for my own study. Adadurov has resolutely rejected the stance of the traditional nationalist historiography that claimed Anhelovych and Harasevych to be natural-born members of the Ruthenian nation. Instead, he adopts a constructivist approach, in which national identity depends on acts of identification that make patent one's *Zusammengehörigkeitsgefühl* or sense of belonging. On this basis, he concludes that it is anachronistic to see Anhelovych as a Ruthenian (in the modern nationalized sense of the term), because he was first and foremost a member of his estate and a subject of the Austrian monarch. Adadurov characterizes Anhelovych's identity as pre-modern feudal, taking for granted the sharp rupture between the *ancien régime* and modernity.²⁸

It is evident that Adadurov has made a significant contribution, both in factual and theoretical terms, and one that will remain useful for several generations. Yet, my own position differs from his on several counts, as I believe that he has overemphasized the contrast between the allegedly pre-modern Austria of that time and the modern order of things that was to follow. As a Catholic bishop in the late eighteenth century, Anhelovych was not a medieval-style vassal of his monarch, but rather a citizen and servant of his state and fatherland. What is more, he was also expected to serve as a leader of his people. Secondly, Adadurov tries to determine the true identity of his protagonist, which is a very elusive goal, so eventually he limits himself to studying Anhelovych's public statements. This, I believe, is the right thing to do, but we should not treat it as an inevitable but sorry concession caused by the dearth of available sources. I would argue instead that we can proudly adopt it as a full-blown methodological stance. Rather than focusing on identity, an important concept to be studied but a clumsy analytical tool itself, we should explore the polemical claims about national groups and acts of identification with them, as made by historical actors in contentious situations.²⁹ Thus, the study of nationalism becomes, first and foremost, a domain of intellectual history. We do not need to search for the true identities or the actual ethnic essence of nations, be it language or anything else, but simply focus on the political institutions and intellectual devices that enabled the choices of historical actors. This should help us to better capture both the contingency of the overall process and the crucial role of individual agency.

For the purposes of this text, I propose to define nationalism as an elite ideology legitimizing power with a reference to the nation, an imagined community described primarily in a relational manner that is represented as being on a par and competing for status with other European peoples.³⁰ In this

naukovykh prats' Drohobysts'koho derzhavnogo universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Serii Istorii (Problems of humanities: Collection of scholarly works of the Ivan Frank Drohobych State University. Series History), no. 11/53 (2022): 310–25.

²⁷Mar'ian Mudryi, "Avstrorosynstvo v Halychyni: sproba okreslennia problemy" (Austro-Ruthenianism in Galicia: an attempt at determining the phenomenon) *Visnyk Lvivs'koho Universytetu. Serii Istorychna*, no. 35/36 (2000): 571–604; Adadurov, "Virnopiddanyi sluha"; Adadurov, *Fundatsiia Halyts'koi Mytropolii u svitli diplomatychnoho lystuvannia Avstrii ta Sviatoho Prestolu 1807–1808 rokiv: zbirnyk dokumentiv* (Foundation of the Galician Metropolitanate in the Light of the Diplomatic Correspondence of Austria and the Holy See 1807–1808: Collection of Documents) (Lviv, 2011); Adadurov, *Podil kyivs'koi ta pidnesennia halyts'koi uniinykh mytropolii: dokumenty ta materialy vatykans'kykh arkhiviv* (Division of the Kyivan Metropolitanate and Erection of the Galician Metropolitanate: Documents and Materials from the Vatican Archives) (Lviv, 2019).

²⁸Adadurov, "Virnopiddanyi sluha," 196–201, 230–31. Zayarnyuk and Sereda, *Intellectual Foundations of Modern Ukraine*, 34–35, in turn, characterize Harasevych and Anhelovych as representing "a pre-national, but no longer 'traditional' worldview."

²⁹Quentin Skinner, "Moral Principles and Social Change," in Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics: Volume 1: Regarding Method* (Cambridge, 2002) 145–57. Cf. Gary Marker, "Constitutio Medievalis: The Politics of Language and the Language of Politics in the 1710 Constitution," in *Pylp Orlyk: zhyttia, polityka, teksty*, ed. Natalia Iakovenko (Kyiv, 2011), 249: "The point here is not about uncovering what Orlyk 'really' thought in his heart of hearts, an enterprise that lies beyond the meager tools of documentary historians who are fated to rely upon textual and physical remnants of a past time to try to reconstruct matters as they appear to us in distant hindsight. Instead, we need to inquire into how Orlyk chose to present himself, his arguments, and his images textually."

³⁰Hirschi, *Origins of Nationalism*, 34–50.

approach, the difference between pre-modern national thought and modern nationalisms is blurred not by claiming direct lineal continuities between the two stages or insisting on the ethno-linguistic essence of nationality, but rather by emphasizing that all identification labels of this kind and resulting definitions of belonging, modern and pre-modern alike, are contingent constructs, promoted by specific interest groups in particular situations and in relation to the existing power structures.³¹

As Larry Wolff notes, “. . . nations are not ascribed according to nature, but rather by the crystallizing of distinct national meanings around formerly overlapping labels . . . the early modern imperial matrix also conditioned the ascription, affirmation, and fluctuation of still volatile identities.”³² The clear-cut opposition between inheritance/continuity and rupture/invention of national identities is a *cul-de-sac*, as cultural products are neither made from scratch nor ossified, but repeatedly reassembled from the items at hand.³³ Nation-building has neither a clear starting point nor does it ever end, as the circumstances constantly change and there is no single scenario of development that is more genuine or correct than others (although, of course, some may be more likely). As Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi reflected in 1906, it had been possible for the Greek Catholic Ruthenians of the Habsburg monarchy to evolve into a nation completely separate from the Orthodox Christian Ukrainians in the Russian Empire, just as it had happened to Croats and Serbs. It was a result of the political choices and concerted efforts of scores of intellectuals and activists that there did not emerge such two separate nations in the Galician-Ukrainian case.³⁴

Hrushevs'kyi's Croat-Serb analogy is a counterfactual speculation, but it is true that until the end of the nineteenth century, Greek Catholic intellectuals in Galicia continued to make conflicting claims about the national belonging of the Ruthenian community. Some defined it as an ethnographic variety of the post-Commonwealth Polish-Lithuanian nation that should regain independence in its pre-1772 borders. Others saw it as a branch of the one and indivisible East Slavic nation of the Holy Rus', encompassing also the Orthodox Ukrainians, Muscovites/Russians, and Belarusians. The group that proved most successful in the long run argued that because of their dialectal proximity, Galician Ruthenians formed one national community with the Orthodox Ukrainians across the Zbruch river, but were completely separate from the remaining Eastern Slavs (Belarusians and Muscovites/Russians). Later, there would also emerge a movement claiming to represent yet another nation, named Rusyns, limited only to the Greek Catholic and Orthodox Eastern Slavic inhabitants of the Carpathians. “Of the making of nationalities there is no end.”³⁵

A Church in Its Contexts

Galicia's Greek Catholic Church was an offshoot of the Uniate Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The latter, in turn, was a somewhat paradoxical institution, at the same time, an *Ecclesia triumphans* and an *Ecclesia dolens*. Uniates formed a Church triumphant, because they had successfully defeated their Orthodox rivals in the Commonwealth, reducing them to a position of a tolerated provincial minority. Uniates' domination was sealed at the Synod of Zamość in 1720

³¹For the opposition between national thought and nationalism see Joep Leerssen, *National Thought in Europe: A Cultural History* (Amsterdam, 2006), 14–17.

³²Larry Wolff, *Venice and the Slavs: The Discovery of Dalmatia in the Age of Enlightenment* (Stanford, 2001), 331.

³³Tomasz Hen-Konarski, “No Longer Just Peasants and Priests: The Most Recent Studies on Nation Building in Nineteenth-Century Ukraine,” *European History Quarterly* 45, no. 4 (2015): 728.

³⁴Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, “Z bizhuchoi khvyli. Halychyna i Ukraina” (From the Current Moment: Galicia and Ukraine) *Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk* 36, no. 12 (December 1906): 494.

³⁵Title of the collection of essays by Paul R. Magocsi, *Of the Making of Nationalities There is No End* (Boulder, 2000). Magocsi also happens to be one of the champions of the Rusyn nationalism. John-Paul Himka has suggestively explored the question of contingency, competing offers, and plausible alternative scenarios in his “Icarian Flights,” *passim* but see especially 112 and 144–45. See also a suggestive comparison of nation-building to Tetris as a game in which it is impossible to achieve a definitive victory in Edin Hajdarpašić, *Whose Bosnia? Nationalism and Political Imagination in the Balkans, 1840–1914* (Ithaca, 2015), 206. For the Polish-Lithuanian and pan-Rus'/Russian alternatives to the Galician Ukrainian national movement see Adam Świątek, *Gente Rutheni, Nazione Poloni: The Ruthenians of Polish Nationality in Habsburg Galicia* (Edmonton, 2019) and Anna Veronika Wendland, *Die Russophilen in Galizien: Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Russland, 1848–1915* (Vienna, 2001).

which can be seen as the culmination of their peculiar confessionalization. Zamość brought Eastern-rite Catholics of Poland-Lithuania under closer papal supervision, stabilizing their structure and customs as a combination of Western and Eastern elements, a *vizioso miscuglio* or corrupt mish-mash, as a bishop championing a stricter alignment with the Byzantine tradition characterized it in the late eighteenth century.³⁶ The Uniate church elite acquired the familiar outlook of cultured Central European prelates of the Baroque era and felt completely at home in the Commonwealth.³⁷ Official documents would occasionally refer to the Uniates as *natio* or *gens Ruthena* (or *Roxolana*), but in the eighteenth century, this did not necessarily imply that they were perceived as a completely separate nation: rather, that they formed a specific variety *within* the broader Polish-Lithuanian community.³⁸ Similarly, many families of noble landowners who had long belonged to the Latin Catholic Church and used Polish in their everyday life would in some situations present themselves as Ruthenians, meaning that they held land estates in the Ruthenian provinces, identified with the regional interests, and traced their heritage to the princes and knights of the medieval Rus'.³⁹

At the same time, the rank-and-file Uniate clergymen remained universally scorned as poorly educated, economically disadvantaged, and legally handicapped peasant priests.⁴⁰ A barely translatable Polish-language saying summarized this situation in the following manner: “Bóg stworzył popa dla chłopca, a plebana dla pana” (God created a Uniate priest for the peasant and a Latin Catholic parson for the gentleman).⁴¹ To add insult to injury, Rus' as a whole was associated with superstition, savagery, and rebellion. In accordance with the negative stereotype prevalent in the Polish-language culture both before and after the definitive collapse of the Commonwealth, Ruthenian commoners were depicted as benighted and rebellious half-savages, whereas the clergymen of the Greek rite were almost

³⁶Synod of Zamość is a central event of the Ruthenian Uniate history, so the literature on it is extensive. For a traditional account see Pelesh, *Geschichte der Union*, 420–45. For the newest perspective see Ihor Skochyliias, ed., *Zamois'kyi provintsynyi sobor Rus'koi Uniinoi Tserkvy. Knyha 1: Diiannia ta postanovy* (Zamość Provincial Synod of the Ruthenian Uniate Church. Vol. 1: Proceedings and Resolutions) (Lviv 2021). For the general outlook of the Uniate Church in the period following the Synod of Zamość see: Ihor Skochyliias, “The Uniate Church in Right-Bank Ukraine in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century: Paradoxes of Regional Adaptation,” in *Eighteenth-Century Ukraine: New Perspectives on Social, Cultural, and Intellectual History*, eds. Zanon E. Kohut, Volodymyr Sklokin et al. (Toronto, 2023) 424–54; Larry Wolff, *Disunion within the Union: The Uniate Church and the Partitions of Poland* (Cambridge, MA, 2020); and Barbara Skinner, *The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in Eighteenth-century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia* (DeKalb, 2009), 36–111.

