

Markian Prokopovych

***Kopiec Unii Lubelskiej: Imperial Politics
and National Celebration in Habsburg
Lemberg***

ece-urban

The Online Publication Series
of the Lviv Centre for Urban History of East Central Europe

No. 3

Lviv, October 2008

At the *fin de siècle*, the Habsburg city of Lemberg – the centre of conflicting Polish, Ruthenian and other national programmes – characterised by long-standing ethnic and religious diversity¹. The city's history was rich in complex events that could serve each segment of the population in its search for identity². Founded as a *metropolia* [capital] by a Ruthenian prince Danylo in the mid-thirteenth century on the site of a much older settlement and under the Polish crown since 1340, Lemberg became the capital of Austrian province of Galicia and Lodomeria in 1772. This run-down somewhat dilapidated³ Baroque town had seen difficult times, often called “the times of ruin,” prior to its acquisition by Austria.³ It had been subject to numerous devastating sieges, with some, such as the siege by the Cossack troops of Bohdan Chmelnyćkyj in 1655, deeply imprinted upon the public memory. Under Austria, it often experienced periods of trouble –as in 1809 when it was taken over by Napoleonic Polish troops and the Russian army, only to fall back to Austria just a few months later, and in 1848, when it became a centre of turbulent revolutionary events. As a consequence of Vienna's continuous political and cultural influence during the “long nineteenth century”. Lemberg was transformed into a “Habsburg-looking” city similar to Trieste, Agram or Czernowitz. Yet in the reformed Dual Monarchy from the late 1860s on, this administrative capital of economically backward Galicia became a powerful battleground in the contests of representation between its major ethnic groups.

In this context, Lemberg's public space was the site of the simultaneous staging of two grand symbolic projects: the empire and the nation. This paper does not aim at an all-encompassing survey of the multifaceted processes of symbolic construction.⁴ Instead, it

¹ This paper is a revised excerpt from my forthcoming book *Habsburg Lemberg: Architecture, Public Space and Politics in the Galician Capital, 1772-1914* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press). An earlier version of this text was presented at Harald Binder's panel “Changing political representation in changing urban space: Central and Eastern European cities from the late 19th century to the inter-war years,” conference of the European Association of Urban Historians, Stockholm, 2006. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of *ecce-urban* for their insightful and critical comments. My gratitude also goes to Veronica Aplenc for her thorough work on my text.

² The Polish name for Lemberg is Lwów, while the modern Ukrainian one is Lviv. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Lemberg's major ethnic groups fell into a stable tripartite division: Poles (50%-55%), Jews (30%-35%) and Ruthenians (15%-20%) (Maria Kłańska, *Daleko od Wiednia. Galicja w oczach pisarzy niemieckojęzycznych 1772-1918* [Far from Vienna: Galicia in the Eyes of German-Writing Authors 1772-1918] (Cracow: Universitas, 1991). 1991: 7-23).

³ Prior to this, Lemberg's economic and political influence had been in decline, due to changes in trade routes that had previously been its major source of prosperity, and due to the numerous sieges it had suffered in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

⁴ For an excellent history, see Harald Binder, “Politische Öffentlichkeit in

focuses on one aspect of the controversial project of “Polish Lwów,” the construction of the man-made mound commemorating the 300th anniversary of the Union of Lublin, *Kopiec Unii Lubelskiej* as a counterpoint to the project of “Habsburg Lemberg”. I will first locate the idea of the mound’s construction within the context of the official understanding of public space by Austrian bureaucrats. I will then trace the evolution of the Union of Lublin celebration’s symbolic meaning from the first celebration in 1869, through the more pompous and public celebration of 1871, followed by the unusual celebration of 1874, and finally to the 1905 celebration of the 250th anniversary of the Chmelnickýj siege which was accompanied by outspoken street protests. Lastly, I will trace the history of the mound’s construction and discuss its implications for a deeper understanding of *fin de siècle* Lemberg history.

Within the vibrant and growing literature on the invention of the nation in nineteenth-century Central Europe, considered in the light of Eric Hobsbawm’s work, there is a growing awareness of the importance of urban public space as a necessary resource for success.⁵ Yet Lemberg’s “provincial” stages still occupy a marginal place in comparison with the studies of *fin de siècle* Vienna, Budapest and Prague. Among a few pioneering studies of imperial celebrations, Daniel Unowski’s work focuses on imperial, rather than national celebrations: specifically, the inspection tours of Galicia in 1851 and 1868, the imperial visits of 1880 and 1894, as well as the 1898 imperial jubilee celebration. Patrice Dabrowski’s and Keely Stauter-Halsted’s research, by contrast, deals with diverse aspects of Polish national celebrations, yet concentrates on the “Polish” part of Galicia with its capital Cracow.⁶ Following this lead, this paper analyzes how “Polish Lwów” was staged in

Galizien – Lemberg und Krakau im Vergleich,” in: Andreas Hofmann and Anna Weronika Wendland, eds., *Stadt und Öffentlichkeit in Ostmitteleuropa 1900–1939*, Stuttgart 2002. Also see Markian Prokopovych, “Staging Empires and Nations: Politics in the Public Space of Habsburg Lemberg”, in Moritz Csáky and Peter Stachel, eds., *Die Besetzung des öffentlichen Raumes. Politische Codierungen von Plätzen, Denkmälern und Straßennamen im europäischen Vergleich (19.u. 20. Jhd.)* (Innsbruck and Vienna: Studienverlag, 2007, forthcoming).

⁵ See especially Maria Bucur and Nancy M. Wingfield, eds., *Staging the Past: the Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2001). For a broad overview of celebrations as part of the invention of tradition in the nineteenth century, see Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Sean Wilentz, ed., *Rites of Power: Symbolism, Ritual, and Politics since the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 177-325.

⁶ Daniel L. Unowsky, *The Pomp and Politics of Patriotism: Imperial Celebrations in Habsburg Austria, 1848-1916* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, c2005), 33-76, 139-41; Patrice M. Dabrowski, *Commemorations and the Shaping of Modern Poland* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 114-15;

fin de siècle Lemberg celebrations, and argues that public participation in these celebrations, and in the actual construction of the Union of Lublin mound, reveal the population's multilayered identities and loyalties. In addition, it highlights the way in which various national and imperial projects for Galicia were imagined – yet usually never fulfilled.

