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Abstract
This article explores the dynamic and main institutional forms of the emergence of the cult of Taras Shevchenko in Austrian Eastern Galicia, and its influence on the shaping of Ukrainian national identity in the province. If prior to the 1860s, Shevchenko's works were circulated in limited number of printed editions and manuscript copies among the narrow circle of Galician Ruthenian activists, the decade after 1861 was marked by the growth of public attention to Shevchenko's poetry and personality. The wide exposure to his texts (through both reading and listening) formed the public of Ukrainian national activists. Since the late 1860s, Shevchenko's cult began to be institutionalized through the regular commemorative practices and school education.
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The decisive influence of Taras Shevchenko's poetry on the shaping of the national identity of the Ukrainians (Ruthenians) of the Austrian-ruled province of Eastern Galicia has been explored by many scholars of various academic schools and generations. Especially, the impact of Shevchenko's texts and literary cult in Galicia in the 1860s, politically unstable decade of imperial reforms, was in the focus of several studies that are rich in factual details.¹

¹ Several pre-Soviet Ukrainian scholars reconstructed various channels of the spread of Shevchenko's poetry and information on him in Galicia: Iaroslav Hordynsky, Do istorii kulturnoho i politychnoho zhyttia v Halychyni u 6o-tykh rr. XIX v. [On the History of the
Nevertheless, the changing dynamic of this impact, the role of the socio-political context, and the particular institutional forms of establishing the supreme canonical status of Taras Shevchenko in Galicia still are not fully analyzed.

The prevailing views on the literary and ideological heritage of Shevchenko resulted not only from the direct influence from the Dnipro Ukraine (Naddnipryanska Ukraina), but were formed through the contest between Ukranophile, Russophile, Old Ruthenian, and Polonophile...
The emerging cult of Shevchenko reshaped the pre-existing system of cultural and political loyalties in Galicia and interfered with various types of religious, national, and cultural identifications, semiotic networks, and reading habits. Since the national myth of Shevchenko revolutionized the historical and political imagination of Ukrainian activists in Galicia, it is important to study how the new public and educational practices of the 1860s and early 1870s contributed to the institutionalization of Ukrainian identity in Galicia through the veneration of the poetry and personality of Taras Shevchenko.

“The Books We Never Saw Before”

Notwithstanding numerous intellectual contacts between the Ukrainian and Slavophile national “awakeners” in both empires since the 1830s, one could hardly find any wider public influence of these literary works in Galicia, since they were disseminated in single copies and read in narrow circles of patriotic friends. In such a way, the poetic lines of Taras Shevchenko were for the first time read in Galicia around 1842 (and then copied) from a single copy of the almanac Lastivka by a small circle gathered around the “Ruthenian Triad.” Nineteenth-century Ukrainian literature was not taught in Galician schools or the University of Lviv until the 1870s. It is noteworthy that the poetry of Taras Shevchenko was not included in the university course of Ruthenian literature read by Professor Iakiv Holovatsky, who focused mostly on medieval times.

---


5 Ivan Verkratsky, “Z pervykh lit narodovtsiv (1861–1866),” [“From the First Years of the National Populists (1861–1866),”] Zapysky NTSh 122 (1915): 79; Vozniak, “Narodyny kultu Shevchenka,” 1.
Also, historical education in Galicia did not provide any information on the history of Ukraine and Cossacks. Until the end of the 1850s, historical textbooks aimed at forging imperial loyalty and avoided any specific references to the non-Austrian past of Habsburg citizens.\textsuperscript{6}

The situation began to change with the revolution of 1848 and the profound transformation of the Austrian political system in the 1860s. Since then, Galician Ruthenians political activists were divided on how to define their nationality. The \textit{Polonophiles} insisted that Ruthenians should remain part of Polish culture and the political nation. The \textit{Old Ruthenians}, on the contrary, opted for dissociation from Polish culture. Most of them were foremost loyal to imperial Austrian authorities and recognized the Greek Catholic Church leadership (“St. George party”) in their national movement. The \textit{Russophiles} aspired to the pan-Russian cultural unity that would include, but not be limited to, Ukraine. And, finally, the “Ukrainian idea” with its strong populist overtones that were elaborated by Shevchenko and his followers attracted the \textit{Ukrainophile} part of the Galician Ruthenian educated public (who consisted of young urban intellectuals, university and theological seminary students, plus several groups of \textit{gymnasium} students).

After 1848, several important literary texts that represented a new cultural code for Ukraine were republished in Galicia (including the novel \textit{Marusia} by Hryhory Kvitka-Osnovianenko, and the novel \textit{Taras Bulba} by Mykola Hohol (Nikolai Gogol), translated from Russian), or circulated in manuscript copies (as \textit{Eneida} by Ivan Kotliarevsky),\textsuperscript{7} but the average Ruthenian students of the \textit{gymnasia} of the 1850s normally were not informed about the main authors of Ukrainian literature.\textsuperscript{8} One

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{6} Czesław Majorek, \textit{Historia utylitarna i erudycyjna. Szkolna edukacja historyczna w Galicji (1772–1918)} (Warszawa, 1990), 101–22.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Volodymyr Shashkevych, “Iak my postupaly dosi i iak nam dalshe postupaty,” [“How We Acted Before and How We Shall Act in the Future,”] \textit{Rus} 21 (9 June 1867): 2–4; Oleksandr Barvinsky, \textit{Spomyny z moho zhyttia} [\textit{Memoirs of My Life}], vol. 1 (Lviv, 1912), 32–33.
\item \textsuperscript{8} Anatol Vakhnianyn recalled that the students of Peremyshl \textit{gymnasium} in the 1850s “had not heard a word about \textit{Eneida} of Kotliarevsky, works of Artemovsky, Hrebinka, Osnovianenko and Taras [Shevchenko].” Vakhnianyn, \textit{Spomyny z zhyttia}, 21–23.
\end{itemize}
can see how Ukrainian literary texts can influence views of a Ruthenian cultural activist through the case of Feodosy (Bohdan) Didytsky, later a prominent Russophile and chief editor of the main Galician-Ruthenian newspaper *Slovo*. After he read “Ruthenian-Ukrainian books,” including *Eneida* by Kotliarevsky and novels by Kvitka-Osnovianenko (Shevchenko still remained unknown to him until 1852),\(^9\) Didytsky began to believe in the possibility of creating Ukrainian democratic and non-aristocratic literature, and thus became a “true Ukrainian or literary *khlopoman* [peasant-lover].” As with many of his friends, he learned *Eneida* by heart and compiled a hand-written Ukrainian dictionary consisting of words and whole phrases copied from the works of Ukrainian writers. Being inspired by Kotliarevsky, he also planned to write a novel *Sich-island behind the Seven Seas* (*Sich-ostriv za semy moriamy*) about the imagined republic of Sich established by one hundred Cossacks who escaped over the Atlantic Ocean after Zaporozhian Sich was destroyed.\(^10\) Then under the influence of Hohol and many Ukraine-born writers who wrote in Russian, Didytsky elaborated the idée fixe of his future literary and public activity – to create such a literature and culture that would be accessible and native for both Ukrainians and Russians and that would integrate their historical heritages.