³⁷For example, Prince Adam K. Czartoryski suggested in 1789 at the diet held in Warsaw that the Uniate higher clergy should be encouraged to return to the Eastern-style dress and ceremonies, because their lifestyle had alienated the Ruthenian commoners by becoming too similar to the Latin church elite, AGAD, Archiwum Sejmu Czteroletniego, 1, 535 (Session 89, 16 April 1789). See Oleh Turij, “Der ‘ruthenische Glaube’ und die ‘treuen Ruthenen’: Die habsburgische Politik bezüglich der griechisch-katholischen Kirche,” in *Grenzregionen der Habsburgermonarchie im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert: Ihre Bedeutung und Funktion aus der Perspektive Wiens*, ed. Hans-Christian Maner (Münster, 2005), 125–26 and Handelsman, *Rozwój narodowości* 3, 61.

³⁸For example, in a 1724 letter to Pope Benedict XIII Metropolitan Lev Kyshka speaks of *gens Ruthena*, whereas in a 1720 pastoral letter to Archimandrite Ivan-Khryzostom Radzymins'kyi-Frantskevych he uses the phrase *gens nostra Roxolana*. In turn, Pope Clement XI in a 1720 letter of salutation to the synod fathers employed the term *Ruthena natio*. It remains to be determined if there was any significant difference of meaning between the words *gens* and *natio*. All quotes after *Zamois'kyi provintsynyi sobor*, 98, 218, 232. Adadurov, “Virnopiddanyi sluha,” 195 quotes an official communication from 1807 between Vienna and Rome where the former speaks of “la nation Ruthène grec unie.” This might suggest that as late as the first decade of the nineteenth century the Austrian government could use the term nation as a synonym for confession.

³⁹For example, in April 1789 at the diet held in Warsaw Jacek Jezierski spoke of “our Ruthenian brethren” (*braci naszych Rusinów*), clearly meaning the nobility of the Ruthenian palatinates. Prince Adam K. Czartoryski, in turn, claimed to possess expertise in the Ruthenian matters, as “a citizen and old/former Ruthenian” (*obywatel i dawny Rusin*), although his family had adhered to the Latin rite since the early seventeenth century, AGAD, Archiwum Sejmu Czteroletniego, 82, 535 (Sessions: 74, 2 April 1789; and 89, 16 April 1789).

⁴⁰Uniate clergymen's level of education was certainly more uneven than the average among the Latin Catholics, but it was not as bad as the stereotypes would have it. Although it was not unusual to encounter candidates to priesthood in the 1770s who had not attended any school, there were also many who had had some exposure to the *ratio studiorum* offered in Jesuit, Piarist, and Basilian schools of the time, as is clearly visible in the data amassed by Amvrosii Androkhovych, “Lvivs'ke Studium Ruthenum,” *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Shevchenka* 131 (1921): 147–85.

⁴¹Bieńkowski, “Organizacja Kościoła Wschodniego,” 1032. *Pop* is a term used in Polish exclusively for Orthodox Christian and Greek Catholic priests. Nowadays, it is considered derogatory.

always suspected of acting in the interest of power-hungry monarchs and of inciting the peasantry's hatred toward the nobility and Latin Catholics.⁴²

In 1809, this negative picture provided the basic interpretive framework through which pro-French Polish officials and military commanders filtered their experience of encounters with Galicia's Greek Catholic leadership. Yet, despite all the resulting tensions and wounds, the Uniate church elite had proven exemplarily loyal to the Commonwealth and had fully identified with this polity prior to 1795, as their main enemy, the Orthodox Church, was sponsored aggressively by the Russian Empire.⁴³

I will give here just one characteristic example of this persistent sense of belonging to the Polish-Lithuanian polity. In 1789, there erupted a *grande peur* in the Commonwealth, as the nobility feared that the Russian government planned to incite a rebellion of Ruthenian peasantry in collusion with the Uniate clergy. There followed a widespread persecution of Ruthenian serfs and their parish priests, including several death sentences. Mykhailo Harasevych knew about it and would later use those facts in a very peculiar way in his own Latin-language *Annals of the Ruthenian Church* (*Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenae*), but here I am more interested in Feodosii Brodovych, archpriest of the Uniate cathedral chapter of Lutsk and author of *The Image of Violence Fiercely Inflicted upon a Helpless Innocence*. This text served Harasevych as the main source of information on the anti-Ruthenian panic of 1789, but Brodovych's perspective is very different from that of the Galician annalist. Despite the absurd injustice of the accusations and the harrowing suffering of scores of helpless clergymen and peasants, Brodovych did not reject the Commonwealth as such, but rather told a story of a tragic misunderstanding caused by a combination of deep-seated nobiliary prejudice against Rus' and anti-clerical trends of the radical Enlightenment. In his account, Ruthenians are innocent children of the same fatherland and the text ends with a lament for the partitioned Poland-Lithuania. Although Brodovych sees this political catastrophe as a divine punishment for the injustices of the nobility, at no point does he distance himself from the Commonwealth. Even in adversity, he continued to see Poland-Lithuania as his country.⁴⁴

Two additional aspects need to be mentioned here, as especially relevant in the context of Habsburg Galicia. First of all, thanks to its low status, Uniates' was a cheap church with an extremely dense network of parishes.⁴⁵ Another important characteristic was the privileged position of the Basilian Order, a corporation of well-educated monks who enjoyed a monopoly on higher ecclesiastical offices, including that of the bishop. For this reason, they used to be called *ordo praelaticus* and sometimes Latin Catholics would even convert to the Greek rite and become Basilians in pursuit of career opportunities.⁴⁶ These factors (conflict with the regular clergy, dense parish network, cultural and social proximity to the people, low status, and openness to state-sponsored social mobility) combined to put the

⁴²Richard Butterwick, *The Polish Revolution and the Catholic Church, 1788–1792: A Political History* (Oxford, 2012), 92, 191–98; Michael Ostling, “Poison and Enchantment Rule Ruthenia: Witchcraft, Superstition, and Ethnicity in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth,” *Russian History* 40, no. 3/4 (2013): 488–507. For suggestive examples in published primary sources see: Adam Moszczeński, *Pamiętnik do historii polskiej w ostatnich latach panowania Augusta III. i pierwszych Stanisława Poniatowskiego* (Memoir on the Polish history in the last years of the reign of Augustus III and the first ones of Stanislaus Poniatowski) (Poznań, 1858), 11–13; Hugo Kołłątaj, *Stan oświecenia w Polsce w ostatnich latach panowania Augusta III* (The state of Enlightenment in Poland in the last years of Augustus III) (1750–1764). T. I, 2 (Poznań, 1881), 17–18, 139–41; Jędrzej Kitowicz, *Pamiętniki ks. A. Kitowicza do panowania Augusta III i Stanisława Augusta* (Rev. Kitowicz's memoir on the reign of Augustus III and Stanislaus Augustus) (Lviv, 1882), vol. 1: 137–40, vol. 2: 357–61.

⁴³Skinner, *Western Front*, 112–43, 169–223; Butterwick, *Polish Revolution*, 299–303.

⁴⁴Teodozy Brodowicz, *Widok przemocy na słabą niewinność srogo wywartej* (Image of Violence Fiercely Inflicted upon a Helpless Innocence), ed. Iakiv Holovats'kyi (Lviv, 1861). The most accessible English-language accounts of these events are Skinner, *The Western Front*, 183–95; and Richard Butterwick, “Deconfessionalization? The Policy of the Polish Revolution towards Ruthenia, 1788–1792,” *Central Europe* 6, no. 2 (2008): 91–121.

⁴⁵Moszczeński, *Pamiętnik*, 13: “None of the magnates lived in Ukraine . . . they preferred to have Eastern-rite churches (*cerkwie*) built in their settlements, rather than the Latin churches (*kościóły*), because the Eastern-rite churches cost nothing except for the wood granted to the village assembly for the construction, whereas the equipment of a Latin church is very costly.”

⁴⁶Perhaps the most suggestive example is that of Iason Smozhozhevs'kyi, Poland-Lithuania's Uniate metropolitan in the 1780s who had been born as a Latin and only transitioned upon entering the Basilians in his late teens. See Andrzej Zięba's entry in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 39 (Cracow, 1999), 216–25. Smozhozhevs'kyi is also the main protagonist of Wolff's *Disunion with the Union*.

Ruthenian parish priests in a position that corresponded very closely with the expectations of the Austrian government concerning the role of the secular clergy in the society at large. At least from the 1770s on, Vienna made a consistent effort to limit the influence and numbers of monks, whereas the secular parish priests were meant to become closer to their flocks, to serve as conveyors of information between the government and the popular masses, especially the rural ones.⁴⁷

Austria's arrival in Galicia in 1772 was doubtless a new opening in many respects, but we should be wary of the Habsburg officials' Enlightenment rhetoric that presented this land as a barbarous country, a *tabula rasa* that just begged to be civilized by upright men from Vienna and Prague.⁴⁸ When it comes to the Greek Catholic Church, the government acted cautiously, building on policies that had been in the making for a number of years and relying on the expertise of Ruthenian intermediaries from the Kingdom of Hungary, like Mykhailo Shchavnyts'kyi.⁴⁹ Initially, Galician Ruthenians were by no means central to Vienna's understanding of the Uniate question. Austrian treatment of Galicia's Greek Catholics in the 1770s and 1780s was shaped by two trends, each of them with its own temporality. The older one was the Habsburg monarchs' sponsorship of the Uniates in the Realm of St. Stephen.⁵⁰ It needs to be understood within the context of the seventeenth-century Counter Reformation and the pacification following the Treaty of Satu Mare of 1711. The other one originated with Maria Theresa's effort to effectively transform her diverse hereditary lands, this *Monarchische Union der Ständestaaten*, into a unified state. The start of this process is usually identified with the so-called Haugwitzian Revolution of 1748/49.⁵¹

In the 1770s, Austrian rulers had been promoting the cause of Greek-rite Catholicism in the Kingdom of Hungary for over a century. They learned there that it was relatively easy to persuade large numbers of Orthodox clergymen to accede to the Union, but it was much harder to keep them loyal to it over a longer term. To achieve the latter, it was necessary to incentivize them by offering a realistic prospect of social ascent tied to the condition of remaining within the Catholic communion. Otherwise, the Union would mean losing the freedom resulting from the status of a tolerated and protected minority enjoyed by the Orthodox, without gaining anything in exchange. One of the indispensable conditions to raise the status of the Uniate clergymen and their Church was to provide them with quality education without which they could not expect to command respect in an *ancien-régime* society.

The other more immediate aspect was that after the loss of Silesia, Maria Theresa was desperate to catch up with her archenemy, the king of Prussia. She sought to transform her loose monarchy into a

⁴⁷John-Paul Himka, "The Conflict between the Secular and the Religious Clergy in Eighteenth-Century Western Ukraine," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 15, no. 1/2 (1991): 35–47; Derek Beales, *Joseph II, Volume II: Against the World, 1780–1790* (Cambridge, 2009), 314–16; William D. Bowman, *Priest and Parish in Vienna, 1780 to 1880* (Boston, 1999), 1–19, 212–20.