The historical process of this curious monument's construction, accompanied by the establishment of a new kind of a popular urban celebration, remains an under-researched and underappreciated aspect of Lemberg's urban culture and politics. Even Paweł Sierżęga, whose "Obchody rocznicy Unii lubelskiej na terenie Galicji w 1869 roku" [The Celebration of the Union of Lublin Anniversary on the Territory of Galicia in 1869] remains the only monograph-length publication on this topic to date, states in his conclusion that, "due to the limited scope [*zasięg*] of the [Lublin Union] celebration, its role should not be overestimated. It was a marginal development that attracted the short-lived attention of a select, and only the most politically and culturally engaged, layers of society."⁷ By contrast, I claim that a closer examination of the local administration of the celebration and of the Mound's actual construction sheds light on the complexity of and contradictions within the Polish national project, as well as on its opponents in the state administration and in the Ruthenian movement; in addition, this examination also throws light on the seemingly peaceful public space of the post-1867 Galician capital that in fact allowed for much creative imagination and political manipulation. Moreover, this perspective provides insight into the story of ethnic Polish-Ruthenian conflict that culminated in the 1908 killing of the Galician Governor Andrzej Kazimierz Potocki, followed by the subsequent murder of Ukrainian student Adam Kocko,⁸ and that supposedly led to bloody excesses during World War I, by outlining the Polish national project's gradual and seemingly non-violent conquest of public space and, at the same time, its fatal failures.

Keely Stauter-Halsted, *The nation in the village: the genesis of peasant national identity in Austrian Poland, 1848-1914* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, c2001).

⁷ Paweł Sierżęga, "Obchody rocznicy Unii lubelskiej na terenie Galicji w 1869 roku [The celebration of the Union of Lublin anniversary on the territory of Galicia in 1869]," in Jadwiga Hoff, ed., *Galicja i jej dziedzictwo, t. 15: Działalność wyzwolenicza* [Galicia and its history, vol. 15: liberation activity] (Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, 2000), 192. All translations in this text are my own. I would like to thank Patrice Dabrowski for pointing me to this key reference.

⁸ For further on this see Hugo Viktor Lane. *State Culture and National Identity in a Multi-Ethnic Context: Lemberg 1772-1914* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1999); Patrice M. Dabrowski, *Reinventing Poland: Commemorations and the Shaping of Modern Nation* (Indiana University Press, 2004), 515-520.

Imperial *Öffentlichkeit* and Lemberg's public space

In the imagination of the average Austrian bureaucrat who had been appointed to Galicia in the early nineteenth century, public space (*Öffentlichkeit*) was synonymous with the symbolic representation of the Empire, to the exclusion of alternative symbols, a stance that was justified as the preservation of “public peace and order.” Despite the fundamental change to the provincial and municipal administrations in the period of Dualism, when the Polish aristocratic conservative elite was essentially given a free hand to rule Galicia and administrative positions were filled by a local, predominantly Polish cadre, Lemberg's municipal authorities concerned themselves little with the construction of public memorials in public spaces until the late 1880s.⁹ Instead, Austria marked its presence in Galicia through an extensive cycle of regular public celebrations, connected to either the Catholic calendar or Habsburg dynastic anniversaries, that remained largely unchanged until the Monarchy's demise. Polish nineteenth- and twentieth-century historians have been all too eager to stress such celebrations' “artificial,” “staged” and generally unpopular character.¹⁰ Yet it appears that Austrian uses of public space turned entertainment sites into centres of social life, and street rituals into rare occasions to enjoy public areas. The illumination and decoration of buildings for special occasions had emerged as a custom during the Middle Ages, and the holding of a standard ceremony for the arrival of every king, archbishop, *hetman*, *wojewoda*, governor or other dignitary had become an established practice in Lemberg by the eighteenth century. A typical street celebration under Austria, such as the celebration of the Emperor's name day, included the “*Te Deum*” mass in the Roman Catholic cathedral, a heavily guarded procession through the Market Square (*Ringplatz*, *Rynek*), the construction of a triumphal arch with appropriate street decoration, evening illumination and a fitting production at the theatre.¹¹

⁹ For example, no monument to an Austrian emperor was ever erected in Lemberg. Apart from modest care of the existing sacred monuments to St. Michael and St. John, in the 1860s only one monument was restored and re-erected in the city centre: the statue of hetman Jabłonowski. For a summary of monument erection in Lemberg, see Ihor Siomočkin, “Pamjatnyky [Monuments]”, in *Halycka Brama* 38 (1998) 2, 14–15. Also see Centralnyj Deržavnyj Istorycnyj Archiv Ukraïny [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, further CDIAU] F. 146, Op. 7, Sp. 2243).

¹⁰ Bronisław Pawłowski, *Lwów w 1809 r. z 20 rycinami w tekście* [Lwów in 1809 with 20 illustrations in text] (Lemberg, 1909), 24. Further see Prokopowych, “Staging Empires and Nations.”

¹¹ CDIAU F. 146, Op. 7, Sp. 633; Sp. 1230; Sp., 1877; Sp. 2867; Sp. 3431; Stanisław Schnür-Peplowski, *Obrazy z przeszłości Galicyi i Krakowa: 1772-1858* [Sketches from Galicia's and Cracow's past: 1772-1858]

Although an increasing number of cultural institutions claimed the right to shape physical public space after the 1867 establishment of Galician Autonomy and the 1870 introduction of municipal self-government, such claims were often limited to intellectual speculation. They, together with purely intellectual discussions of Lemberg's founding, its university, and its democratically elected municipal and provincial government, belong to a broader discourse that invented a "national" historic and modern Lemberg.¹² The city's parks, those curious semi-public spaces most closely associated with the relatively unrestricted socializing of the *Biedermeier* period, were the first to be politicised in diverse cultural practices. Parks became contested public space, where monuments were erected, celebrations organised and next to which meetings and demonstrations were held. Yet streets became even more bitterly contested spaces in the late nineteenth century. The decisive role the Polish-dominated, yet *kaisertreu* municipal government played in urban planning at the *fin de siècle* led to the city being marked with statues of great Austrian officials who were also aristocratic Poles, such as Galician Governor Count Agenor Gołuchowski, who symbolised long-standing Polish-Austrian common interests. Great figures of Lemberg's other "nations," such as the Ukrainian poet Taras Ševčenko, and to a lesser extent the Polish revolutionary leader Tadeusz Kościuszko who was highly regarded by democratically oriented Poles, were excluded official monuments and commemorations.¹³ At the same time, the insertion of national symbols into official rituals gradually became commonplace.

(Lemberg: Gubrynowicz & Schmidt, 1896), 24. For a more recent analysis of late nineteenth-century imperial celebrations in the Habsburg Monarchy, and especially in Galicia, see Daniel Unowski, *The Pomp and Politics of Patriotism: Imperial Celebrations in Habsburg Austria, 1848-1916* (Purdue University Press, 2005); also see Prokopowych, "Staging Empires and Nations."