Yet such a direct exposure to the texts of Ukrainian authors from the Russian Empire in the time of neo-absolutism was still rather an exception. Ukrainian authors, who searched for information on the writings of Shevchenko in Galicia, acknowledged that prior to the 1860s, only a small circle of the educated public who personally connected with the first Galician-Ruthenian “awakeners” had read his poetry.\(^11\) Moreover, even after 1848, the Polish literary journals seemed to be more interested in

---

11 Studynsky could number only five Galician Ruthenians who, as he assumed, knew well enough Shevchenko’s verses before 1861 (Studynsky, “Do istorii vzaiemyn Halychyny z Ukrainoiu,” 13). See also Zahaikevych, “Kult Shevchenka v Halychyni,” 254; Dubyna, *Za pravdu slova Shevchenka*, 7–11.
Shevchenko’s works, especially those of an explicit anti-Russian character, than Galician-Ruthenian periodicals.\textsuperscript{12} All in all, there were few if any signs of Shevchenko’s cult before the poet’s death in 1861, which coincided with the beginnings of political liberalization in the Austrian Empire.

The politics of “constitutional experiments” and loosening of censorship in the early 1860s created new opportunities for the dissemination of Shevchenko poetry in the Habsburg monarchy. One should also take into account the liberalization of the censorship regime in the Russian monarchy that provided for an increase in the publication of books in Ukrainian or on Ukraine-related topics by the late 1850s – early 1860s, which then could be imported into Galicia. As a result, in the early 1860s, with the end of neo-absolutism, there was a real influx of Ukrainian publications from the Russian Empire into Austrian Galicia. There were several sources, known to historians, from which Ukrainian books were received, but two of them were the most important.

In 1858, one of the leading Ukrainian national activists from the Russian Empire Panteleimon Kulish for the first time visited Galicia.\textsuperscript{13} Already by then, he had left in the Ruthenian bookshop of the Stavropygian (Stavropigiisky) Institute the novels of Marko Vovchok, a published edition of the Cossack chronicle by Samovydets, and the works of Hohol.\textsuperscript{14} After a few years, he became a spiritual guide and supplier of Ukrainian books for many young Galician Ruthenians. In October 1861, a student of the Greek Catholic seminary Iosyf Mohylnytsky wrote that “the students of our seminary are in very close contact with the


head of our literature Kulish, and very often receive letters and books from him.”

In the spring of 1862, a Ruthenian merchant from Lviv Mykhailo Dymet, counselled by the younger Ruthenian activists, carried on his way back from Kyiv a parcel of books with Shevchenko’s “Kobzar,” and quickly sold them all. The book-trade suddenly proved to be profitable for Dymet; thus, during the next years, he brought more and more poems of Shevchenko from the Russian Empire. All of them met with the tremendous interest and enthusiasm of a significant part of the Galician Ruthenian youth. At that point, bookseller Dymet clearly acted “as a cultural agent, the middleman who mediated between supply and demand at their key point of contact.”

There are several preserved lists of the books he imported into Galicia. The list of books that were selling through the bookshop of the Stavropygian Institute, compiled by an early Ukrainophile Ivan Verkhratsky, consisted of the 1860 St. Petersburg (the so-called Platon Semerenko’s) edition of Shevchenko’s “Kobzar”; the collections of folklore *Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi* (1856–1857), and the literary anthology *Khata* (1860), edited by Kulish; the latter’s historical novel *Chorna Rada* (1857) and grammar, *Hramatyka* (1857); the collected literary works of Marko Vovchok (1861),

---

15 See the letter of Iosyf Mohynnytsky, a student at the Lviv clerical seminary, to Father Amvroyi Shankovsky of 6 October 1861, in Hordynsky, *Do istorii kulturnoho i politychnoho zhyttia*, 151.


17 It was believed that the purchase price of the Ukrainian books imported by Dymet was 1,000 guldens. “Kobzar” costed in the bookshop 2,50 guldens, and more expensive editions, like two-volume *Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi* or *Bogdan Khmelnitskii* by Kostomarov could cost up to 7–8 guldens. One can estimate that Dymet brought about several hundred copies of books. As one of the students informed, some of his classmates paid up to 30 guldens for books, and in general, students of the seminary bought books for 200 guldens. See Hordynsky, *Do istorii kulturnoho i politychnoho zhyttia*, 40–43.

Kvitka-Osnovianenko (1861), and Kotliarevsky (1862); and the collection of Ukrainian folk songs by Danylo Kamenetsky (1861). Most of these books, in spite of their high price, were sold in 1862–1863 and soon became a rarity.

In the list of books received from Panteleimon Kulish, compiled by a student of Lviv Greek Catholic seminary, Iosyf Mohylnytsky, there were also the Leipzig edition of Shevchenko's poetry (1859), the historical drama *Pereiaslavska nich* by Mykola Kostomarov, and Ukrainian poems of Mykhailo Makarovsky, Mykhailo Petrenko, and Stepan Aleksandrov. Among the Ukrainian books that circulated among Ruthenian students, there was also the collection of Cossack *dumy* by Mykhailo Maksymovych. Also, various issues of St. Petersburg journal *Osnova*, the main periodical organ of Ukrainian activists in the Russian Empire, were very popular. In 1862, the Lviv Ukrainophiles subscribed to *Osnova*; it could also be bought in the bookshop of the Stavropygian Institute.