⁴⁸Orientalist depictions of the local population and environment are a classical topic of Galicia studies. The most important exploration of this theme is Larry Wolff, *The Idea of Galicia: History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture* (Stanford, 2010), but see also: Klemens Kaps, *Ungleiche Entwicklung in Zentraleuropa: Galizien zwischen überregionaler Verflechtung und imperialer Politik (1772–1914)* (Vienna, 2015); Christoph Augustynowicz, "Blutsaugen als othering oder Reiseerfahrungen aus dem Galizien des 18. Jahrhunderts. Einige Beobachtungen zu Postkolonialismus und Vampir(ismus)-Diskurs" and Klemens Kaps, "Kulturelle Differenzen des Ökonomischen: Galizische Entwicklungsdiskurse im Spannungsfeld räumlicher Funktionalisierung und sozialer Bruchlinien (1772–1848)," *Historyka: Studia Metodologiczne* 42 (2012): 61–76 and 97–116; Christoph Mick, "Reisen nach 'Halb-Asien.' Galizien als binnenexotisches Reiseziel," in *Zwischen Exotik und Vertrautem: Zum Tourismus in der Habsburgermonarchie und ihren Nachfolgestaaten*, eds. Peter Stachel and Martina Thomsen (Bielefeld, 2014), 95–112. For older critical treatment of these stereotypes underwritten by the Polish national sentiment, see Ludwik Finkel, "Memoriał Antoniego hr. Pergena, pierwszego gubernatora Galicyi, o stanie kraju" (Count Pergen's Memorial on the State of Galicia) *Kwartalnik Historyczny* Year XIV (1900), 24–43 and Władysław Chotkowski, *Historia polityczna Kościoła w Galicyi za rządów Marii Teresy* (Political History of the Church in Galicia under Maria Theresa), vol. 1 (Cracow, 1909), 52–78. For comparison, see Peter Stachel, "Halb-kolonial und halb-orientalisch? Dalmatien als Reiseziel im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert," in Stachel and Thomsen, *Zwischen Exotik und Vertrautem*, 165–99; Valentina Glajar, "'Halb-Asien' to Europe: Contrasting Representations of Austrian Bukovina," *Modern Austrian Literature* 34, no. 1/2 (2001): 15–35.

⁴⁹For Shchavnyts'kyi, see Androkhovych "Studium Ruthenum," 41–46; Androkhovych "Barbareum," 166–69; and Fr. Tichý, "U sv. Barbory ve Vídni" (At St. Barbara in Vienna) *Dunaj: Revue Rakoských Čechoslovaků*, Year XII (1935), 57–62.

⁵⁰Androkhovych "Barbareum," 47–57; Paul R. Magocsi, "Eastern Christians in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1526–1918," in *Eastern Christians in the Habsburg Monarchy*, eds. John-Paul Himka and Franz A. J. Szabo (Edmonton, 2021), 1–14.

⁵¹For the Haugwitzian Revolution, see Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, *Maria Theresa: The Habsburg Empress in Her Time* (Princeton, 2021), 202–20.

unified *wohlgeordnete Polizeistaat* that would efficiently promote the *publica felicità* or *gemeinschaftliche Glückseligkeit* of her subjects.⁵² As she lacked competent officials, she implemented a reform of universities that would train a new army of state servants. Even this was not enough, for the Monarchy was too vast and diverse. In order to convey the government regulations to the populace all over her dominions and to gather intelligence on the ground, the Queen needed a functionary in every village. There was only one organization that came close to this ideal: the Catholic Church. It was, then, necessary to carry out a thorough *Verstaatlichung* of the church structure, to transform it into a tool of state.⁵³ From now on, Catholic priests were to be not only *sacerdotes* but also a special class of *Staatsbeamte*: this meant the emergence of a completely new kind of priest and higher church official. It was necessary to inculcate clerics with a sense of duty toward the Austrian Monarchy. With this purpose in mind, the Abbot of Břevnov Franz Stephan Rautenstrauch sketched the necessary reform of priestly education in his *Outline for the Establishment of Theological Schools in the Imperial-Royal Hereditary Lands*.⁵⁴

In this perspective, the key caesura is not so much 1772, the year of the first partition of the Commonwealth, as 1773, when the abolition of the Jesuit Order marked a symbolic end of the Baroque *pietas austriaca*. Perhaps more importantly, the confiscated Jesuit property allowed the Habsburg government to fund its ambitious initiatives. It is symptomatic that the first state-run educational establishment for the Austrian Greek Catholics was located in Vienna in a former Jesuit building. This was the so-called Barbareum, controlled throughout its short existence by a coalition of priests from northern Croatia and Transylvania. This circumstance illustrates well that it was intended to be, first and foremost, a solution to the problems encountered by Maria Theresa in her efforts to sponsor her Uniate subjects in the Kingdom of Hungary, rather than an attempt to win over the new ones from Galicia. Even more striking is the fact that the Barbareum was the first school in the whole Monarchy established from scratch after the formulation of F. S. Rautenstrauch's plan (three years before Melchior Blarer's well-known Brno seminary).⁵⁵

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of the Barbareum for the topic of this article. The opportunity to study there was a formative experience for a number of Galician Ruthenians. Vienna, a predominantly German-speaking city of 200,000 inhabitants, must have been a devastating culture shock for boys and young men who came from small localities of Red Rus' (for example, both Anhelovych and Harasevych were sons of parish priests, the former born and brought up in the village of Hryniv, the latter in that of Iaktoriv). Seeing the Habsburg rulers and their court for themselves must have made a strong and lasting impression on such provincials. The University of Vienna provided a completely different kind of education focused on the necessity of being useful to the state. Lastly, the seminary itself was a networking hub where the Greek Catholics from all over the

⁵²This concept has been codified by Ludovico Antonio Muratori, *Della pubblica felicità, oggetto de' buoni principi* (Lucca, 1749) and further popularized by Johann Heinrich Gottlob von Justi.

⁵³Elisabeth Kovács, "Beziehungen von Staat und Kirche im 18. Jahrhundert," in *Österreich im Zeitalter des aufgeklärten Absolutismus*, ed. Erich Zöllner (Vienna, 1983), 29–53; Ernst Wangermann, "Reform Catholicism and Political Radicalism in the Austrian Enlightenment," in *The Enlightenment in National Context*, eds. Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich (Cambridge, 1981), 127–40; Franz A. J. Szabo, *Kauniz and Enlightened Absolutism 1753–1780* (Cambridge, 1994), 209–57; Beales, *Joseph II: Against the World*, 68–89, 271–332; Stollberg-Rillinger, *Maria Theresa*, 563–648; Harm Klueping, "The Catholic Enlightenment in Austria or the Habsburg Lands," in *A Companion to the Catholic Enlightenment in Europe*, eds. Ulrich Lehner and Michael Printy (Leiden, 2010), 127–64.

⁵⁴[Franz Stephan Rautenstrauch], *Entwurf zur Einrichtung der theologischen Schulen in den k. k. Erblanden* (Vienna, 1784). See also: Thomas Wallnig, "Franz Stephan Rautenstrauch (1734–1785): Church Reform for the Sake of the State," in *Enlightenment and Catholicism in Europe: A Transnational History*, eds. Jeffrey D. Burson and Ulrich L. Lehner (Notre Dame, 2014), 209–26; Josef Müller, *Der pastoraltheologisch-didaktische Ansatz in Franz Stephan Rautenstrauchs "Entwurf zur Einrichtung der theologischen Schulen"* (Vienna, 1969); Beda F. Menzel, *Abt Franz Stephan Rautenstrauch von Břevnov-Braunau: Herkunft, Umwelt und Wirkungskreis* (Königstein im Taunus, 1969). Mykhailo Shchavnyts'kyi considered Rautenstrauch an important patron of all Greek Catholics in the Monarchy, Androkhovych "Barbareum," 11. At the very least, the Abbot of Břevnov was aware of the Galician affairs as an active member of the *Geistliche Hofkommission*, for example in July 1783, he expressed his opinion on Bishop Bilians'kyi's conflict with the Basilians, Władysław Chotkowski, *Historia polityczna* 2, 455.

⁵⁵For this establishment, see Peter Hersche, *Der Spätjansenismus in Österreich* (Vienna, 1977), 274–305.

Monarchy could get to know each other and central government officials like F. S. Rautenstrauch. As a result, the Barbareum became a veritable forge of the new Galician Ruthenian ecclesiastic elite.⁵⁶

This extremely successful establishment was in many ways a prototype of Joseph II's general seminaries, but, somewhat ironically, it was closed down precisely because of their emergence. Upon learning that many diocesan and monastic schools avoided implementing F. S. Rautenstrauch's plan, Joseph II decided to abolish all the hitherto existing training institutions for clerics and to replace them with a highly centralized network of state-run seminaries that would offer a standardized education all over the Austrian lands.⁵⁷

This programme is a typical example of Enlightenment hubris corresponding closely to the high-handed treatment of Galicia as a savage *tabula rasa* by the state officials such as Count Pergen or the emperor himself. Yet, in its dealing with the country's Greek Catholics Vienna exercised exemplary caution. First, against one of the basic tenets of the seminary reform, it allowed two parallel institutions in Lviv, one for the Latins, and the other for the Ruthenians and Armenians. Additionally, the government funded special chairs in philosophy and theology to be taught in Ruthenian to those students who would not be able to understand lectures in Latin. While local Greek Catholic bishops fought to delay the closure of the less demanding diocesan seminaries under their control, young and ambitious Barbareum graduates, such as Antonii Anhelovych, Mykhailo Harasevych, Kostiantyn Sabatovs'kyi, Mykhailo Shchavnyts'kyi, or Mykola Skorodnynskyi became the most dedicated enforcers of Josephinism in Galicia.

Galicia's Greek Catholic clergy was perhaps the only milieu in which the General Seminary reform was not rejected, but in fact embraced as an improvement. Consequently, Lviv's was the only General Seminary in the whole Monarchy that was not closed down after Joseph II's death—on the explicit request of Galicia's Greek Catholic ecclesiastic elite. This unique success story of Josephinism winning hearts and minds of elite churchmen can be attributed to the concessions, thanks to which the emperor's radical ideas were adjusted to the local realities, but also to the influence of the Barbareum graduates who owed their ascent to the new order imposed in the province by Vienna.⁵⁸

Farewell to the Commonwealth: A New Sense of Belonging for the Ruthenian Elite

What did all this mean for the Ruthenian Greek Catholic churchmen? In the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, ascent within the ecclesiastical hierarchy depended on nobiliary patronage and, in any case, clergymen who did not belong to the Basilian Order were seriously handicapped from the start. Secular parish priests were universally disdained as the pastors of coarse Ruthenian peasants. Whereas for the Latin Catholic churchmen, the policies of the Austrian *Staatskirchentum* meant a serious limitation of their freedom and were perceived as debasing, to their Greek-rite counterparts they offered substantial boons. First, they would all obtain a standardized education of relatively high quality. Second, talented and ambitious individuals could even get a chance to study in Vienna. As already mentioned, this was not merely an educational opportunity, but a real civilizational shock for young men originating from Galician villages and small towns. Next, Greek Catholic secular clergymen saw

⁵⁶For a brief discussion of this process, see John-Paul Himka, "German Culture and the National Awakening in Western Ukraine before the Revolution of 1848," in *German-Ukrainian Relations in Historical Perspective*, eds. Hans-Joachim Torke and John-Paul Himka (Edmonton, 1994), 30–34. Specifically for Barbareum, see Androkhovych "Barbareum"; *Regii seminarii græco-catholici Viennæ ad Sanctam Barbaram recens fundati leges, atque institutiones* (Laws and Institutions of the Recently Established Royal Greek Catholic Seminary at St. Barbara in Vienna) ([Vienna, 1779 or 1780]); Archiwum Państwowe w Przemysłu, Archiwum Biskupstwa Grecko-katolickiego w Przemysłu (henceforth APP, ABGK), 9428: *Historia Regij Generalis Seminarii Græco Catholici Viennæ ad S. Barbaram per Imperatricem et Reginam Apostolicam Mariam Theresiam clementissime fundati* (History of the Royal General Greek Catholic Seminary established at St. Barbara in Vienna by the clemency of the Empress and Apostolic Queen Maria Theresa).

⁵⁷For a very accessible introduction to the question of general seminaries, see Ernst Popp, "Zum Besten von Staat und Religion – Die geistliche Hofkommission" (Ph.D. diss., University of Vienna, 2019), 204–70.