¹² Lemberg's Ruthenian or, alternatively, Polish origins have long been a matter of dispute. At the *fin de siècle*, Ruthenian scholars emphasised the history of the medieval Ruthenian period, while the Polish historians concentrated on the Renaissance-era urban planning of Casimir the Great, after the city's incorporation into the Polish Crown. Polish discussions of the university emerged as a reaction to an official Austrian statement on the foundation of the modern university by Joseph II and claimed a historic continuity between Lemberg University and the earlier Jesuit College. Polish historical arguments in support of greater municipal and provincial freedom were also politically charged; they interpreted these as a continuation of the earlier Magdeburg law, abolished by the Austrians shortly after 1772. Ruthenians, who lacked an independent body of intellectuals willing to work with the Polish-dominated authorities and whose relation with the municipal government could be described as cautious and later hostile by the early twentieth century, were marginalized in these debates, while Jewish organisations did not participate in them at all.

¹³ Most frequently a kind of consensus with imperial values was sought in official commemorations, even if it was a figure of Polish national history who was to be "memorialised." Such was the case with the monument to King John III Sobieski, a major hero in Polish national history who was also renowned for his defence of Vienna from the Turkish army in 1683. Lemberg's late-nineteenth-century streets and squares remained

In times of peace, the Lemberg public attended open-air “stagings” of both imperial and national politics. In times of unrest, as in 1809 and 1848, backed with centuries-old divisions and recent economic misfortunes, national sentiment mobilised much larger portions of the population. In 1848, the governor of Galicia Franz Stadion succeeded in manipulating the ethnic issue by taming Polish nationalism and “inventing the Ruthenians.”¹⁴ In the late 1860s, public spaces could and were used for national memorials and celebrations. From the Compromise of 1867 on, several issues related to city celebrations came to be disputed in Lemberg, including the right to charge entrance fees and collect donations; the right to make use of city illumination, music, costumes, flags, salvos, and fireworks; and the right to use the municipal guard, to close shops, to stage performances in theatres, and to hold holiday mass in church; the authorities were not willing to grant these rights easily. Thus, those who organised popular celebrations were generally forced to limit their ambitions to modest commemorations. Those with greater ambitions attempted to assure the authorities that theirs would be a quiet celebration, in order to obtain the required municipal permissions. For radicals such as Franciszek Smolka,¹⁵ a member of the Diet, a former revolutionary, a democrat and federalist, as well as the organiser of Lemberg’s first celebration of a different colour, the use of streets and buildings became a political weapon to support a cause.

double-coded; symbols of Polish national rebirth simultaneously delivered a message of faith to Austria. On Lemberg parks, see Zygmunt Stańkiewicz, “Ogrody i plantacje miejskie [Urban parks and plantings],” in Bohdan Janusz, ed. *Lwów stary i dzisiejszy. Praca zbiorowa pod redakcją* [Lwów of yesteryear and of today: A Collected and edited volume under the editorship] (Lwów, 1928), 63–70. On monuments to Gołuchowski and Kościuszko, see Markian Prokopowych, “The Lemberg Garden: Political Representation in Public Greenery under the Habsburg Rule,” in Maciej Janowski, Balazs Trenscenyi, Constantin Iordachi and Markian Prokopowych, eds., *East Central Europe - l'Europe du Centre-Est - eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift*, 33 (2007) 2.

¹⁴ Stadion thought to frustrate Polish irredentism by appealing to the class interests of the peasants and by supporting Ukrainian claims. However, as rightly pointed out by Ivan L. Rudnytsky with a quote of Stadion’s contemporary M. Freiherr von Sala, there was no need for Stadion to “invent” the Ruthenians in 1848; they had already been mobilized in that area by the awakening movement of the Rus’ Triad (Ivan L. Rudnytsky, *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* [Edmonton, Alberta: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, c1987], 320-21). On Franz Stadion (1806–1853), see *Neue österreichische Biografie ab 1815: grosse Österreicher*, Zurich, Leipzig and Vienna Vol.14, 1960), S. 62–73.

¹⁵ Franciszek Smolka (1810-1899), by education a lawyer, was a Polish revolutionary and a liberal politician in Galicia. Arrested in 1841 for his membership in the secret separatist Society of the Polish Nation (*Stowarzyszenie Ludu Polskiego*), he was convicted in 1845 to the death sentence although later released. He was active during the events of 1848 and in the Slavic Congress in Prague of the same year. In 1848-1849, he served as Vice President and later President of the Austrian Parliament in Vienna. In 1861, he was elected a member of the Galician Diet (*Sejm*) and in 1862 to the Viennese Parliament. See Józef Białynia Chołodecki,

The Brotherhood of Nations on Franz Joseph's Hill

Smolka, whose father was an Austrian army officer from Silesia and whose mother was a Hungarian, was one of the most prominent Polish politicians who typified Lemberg's post-*Ausgleich* political culture. Lemberg, a multi-ethnic city amidst a predominantly Ruthenian countryside, had a much more diverse, complex and vibrant social and political structure than Galicia's second informal capital, Cracow, which was a predominantly Polish city dominated by Polish conservatives, the Stańczyks. Lemberg, by contrast, was the seat of the Galician Provincial Parliament, the *Sejm*, and the provincial administration, but its municipal government enjoyed greater autonomy. Though these institutions were also dominated by Polish conservatives, such as Count Gołuchowski, close to the end of the nineteenth century Lemberg came to be seen as a democratic stronghold. The Polish liberal democratic camp, whose representative Smolka was, had much more room to manoeuvre in the Galician capital than in conservative Cracow.¹⁶ Hitherto marginalized political groups, such as the Smolka's followers in the democratic camp, pejoratively called *tromtadraci* (the trumpeters), as well as the growing Ruthenian populists (*narodovci*), and later the Radicals, the student movement, the Social Democrats and the worker movement, explored and contested Lemberg's public spaces in order to realize their alternative political projects.¹⁷ The Mound to the Union of Lublin was the first of these, and its realization laid the foundation for later endeavours. In keeping with the general politics of Polish liberal democracy, the celebration of the Union of Lublin invoked Polish patriotism, but the event's true aim was to highlight the federalism of the Polish Commonwealth as an

Franciszek Smolka (Lemberg: Komitet budowy pomnika F. Smolki, 1913); Karol Widmann, *Franciszek Smolka. Jego życie i zawód* [Franciszek Smolka. His life and activity] (Lemberg 1884–1886).