Besides fine literature, there was also an influx of scholarly historical studies on the Cossacks. *Bogdan Khmelnitski* by Mykola Kostomarov (1857) was probably the most popular historical monograph of that time among the Galician Ruthenians. Since the book was very expensive (it cost about 10 gulden), the group of secular students at the University of Lviv shared a borrowed copy of the monograph and came together to read it aloud. These gatherings constituted the beginning of one of the first Ukrainophile circles in Lviv that, in 1862, started to publish its own periodical *Vechernytsi*. Lviv students also read the *Istoria*
Malorossii (History of Little Russia) by Mykola Markevych (1842–1843), a work that focused on the Cossack past and included big sections from Istoria Rusov. Both the works of Markevych and Kostomarov were in favour for the “unification” of the Cossacks with tsarist Russia, but the Galician Ukrainophiles never believed in the sincerity of this judgment. Galician Ukrainophiles were also fascinated by the popular overview of the Khmelnytsky uprising by Kulish, Khmelnychchyna, published in Osnova. The most popular among Ukrainophiles historical readings also included works on Cossacks by Johann Christian Engel, and Dmytro Bantysh-Kamensky, and studies on Galician Rus by local historians Izydor Sharanevych and Denys Zubrytsky.

The Emerging Ukrainophile Public as a Reading Circle

In 1861, the unpublished manuscripts of Shevchenko were also brought to Galicia by Volodymyr Bernatovych, a prominent khlopoman from Right-bank Ukraine and former student of Kyiv University. Bernatovych stopped briefly in Lviv in July 1861 on his way from Odessa to Prague. He met Volodymyr Shashkevych (a son of famous Galician Ruthenian poet Markian Shashkevych), Danylo Taniachkevych, and a close circle of their friends. In the mansard room of Shashkevych, Bernatovych told them vivid stories about Shevchenko, Kulish, Kostomarov, and the Ukrainian national activities in Kyiv.

Volodymyr Shashkevych later recalled that the first circle of Ukrainophiles in Lviv consisted of only five persons. Besides Shashkevych and Taniachkevych, it included Ksenofont Klymkovych, Fedir Zarevych, and Ievhen Zharsky. Both Shashkevych and Taniachkevych had just finished the gymnasium and prepared to study law and theology, respectively, at

26 See letter of I. Mohylntsky to A. Shankovsky from 13 April 1862 in Hordynsky, Do istorii kulturnoho i politychnoho zhyttia, 159. On the other readers of the Markevych’s monograph see Barvinsky, Spomyny z moho zhyttia, vol. 1, 70.
27 Barvinsky, Spomyny z moho zhyttia, vol. 1, 56.
the University of Lviv. Zharsky had been studying at the University in Lviv since 1854. Klymkovych did not finish gymnasium and was employed as a clerk. Zarevych, due to his participation in secret student societies in the gymnasium, also did not complete his secondary education, and like Klymkovych, worked as a clerk.\(^{29}\) All five were sons of Greek Catholic priests, but four of them preferred secular occupations. At least some of them were brought up in families who cultivated a sense of Ruthenian distinctiveness.\(^{30}\) In 1861, they all shared devotion to the “Ukrainian idea” and formed the first intellectual centre of Ukrainophilism in Lviv.

In particular, Taniachkevytsch became the main promoter of the network of Ukrainophile hromady (communities) in Galicia.\(^{31}\) Soon, he established correspondence with gymnasium students from all major provincial towns. Together with letters, he sent poems and pictures of Shevchenko and urged his correspondents secretly to establish local Ukrainophile circles modelled on Cossack fraternities. The program of activity of each hromada stressed foremost the need for “national self education.” For example, hromada members in Ternopil had their meetings three times per week where they read aloud papers on history, literature, and recited Shevchenko’s poetry.\(^{32}\) Hromady tried to influence the mood of other

---


\(^{30}\) The case of Shashkevych was rather exceptional since his father was himself the main national “awakener” of Galician Ruthenians. Even after his father’s early death Volodymyr was educated “in Ruthenian spirit,” and already before the 1860s read Taras Bulba by Hol and Eneida by Ivan Kotliarevsky. Vozniak, “Nedrukovanav avtobiografiia Volodymyra Shashkevycha,” 4. The father of Taniachkevytsch was a widely read person with interest to Ukrainian literature and populist disposition. John-Paul Himka, Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century (Edmonton, London and New York: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, Macmillan, St. Martin’s Press, 1988), 309.


\(^{32}\) Vasyl Stefanyk Lviv National Academic Library of Ukraine (Lvivska Natsionalna Naukova Biblioteka Ukrainy im. V. Stefanyka), manuscript division, collection 1, file 560, sheet 60–61; Barvinsky, Spomyny z moho zhyttia, vol. 1, 60.
students and all the Ruthenian public, mostly through open literary evenings.\footnote{In Peremyshl, Anatol Vakhnianyn tried to hold such meeting every Saturday at the clerical seminary. Vakhnianyn, \textit{Spomyny z zhyttia}, 54; Vasyl Stefanyk Lviv National Academic Library of Ukraine, manuscript division, collection 1, file 560, sheet 31.} Often, those literary meetings were devoted to the anniversary of Taras Shevchenko's death. The passionate reading of Shevchenko often revealed national sentiment that was modelled on the traditional religious pattern. Sharing impressions from his “learning of Ukraine,” a member of Sambir \textit{hromada} Volodymyr Stebelsky used the language of a converted person, juxtaposing his “sacred” Ukraine (\textit{sviatu moiu Ukrainu}) to the surrounding profane reality: “Not satisfied by the world, not satisfied by myself, I live only in my ideal Ukraine.” Ukraine was treated as a sacred sphere manifested through the ideas declared by the “Apostle Taras.” On the other hand, the public life of Ruthenians in Sambir looked like a “miserable obscure picture.” Within this dualistic system, Stebelsky saw himself – typically for the Romantic imagination – in the role of the preacher of a new revelation, rejected by the heartless people around him.\footnote{Vasyl Stefanyk Lviv National Academic Library of Ukraine, manuscript division, collection 1, file 560, sheets 40, 52, 71.} According to Ostap Terletsy, “the wings of Shevchenko’s poetry” helped the young Ukrainophiles to escape from “depressing reality” in the early 1860s.\footnote{Ostap Terletsky, \textit{Moskovofily i narodovtsi v 70-yykh rr. [Moscowphiles and National Populists in the 1870s]} (Lviv, 1902), 28.}