⁵⁸Josephinism is a deeply problematic concept originating in the specific circumstances of the *Vormärz*. Nevertheless, at this point, its complete elimination from history writing would cause more confusion than benefit. For an in-depth discussion, see Franz L. Fillafer and Thomas Wallnig, "Einleitung," in *Josephinismus zwischen den Regimen: Eduard Winter, Fritz Valjavec und die zentraleuropäischen Historiographien im 20. Jahrhundert*, eds. Franz L. Fillafer and Thomas Wallnig (Vienna, 2016), 7–50.

that the Hofburg sidelined the powerful Basilian monks, their hitherto invincible rivals. This meant that secular clerics could hope to rise through the ranks on the basis of their talent and hard work, which had been very unlikely in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Finally, having finished their studies, even those who would not have great ecclesiastic careers were no longer lowly peasant priests but representatives of a powerful state apparatus, which meant many additional duties but also a new sense of belonging and a much higher degree of self-esteem, not to mention the financial security provided by the *Congrua* from the *Religionsfonds*.

Mental adjustment to these favorable circumstances was not all that easy for the Greek Catholic clergymen, especially those belonging or aspiring to the social elite. Galicia's upper strata were shaped by their Polish-Lithuanian heritage, meaning that they were predominantly Polish-speaking; either noble landowners themselves or at least unwaveringly deferential to this group; if not necessarily hostile toward than at least distrustful of the Austrian bureaucracy (and *vice versa*); and still strongly influenced by the old-style republican culture and politics of the Commonwealth (which continued to exist across the border for the next twenty-three years). Pro-Habsburg enthusiasm was not exactly rewarded in this social environment.⁵⁹ What career strategies would the Ruthenian priests employ to take advantage of the new situation and how would they explain their new position to themselves and to those around them?

The answer is not simple, as the circumstances of every individual differ. Initially, the government was forced to make do with priests who had been shaped in the Commonwealth and thus saturated with its political culture. This does not mean they were necessarily disloyal to Vienna, but their loyalty was of a different type than what the Austrian government sought in the 1770s and 1780s. Bishops Lev Sheptyts'kyi or Maksymilian Rylo accepted the partition and tried to come to terms with the Habsburg rulers on the basis of their experiences with the elective kings of Poland-Lithuania. There, the king was a symbolic head and the supreme patron in a dense and complicated network of dependencies which included also irremovable aristocratic ministers, regional magnates, and middling landowners (a situation somewhat similar to that of the Habsburg lands before the reforms of the 1740s).

The old bishops understood well that in Austria the monarch had a much stronger position than in Poland-Lithuania, but they were not able to completely discard their earlier experience. In this context, Petro Bilians'kyi, the first Greek Catholic bishop nominated by the Austrian government, is an interesting transitional case. As a commoner by birth and a secular priest, he would have had very slim chances of achieving the rank of bishop under the Commonwealth.⁶⁰ This was exactly why the Austrian government selected him: to showcase that it would not follow the old ways and to create a church official who should be fully dependent on and loyal to the state. Still, Bilians'kyi, a person shaped before the partition, was somewhat of a disappointment, as he remained overly focused on cultivating local aristocratic interests and administering the part of his diocese which remained on the Polish-Lithuanian side of the border.⁶¹ It was only with the arrival of the next generation of priests, trained in the new state-run establishments, that Vienna eventually got suitable collaborators who were not only willing to be respectful subjects of the Austrian monarchs but also able to serve the Austrian state as *Lehrer und Führer des Volkes* (a term from F. S. Rautenstrauch's publications).

⁵⁹Marya Jarosiewiczówna emphasizes in her work the hostility of Galicia's Polish-speaking noble elite towards Austria, but we must not forget that her vision is strongly colored by the patriotic outlook of her intellectual environment: see her "Galicya a sprawa polska (październik 1806–lipiec 1807)" (Galicia and the Polish question (October 1806–July 1807)), *Biblioteka Warszawska* 2 (1912): 245–86 and "Polacy pod rządem austriackim na początku XIX wieku" (Poles under the Austrian government at the beginning of the nineteenth century), *Biblioteka Warszawska* 3 (1913): 568–99. Michał Baczkowski offers a more complicated picture: *W służbie Habsburgów: Polscy ochotnicy w austriackich siłach zbrojnych w latach 1772–1815* (In the Habsburg Service: Polish Volunteers in the Austrian Armed Forces in the Years 1772–1815) (Cracow, 1998).

⁶⁰Dorota Wereda, *Biskupi unickiej metropolii kijowskiej w XVIII wieku* (Bishops of the Uniate Metropolitanate of Kyiv in the Eighteenth Century) (Lublin, 2013), 28–38.

⁶¹For a unique testimony of Bilians'kyi's conduct, see Anonymous, *Historia domowa od nominacji na biskupstwo lwowskie, halickie i Kamieńca Podolskiego Jaśnie Wielmożnego J. X. Piotra Bielańskiego* (Domestic History . . . of the Bishop Petro Bilians'kyi) kept in the collection of the Andrey Sheptytsky National Museum of Lviv, RkI-100. See also Michał Wąsowicz's entry in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 2 (Cracow, 1936), 34–35; Julian Pelesz, *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart. Bd. 2: Von der Wiederstellung der Union mit Rom bis auf die Gegenwart (1598–1879)* (Vienna, 1880), 676–83; Chotkowski, *Historiya polityczna* 2, 449–64.

Later in their careers, these new pastors would have to deal with close supervision of their activities by Galicia's central administration. Perhaps nothing illustrates the epochal change better than the letters addressed by the bishops and diocesan administrators to the *Excelsum Gubernium*, an abstract yet strong presence, embodied in austere functionaries of diverse social backgrounds, including numerous commoners along with the old and new nobility.⁶² The explicitly personalized and multidirectional network of power relations characteristic of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had been replaced by a centralized structure emanating from Vienna (or at least pretending to be organized in this way).

Characteristically, for virtually all of Galicia's Greek Catholic elite ecclesiastics a stint as lecturer at the state-run General Seminary of Lviv served as the stepping stone to a further career. These figures included: Mykhailo Shchavnyts'kyi, a graduate of the Barbareum from Upper Hungary; Mykola Skorodyns'kyi, Bilians'kyi's successor as bishop of Lviv; Antonii Anhelovych, bishop of Przemyśl and later the first Greek Catholic Metropolitan of Galicia; Mykhailo Harasevych, vicar general of Lviv; and eventually Mykhailo Levyts'kyi, bishop of Przemyśl, the second Greek Catholic Metropolitan, and the last Primate of the Catholic Church in Galicia (of all three rites, the position was discontinued after Levyts'kyi's death). State-run seminaries were not only training grounds producing the new kind of priests but also testing grounds where the government could select suitable candidates for higher ecclesiastic offices. Thus, the new Austrian system constituted a social lift allowing for careers that would have been very unlikely within the framework of the nobiliary patronage predominant under the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Whereas all of the above-mentioned prelates were sons of parish priests, Anhelovych and Skorodyns'kyi happened to be of petty noble stock, while Shchavnyts'kyi, Bilians'kyi, Harasevych, and Levyts'kyi were mere commoners by birth (only Shchavnyts'kyi was not ennobled by the emperor).

The social transformation undergone by the protagonists of this paper was not unique: rather, they were part and parcel of the fledgling intelligentsia or *Bildungsbürgertum*. Mykhailo Harasevych's stint as editor of the Polish-language *Dziennik Patriotycznych Polityków* (Journal of Patriotic Politicians) together with his tumultuous marriage to a Latin Catholic noblewoman may be interpreted as an attempt at building an alternative non-ecclesiastic social position of an intelligentsia type more in line with the values predominant in Polish-language society.⁶³ But in the 1790s, symbolic and material resources for such an endeavour were too scarce for an individual of such modest origin to succeed completely on his own. State-supported church structures were a much more viable option.

Although it would be an exaggeration to say that the work for the Austrian government was condemned as such by the Polish-language elites of Galicia, it is clear that an unwavering loyalty to it was neither typical nor incentivized in this environment. Rather, some sort of nostalgia for the partitioned Commonwealth and passive sympathy for an emerging Polish irredentism was the norm. Greek Catholic church leaders were inheritors of the Ruthenian Uniate elite who had fully identified with the Polish-Lithuanian nobiliary polity and cherished it as the protectress of their Church. How could the Galician Greek Catholic prelates detach themselves from the Polish-Lithuanian political tradition which conflicted with their new social position as representatives of the Austrian monarchical government?

The case of Antonii Anhelovych suggests that the catalyst of this process was the French Revolution, presented all over Europe as a catastrophe that threatened peace, order, and the Christian religion. In the course of the late 1790s and early 1800s, Polish irredentism came to be closely associated with French expansion in Europe, so the rejection of the latter should logically result in reservations toward the former.⁶⁴ As already mentioned, Anhelovych authored several Polish-language texts denouncing

⁶²For example, the communication of 19 April 1797 concerning the affairs of the Lviv General Seminary from APP, ABGK, 9337, 34. See also Iryna Vushko, *The Politics of Cultural Retreat: Imperial Bureaucracy in Austrian Galicia, 1772–1867* (New Haven, 2015), 18–82.

⁶³For the fledgling Polish-Lithuanian intelligentsia, see Maciej Janowski, *Birth of the Intelligentsia 1750–1831* (Frankfurt am Main, 2014).

⁶⁴Early modern nobiliary republicanism formed the point of departure for the nineteenth-century Polish insurrectionary irredentism: Władysław Konopczyński, *Polscy pisarze polityczni XVIII wieku: do Sejmu Czteroletniego* (Polish political writers of the eighteenth century: until the Four-Years Diet) (Warsaw, 1966); Zofia Zielińska, *Republikanizm spod znaku buławy: publicystyka*

Bonaparte's aggressive politics. As bishop of Przemyśl, in a letter to the deans of his diocese circulated in January 1797, he made a case for Austrian patriotism, echoing Joseph von Sonnenfels's concept of *Vaterlandsliebe*, which he must have encountered while a seminarian in Vienna. According to Sonnenfels, love of fatherland is a rational, yet passionate, extension of *Eigenliebe*, an appreciation of security and advantages offered to each of us by the state in which we live.⁶⁵ After briefly mentioning that the enemy threatens to eradicate religion and destroy social order (standard stock of anti-French propaganda of that time), Anhelovych enumerates in his letter all the boons bestowed upon the Greek Catholic parish priests by "the Most Graceful Austrian Government." His conclusion is that the Ruthenian shepherds' properly understood self-interest should converge with the effective defense of the fatherland, meaning Austria.⁶⁶

A decade later, Anhelovych had no qualms about denouncing his rival Father Jordan Mitskevych, a *procurator* (or representative) of the Ruthenian Basilian Order in Rome, as a Polish patriot. To substantiate his denunciation, he passed to the Austrian government the kind letter sent to that monk in the late 1790s by Jan Henryk Dąbrowski, the commander-in-chief of the Bonaparte-sponsored Polish Legions in Italy. This was an exceptionally incriminating item. It was written in Polish by a general of an enemy army on the official paper featuring the name of the Cisalpine Republic together with the easily recognizable symbols of the French Revolution and the slogan: "Freedom. Love of the Fatherland. Equality" (*Wolność. Miłość Ojczyzny. Równość*). What is more, Dąbrowski offered assurances that he considered Mitskevych "a good and honest Pole" (*jest dobrym i poczciwym Polakiem*). Anhelovych explained that this document illustrated Mitskevych's political position: in the light of the then imminent restoration of Poland (*als stünde bei den dermaligen Verhältnissen die Wiederherstellung des Königreichs Pohlen bevor*), the *procurator* wanted to see the Galician Metropolitanate occupied by a Basilian "from the Polish nation" (*aus der pohlnischen Nazion*). Apart from opposing the interests of the Austrian Monarchy, it would also exclude the candidacy of Anhelovych.⁶⁷

Seweryna Rzewuskiego z lat 1788–1790 (Republicanism under the sign of mace: Seweryn Rzewuski's polemical writings 1788–1790) (Warszawa, 1988); Andrzej Walicki, *The Enlightenment and the Birth of Modern Nationhood: Polish Political Thought from Noble Republicanism to Tadeusz Kosciuszko* (Notre Dame, 1989); Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, *Queen Liberty: The Concept of Freedom in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth* (Leiden, 2012); Jerzy Michalski, *Rousseau and Polish Republicanism* (Warsaw, 2015); Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, *The Political Discourse of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: Concepts and Ideas* (New York, 2021). For its transformation in the early nineteenth century and the role of the French Revolution, see Michael G. Müller, "Poland," in *Nationalism in the Age of the French Revolution*, eds. Otto Dann and John Dinwiddy (London, 1988), 113–28; Handelsman, *Rozwój narodowości* 2, 17–48; Jarosław Czuby, *Zasada 'dwóch sumień': Normy postępowania i granice kompromisu politycznego Polaków w sytuacjach wyboru (1795–1815)* (The Principle of Double Conscience: Norms of Conduct and Limits of Compromise of Poles in Situations of Choice) (Warsaw, 2005); Andrzej Nowak, "Początki rozwoju idei powstańczej w polskiej myśli politycznej" (Beginnings of the Development of the Insurrectionary Idea in the Polish Political Thought) and Jarosław Czuby, "Insurrekcja, rewolucja, wojna. Koncepcje odbudowy państwa polskiego na przełomie XVIII i XIX wieku" (Insurrection, Revolution, War. Conceptions of the Restoration of the Polish State at the Turn of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries) in *Wbrew królewskim aliansom: Rosja, Europa i polska walka o niepodległość w XIX wieku* (Against the Royal Alliances: Russia, Europe, and the Polish Struggle for Independence in the Nineteenth Century), eds. Łukasz Adamski and Sławomir Dębski (Warsaw, 2016), 21–62.