¹⁶ Unlike the Polish conservatives, Smolka and his supporters opposed pursuing special status for Galicia and hence were against the specific arrangement of the 1967 *Ausgleich*. Instead, they championed the establishment of a federal structure for all of Cisleithania, the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy that would have taken into account the distinct political heritage of all the nations in. See Maciej Janowski, *Inteligencja wobec wyzwań nowoczesności - dylematy ideowe polskiej demokracji liberalnej w Galicji w latach 1889 - 1914* [Intelligentsia in the face of the challenges of modernity: Ideological dilemmas of Polish Liberal Democracy in Galicia in 1889-1914] (Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN, 1996), 17-18; Hugo Viktor Lane, *Nationalizing Identity: Culture and Politics in Austrian Galicia, 1772-1918* (unpublished book manuscript), 161-165.

¹⁷ See Unowski, 73-75; also see Hugo Viktor Lane, *State Culture and National Identity in a Multi-Ethnic Context: Lemberg 1772-1914*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1999. On the Ruthenian movement, see Rudnytsky, 63-64, 320-342. Recent work has demonstrated the crucial role played by the Cracow liberal

alternative to the centralized model of the Monarchy – rather than to question the very existence of the Monarchy altogether.

Union Mound was the city's first memorial whose construction was initiated by a society, rather than by the authorities.¹⁸ As Sierżęga illustrated in his study, the details of the location, time and format of the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the Lublin Union, with the construction of the Mound, was a matter of long negotiations between Polish émigrés in Paris, Cracow and Lemberg enthusiasts, and the Austrian administration. In addition, it was influenced by a complex array of foreign and domestic political factors, most especially strong opposition and criticism by Cracow conservatives, as well as the shaky and *ad hoc* state of Polish-Ruthenian political relations. Once consensus was reached among supporters on the Lemberg celebration, Smolka needed to go through further troublesome negotiations with various branches of the Galician and local public administrations, the police, and Ruthenian representatives.¹⁹

That the mound was to be erected in a green city space can be attributed to several influences. First, the Kościuszko Mound in a green space in Cracow had existed since 1823. Second, as will be argued below, the official understanding of public parks as semi-public space was central to Smolka's position. Finally, the site was marked by Habsburg imperial symbolism, and as such radicalised Smolka's initiative. Following Joseph II's visit in 1780, a memorial obelisk had been erected in the future location of the mound, and after Franz Joseph's visit in 1851, the hill itself was named *Franz-Joseph-Berg*. Given that the idea of erecting Union Mound was first expressed only two years after the establishment of Galician Autonomy, it was bound to be seen by the Galician provincial administration as radical.

The 1569 Union of Lublin figured as one of the key treaties in Polish history: it symbolised the greatness of the Polish nation and encouraged national pride. The Union resulted in the creation of the medieval Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth that united the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and lasted until the

democratic camp associated with the daily *Nowa Reforma* in national ceremonies in Cracow (see Dabrowski, 17, 65)

¹⁸ Smolka not only proposed constructing the mound, but also included an extensive, boldly political celebration programme. The event was to attract international attention and therefore “celebrities from other Slavic nations” were to be invited, a civilian militia guard was to be created and national speeches publicly made. See CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 8–11; also see Schnür-Peplowski, 79–85.

Commonwealth's final partition in 1795. At the same time, the monument fitted into the revolutionary notion of uniting free nations under the leadership of the most progressive one, Poland. To commemorate it would mean to suggest a radical alternative to the Habsburg project, one in which Poland would play the leading role. Indeed, there is evidence that the authorities saw the proposed celebration as a political call for the revision of Poland's partitions.²⁰

The ambitions of the organisational committee were grand. When Smolka submitted for approval a initial construction plan, along with an accompanying event program for August 10, 1869, his proposal included outrageously bold suggestions. In one of the first documents submitted to the Galician provincial administration authorities in the Polish language, Smolka not only proposed a ceremony for the laying of the Mound's foundation stone, but also an extensive celebration program. The event was to attract international attention, and therefore "celebrities from other Slavic nations" were to be invited, while "all European nations" were to be informed of it. Smolka's view was that the authorities need not be involved in the celebration at all.²¹ Thus while there were good reasons to hold the event "privately" with an invited audience – as this would avoid the strict censorship that public events were subject to – it is clear from the provincial files that Smolka's initial intention was to mark the foundation of the Mound with an explicitly public ceremony.

Smolka's initial idea was to have a two-day celebration over August 10-11, 1869, which would include the August 11 as a new national holiday. The organising committee, led by Smolka, envisioned a *theatre paré* in the Skarbek Theatre and a celebration ceremony of the greatest possible scale: cannon salvos at dawn, a holiday mass at all churches, and a procession through Market Square] carrying national emblems and flags, and dressed in national costume. Accompanied by music – a chorus and orchestra – and with further salvos, the procession would head to Castle Hill. Smolka even anticipated that a citizens' guard (*straż obywatelska*) would accompany the procession and help oversee the event.²²

¹⁹ Sierżęga, 146, 151-178.

²⁰ Sierżęga, 168.

²¹ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 8-10.

²² CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 8-11; see also Schnür-Pepłowski, 79-85.

All the ceremonial arrangements described above recall the structure of official celebrations of the time. However, the purpose of this event was far from glorifying the Habsburg monarch; rather, this celebration was to promote a revisiting of the “Jagiellonian idea,” the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth understood as a voluntary, “brotherly” union of the Polish, Lithuanian and Ruthenian nations.²³ After official greetings from the chairman, Smolka envisioned that a speaker would “explain the importance, value and significance of the Union, while he would at the same time point out the duties of the nation deriving from it. He would further solicit adequate contributions that would express the feelings and beliefs of the Polish nation on the duties embodied in the Union.”²⁴ The practical measures of having a guard and a predetermined list of speakers were intended to prevent any mishap from serving as a pretext for the police to intervene and thereby stop the ceremony. Yet by copying the organisational structures and methods of the state authorities, the committee also aimed to remove those same authorities from the ceremony and to demonstrate that – at least for this event – Polish democrats were in control of the city. To legitimise the proposed use of public space and buildings – notably the theatre – for a national celebration, Smolka invoked a comparison with Vienna where the anniversary of the Viennese riflemen’s society, he claimed, was to be held to “uplift the spirit of the revival of German unity.”²⁵

The provincial authorities reigned in Smolka’s plans for the commemoration ceremony. August 11 was to be a usual working day, while his proposal for a public procession and illumination of the city were rejected.²⁶ The police director’s report to the provincial and central state administration of June 14, 1869, noted that an agreement between the Democrats and the Ruthenians had not been reached.²⁷ While it is not possible to tease out the complexity of the Ruthenian attitude towards the event and the construction

²³ For more on the Jagiellonian idea, see Dabrowski, *Commemorations*, 171-175.