Since the imported books of “Kobzar” were too expensive for \textit{gymnasium} students,\footnote{Verkhratsky, “Z pervykh lit narodovtsiv (1861–1866),” 82–83.} only a few could afford them. Taniachkevych encouraged his fellow-students of Lviv clerical seminary to rewrite “Kobzar” by hand and send manuscript copies all over Galicia.\footnote{For example, at the beginning of 1862–1863 academic year, \textit{gymnasium} student Tyt Revakovych received a note-book with hand-written Shevchenko's poetry from a student of Lviv seminary Ivan Rudnytsky and brought it to Drohobych where he studied. (Zahaikevych, “Kult Shevchenka v Halychyni,” 256). In Ternopil, Ukrainophile \textit{hromada} used “Kobzar” re-written by the student of Lviv seminary Mykola Mykhalevych (Barvinsky, \textit{Spomyny z moho zhyttia}, vol.1, 59).} Copying Shevchenko’s poetry became very popular also among the provincial \textit{gymnasium} students,
since it was the cheapest way of obtaining them. Often, those who were fortunate enough to acquire a printed copy of Shevchenko had to read it aloud on various occasions to all interested fellows.³⁸ Learning Shevchenko’s poetry by heart was another widespread practice that became fashionable.³⁹ It was done not only for impressive declamations of large pieces of patriotic verses or to save money on buying books. In fact, this memorization was the act of studying new words, phrases, accents, and all other elements of modern literary Ukrainian.⁴⁰

Shevchenko’s poetry could be also read from the Galician Ukrainophile journals (Vechernytsi, 1862–1863; Meta, 1863–1865; Rusalka, 1866; Prawda, 1867–1870) that republished them from the Leipzig edition of Shevchenko or from manuscript copies delivered by Volodymyr Bernatovych or other East Ukrainian intellectuals.⁴¹ Some of his works were published in Lviv for the first time, such as “Vidma” (1862); “Rusalka” (1862); “Chyhryne, Chyhryne” (1863); “Meni odnakovo, chy budu” (1863); “Plach Yaroslavny” (1863); “N. Kostomarovu” (1863); the anti-tsarist satirical poem “Son” (in separate edition prepared by Klymkovych in 1865); “Velykyi liokh” (1869); and others. In 1863, the Ukrainophile journal Meta published the poem of Pavlo Chubynsky, “Shche ne vmerla Ukraina,” attributed by mistake to Shevchenko’s authorship. All in all, the early Ukrainophile newspapers saw their mission as the spread of the word and cult of Shevchenko among the educated Galician Ruthenian public. Summarizing their impact on the Galician provincial life, the editors of Vechernytsi claimed that due to their efforts, one could see portraits of Shevchenko among the portraits of local writers in every house of the

³⁹ Some gymnasium students knew the entire lengthy poems by Shevchenko, such as Haidamaky, by heart. Petrykevych, Istoria kultu Shevchenka, xxxv.
⁴⁰ As Viktor Petrykevych commented, “many students learned ‘Kobzar’ by heart in order to acquire knowledge of Ukrainian and to possess some copiam verborum” (Petrykevych, Istoria kultu Shevchenka, xxviii, xxxiv).
⁴¹ Dubyna, Za prawdu slova Shevchenka, 70.
Greek Catholic priests, “and he peacefully rules over them, like a father among little children.”42

The practices of memorization and copying vanished after the Lviv two-volume edition of Shevchenko’s works, prepared by a group of Ukrainophiles (Oleksandr Barvinsky, Omelian Partytsky, Kornylo Sushkevych and Hnat Rozhansky), was printed in 1866–1867. It included the most famous Romantic Cossackophile verses, several political anti-tsarist poems that could not be published in the Russian Empire (“Kavkaz”, “Son”), and, of course, those that prophesied the future resurrection of Ukraine (“Subotiv” [“Stoit v seli Subotovi”] and “Shche ne vmerla Ukraina”). As Barvinsky recalled, Ukrainophiles of his generation favoured those poems of Shevchenko that offered a romantic vision of Ukraine’s past, and did not fully understand the poet’s views on Ukrainian history.43

Contested Biography and Changing Reception

Producing a biography of Shevchenko and a literary analysis of his works was certainly a matter of great ideological importance for early Ukrainophiles. In 1861, there were several accounts of the death of Shevchenko published in Slovo. The first two articles were produced in March and May by Didytsky and his collaborators, who themselves were little informed about Shevchenko and made several biographical mistakes. From the beginning, they accepted the laudatory tone, probably under the influence of the Kulish’s letters, who was their main informant. Just after his death, Shevchenko was praised as the greatest “prophet, artist and bard-nightingale” of Little Russia, whose truly Ruthenian heart (shchyro-ruskaia hrud) was full of love for the steppes of his native Ukraine.44 And in the May article, which was published just after Shevchenko’s symbolic re-burial in Ukraine, the author stated that the Lviv Ruthenians sympathized with this great loss of Ukraine.45 In fact, after Ruthenian gymnasium students

42 Vechernytsi 35 (1 November 1862), 297–98.
43 Barvinsky, Spomyny z moho zhyttia, vol.1, 60.
44 Slovo, 15 (15 March 1861).
45 Slovo, 27 (11 May 1861): 156.
of Lviv read about the poet’s death in Polish and Ruthenian press, some of them wore black cockades. The group of future Ukrainophiles planned to collect and publish novels and historical works devoted to the memory of Shevchenko under the title *Kytytsia na mohyli Tarasa Shevchenka* (*Tassel on the Tomb of Taras Shevchenko*). 46