⁶⁵Teodora Shek Brnardić, "Modalities of Enlightened Monarchical Patriotism in the Mid-eighteenth Century Habsburg Monarchy," in *Whose Love of Which Country?: Composite States, National Histories and Patriotic Discourses in Early Modern East Central Europe*, eds. Balázs Trencsenyi and Márton Zászkaliczky (Leiden, 2010), 631–61; Franz L. Fillafer, *Aufklärung habsburgisch: Staatsbildung, Wissenskultur und Geschichtspolitik in Zentraleuropa 1750–1850* (Göttingen, 2020), 24–29; Ernst Wangermann, "Joseph von Sonnenfels und die Vaterlandsliebe der Aufklärung," in *Joseph von Sonnenfels*, ed. Helmut Reinalter (Vienna, 1988), 157–69; Harm Kluetting, "Bürokratischer Patriotismus: Aspekte des Patriotentums im thesianisch-josephinischen Österreich," *Aufklärung* 40, no. 2 (1991): 37–52; Reinhard Stauber, "Vaterland - Provinz - Nation: Gesamtstaat, Länder und nationale Gruppen in der österreichischen Monarchie 1750–1800," *Aufklärung* 10, no. 2 (1998): 55–72.

⁶⁶APP, ABGK, 9470, 2–3. Adadurov analyzes the same letter but uses a copy from the State Historical Archive in Lviv, "Virnopiddanyi sluha," 197–200. We find a similar argument in Anhelovych's pastoral letter from 1805 reproduced in Anna Krochmal, "Biskupi unicy Antoni Angellowicz i Ferdynand Ciechanowski wobec wydarzeń epoki napoleońskiej" (Uniate Bishops Antoni Angellowicz and Ferdinand Ciechanowski in the face of the events of the Napoleonic period), *Miscellanea Historico-Archivistica*, t. XX (2013), 184–86.

⁶⁷HHSA Provinzen Galizien 4–14 (1796–1811): Kirchliche Würdenträger in Galizien, 3, 5.

The rift between the Basilian monks and the fledgling secular church elite went back to the 1740s.⁶⁸ The Austrian government espoused a strong prejudice against the religious orders and rejected any limitations on the monarchs' rights to select their bishops (such as the resolutions of the Synod of Zamość), so it is only natural that Vienna consistently selected non-Basilian candidates like Anhelovych himself. In this context, Anhelovych's most striking innovation lies in the way he conflated the traditional conflict between the regular and secular clergymen with the new political struggle between the allegedly anarchic revolution and the rational Enlightened monarchy as well as the postulated national difference between Poles and Ruthenians.

Anhelovych found Dąbrowski's letter to Mitskevych in the papers of Ieronim Strilets'kyi who had died in 1804 as the parish priest of St. Barbara's church in Vienna. This temple remained the center of Greek Catholic life in the Habsburg capital even after the closure of the Barbareum in the 1780s (and continues to fulfil this function until today). Strilets'kyi himself was a Basilian monk, but he was also a graduate of the Barbareum. As the first head of the St. Barbara parish, he occupied one of the most visible and influential positions a Greek Catholic clergyman could ever dream of in the Austrian Monarchy (former nineteenth-century parish priests of St. Barbara included the influential Bishop of Przemyśl Ivan Snihurs'kyi and Galician Metropolitan Spyrydon Lytvynovych). In other words, he was clearly no revolutionary and enjoyed the full trust of the Habsburg government.⁶⁹ Yet, for some reason, he did not find it convenient to share Dąbrowski's letter to Mitskevych with the authorities. Most probably, we will never be able to ascertain Strilets'kyi's motivations for his potentially incriminating decision, but there was actually nothing unusual about it in the broader context of the post-Commonwealth realities. Even if many members of the social and intellectual elites of the former Poland-Lithuania had serious doubts about the French Revolution and Napoleon Bonaparte, informing on someone's communications with the Polish independence warriors must have been seen as a shameful transgression by most in that environment. How could one justify such an abrupt break with predominant values and norms? How could one explain this to oneself, to the people around him, to the society at large, and not least to the Austrian government? To an uninitiated state official from Bohemia or Lower Austria, Polish-speaking Greek Catholic prelates might have seemed more Polish than some of the French-speaking Galician aristocrats who nevertheless identified with the Polish-Lithuanian nobiliary nation. Were the Greek Catholic leaders just sell-outs who could be relied upon only as long as they were rewarded with promotions and funds?

According to Prince Metternich's well-known assessment, Polonism was just another name for the destructive spirit of revolution.⁷⁰ Conservatives, like the Austrian Field Marshal Prince Adam K. Czartoryski, the Privy Councillor Count Antoni J. Lanckoroński, the Head of the Imperial Court Library Count Józef M. Ossoliński, or the Latin Archbishop of Lviv Kajetan I. Kicki, were very unhappy about the alliance with France, but as Poles, they had little room for manoeuvre. Public opinion would have never forgiven them for acts of overt resistance against the alleged liberators sponsored by Bonaparte. In turn, the leadership of Galicia's Greek Catholic Church found a creative solution. They chose to downplay their community's links to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, links nobody had doubted or questioned throughout the five serene decades following the Synod of Zamość. Anhelovych and Harasevych chose to rebrand themselves as belonging to a completely separate nation that just happened to live together with Poles for a couple of bumpy centuries. This required, among other things, a wholesale reassessment of history. In his later *Annals of the Ruthenian Church*, Harasevych (or his editor) offered his own rather original interpretation of the

⁶⁸Himka, "The Conflict between the Secular and the Religious Clergy," 35–47.

⁶⁹For Strilets'kyi, see Androkhovych, "Videns'ke Barbareum," 170–71 and Willibald M. Plöchl, *St. Barbara zu Wien: Die geschichte der griechisch-katholischen Kirche und Zentralpfarre St. Barbara. Band 1* (Vienna, 1975) 143–54.

⁷⁰Klemens Wenzel von Metternich, *Mémoires, documents, et écrits divers*, ed. Richard de Metternich, Part II (1816–48), Vol. VII (Paris, 1883), 211. Quoted after Wolff, *The Idea of Galicia*, 151. Metternich espoused a similarly negative assessment of the Polish mindset already in the first decade of the nineteenth century, occasioning inquiries by the Austrian administration in Galicia. See Emil Kipa, *Austria a sprawa polska w r. 1809* (Austria and the Polish Question) (Warsaw, 1952), 8–15. See Vadym Adadurov, "Identities of Little Russian Society through the Prism of Napoleon's Russian Campaign," in Kohut, *Eighteenth-Century Ukraine*, 203–4.

Commonwealth's *grande peur* of 1789 that stood in stark contrast to Feodosii Brodovych's Polish-Lithuanian patriotism. The writer of the *Annals* accused the reformist republicans at the Polish-Lithuanian Four-Year Diet of deliberately directing public ire against the Uniate Ruthenian clergy in an elaborate scheme against the King Stanislaus Augustus. Characteristically, he described these Enlightenment reformers as a "potent faction imbued with Gallic or revolutionary principles."⁷¹ He thus echoed (or prefigured) Metternich's identification of the (post-)Commonwealth Enlightenment nationalism with the spirit of the European revolution.

If Galicia's Greek Catholics were not Polish, then who were they? Habsburg governments and their bureaucrats strove to fashion Austria as a unified state, but they had never claimed that there was a single Austrian nation. The Austrian Monarchy presented itself as a common home to several brotherly peoples.⁷² To give just one example, in the manifesto published in April 1809 by Archduke Ferdinand d'Este, commander-in-chief of Habsburg forces in Galicia, we read:

The world sees already as Austrians, Hungarians, and Bohemians hurry from all directions to the fraternal banner (*Austryacy, Węgrzyni, Czechy śpieszą pod Bracką chorągiew*), and as, enlivened by the internal feeling of national honor and love of fatherland (*nacyonalnego honoru i miłości oyczyzny*), they swear certain defeat to every enemy. These noble hosts have already formed for the battle.

Now, it is your turn, faithful Galicians! Although younger brothers of the great and happy union of Austria's Peoples (*młodszy Bracia wielkiego i szczęśliwego związku Ludow Austrii*), you are tightly and internally united with the whole. Turn your gazes here. Where can one enjoy more freedoms than under the sweet and fatherly Rule of Our Dignified Monarch? Where is private property better protected? Where is the common weal more augmented? And even though Austria fights very costly wars, are not her subjects counted among the richest and happiest? Here, you are not being misled with any deceptive promises of a distant happiness, but all of you enjoy the fatherly care (*oycowska opieka*) and so you live truly happy.⁷³

Several elements deserve our attention here. First, Austria is clearly a monarchy of many peoples united by a strong bond of family love. This bond, however, does not annul the specificity of each group: different peoples are brothers, sons of the same *Landesvater*, the Habsburg emperor. If we accept Caspar Hirschi's argument that nationalism is relational, that it is a way of imagining your community as being on a par with other communities and competing with them for status, then the Austrian Monarchy, fashioned by its government as a shared arena of brotherly peoples, becomes a perfect breeding ground for nationalist allegiances. Second, Archduke Ferdinand's argument again echoes Joseph von Sonnenfels's *Vaterlandsliebe*: you should love Austria, because it offers you freedom, security, and prosperity. Enlightenment reasoning remains entrenched in the official propaganda of the Austrian state, even in the face of the French Revolution. Third, the Austrian commander addressed Galicians, but we should not make too much of it. This label had never been a consistently pursued identity project. Hardly anybody believed in the existence of a separate Galician nation on a par with say Russians, Germans, or Poles. At best, it was a goal to be achieved somewhere in the future, but for the moment it was just a vague administrative term denoting the inhabitants of this province, with the pride of place ascribed to its noble landowners, who overwhelmingly identified as Poles.⁷⁴

⁷¹"... potens factio Gallorum principii (sic dictis revolutionisticis) imbuta," Harasiewicz, *Annales*, 540.

⁷²For an exploration of this theme in the later period, see Jana Osterkamp, *Vielfalt ordnen: das föderale Europa der Habsburgermonarchie* (Vormärz bis 1918) (Göttingen, 2021).