²⁴ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 11.

²⁵ “Should we draw parallels between that celebration, which revives a truly commendable idea – yet one from which benefit will be derived only by Austria and by purely German lands – and the celebration that has recently been forbidden by the [local] police which aimed to commemorate a worthy historical truth?! ... And yet [in the former case] the government ... had contributed to the event ... and even the ministers took part in it, [and] moreover, precisely in the spirit in which the event was understood!” (Ibid., L. 31).

²⁶ The city did make a few concessions to the commemoration organizers: the daily market on Market Square was moved to Castrum Square, and from 10 am on the shops on Market Square and the street leading to the Dominican church – where the procession would head – were closed.

²⁷ “Doniesienie zastępcy Dyrektora policyi we Lwowie 1. sierpnia 1869 [Report of the Lemberg Police Director in chief of 1 August 1869]”, Ibid., L. 37.

of the Mound itself in this paper,²⁸ it is clear from the municipal files that the only outspoken protests came from those Ruthenians with whom the Polish Democrats could potentially cooperate the most – the less influential Young Ruthenian populist fraction.²⁹ The older, dominant and conservative clerical elite, known as “St. George Circle” which by the late 1860s was fully Russophile in orientation, actually withdraw its equally radical proposal to hold requiem masses in all Greek Catholic churches and to hang black flags on the Ruthenian houses of Lemberg.³⁰ The Young Ruthenians’ opposition may appear doubly surprising; not only had they frequently cooperated in the 1870s to the mid-1890s with the Polish Democrats to oppose the conservatives in the Galician provincial and municipal administration,³¹ but they, even more than the older Russophile clergy, were inclined to see the positive aspects of the Lublin Union in the history of the Ukrainian peoples.³² The Ruthenian populists’ position could be explained by a number of factors. First, even though they later used mass protest strategies such as electoral campaigns, agrarian strikes, popular rallies, and demonstrations in order to exert their influence on public opinion,³³ in 1869 they were focused on winning over the Ruthenian-dominated countryside, rather than the public space of the Galician capital. Second, Castle Hill was a symbolically contested territory: it held the ruins of the Medieval Castle, whose origins were disputed by the Poles and the Ruthenians. With this in mind, it is possible that the Ruthenian populists felt anger at either Smolka’s explicit rhetoric or the attitude of “St. George Circle,” as they frequently did when Poles spoke of the entire nation while disregarding Ruthenian opinion.³⁴

²⁸ On different currents in the Galician Ruthenian leadership, see Rudnytsky, 63-64; 320-42.

²⁹ The Ruthenians (*die jungruthenische Partei*, i.e. Ukrainophiles) printed a brochure in June 1869, in which they explicitly positioned themselves against the celebration (“Doniesienie zastępcy Dyrektora policyi we Lwowie 1. sierpnia 1869 [Report of the Lemberg Police Director-in-Chief of 1 August 1869]”, *Ibid.*, L. 37).

³⁰ Sierżęga, 181

³¹ Janowski, 66-68; Rudnytsky, 64.

³² Historian Mychajlo Hruševskij, whose opinion was influential among the Galician Ruthenian populists, stressed that the Lublin Union united the “long-separated parts of Ukraine” but noted that prior to the signing of the Lublin Union the situation had been better for the inhabitants of Ukraine in terms of linguistic and legal equality. Michael Hrushevsky, *A history of Ukraine* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1970)165-171. Also see Mychajlo Hruševskij, *Istoriija Ukrajiny-Rusy* [History of Ukraine-Ruthenia] (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1991), Vol. 5, 1-3, 7, 62-73.

³³ Rudnytsky, 64.

³⁴ For example, during the 1890 Cracow celebration of the re-burial of Mickiewicz’s ashes in the Wawel Castle, the Young Ruthenians declared that they would not participate, to which the progressives gathered in protest, angered by the former having spoken for the entire nation (John-Paul Himka, *Socialism in Galicia: the Emergence of Polish Social Democracy and Ukrainian Radicalism (1860-1890)* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, c1983), 166; see also Dabrowski, 99.

Using the Ruthenian protest as a pretext, the provincial administration prohibited the celebration altogether on the grounds that it would cause “irritation to the majority of inhabitants of the city and province” and thereby threaten law and order.³⁵ Yet Smolka was not only an ambitious social activist and a member of the Diet, but also a practising lawyer who did not give up easily. Employing all his legal skills, he succeeded in holding as grand a celebration as possible in 1869, even when he had to submit to official restrictions that prevented it from being “public.” Smolka reasoned that, since the organising committee had changed the program into a “private” celebration, the state could not prohibit people from gathering in the morning for a church service and then, in small groups and without “disturbing public peace,” from proceeding through the city to Castle Hill.

Police records provide a coherent picture of the celebration which was held on August 11, 1869, and which started with an expected mishap: brochures detailing a protest by young Ruthenian populists against the celebration were sold on every corner, causing several minor conflicts in the streets.³⁶ It was printed by the Viennese Ruthenian periodical *Zoria Slovjanska* and was followed by an article in the local Russophile paper *Slovo* which contemporary Polish historiography labeled as false and tendentious.³⁷ Other disturbances continued throughout the day and were not limited to those opposed to the celebration:

There was no shortage of disturbances and excesses. ... The members of the Democratic Party took part in the celebration, and naturally showed their dissatisfaction with the nature of the government’s prohibition [of the commemoration].³⁸

The city maintained its standard appearance: no holiday cleaning was done and public offices were open all day. A small crowd gathered for a church service in the Dominican Church and an even smaller group convened at the Bernadine Church. Few wore national costumes, while the aristocracy and peasantry did not attend.³⁹ A local priest referred to the Union in his sermon as of an act of brotherly love and unity, then suggested that its principles be observed in the present, once quiet political engagement would become

³⁵ Ibid., L. 20-25.

³⁶ “Bericht des Polizeidirektorats Stellvertreters an das Presidium des Ministeriums für Landesvertheidigung in öffentlicher Sicherheit, Lemberg den 12. August 1869,” (Ibid., L. 48-50).

³⁷ Schnür-Pepłowski, 79-85.

³⁸ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 50.