However, in the provincial Galician towns, only a few educated Ruthenians were aware of the significance of Shevchenko until another obituary written by Volodymyr Bernatovych was published in July 1861. 47 Bernatovych’s article with information on Shevchenko’s funeral was representative of populist rhetoric on Shevchenko. Bernatovych emphasized the poet’s deep devotion to his native Ukraine, his martyrdom, and the profound effect that the view of the coffin, which kept “the most valuable treasure of our Ukraine,” made on the students of Kyiv. Their relationship with Shevchenko was characterized as similar to that between children and their father. This reference to Shevchenko as “our dead father” (*nash pokiinyi batko*) became a recurrent expression in the letters “from Ukraine” published in *Slovo* and soon was accepted by the Galician Ukrainophiles themselves. 48

In the early 1860s, Panteleimon Kulish was the main East Ukrainian authority who shaped the Ukrainophile’s understanding of Shevchenko in Galicia. His third “Letter from khutir,” “Choho stoit Shevchenko iako poet narodny” (“Why Shevchenko is the Poet of our People”), where he sketched a symbolic understanding of Shevchenko as the poet who revealed the history and the future of Ukraine, was publicly read at the “declamational evening” on 15 May 1862, and was republished from *Osnova* in *Vechernytsi* in June 1862. 49 In the following issue *Vechernytsi*, also published Kulish’s

---

46 Vasyl Stefanyk Lviv National Academic Library of Ukraine, manuscript division, collection 11, file 3875, sheet 1 (letter of Volodymyr Shashkevych, 3 December, 1866); *Slovo* 40 (19 June 1861): 233. Later, Volodymyr Shashkevych recalled that *Kytytsia* was planned as an anthology of poetry and novels copying the example of Didytsky’s *Zoria Halyska iako album*. See Shashkevych, “Iak my postupaly,” 2–4.


48 *Slovo* 16 (8 March 1862): 64.

speech at Shevchenko’s funeral together with its full description.\textsuperscript{50} The biographical pattern elaborated by Kulish was often followed by contemporary Galician Ukrainophile authors. In 1862, Anatol Vakhnianyn wrote one of the first local Galician critical essays on Shevchenko’s muse. He followed Kulish’s symbolic perception of Shevchenko’s muse and almost copied some of Kulish’s metaphors. Vakhnianyn stated that Shevchenko tore up the curtain that hid a true freedom-loving Little Russian (Kulish wrote that Shevchenko tore up the curtain that hid Ukrainian history), and that Shevchenko discovered in Ukrainian burial mounds (\textit{mohyly}), the true language of the people (Kulish wrote that only Shevchenko received true answer from the \textit{mohyly}).\textsuperscript{51}

There were also many other laudatory publications devoted to Shevchenko in Galician Ruthenian press in 1862 and 1863, mostly based on materials already published in Russian and Ukrainian journals.\textsuperscript{52} Shevchenko’s biography was presented in both a populist and nationalist light: as suffering from the social oppression under serfdom, and from political repressions. Most of the authors stressed the revealing role of his poetry. This treatment of Shevchenko’s poetry as a new prophecy contrasted with the purely aesthetic one, particularly with that of the older Ruthenian educated public. The latter, as a rule, liked Shevchenko, but did not value him as much as Ivan Kotliarevsky and Hryhory Kvitka-Osnovianenko (Iakiv Holovatsky) or local Galician poet Mykola Lisikevych (Mykhailo Kachkovsky).\textsuperscript{53}

In their turn, Ukrainophiles argued that Galician Ruthenians did not possess writers who would be able to compete with such acclaimed authors as Shevchenko, Kvitka-Osnovianenko, Kulish, Kostomarov, Marko

\textsuperscript{50} Vechernytsi 22 (28 June 1862): 193–97. See on the role of Kulish in the formation of Shevchenko’s cult in Galicia Fedoruk, “Do istorii stanovlennia kultu Shevchenka u Halychyni,” 56–68.

\textsuperscript{51} N. [Anatol Vakhnianyn], “Deshcho za Muzu Shevchenkovu y rozbor dumy predsmertnoy,” [“Something on Shevchenko’s Muse and the Analysis of His Death Thought,”] \textit{Peremyshliany} (Peremyshl, 1862), 49–57.

\textsuperscript{52} Slovo 53 (19 July 1862): 207.

\textsuperscript{53} Viktor Petrykevych, \textit{Istoryia kultu Shevchenka}, vi, xxvii.
Vovchok, and others. To preserve the unity of Little Rus, they had to “accept unconditionally our literary language from Ukraine.” Ukrainophiles insisted that the “vernacular” language that the East Ukrainian writers used united all parts of Little Rus. They also argued that even a peasant woman in Galicia easily understood the poems of Shevchenko.

Yet, at the same time, some Galician Ukrainophiles acknowledged that, to spread out a new Ukrainian standard, they had to learn it first. Many early Ukrainophiles felt ashamed that they mastered Polish and German better than they did Ukrainian. Some acknowledged that, in school, they used to think in German and then translate German forms into Ruthenian. Some even believed that due to the limiting influence of German, Galician artists cannot represent in their works the beauty of popular Ukrainian culture in the same natural and attractive way as Eastern Ukrainian writers could. A contributor to Pravda stated in 1867 that “not Galician but only Ukrainian Rus posses the conditions necessary for the development of independent Little Russian literature [...] and only Ukraine deserves to lead our Rus.” In sum, this caused a long-lasting feeling of inferiority in the Galician Ukrainian intelligentsia and a cultural dependence on the works of Eastern Ukrainians. Among Galician Ruthenian authors, only Markian Shashkevych was valued as a


59 Rus 16 (23 May 1867): 1–2.

60 Pravda 1 (1 April 1867): 7–8.
writer who can be compared to Shevchenko. “Appeared these great men in Ukraine and in Galicia: there – Taras, here – Markian. They passed away, but showed us the way where we have to go,” wrote Anatol Vakhnia-nyn in 1862.  