⁷³*Gazeta Krakowska* (Cracow Gazette) 1809, no. 29 (9 April), 337–38. We need to read this piece in the context of the government propaganda efforts intensified in 1808–09, for which see Michał Baczkowski, "Austriacka propaganda w Galicji w latach 1795–1815" (Austrian propaganda in Galicia in the years 1795–1815), *Studia Historyczne*, no. 3 (1999): 361–74 and "Czy Kraków mógł zostać stolicą Galicji na początku XIX wieku?" (Could Cracow Become the Capital of Galicia at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century?), *Zeszyty Naukowe UJ: Prace Historyczne* no. 136 (2009): 49–56.

⁷⁴Wolff, *Idea of Galicia*, 4–8 and passim.

At the same time, the cutting-edge Austrian scholarship did recognize that, apart from the Poles, there was in Galicia yet another nation with its own history, language, and customs: *Ruthenier*, *Russniaken*, *Kleinrussen*, or simply *Russen*. In the 1790s, Johann Christian von Engel, a German-speaking historian from the Hungarian part of Spiš, published his twin histories of the Cossack Ukraine and Galicia (*Halitsch und Wladimir*), as part of the Halle series on world history (*Die Allgemeine Welthistorie durch eine Gesellschaft von Gelehrten in Teutschland und Engelland ausgefertigt*). In 1804, Joseph Rohrer, a native of Vienna but brought up in Tyrol and later turned professor of political science and statecraft in Lviv, released his two-volume *Essay on the Slavic inhabitants of the Austrian Monarchy* (preceded by his works on Austria's Germans and Jews). Rohrer presented the Ruthenians of Galicia and northeastern Hungary as one of the most numerous Slavic peoples of the Monarchy. His findings were mirrored by the observations of other Austrian scholars of that time, like Franz Kratter and Belsazar de la Motte Hacquet.⁷⁵

Let us sum up: Anhelovych and Harasevych wanted to distance themselves from the nobiliary Polish-Lithuanian nation and its traditional republicanism morphing into revolutionary irredentism; the Austrian government understood its state as populated with many different peoples and prominent contemporary scholars discerned Ruthenians among them; nobody in government circles would treat an act of identifying with the Austrian or Galician nation as very convincing. Therefore, Anhelovych and Harasevych needed some other national label to explain to their Viennese interlocutors why they could be trusted more than Galicia's landowning elites and why they should be respected more than the upstart careerist sell-outs or itinerant adventurers so common in the late-eighteenth-century halls of power.⁷⁶

Caspar Hirschi, whose work is focused on the Holy Roman Empire in the later Middle Ages and early Renaissance, argues that nationalism was initially an ideology of those members of the intellectual elite who felt insecure because they came from low social origins.⁷⁷ This was exactly the situation of the new leadership of Galicia's Greek Catholic Church. Anhelovych and Harasevych were Quentin Skinner's "innovating ideologists" who sought "to legitimize questionable forms of social behaviour" by showing that "a number of favourable terms can somehow be applied to their seemingly questionable actions."⁷⁸ To achieve rhetorical success they had to present their argument with the help of a lexicon understandable to their conversation partners, the government decision-makers in Vienna who casually employed the vocabulary of Austria's faithful brotherly peoples. The new generation of Greek Catholic prelates needed a people of their own that would be separate from the Polish-Lithuanian nobiliary nation, but older and more tangible than the postulated Galician aggregate of 1772/95. It was not the Austrian government that invented the Ruthenian nation, but its interlocutors among the Greek Catholic ecclesiastical elite who took up this label, because they wanted to fit into the "the great and happy union of Austria's Peoples."

This dynamic is clearly visible in a memorandum on the situation of the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia submitted by Anhelovych to the government in Vienna, most probably in 1806 at the time

⁷⁵Johann Christian von Engel, *Geschichte der Ukraine und der ukrainischen Cosaken, wie auch der Königreiche Halitsch und Wladimir* (Halle, 1796); Joseph Rohrer, *Versuch über die slavischen Bewohner der österreichischen Monarchie* (Vienna, 1804); Franz Kratter, *Briefe über den itzigen Zustand von Galizien* (Leipzig, 1786); Balthasar Hacquet, *Neueste physikalisch-politische Reisen in den Jahren 1788 und 1789 durch die Dacischen und Sarmatischen oder Nördlichen Karpathen, Erster Theil* (Nuremberg, 1790). Curiously, the first part of Engel's work, devoted to the Ukrainian Cossacks, was immediately translated into Polish, but the translation was never published. An almost clean handwritten copy titled *Historya Ukrainy i ukraińskich kozaków przełożona z niemieckiego dzieła Jana Chrystjana Engela wydanego w Halle w 1796*. (History of Ukraine and Ukrainian Cossacks translated from a German work of Jan Chrystian Engel published in Halle in 1796) is now in the possession of the University of Vienna, kept in the *Fachbereichsbibliothek Osteuropäische Geschichte und Slawistik*. I would like to thank Benedikt Stimmer for helping me to locate it. See also Wolff, *Venice and the Slavs*, 328–29.

⁷⁶For the phenomenon of eighteenth-century adventurers and charlatans, see Paweł Maciejko, *The Mixed Multitude: Jacob Frank and the Frankist Movement, 1755–1816* (Philadelphia, 2011), 216–31 and Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, *Gulliver in the Land of Giants: A Critical Biography and the Memoirs of the Celebrated Dwarf Joseph Boruwlaski* (London, 2016), 15–19, 61–119, 167–72.

⁷⁷Hirschi, *Origins of Nationalism*, 88–98, 119–79.

⁷⁸Skinner, "Moral Principles," 149–50.

when the fate of the Galician Metropolitanate was being decided. I know this text only second-hand from an exchange between Austrian officials, itself badly damaged by the 1927 *Justizpalastbrand*. It is legible, however, that Anhelovych lobbied here for the interests of his own very specific group, that is the elite secular clergymen, whom he considered the only legitimate representatives of the Greek Catholic Church as a whole. Even though his actual focus is on internal church affairs, he does not hesitate to use arguments of another kind to strengthen the case for the importance of his ecclesiastical community: “the majority of [Galicia’s] population and of its indigenous people, the Ruthenian nation,” identifies itself with the Greek rite, he states. Now, Anhelovych’s reference to the Ruthenian nation and its primacy in Galicia may be completely instrumental and subordinate to the cause of elite ecclesiastics’ elevation within the hierarchical framework of the Austrian state, but this fact alone does not annul the long-term significance of his polemical innovation.⁷⁹

Another example from the same year originates with Mykhailo Harasevych. In a thanksgiving address submitted to Emperor Francis II/I in June of 1806 on the occasion of the reestablishment of the Galician Metropolitanate, he claimed to speak for “the Ruthenian clergy and the Ruthenian people,” a community that no other could surpass in its loyalty to the House of Austria.⁸⁰ As Vadym Adadurov rightly notes, Greek Catholic church leaders continued to see the dynasty as the central element of the political order. They also envisioned their nation as composed of two clearly delimited estates, the common people guided by the hierarchically organized clergy.⁸¹ This, however, does not imply that we can reduce their understanding of the world to the label of “pre-modern feudal.” The House of Habsburg served as the central embodiment of the bureaucratic Austrian state until its very end in the late 1910s, yet it would be a misunderstanding to conclude that the Monarchy remained a feudal relic in twentieth-century Europe. Similarly, the acceptance of a social hierarchy, based on estates (or other), does not preclude a vision of a self-standing nation. Harasevych and Levyts’kyi, to name only the two most prominent examples, were commoners by birth and there is no reason to believe that they saw estates as permanently enclosed units that forever determined individuals’ fates. Rather, the very meaning of the category of estate was changing, because in early-nineteenth-century Austria it had to coexist with the concept of universal citizenship enshrined in the *ABGB*.⁸²

It would be an exaggeration to advertise Harasevych’s address as Galician Ruthenians’ “we-the-people” moment. Rather we should understand the whole process in question as a gradual reconfiguration of accents, leading to the eventual politicization of the label “Ruthenian.” The address of 1806 is a document that allows us to zoom in on an early stage of this transformation and see how the “Ruthenians” are being reshaped as a self-standing community on a par with other nations, most importantly the rebellious Poles. In this particular text, the kernel of Harasevych’s innovation lies in the fact that he presents his people as participating in a sort of tournament of patriotism in the shared arena of the Austrian state, where they successfully compete for the title of the most loyal and dedicated nation. Anhelovych further extends this horizon in his brochures, depicting Austria as a member of the European family of independent states, all of them endangered by an insatiable French imperialism embodied in a man who never keeps his word.

⁷⁹AVA Inneres PHSt 490: Angellowicz, Anton, Denkschrift über die Lage der griechisch katholischen Kirche in Galizien, 1806, 1: “. . . die Majorität des Volkes und der Urstamm der Einwohner, die ruthenische Nation . . .” To get an idea of what kind of demands Anhelovych had at that time, see his “Allerunterthänigste Bitte” submitted to the emperor in December 1806 and reproduced by Mykhailo Malynovs’kyi in *Die Kirchen- und Staats-Satzungen bezüglich des griechisch-katholischen Ritus der in Galizien* (Lviv, 1861), 424–30.

⁸⁰ “. . . daß das Haus Oesterreich in seinen ausgedehnten Staaten Niemanden habe, der ihm mehr anhänglich und zugethan wäre, als es im Königreiche Galizien der ruthenische Klerus und das ruthenische Volk ist.” Harasiewicz, *Annales*, 829. For the handwritten original, see HHStA Provinzen Galizien 4–14 (1796–1811): Kirchliche Würdenträger in Galizien, 20.

⁸¹Adadurov, “Virnopiddanyi sluha,” 196–201.

⁸²The lexicon of natural law and universal citizenship is omnipresent in the Austrian civil legislation of the time, which makes it difficult to select one illustration, but see, for example, articles 28 and 29 of the pilot *Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch für Westgalizien* (Vienna, 1797), 10 and articles 16, 17, 18 of the *Allgemeines bürgerliches Gesetzbuch* (Vienna, 1811), 6–7. See also Henry E. Strakosch, *State Absolutism and the Rule of Law: The Struggle for the Codification of Civil Law in Austria, 1753–1811* (Sydney, 1967); Fillafer, *Aufklärung habsburgisch*, 335–417, 443–53.

I believe that we should see the efforts made by Harasevych and Anhelovych as, first and foremost, polemical devices serving to distance the Greek Catholic ecclesiastical elite from the taint of revolutionary Polishness. Whether it was based on a deep national sentiment is not so important. We will never know. What matters is that these two leaders introduced to the Austrian public sphere a new national identification, one that was to have a complicated but fruitful future. By the summer of 1836, when Mykhailo Harasevych's obituary appeared in the *Wiener Zeitung* (but still before the release of the Ruthenian Trinity's *Rusalka Dnistorivaia*), the existence of the Galician Ruthenian nation (*Ruthenisch-Galizische Nation*) seemed an obvious fact that did not require any additional explanations.⁸³ Although initially a polemical tool employed by a narrow ecclesiastical elite, this label appealed also to broader numbers of Greek Catholic parish priests and cantors. It corresponded with their lived experience of being treated as inferior in comparison with their Latin Catholic counterparts and it allowed them to escape the burden of being classified by the state as rebellious Poles.