³⁹ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 50.

appropriate, and concluded with praise for the Austrian throne. After the *Honorationi* and the guilds left the church, the remaining public sang “*Boże, coś Polskę*” [God, Thou protected Poland] and “*Z dymem pożarów*” [With the smoke of fires], Polish religious songs associated with the Polish insurrection of 1863. In small groups, the participants then made their way to Castle Hill.⁴⁰ Numbering about five hundred people altogether, the group included representatives of the district and city councils. When the foundation stone, bearing the Polish coat-of-arms and the inscription “Free among the free and equal among equals – Poland, Lithuania and Ruthenia unified by the Act of the Lublin Union on August 11, 1569”, was in place, Smolka began his speech:

We cannot afford marble and bronze to erect an adequate monument to the most magnificent moment in our historic past. Thus let us erect a monument ... from the soil taken from all of Poland. Let it be a symbol of the indivisible union between the brotherly nations that inhabit this land.⁴¹

Smolka expressed his gratitude to the city council for their efforts in support of the construction of the mound. He threw the first handful of soil, saying “In the name of God, in the name of love for the Motherland, and for the sake of equality and brotherhood, let us now, citizens, begin to mould this monument that will symbolise these principles and that will commemorate this great anniversary.”⁴² Smolka’s words made a connection between God, the motherland and democratic principles, a link that was a standard ideological feature in Polish nationalism.⁴³ City representatives and foreign guests followed Smolka in metaphorically initiating the construction of the Mound.⁴⁴ Soil had been brought from numerous symbolically significant places: from the battlefield of Grunwald;⁴⁵ from the

⁴⁰ According to Sierżęga, the crowd counted around one thousand people, while the police report makes mention of a few hundred. Sierżęga, 179.

⁴¹ Schnür-Pepłowski, 80.

⁴² Schnür-Pepłowski, 80.

⁴³ Smolka also appealed to the participating public to refrain from anything that could be interpreted as violating the government’s prohibition of a public celebration and, although the event would not live up to their initial plans and expectations, to nevertheless make the commemoration a dignified one (Schnür-Pepłowski, 80).

⁴⁴ Schnür-Pepłowski, 80.

⁴⁵ The Battle of Grunwald, also known as the Battle of Tannenberg, was fought on July 15, 1410, between the Kingdom of Poland, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and their allies on one side, and the Knights of the Teutonic Order on the other. It was the decisive engagement of the Polish-Lithuanian-Teutonic War (1409-1411).

tombs of Kościuszko, Lelewel, Mickiewicz, Kniaziewicz, Słowacki, and Ostrowski;⁴⁶ from the Tomb of the Five Victims in Powązki,⁴⁷ Sołowijówka;⁴⁸ from the tomb to those deported to Siberia; and even from Jerusalem and San Francisco.⁴⁹ Some deputies, such as Dworski, spoke in the name of Polish *Emigracjoni*, while others, such as Krystyn Ostrowski – whom the police report called “*ein obscures Individuum*” – invoked the name of their late fathers who had died in the “wars of liberation.”

This excerpt from Smolka’s speech illustrates what is the most striking characteristic of national celebrations in Lemberg, the profound gap between aspirations and the attainable. In addition to official restrictions – which would ease with time, as the provincial and municipal administrations came to include members of the Polish Democratic Party – Polish national projects were chronically short of money and manpower. Thus, the organisers of such undertakings were forced compensate for this lack of funding and manpower by using affordable designs for their symbolically charged projects.

On this occasion, the inclusive character of Polish nationalism – the “brotherly union of nations that inhabit this land” – was clearly foregrounded. For example, a Ruthenian had been invited to speak at a concert in the restaurant on Castle Hill later in the day, and following the commemoration event a donation was made to the Ruthenian

⁴⁶ Polish historian Joachim Lelewel (1786-1861) was one of the most radical figures in the November Uprising (1830-1831) in the Congress Kingdom and a political émigré. Karol Otto Kniaziewicz (1762-1842) was a Polish general and political activist. He was active in the Polish-Russian War in 1792, in the Kościuszko Uprising in 1794, and in the Napoleonic Wars in the Polish Legions (*Legia Naddunajska*). An émigré in Paris who lived close to Hotel Lambert, he served as a representative of the Polish National Government during the November Uprising in Paris. Juliusz Słowacki (1809–1849) was one of the most famous Polish Romantic poets to date and had dedicated much of his verse to the November Uprising. Count Antoni Jan Ostrowski (1782-1845), a member of the Diet in the Kingdom of Poland from 1815 to 1830), was appointed general and commander of the National Guards (*Gwardia Narodowa*) in Warsaw during the November Uprising of 1830-1831.

⁴⁷ The Tomb of the Five Victims (*Pogrzeb pięciu poległych*) is the burial site of the victims of the February 27, 1861, political demonstrations against Russian rule which occurred in Warsaw’s Cracow district. The demonstrations were organized in Warsaw by students of the Warsaw Art Academy and Medical Academy. Powązki Cemetery (*Cmentarz Powązkowski*) is the oldest and most famous cemetery in Warsaw. It is situated in the western part of the city and figures as Poland’s greatest national necropolis.

⁴⁸ Sołowijówka (in Ukrainian, *Solov’ivka*) close to Kiev, is the place where Polish students of the Kiev University was massacred by a Ukrainian peasant crowd during the 1863 uprising.

⁴⁹ According to Franciszek Jaworski, *Lwów stary i wczorajszy (szkice i opowiadania) z ilustracjami, Wydanie drugie poprawione* [Lwów of old and yesteryear (sketches and stories) with illustrations. Second improved edition] (Lemberg: Nakl. Tow. Wydawniczego, 1911), 308. According to Schnür-Pepłowski, soil from the tombs of Kościuszko, Krakus and Wanda, from the Siberian graves of deported Poles from the

Prosvita Society.⁵⁰ The indoor – “private,” per Smolka – program continued in the same spirit in Skarbek Theatre in the evening, although the authorities had forbidden the full performance of Ostrowski’s “Golden Mountains” (*Złote góry*), written specifically for the event. This historical piece on the three main events in the history of the Polish crown was intended to be an educational guide to what were seen as the three main characteristics of Polish national identity: civilising, Catholic and democratic.⁵¹ At the end of the evening, the theatre troupe performed Kamiński’s *Krakowiaki*, the opera *Ukrainka*, the Ruthenian song (*ruśka дума*)⁵² and an excerpt from the play *Zygmunt August on His Throne*. The last number, possibly taken from Ostrowski’s monumental work, included three female figures in folk costumes who symbolised the Union of the Polish, Lithuanian and Ruthenian “nations.”⁵³

Just as the Galician provincial administration could not disallow the celebration altogether, it could not prohibit the spectacular lighting of private houses. If the police report of the time is to be believed, the city must have had taken on a striking appearance that evening: “Simultaneous [with the theatre performance], [the] illumination [of houses] began. Except for the dwellings of the Ruthenians, military officers and some officials, and except for the buildings of the Provincial Administration and the Town Hall, all (*sämtliche*) private residences were illuminated.”⁵⁴

Tomb of the Five Victims in Powązki, and from the Raclawice and Radziwillów battlesites were thrown on the founding stone on August 13, 1871 (Schnür-Pełowski, 83).