Evaluation of Shevchenko’s poetry became a sensitive topic for all Ukrainophiles in Galicia, since his poetical talent stood for the whole Ukrainian nation’s spirit. Almost every discussion of the “Ukrainian idea” touched upon the properties of Shevchenko’s personality. Ukrainophile authors carefully scrutinized the reception of Shevchenko’s poetry by Russian (and Russophile), and Polish (and Polonophile) authors and debated it in the press. Critical and offensive articles on Shevchenko began to appear in Galician-Ruthenian press, usually as a “repercussion” of the criticism on the sacralised reception of Shevchenko that intensified in the Russian press in connection with the debates that led to the Valuev circular of 1863. Although the Old Ruthenians and Russophiles might not sympathize with its diminishing tone on Ukrainian history, or with its Russian imperial loyalty, in order to oppose the national and cultural radicalism of Ukrainophiles, they were eager to bring into Galician public discourse these other voices from Russian-ruled Ukraine.

In June 1863, one of the contributors to the Vienna-based Old Ruthenian Vistnyk outlined a brochure by Ivan Kulzhinski O zarozhdaiushchei-sia tak nazyvaiemoi malorusskoi literature. Kulzhinski, who in the 1860s was a leading anti-Polish polemist and saw the Ukrainophile movement as “Polish intrigue,” did not find poetic talent in Shevchenko’s poetry and like some Galician Ruthenians praised much more Kotliarevsky’s

---

63 Kulzhinski was a gymnasium teacher of Hogol and author of several critical works on Little Russian poetry, ethnography and of the fictional stories on Cossack past. Since the 1830s he became a follower of Uvarov’s doctrine. N. Kuznetsova, “Kulzhinski Ivan Grigorievich,” Russkie pisateli 1800–1917. Biograficheski slovar [Russian Writers 1800–1917. Biographical Dictionary], vol. 3 (Moscow, 1994), 217–19.
Based on Kulzhinski’s arguments, Old Ruthenians attempted to preserve their control over the development of the Ruthenian language in Galicia and to ignore the national-political message of Shevchenko. Yet, interestingly enough, some Russophile circles in Galicia did not deride Shevchenko, seeing in him, and generally in Ukrainian literature, an antidote against the “polonizing” influences. This concept was mainly elaborated by Bohdan Didytsky and a few prominent figures in the Russophile movement. For example, Pylyp Svystun, a devoted follower of Shevchenko in the 1860s and a Russophile in the 1880s, advised readers to use Ukrainian literature thoughtfully. He argued that “Ukrainianism, after all, does not separate us from the Great Russian world, on the contrary, it brings us closer to the spiritual life of Great Rus.”

The Polish (and Polonophile) perception of Shevchenko varied as well. Already in 1862, Vechernytsi had the occasion to develop, in line with other Ruthenian press, anti-Polish rhetoric defending Shevchenko. In one article in a leading Polish intellectual journal in Lviv, Dziennik Literacki, Shevchenko was accused of “literary hajdamactwo” and was criticized for glorifying haidamak murders of Poles. Cossack tradition, in general, was discarded as inappropriate for a genuine national idea. In response, Taniachkevych wrote a lengthy piece where he defended the morals expressed in the poetry of Shevchenko, the “Little Russian idea,” and the Cossack and haidamak struggle against the Poles.

In general, through the 1860s, Polish press gave two pictures of Shevchenko: a hero who suffered from Russian imperial tyranny and cooperated
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64 Ivan Kulzhinskii, Pismo k izdateliu lvovskogo zhurnala “Meta” g. K. Klimkovichu [A Letter to the Editor of Lviv Journal Meta, Mr. Klymkovych] (Kyiv, 1864), 11.


67 Budovlia [Danylo Taniachkevych], “Slivtse pravdy Dziennik-ovy Literack-omu pro nashoho batka Tarasa Shevchenka,” ["A Word of Truth to Dziennik Literacki about Our Father Taras Shevchenko," Vechernytsi 35 (1 November 1863); 36 (8 November 1863); 37 (15 November 1863); 38 (22 November 1863); 39 (29 November 1863); 40 (6 December 1863); 41 (12 December 1863); 42 (19 December 1863); 43 (28 December 1863).
with the Poles, and a malefactor who provoked Polish-Ukrainian conflict, particularly in his poem “Haidamaky.” While the bloody scenes from “Haidamaky” outraged some, others, especially those adhering to Ukrainophile tradition, proclaimed Shevchenko a promoter of Polish-Ruthenian rapprochement.\textsuperscript{68} Polish translations of Shevchenko in the early 1860s by Antoni Gorzałczyński, Leonard Sowiński, and Władysław Syrokomla were seen by the Ukrainophiles as proof of his talent.\textsuperscript{69}

The most sympathetic version for interpreting Shevchenko was proposed from the Polish side by Gwido baron Battaglia, a critic close to the Polish Ukrainophile circles, in a biography published in Lviv in 1865. He begins with a brief overview of Polish-Ukrainian relations in the past, blaming Jesuits and the \textit{szlachta} for their treatment of the Ruthenian Orthodox and Cossacks. He also criticizes the Cossacks’ hatred of all Poles that was inspired by the Russian despotic government and that led to moral degeneration. Against such a historical background, he pictured a new national idea that emerged in the poetry of Shevchenko and that was directed against despotism. Admitting that it occasionally offended Polish national sentiments, Battaglia still argued for an impartial reception of Shevchenko, particularly “Haidamaky.” To understand the new idea of Ukraine, the Poles had to study Shevchenko who was its “father.”\textsuperscript{70} In the description of the poet’s life, Battaglia relies mostly on the Ukrainian texts published in \textit{Osnova} and \textit{Vechernytsi} and disputes claims by several Polish critics of Shevchenko. Although Battaglia’s work was directed to the Polish readers in Galicia, it was well-received by the Ukrainophile \textit{hromady} and even valued by them as the best contemporary study of Shevchenko’s work and life.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{68} For example, see “Dziennik Poznański o Rusinach,” \textit{Dodatek do Gazeta Narodowa} 28 (1866); “Wieszcze Oratorjum” Bohdana Zaleskiego, \textit{Gazeta Narodowa} 145 (24 June 1866): 1–2; and the articles on Shevchenko published in \textit{Siolo} in 1866–1867.

\textsuperscript{69} On the Polish translations of Shevchenko in the 1860s and the public discussions around them see Verves, “Taras Shevchenko i polska kultura,” 28–36.

\textsuperscript{70} Gwido Battaglia, \textit{Taras Szewczenko, życie i pisma jego} (Lwów, 1865), 57.