In the first decades of the nineteenth century, the label of "Ruthenians" was primarily a name associated by default with the Byzantine-Slavonic rite and the heritage of medieval Rus'. Other than that, it was defined very vaguely in opposition to the ascending revolutionary Polishness (and let us not forget that many adherents of the latter option were Greek Catholics and self-aware descendants of the knights and princes of Rus').⁸⁴ Harasevych himself had difficulty conceiving a historical narrative that would not be focused on his Church, but this does not mean that he was necessarily incapable of seeing beyond it. Let me give just one example. For the Enlightened Greek Catholic prelate that he was, the seventeenth-century Cossack wars must have been an awkward topic, yet the passage on this issue in his *Annals of the Ruthenian Church* opens with an intriguing reflection on the Polish-Ruthenian competition for historical respectability: "Poles like to extol their national patriotism, for which they demand admiration from other nations. When subject to Poland, the Ruthenians defended their liberties and national laws against the Poles with no less effort."⁸⁵ There can be no doubt that at this point the writer of the *Annals* understood the label "Ruthenians" as denoting a separate people that could be contrasted with the Poles and other nations, not just a mere synonym for the Greek Catholic faithful. There is only one problem here (from the point of view of my argument): it cannot be excluded that these words were added later in the nineteenth century by Mykhailo Malynov's'kyi who had been organizing Harasevych's papers for publication.⁸⁶ Malynov's'kyi, however, was himself a typical product of the Greek Catholic *Staatskirchentum* and he submitted the manuscript to the censors in the late 1830s, so it is legitimate to see this thought, at the very least, as a logical conclusion of a longer-term intellectual process that had its roots in the activities of Anhelovych and Harasevych.

For Galician Ruthenians of their generation language politics remained irrelevant, although the activities of the so-called Przemyśl circle testify that toward the end of their lives, it was gradually gaining significance.⁸⁷ In any case, Francis II/I remained suspicious even of unmistakably pro-Habsburg outbursts of national sentiment, as the example of Joseph Hormayr shows us.⁸⁸ Consequently, Galicia's

⁸³*Wiener Zeitung* 1836, no. 174 (1 August), 985.

⁸⁴Denys Zubryts'kyi, later one of the pioneers of Galician Ruthenian history writing, in 1809 actively collaborated with the occupation authorities established by the Duchy of Warsaw in Przemyśl. For more examples of such ambiguities as late as the 1830s, see Procyk, *Mazzini's Young Europe*, 95–132.

⁸⁵"Poloni solent extollere suum patriotismum nationalem, quem requirunt etiam admirandum ab aliis nationibus. Non minus propugnabant quoque Rutheni, Poloniae subjecti, libertates et jura sua nationalia contra Polonos." Harasiewicz, *Annales*, 414.

⁸⁶Emilian Kossak articulates this accusation in his brochure *Odpowiedź na historję "O unii kościoła grec. kat. Ruskiego" przez ks. Michała Malinowskiego, kanonika świętojurskiego we Lwowie, w 1862 r. wydaną* (Lviv, 1863), although without providing any substantial evidence.

⁸⁷Feodosii Steblii, *Predtecha Rus'koi Triitsi: Peremysl's'kyi kul'turno-osvitnii oseredok pershoi polovyny XIX st.* (Forerunners of the Ruthenian Triad: Przemyśl Cultural-Educational Centre of the First Half of the Nineteenth Century) (Lviv, 2003).

⁸⁸Fillafer, *Aufklärung habsburgisch*, 39–51; Walter Landi, "Joseph von Hormayr zu Hortenburg (1781–1848). Romantische Historiographie im Zeitalter der Restauration zwischen patriotischer Loyalität und liberalen Unruhen," in *Eliten in Tirol zwischen Ancien Régime und Vormärz/Le élites in Tirolo tra Antico Regime e Vormärz*, eds. Marco Bellabarba et al. (Innsbruck, 2010), 385–405.

Ruthenian church elite was not encouraged to fill the national label they had taken up with more meaning. Characteristically, Harasevych's historical work languished in manuscript form until 1862, because the government feared that it could injure the Latin Catholic public opinion in *Vormärz* Galicia.⁸⁹ It was to be the work of the Ruthenian clergymen and secular intelligentsia born at the beginning of the nineteenth century to endow the political device of this national label with tangible cultural content and effective emotional appeal. When this eventually started to happen, the Greek Catholic church establishment saw it as an insolent attempt to undermine its monopolistic prerogative to define what made a good Ruthenian. It is no accident that *Rusalka Dnistrovaia* was banned by a Ruthenian Greek Catholic censor nominated by the Metropolitan Mykhailo Levyts'kyi. But this is a completely different story.⁹⁰

Tyroleans of the East or the Wealth and Poverty of Historical Comparisons

In the nineteenth century, some would refer to the Galician Ruthenians as Tyroleans of the East.⁹¹ This is an interesting if problematic comparison: the rationale behind it is that just like the Tyroleans (but unlike the Poles) Ruthenians espoused exemplary loyalty to the House of Austria. In this sense, Anhelovych and Harasevych can be seen as the most Tyrolean among the Ruthenians of Galicia. There is, however, at least one problem here: in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Tyroleans were by no means loyal and obedient subjects of their monarch. During Joseph II's rule, the Princely County of Tyrol was one of the hotbeds of the conservative resistance to his Enlightenment reforms, especially those concerning church affairs. At that time, Anhelovych and Harasevych, graduates of one of Austria's model state seminaries, eagerly imposed the very policies so hated in the Alpine region.

After Joseph's death, his brother and successor Leopold II managed to pacify the Tyroleans by revoking the most hated laws, but the situation remained far from the harmonious collaboration between the Austrian government and the Ruthenian career prelates that we observe in Galicia. The myth of Tyrol's Habsburg loyalism crystallized only in 1809 during the dramatic uprising led by Andreas Hofer against Bavarian rule sponsored by the French. As with Joseph II, Tyroleans had been enraged by the reforms imposed upon them by Bavaria's Enlightened minister Maximilian von Montgelas. And even though this time they rebelled to return under the Habsburg sceptre, the emperor in Vienna remained reluctant about their newly found love for his dynasty and eventually abandoned them to their fate after the treaty of Schönbrunn. When in the early 1810s the Tyrolean intellectual Joseph von Hormayr languished in the fortress of Mukachevo for attempting to incite another unauthorized rebellion, Anhelovych and Harasevych were being rewarded with honours for their unwavering loyalty in 1809.⁹²

Tyroleans' vehement hatred toward Josephinist reforms allows us to appreciate one characteristic of the Galician Greek Catholic leadership that must not be overlooked: even in their opposition to the French Revolution and Napoleon, they did not reject the Enlightenment as such, but instead stuck

⁸⁹For the official exchange on this delicate issue, see *Ukrains'ko-rus'kyi arkhyyv*, vol. 3 (1907), 121–24.

⁹⁰For a taste of the bitterness between the representatives of the two milieux, see Holovats'kyi, *Zustände der Russinen*.

⁹¹Hrytsak, *Ivan Franko*, 163.

⁹²Tyroleans' hostility toward Enlightened reforms should not be misunderstood as resulting from the lack of development in the region, as in fact it underwent a complex transformation in that period. Tyrolean conservatism was rather a very modern attempt at conceptualizing and controlling the changes in question. Miriam J. Levy, *Governance & Grievance: Habsburg Policy and Italian Tyrol in the Eighteenth Century* (West Lafayette, 1988); Laurence Cole, "Nation, Anti-Enlightenment, and Religious Revival in Austria: Tyrol in the 1790s," *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 2 (June, 2000): 475–97; Reinhard Stauber, *Der Zentralstaat an seinen Grenzen: Administrative Integration, Herrschaftswchsel und politische Kultur im südlichen Alpenraum 1750–1820* (Göttingen, 2001); Beales, *Joseph II: Against the World*, 492–94, 597–98, 624–25; Laurence Cole, "Vom Sonderfall zum europäischen Normalfall? Zur kollektiven Identitätsbildung in Tirol um 1809," in *Eliten in Tirol*, 113–42; Michael Span, *Ein Bürger unter Bauern? Michael Pfürtscheller und das Stubaital 1750–1850* (Vienna, 2017); Wolfram Siemann, *Metternich: Strategist and Visionary* (Cambridge, MA, 2019), 275–78, 322–25; Fillafer, *Aufklärung habsburgisch*, 39–49; Stollberg-Rillinger, *Maria Theresa*, 330–34; Scott Berg, *Finding Order in Diversity: Religious Toleration in the Habsburg Empire, 1792–1848* (West Lafayette, 2022), 75–79.

to its conservative elitist version. They remained cautious Josephinist prelates, much closer in their mindset to Joseph von Sonnenfels than Joseph de Maistre.⁹³

I will not explore this comparison further, since it is clear that there are more contrasts than analogies here. Tyrol's case does, however, show at least one relevant similarity with that of Galician Rus': the importance of French revolutionary imperialism as the catalyst of the conservative turn in building communities around the Habsburg banner. This leads me to my next point: every such comparison has a real but limited value. It will reveal some aspects of the phenomenon in question but obscure others. For this reason, I would like to suggest here a procedure that I would provisionally label "many-sided asymmetrical comparison." In this text, there is not enough room for its full elucidation, so I will only sketch it with the broadest strokes.

My comparison could start with the early Czech and Slovak awakeners who were contemporaries of my protagonists. Josef Dobrovský, one of the most recognizable figures of that period, was also deputy head of the General Seminary in Olomouc. Anton Bernolák, the first codifier of a modern Slovak language standard, was a graduate of the General Seminary of Prešporok (today's Bratislava). Despite obvious biographical parallels, a closer look would reveal that their focus and motivations differed substantially from those of Harasevych and Anhelovych. Both Dobrovský and Bernolák concentrated on language issues, wishing to advance Enlightenment and stem their ideological and confessional adversaries: Protestants (the latter) and Baroque Catholics (the former).⁹⁴ A much closer analogy for Galicia's Greek Catholic prelates can be built with the leaders of the Greek Catholic Wallachians (Romanians) in Transylvania, who also fought to elevate the status of their Eastern Christian community vis-à-vis the recognized *nationes* of Saxons, Magyars, and Szekelys. As a result, they embarked upon a fruitful collaboration with Josephinist decision-makers in Vienna and several of them (Samuil Klein, Gheorghe Șincai, Petru Maior, Ion Budai-Deleanu, Samuil Vulcan) either studied or taught at the Viennese Barbareum, where their paths crossed with those of the Galician Ruthenians. All this notwithstanding, their political gains proved much more modest than those of the Galician churchmen.⁹⁵ Another suggestive case for comparison in the Austrian Monarchy is Dalmatia, where Fra Andrija Dorotić participated in the resistance against Napoleon's rule in the Illyrian Provinces. Although born and educated under the Republic of Venice, he became an active supporter of the House of Austria, which he saw as the only force capable of defending his country and religion from the godless French.⁹⁶ Outside the Habsburg lands, possible comparisons include

⁹³Trencsényi, *Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe*, 116–67; Reinalter "Joseph von Sonnenfels als Gesellschaftstheoretiker," in Reinalter, *Sonnenfels*, 139–56. For a fascinating study of one such conservative man of Enlightenment in the nineteenth century, see Siemann, *Metternich*, 45–88, 98–131, 555–58, 579–92, 726–36, 746–55.

⁹⁴Niederhauser, *Rise of Nationality*, 181–95, 223–33; Hroch, *Social Preconditions*, 44–61, 98–106; Mikuláš Teich, "Bohemia: From Darkness into Light," in Porter and Teich, *Enlightenment in National Context*, 141–63; Josef Taborský, *Reformní katolík Josef Dobrovský* (Reform Catholic Josef Dobrovský) (Brno, 2007); Mária Vyvjalová, "Bratislavský generálny seminár a jeho význam pre slovenské národné hnutie" (Bratislava General Seminary and its Significance for the Slovak National Movement) in *Slovenské učené tovarištvo 1792–1992* (Slovak Learned Society 1792–1992), ed. Milan Petráš (Trnava, 1993), 19–40; Eva Kowalská, "The Enlightenment and the Beginnings of the Modern Slovak Nation," Ludovít Haraksim "Slovak Slavism and Panslavism," and Dušan Kováč, "The Slovak Political Programme: From Hungarian Patriotism to the Czecho-Slovak State," in *Slovakia in History*, eds. Mikuláš Teich, Dušan Kováč, and Martin D. Brown (Cambridge, 2011), 87–136; Maxwell, *Choosing Slovakia*.