⁵⁰ According to the police report, 120 persons belonging to the Democratic Party were invited to the afternoon luncheon and subsequent concert at the restaurant. Three speakers were also invited: Platon Kostecki, a member of *Gazeta narodowa*’s editorial board, as well as two other persons whom the police informer did not know and whose speeches produced no effect on the invited public (CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 48-50). According to Schnür-Pełowski, the speakers were: the poet Krystyn Ostrowski, who had brought soil from the tombs of Mickiewicz, Słowacki and Kniaziewicz; Father Chromecki; Platon Kostecki; Tadeusz Romanowicz; and Karol Groman (Schnür-Pełowski, 79-85; see also Jaworski, 308-309).

⁵¹ The first act of the historical piece depicted the Lithuanian wilderness where pagan gods reigned and destroyed altarpieces, the second featured the Christian marriage of Jagiello and Jadwiga, while the third act portrayed the Lublin Union at the throne of Zygmunt August. In this final act, the king spoke the following words: “Ruthenia, Poland and Lithuania, with all their towns and villages, / This is our inseparable Motherland! / ... Let the three brotherly symbols, / Archangel, Pogoń and our white Eagle / Breathe with the Cross!” (Schnür-Pełowski, 81).

⁵² During indoor performances such as the one at Skarbek Theatre, the organizers did not envision the participation of actual Ruthenians on stage: *ruśka дума* was sung by the Polish actors Kuncewicz and Kwiecińska (Schnür-Pełowski, 81).

⁵³ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, S. 110, L. 48-50.

⁵⁴ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, S. 110, L. 48-50.

By the end of the day and with his ostensibly private format, Smolka appeared to have created a truly national, mass celebration. His idea of organizing a Polish congress at the Mound commemorating the Union of Lublin⁵⁵ was realised two years later, in 1871. On August 13 of that year, a large gathering was held in Lemberg with distinguished guests from Greater Poland (*Wielkopolska*), Prussia, Silesia and Cracow, and the event included a solemn procession to Castle Hill. While the late nineteenth-century historian Stanisław Schnür-Pepłowski has left a detailed account of this event, primary source materials on it have yet to be discovered.⁵⁶ However, the information available allows us to trace an important change in the authorities' treatment of these commemorative events.

At the 1871 congress, the municipal authorities did not attempt to place restrictions on the commemoration ceremony that was planned in tandem with the congress, nor did the organisers pay lip service to the Ruthenians as they had in 1869.⁵⁷ Despite the unusual summer heat, crowds assembled early in the morning at the train station to greet the honorary invitees. The great procession started at Municipal Park in the afternoon and headed through the city centre towards Castle Hill, bypassing the ring road and *Rynek Square*. Gentry's hats (*kolpaki*) mingled with caps from the Confederation of the Bar (*konfederatki*) and the helmets of the fire brigade; some participants carried flags depicting the Polish white eagle. At Castle Hill, Smolka spoke of the Union as "the most wonderful act in Polish history" that united "nations of different origin into one political entity for the defence of common interests, so that they might march together on the road of civilisation and progress."⁵⁸ The Riflemen Garden hosted a dinner and a performance of "Cracovians and Mountaineers" in the evening, while on the following day, August 15, a grand ball was held in a large tent constructed for this purpose in Municipal Park.

⁵⁵ Smolka had had this idea in mind when he suggested that numerous foreign guests from the Polish lands outside imperial borders attend the commemoration he had planned in 1869.

⁵⁶ Schnür-Pepłowski, 83-84. Yet another source of information is Stanisław Kunasiewicz's *Wzmianka krytyczna o przewodniku po mieście Lwowie wydanym staraniem komitetu zawiązanego na przyjęcie gości z Wielkopolski, Prus, Szlązka i Krakowa, przybyłych na zjazd do Lwowa dnia 13 sierpnia 1871* [A Critical Note to the City Guide issued by the Committee for the Welcome of the Guests from Greater Poland, Prussia, Silesia and Cracow to Lwów, August 13, 1871] (Cracow, 1873). Kunasiewicz is also the author of several other pieces, including *Lwów w roku 1809* [Lwów in 1809] (Lemberg: Wild, 1878) and *Przechadzki archeologiczne po Lwowie* [Archaeological Walks through Lwów] (Lemberg, Przeg. Arch, 1874 and 1876).

⁵⁷ Schnür-Pepłowski, 83-84.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 83.

The survival of the Jagiellonian idea well into the twentieth century has been demonstrated by Patrice Dabrowski in her analysis of the Grunwald celebrations throughout Galicia in 1902 and 1910.⁵⁹ The reaction of Cracow conservatives to Lemberg's Union of Lublin celebrations will only be known through further research, but knowing conservative *Stańczyks'* reluctance to consider public opinion and their notorious opposition to public celebrations organized by the democrats of Cracow, it can be expected that they fiercely opposed Smolka's approach and thus further radicalised the Lublin Union celebration, even if they were later to claim the contrary.⁶⁰ Yet a comparison of the two ceremonies on Castle Hill in 1869 and 1871 clearly reveals an important difference that speaks to a fundamental change in the way public space was used following the establishment of Galician autonomy and Lemberg's self-government in the late 1860s and early 1870s. Notably, Polish national celebrations gradually transitioned from the "private" to the "public" realm. Although indoor expressions of national sentiment remained more explicit, the use of public buildings – such as the Roman Catholic Cathedral, the Riflemen's shooting range building, and the theatre – is highly revealing. The celebrations of 1869 and 1871 were both held on the hill that had been renamed *Franz-Joseph-Berg* in 1851, physically the most prominent landmark in the city and a highly contested site. In contrast to the events of 1869, the 1871 celebration had been sacralised in the cathedral and legitimated by passing through the city centre, by the Town Hall, and past the Dominican Church, actions ostensibly undertaken in a private mode in 1869, but carried out publicly and with grandeur in 1871. Other increasingly public – meaning, outdoor – versions of Polish national celebrations, each slightly different, occurred in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As public buildings became increasingly available for such events, the speeches given at the Town Hall became an integral part of these celebrations, as did the accompanying printed materials.

Moving the Lion to Castle Hill

Castle Hill and Union Mound would witness yet another celebration in 1874, this one organised by a rather well-known local Pole. Careful analysis of the 1874 celebration's

⁵⁹ Dabrowski, *Commemorations*, 160-175.