\textsuperscript{71} Viktor Petrykevych, \textit{Istoryia kultu Shevchenka}, v, ix; Oleksandr Barvinsky, \textit{Spomyny z moho zhyttia}, vol. 1, 59; “Materialy do istoryi znosyn Halychan z Bukovyntsiamy,”
The cult of Shevchenko also survived the growing criticism of Shevchenko by Kulish, who at the end of the 1860s developed a much more critical attitude to Shevchenko's poetry. In fact, it was the cult of Shevchenko that rather conditioned the character of Kulish's critical writings published in Galicia, not vice versa.\(^\text{72}\) Until that time, his cult, as of the national poet whose poetry revealed a national idea, became institutionalized in Galicia.

In the 1870s, the discussions in Galicia over the meaning of Shevchenko's poetry obtained, besides national, also social and religious dimensions. Omelian Ohonovsky, in line with the concepts of “organic work,” emphasized the educational message of Shevchenko, and the idea of social solidarity of previously denationalized pany (lords) with narod (the people). On the other hand, Shevchenko's ideal of the Cossack brotherhood, important for early hromady, was criticized.\(^\text{73}\)

**Literary Evenings and Requiem Masses**

In the first half of the 1860s, church requiem masses and literary evenings became the main forms of the growing cult of Taras Shevchenko. The first requiem mass in honour of Taras Shevchenko, celebrated in 1862, took place in the only Orthodox Church in Lviv that belonged to the Bukovynian bishopric at a time when the so-called “ritual purification” (obriadovyj) movement, which aimed at the return to a more Eastern form of liturgy as a liberation from Polish domination and assimilation, was at the centre of public discussion.\(^\text{74}\) Therefore, it was attended not only by


\(^{74}\) I have dealt with complicated relationship between ritual-purification movement and the growing cult of Taras Shevchenko in my article: Ostap Sereda, “From Church-
the admirers of Shevchenko poetry, but also by those Ruthenians who were interested in the Orthodox Church ritual in general. Paradoxically, the public cult of Shevchenko appeared in Galicia not in spite of the fact that he was seen as an Orthodox figure, but precisely because he was. Future Ukrainophile and Greek Catholic priest, Father Emanuil Lysynetsky, who in 1862 was a gymnasium student in Lviv, recalled later that because of the general favourable attitude to the ritual-purification issue, “the requiem service in Orthodox Church for Shevchenko announced through the posters attracted [...] many devout Uniates, young and old Ruthenians... All lay Ruthenians, as many of them were in Lviv, without few officials and professors, with devotion (not formally) listened to the church service.”

Nevertheless, for the Ukrainophile group the church requiem mass provided an occasion for public expression of the national solidarity with the Orthodox Ukrainians. In his report, Volodymyr Shashkevych called this first Shevchenko requiem service the beginning of a “New Era” that would succeed the previous “Dark Age,” and proudly stated that numerous participants showed that they “were not afraid to pray for Orthodox Taras in an Orthodox church,” and proved that they have a “true Little Russian heart.”

Until the mid-1860s, the requiem services for Shevchenko, regularly organized on the anniversary of his death, were received enthusiastically. They turned into a newly established tradition and important patriotic event for many educated Galician Ruthenians irrespective of national preferences, Old Ruthenians and Russophiles included. But in the second half of the 1860s, the Orthodox requiem masses for Shevchenko became less popular due to the fact that the ritual-purification movement became increasingly associated with Russophilism in Galicia. In response,
Ukrainophiles did not want to associate the celebrations of Shevchenko with the religious demonstrations and restrained from organizing and participating in requiem services. With the course of time, the Galician Ukrainophiles reformulated their position in the confessional question, becoming less interested in ritual reform, but focused instead on the national autonomy of the Greek Catholic Church.

When the tradition of the requiem church services vanished, the new institution of Shevchenko’s yearly commemorative “evening” (*vecher-nytsi*) evolved from the irregular musical-poetical concerts organized by *Ruska Besida* in 1862–1863, where readings of Shevchenko’s poetry were a permanent part of the program. On 10 March 1865, Ukrainophiles for the first time organized in Peremyshl a separate “evening” devoted to the memory of Shevchenko. Then, after a certain interlude, these evenings were again held in Lviv in 1868–1871. At that time, the Old Ruthenians and Russophiles boycotted all activities of the Ukrainophiles and did not let them in the *Narodnyi Dim*. Thus, the “evenings” in 1869–1871 took part in the hall of the Sharpshooters’ society (*Lvivska Strilnytsia*) controlled by the Poles. In 1872, the Lviv Ukrainophiles could use the hall of Lviv city council, which was another clear sign of Polish support for their undertakings. In 1873–1874, the Shevchenko commemorative evening again took place in the Lviv city council hall, and was attended by the Galician Viceroy Count Agenor Goluchowski and the speaker of the Diet Prince Leon Sapieha. Tyt Revakovych, who deliberately came to Lviv to take part in the 1872 evening, noticed with satisfaction that “by the unusual

---


78 In 1868, the tradition of choral singing Shevchenko’s *Zapovit* on the music of Mykola Lysenko was introduced (*Pravda* 8 (30 November 1868): 95–96). See the description of other Shevchenko’s evenings in *Pravda* 9 (8 March 1869): 83–84; *Pravda* 3 (1870): 144–45; *Osnova* 19 (17 March 1871): 181–82.

79 *Pravda* 7 (22 February 1869): 64.

great number of participants [500 according to the estimations of Osno-
va], one could see the unceasing growth of Shevchenko’s cult in Galicia.”
Those members of the provincial gymnasium hromady who could not 
take part personally in the Shevchenko evening sent greeting telegrams 
that normally included some strophes from Shevchenko. A similar public 
Shevchenko evening was held in 1872 in Peremyshl. In the second half of 
the 1870s and early 1880s, such evenings started to be organized in other 
provincial towns in Galicia: Stanislaviv (1877), Kolomyia (1880), Ternopil 
(1882), then in Zbarazh, Sudova Vyshnia, Kalush, and later, even in the 
countryside.