⁹⁵Niederhauser, *Rise of Nationality*, 274–87; Mathias Bernath, *Habsburg und die Anfänge der rumänischen Nationsbildung* (Leiden, 1972); Keith Hitchins, *The Idea of Nation: The Romanians of Transylvania, 1691–1849* (Bucharest, 1985); Radu Nedici, *Formarea identității confesionale greco-catolice în Transilvania veacului al XVIII-lea. Biserică și comunitate* (The Formation of Greek Catholic Confessional Identity in Eighteenth-Century Transylvania. Church and Community) (Bucharest, 2013); Greta-Monica Miron, "New Uses of an Old Theme: The Roman Origins of Romanians in the Discourse of the Greek Catholic Elite in Eighteenth-Century Transylvania," in *Central European Past: Old and New in the Intellectual Culture of Habsburg Europe, 1700–1750*, eds. Ines Peper and Thomas Wallnig (Berlin, 2022), 441–58.

⁹⁶Paul Pisani, *La Dalmatie, de 1797 à 1815: épisode des conquêtes napoléoniennes* (Paris, 1893); Monika Senkowska-Gluck, *Rządy napoleońskie w Ilirii 1809–1813* (Napoleonic rule in Illyria 1809–1813) (Wrocław, 1980); Andrija Dorotić, *Politički spisi* (Political writings) (Split, 1995); Ivan Pederin, "Otpor francuskoj vlasti u Dalmaciji i Ilirskim pokrajinama poslije 1806" (Resistance to the French Administration in Dalmatia and Illyrian Provinces Following 1806) *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru* no. 45 (2003): 291–308; Michael Broers, *Napoleon's Other War: Bandits, Rebels and their Pursuers in the Age of Revolutions* (Oxford, 2010), 81–83; Reinhard Stauber, "Politische und soziale Integration in 'Illyrien' in der ersten Hälfte

the way in which Finland's Swedish-speaking elites chose to distance themselves from Sweden and its liberal framework to win the trust of their new masters in Saint Petersburg;⁹⁷ and the *Landespatriotismus* of the Little Russian landowners, in which many historians want to see the key link between the political tradition of the early modern Cossack republic and nineteenth-century Ukrainian nationalism.⁹⁸

This most cursory survey of possible historical comparisons allows us to see that my account of Galicia's Greek Catholic elite is not completely outlandish, as analogous developments could be observed in other contexts as well. All these cases are political in one sense or another, yet none of them offers a mirror image that would repeat all the major aspects of the Galician Ruthenian story. Although perhaps in some situations it would be possible to find such twins, this is not necessarily the main goal of historical comparisons. Rather, they should allow us to think in higher orders about structures and processes, appreciating both similarities and differences across the spectrum. My succinct outline of available asymmetrical comparisons suggests that even though we can clearly discern similar patterns of development across time and space, we do not need to think about nation-building as following (or deviating from) one prescribed model. What we deal with here is the Wittgensteinian *Familienähnlichkeit* or family resemblance. It is a series of cases that share a number of overlapping similarities, but none of these features is common to all the items in the group. In other words, although the cases are clearly related, there does not exist one common trait that could be treated as the essence of the series as a whole.

Instead of blindly relying on grand schemes that promise to reduce everything to a few taxa, we should rather seek to reconstruct the *Lokalvernunft* behind each phenomenon. Stiff comparative models, such as Miroslav Hroch's canonical ABC schema, although sometimes helpful as heuristic devices, are a fundamental distortion of the complex realities we try to study. As such, they should be applied with utmost caution and alongside clear-eyed acknowledgments of their limitations.

Conclusion

If nation is a claim-making concept, then nationalism can be reduced to an ideology in which invocations of the nation and its interest serve as the central legitimizing instrument. My argument in this

des 19. Jahrhunderts," in *Eliten in Tirol*, 61–82; Reinhard A. Stauber, "The Illyrian Provinces," in *The Napoleonic Empire and the New European Political Culture*, eds. Michael Broers, Peter Hicks, and Agustin Guimerá (London, 2012), 241–53; Marko Trogrlić and Josip Vrandečić, "French Rule in Dalmatia, 1806–1814: Globalizing a Local Geopolitics," in *Napoleon's Empire: European Politics in Global Perspective*, ed. Ute Planert (New York, 2015), 264–76; Trencsényi, *Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe*, 128–30.

⁹⁷Hroch, *Social Preconditions*, 62–75; Osmo Jussila, Seppo Hentilä, and Jukka Nevakivi, *From Grand Duchy to a Modern State: A Political History of Finland since 1809* (London, 1999); Łukasz Sommer, *Mowa ojców potrzebna od zaraz: Fińskie spory o język narodowy w pierwszej połowie XIX wieku* (The Language of Fathers is Urgently Needed: Finnish Polemics Concerning the National Language in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century) (Warsaw, 2009); Jussi Kurunmäki and Jani Marjanen, "Catching Up Through Comparison: The Making of Finland as a Political Unit, 1809–1863," *Time & Society* 30, no. 4 (2021): 559–80; Evgenii Egorov, "Perevod so shvedskogo na 'finliadskii': politicheskaia identichnost' Velikogo Kniazhestva Finliandskogo (1831–1854)" (Translation from Swedish to 'Finlandic': political identity of the Grand Duchy of Finland 1831–1854) *Ab imperio*, no. 4 (2021): 203–37.

⁹⁸Classical works of this elite-focused tradition include Waclaw Lipiński [V'iacheslav Lypyn's'kyi], *Szlachta na Ukrainie. Udział jej w życiu narodu na tle jego dziejów* (Nobility in Ukraine. Its part in the life of the nation against the background of its history) (Cracow, 1909); Waclaw Lipiński [V'iacheslav Lypyn's'kyi], *Stanisław Michał Krzyczewski. Z dziejów walki szlachty ukraińskiej w szeregach powstańczych pod wodzą Bohdana Chmielnickiego* (Stanisław Michał Krzyczewski. From the History of the Ukrainian Nobility's Struggle in the Insurrectionary Ranks Under the Leadership of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi) (Cracow, 1912); Oleksandr Ohloblyn, *Liudy staroi Ukrainy* (People of Olden Ukraine) (Munich, 1959); Nataliia Polons'ka-Vasylenko, *Istoriia Ukrainy* (History of Ukraine), 2 vols. (Munich, 1972, 1976). There are several more recent works building on this tradition: Frank Sysyn, *Between Poland and the Ukraine: the dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–1653* (Cambridge, MA, 1985); Zenon Kohut, *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s–1830s* (Cambridge, MA, 1988); and Serhii Plokhy, *The Cossack Myth: History and Nationhood in the Age of Empires* (Cambridge, 2012). See also Natalia Starchenko, "Znaity mistse dlia shliakhty v ukrains'kii istorii. Viziiia optymystychna" (Finding a Place for the Nobility in Ukrainian History. An Optimistic Vision) available at <https://www.istpravda.com.ua/articles/2021/06/8/159640/> (accessed 20 February 2023).

article is simple: late-eighteenth-century Greek Catholic prelates from Galicia espoused a form of Ruthenian nationalism, as they forcefully denied belonging to the post-Commonwealth Polish-Lithuanian nation (unmaking it, in Roman Szporluk's terms).⁹⁹ They did so, because they did not want to be associated with the republican values championed by France, then the main patron of the Polish-Lithuanian irredentism. In this way, the Greek Catholic prelates sought to cement their new social position, owed to the tasks ascribed to Catholic churchmen by the Habsburg government. Their main interlocutors were the decision-makers in Vienna who imagined Austria as a great union of peoples. Galicia's Greek Catholic leaders needed to adopt a national label that would distance them unequivocally and convincingly from the Poles.

This kind of nationalism may seem very thin, almost hollow, as its specific content was vague and it did not have much to offer in terms of emotional appeal to the masses. We could characterize its proponents with the help of the disparaging label used in the mid-1870s by Mykhailo Drahomanov: "individuals of the Austro-Seminarian-Ruthenian nationality" (*individuumy avstro-bursako-russkoi narodnosti*).¹⁰⁰ One might question the longer-term significance of such a phenomenon, but I would argue that even if my readers do not wish to classify it as nationalism, instead preferring to name it otherwise, this idea constitutes an important link in the longer process of Ukrainian nation-building in Galicia. My protagonists acquainted the Austrian government and public with the label "Ruthenian" as a signifier for a self-standing community understood as completely separate from the Poles (who, in turn, continued to claim the whole legacy of the Commonwealth, including Rus' and its culture). Whoever came after Anhelovych and Harasevych would find this part of the job done and could focus on other tasks, such as the development of the national language or assembling the canon of national heroes.

If my interpretation of the specific Galician case proves defensible, Hroch's model with its procession from purely cultural/linguistic activities toward more strictly political ones would turn out to obscure an important dimension of the process in question and erase from the record several decades of development.¹⁰¹ As John-Paul Himka concluded long ago, "in spite of the complexity and variety of factors entering into the process, the primary determinant of the construction of a national culture was political."¹⁰² Language issues and culture wars centered upon them are not necessarily the defining feature of the early stages of nation-building in Central and Eastern Europe, but rather a mobilizing device adopted by later cohorts of activists in the specific context created by the popularity of the post-Herderian thought and the legal avenues offered by Article 19 of the 1867 *Staatsgrundgesetz über die allgemeinen Rechte der Staatsbürger*. Their polemical success in the second half of the nineteenth century was so overwhelming that it almost completely obscured those earlier protagonists and processes that did not position the language question in the center. By the early 1880s, when Walerian Kalinka reminded his audience of the work of Mykhailo Harasevych and Denys Zubryts'kyi, it was almost universally accepted that the struggle for language rights constituted the kernel of nation-building.¹⁰³ This, however, does not mean that such figures as Anhelovych and Harasevych had not made significant contributions and that we should not see them as important links in the development of the national movement as a whole. From the very beginning, the gesture of identifying as Galician Ruthenians was all about politics, not only Galician, but also Austrian and European.

⁹⁹Roman Szporluk, "Ukraine: From an Imperial Periphery to a Sovereign State," *Daedalus* 126, no. 3, 92.

¹⁰⁰Quoted after Himka, "Icarian Flights," 146. Two points must be noted here: firstly, Drahomanov spoke of the conservative churchmen of his time; secondly, the Russian-language adjective *russkii* could mean both Ruthenian and Russian, depending on the context.

¹⁰¹Szporluk, "Ukraine: From Periphery to State," 91–92. Roman Szporluk pointed out the inherently political nature of the activities classified by Hroch as belonging to the allegedly innocuous folkloric phase A. I fully agree with Szporluk's observation, but here my argument is different, namely I try to show that in the Galician Ruthenian case the cultural activities of the 1830s had been preceded by *sensu stricto* political claim making of the Napoleonic era.

¹⁰²Himka, "Icarian Flights," 154.

¹⁰³Gerald Stourzh, *Die Gleichberechtigung der Nationalitäten in der Verfassung und Verwaltung Österreichs 1848–1918* (Vienna, 1985); Pieter Judson, *Exclusive Revolutionaries: Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848–1914* (Ann Arbor, 1996), 193–272; Judson, *Guardians of the Nation*, 1–65; Pieter Judson, *Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge, MA, 2016) 269–75, 292–316.

Funding Statement. Work on this article was enabled by a research grant generously funded by the National Science Centre of Poland (NCN2019/32/C/HS3/00466).

Acknowledgements. I need to thank two anonymous reviewers for their challenging comments and life-saving tips. Many other people helped me on this journey. I mention several of them in the body of the text or reference their work in my footnotes. Others include Ivan Al'mes, András Fejérdy, Maciej Górny, Emília Hrabovec, Adam Kożuchowski, Aleksander Łupienko, Anna Navrots'ka, Željko Oset, Katalin Pataki, Tomáš Pavlíček, Przemysław Pazik, Andrii Portnov, Johannes Remy, Wojciech Sajkowski, Anca Şincan, Philipp Ther, Mikko Toivanen, Miklós Tömöry, and Jared Warren.