Introducing Shevchenko into the Textbooks

By the 1870s, Shevchenko’s poetry and the Ukrainophile interpretation of 
it became included in the school curricula and thus was turned into an 
officially sanctioned national canon. Although the educational system in 
Galicia was Polonized by the early 1870s, Polish politicians who thought 
about combating Russophile influences, endowed the Ukrainophile 
educators with control over the content of Ruthenian textbooks through 
the Galician School Council. At the end of the 1860s, the commission 
for Ruthenian textbooks was dominated by Ukrainophile educational 
activists (Vasyl Ilnytsky, Omelian Ohonovsky, Mykhailo Poliansky, Iulian 
Romanchuk, Omelian Partytsky, and Anatol Vakhnianyn).

As a result 
of this shift, the Galician School Council promoted new textbooks of Ru-
thenian literature that focused on Taras Shevchenko and Ukrainian Ro-
mantic writers. In particular, Chytanka (A Reader) for lower gymnasium 
compiled by Omelian Partytsky (1871), and the Chytanka for higher gym-
nasium compiled by Oleksandr Barvinsky (1870–1871) clearly enforced

81 Shchurat, “Sviatkovanie rokovyn smerty Shevchenka,” 6; Osnova 17 (29 February 1872): 
1–2.
82 Viktor Petrykevych, Istoria kultu Shevchenka, xxxix–xli.
83 On the debates in the commission and related personal changes see Oleksandr Barvinsky, 
Spomyny z moho zhyttia, vol. 1, 159; Anatol Vakhnianyn, Spomyny z zhyttia, 125–28; Kyrylo 
Studynsky, Slidamy Kulisha [Following Kulish] (Lviv, 1928), 53.
identification with Ukraine and focused on the literary heritage of Taras Shevchenko. The *Chytanka* by Partytsky consisted of excerpts from fine literature, collections of folklore, geographic descriptions, and historical accounts. It began with poetic lines from Shevchenko and a novel by Kulish. Most of the authors included were from the Russian-ruled Ukraine (Shevchenko, Kulish, Nechui-Levytsky, Storozhenko, Marko Vovchok, and others). Historical texts were centred on the history of Galician-Volhynian principality and then of the Cossacks, while the history of Kyivan Rus was left aside.

The three-volume *Chytanka* of Barvinsky focused on fine literature. Its first volume was entirely devoted to “folk literature” (*usna slovesnist*). In this way, it indicated the origins of contemporary fine literature, as it was seen by the Ukrainophiles. The volume was based on collections of folklore of East Ukrainian and Galician ethnographers in such a way that Cossack *dumy* were mixed with Galician *kolomyiky* and carol songs (*koliady*). It included also several legends about the Cossacks collected by Kulish and numerous proverbs collected by Nomys that *inter alia* introduced Ukrainophile symbolic geography. Kyiv, Ukraine, and Sich became the most important coordinates of national space, into which also Lviv and other Galician towns were included. Yet the attention of a *gymnasium* student was directed to the Cossack *step* with its *mohyly* and “eternal freedom.” The second and the third volumes presented Ruthenian fine literature properly. They began with Ivan Kotliarevsky’s *Eneida*, leaving aside the Ruthenian literary tradition prior to the late 18th century. Kotliarevsky was followed by Hulak-Artemovsky and Kvitka-Osnovianenko. Some Galician Ruthenian writers, such as Shashkevych, Vahylevych, and Holovatsky, were also included, but Russophile authors, such as Didytsky, obviously did not belong there. The literature of Galicia was integrated as part of the same literary process with the Ukrainian literature. The central figure was, of course, Taras Shevchenko. About 20 poems of his authorship and detailed biography were included into the anthology. Both *Chytanky* were used as textbooks in East Galician *gymnasia* through the second half of the 19th century. They were the first Ruthenian textbook in Galicia in
which key elements of Ukrainian culture played central roles, and were codified as the national culture of Galician Ruthenians.

**Conclusions**

Both annual literary evenings devoted to Taras Shevchenko and new Ruthenian textbooks where his poetry received the central place chiefly contributed to the establishing of his supreme canonical status in Galician Ukrainian public discourse. Although the meaning of Shevchenko's poetry (especially of his most controversial poems on religious topics) was still constantly discussed, his image as national father and prophet became undisputed within Ukrainophile circles, which by the end of the 19th century, became the dominant group in the Ruthenian public life in Galicia. One can distinguish three stages of the emergence of Shevchenko’s cult in the province between the 1840s and 1870s. During the first period (prior to the 1860s), Shevchenko’s works were circulated in limited number of printed editions and manuscript copies among the narrow circle of Ruthenian activists. The second period (ca. 1861–1868) was marked by the growth of public attention to Shevchenko’s poetry and personality: his poems began to be regularly published in the Galician press (first, in Polish, then, increasingly, in Ruthenian periodicals) and in separate editions. The wide exposure to these texts (through both reading and listening) formed the public of Ukrainian national activists. In the third period (since the late 1860s), the cult of Taras Shevchenko began to be institutionalized through regular commemorative practices and school education.

With the massive introduction of Shevchenko's poetry into Galician Ukrainian public discourse in the 1860s, cultural affiliation with a new secular literature became more important for national identification than traditional loyalty to the Greek Catholic church. Yet, this important transition did not necessarily result in the prevalence of new secular cultural practices such as extensive reading. The concept of a “reading revolution” was once summarized by the critic and famous cultural historian Robert Darnton in the following way: before the end of the
eighteenth century, “readers tended to work laboriously through a small number of texts, especially the Bible, over and over again. Afterwards, they raced through all kinds of material, seeking amusement rather than edification. The shift from intensive to extensive reading coincided with a desacralization of the printed word.” Yet, although the cult of Taras Shevchenko emerged in a time when the practice of extensive reading of political newspapers and literary almanacs became widespread among the Galician reading public, intensive and passionate reading of highly venerated Shevchenko's texts, which were not seen as mere secular fiction, prevailed. It reflected the specific Romantic appreciation of the revealing power of literature. The veneration of Shevchenko in Galicia was also connected to the fact that his cult initially emerged in the context of the church ritual-purification movement. Only later, at the end of the 1860s, did the new public practice of annual commemorative literary evenings become one of the dominant institutions of Ukrainian national identity in Austrian Eastern Galicia.
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