⁶⁰ Dabrowski, *Commemorations*, 51, 84, 108-109; Unowski, 70-72.

complicated history leads to a further rethinking of the role of Lemberg's *tromtadraci* ("trumpeters," a pejorative for the Polish Democratic Party) in nationalising Lemberg's public space, and of the complex reality of the late nineteenth-century multi-ethnic city under the Habsburg rule. Furthermore, it provides an illustration of the constant re-invention of tradition – initially constructed along the lines Hobsbawm has suggested – in continuous modifications to suit changing political realities. For Lemberg historian Franciszek Jaworski, author of a number of monographs on the city's history, the celebration was a spontaneous but repulsive popular event, held without clear cause or purpose:

Out of the blue (*ni z tego ni z owego*) the Lwów *tromtadracja* came up with the notion of solemnly transferring [the sculpture of] a lion from the old ... Town Hall to Castle Hill. It was carried with great pomp, and the first day it arrived as far as Teatyńska [Street]. The police, from a fear of possible demonstrations, however, made the subsequent procession impossible in such [a curious] way that the procession [participants] moved the lion to Castle Hill during the next night. [The lion stood there and] in a peculiar Lwów dialect spoke: "*Dalibóg, niech mnie piorun trzaśnie, wenn ich weiss, na co oni mnie tu postawili, i co się ma znaczyć diese ganze Geschichte.*"⁶¹

Yet the organiser of the celebration Jan Bończa Pawulski, a war veteran who had served with the guards supervising the construction of the Union of Lublin Mound⁶² and a member of the Democratic Party, was driven by a clear idea, derived from a mixture of Habsburg loyalty, local patriotism and nationalism. In August 1874, Pawulski wrote to the Municipality to propose a small party at Castle Hill five years after the commemoration of the Union's 300th anniversary.⁶³ He fully realised that his request to include traditional elements from royal ceremonies – even if made in connection with the Mound's anniversary and at the time when the city administration was predominantly Polish – was not a promising strategy:

⁶¹ "For God's sake, may thunder (*piorun*) strike me [until] I know why they have put me here and what all this is supposed to mean" (Jaworski, 309).

⁶² It was Pawulski who had informed Juliusz Hochberger, the Head of the Municipal Building Department, in March 1872 of the intention of the Committee to demolish part of the historic castle fortifications (CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 97). For further on Pawulski, see Sierżęga, 189.

⁶³ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 106.

There has been a gloomy silence on Castle Hill for five years [since 1869]. We are planning a celebration for August 11 for the youth who remain [in the city] during the holidays, children under their parents' eye, and the public of both sexes, ... free of charge, without military orchestra or fireworks, ... without the slightest resemblance to a political demonstration, and yet under the eye of the political authorities and the supervision of the Building Department in the person of Alfred Bojarski.⁶⁴

After receiving preliminary approval, Pawulski's second letter to the Municipality revealed that he already had a much broader idea in his mind. He suggested that the medieval sculpture of a lion, one that prior to the construction of the neoclassical Town Hall had stood in Market Square and that remained in the ownership of the Municipality, could be presented to the celebration committee. The sculpture would then be ceremoniously transported to Castle Hill where, Pawulski claimed, it would enjoy a more fitting location than it had previously:

For many centuries the proud Lion, the Ruthenian prince's and this city founder's true coat-of-arms, stood ... at the entrance to the Town Hall. ... For decades now he has stood redundant, presently near the stable and toilettes, desecrated from the front and from the back, [as if] condemned to shame and misery. Present him to us so that he may decorate the city's future landmark, the mound. Already this Sunday (August 9) he could inhabit a place more appropriate to him: the residence of Casimir the Great, destroyed by the Swedes. Monument conservator Mr. Potocki will restore him and put him in new attire, as [he did with] the statue to Hetman Jabłonowski It would become a possession, a decoration and a symbol (*własność, ozdoba i klejnot*) of yours, of the entire province (*Kraj*), of this city and of us!"⁶⁵

This quote reveals that Pawulski, a regular member of Lemberg *tromtadracja*, was close to the majority of public officials and monument conservators, two groups for whom historic monuments held significance by virtue of their age, rather than any national – or other – historic association. In this view, the Ruthenian prince could coexist with the Polish king,

⁶⁴ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 106, 110.

⁶⁵ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 110-111.

and the medieval sculpture with the new mound on Castle Hill, while local patriotism overlapped with imperial loyalty and ethnic affiliation.

On August 15, 1874, the city council approved the commemoration on the grounds that the sculpture “was neither significant from the artistic point of view, nor through its age, and that there cannot be a better place for it than on the Mound.”⁶⁶ Moreover, the authorities allowed the incorporation of architectural landmarks traditionally significant in official ceremonies: the Town Hall would mark the commemoration’s starting point, while salvos would be set off from Castle Hill when the procession arrived at the triumphal arch by Kiselka Tollgate.⁶⁷ Thus Pawulski lent legitimacy to his ceremony with the use of elements from well-known official celebrations. By taking a more tolerant stance towards the authorities than Smolka’s aggressive claiming of public space as a civil right, Pawulski allowed for the further institutionalisation of an invented national celebration and, at the same time, set a precedent for later, innovative intrusions into official ceremonies.

Chmelnýckyj Anniversary

Castle Hill found itself on the municipal agenda once again in 1905, this time as a site of historical reference: 1905 was the 250th anniversary of the siege of Lemberg by the Cossack troops, led by Bohdan Chmelnýckyj, during which the defence of Castle Hill had figured very significantly. The predominant Polish and Ruthenian historical interpretations of the siege, however, differed radically. Polish historiography viewed the attack as an act of violence, replete with notorious abuse of the city’s Jewish inhabitants, as well as a demonstration of Lemberg’s spiritual strength and its unanimous loyalty to the Polish crown.⁶⁸ Ruthenian historians such as Mychajlo Hruševskýj, conversely, understood the siege as an unsuccessful attempt to liberate Lemberg from the yoke of Polish rule and as a symbol of Chmelnýckyj’s solidarity with the Galician Ruthenians.⁶⁹ In parallel, the Russophile newspaper considered Chmelnýckyj’s demand that Lemberg give up its Jewish

⁶⁶ For more on the approval granted on August 15, 1874, see CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 112.

⁶⁷ Events at the Town Hall signaled the start of the ceremony at 2 pm, while salvos came from the Mound at 4 pm and ended at 8 pm (Ibid., L. 111).

⁶⁸ “Krysztof Arciszewski. Obrazek historyczny z dawnej przeszłości Lwowa,” [Krysztof Arciszewski. A Historical Image from the ancient history of Lwów] *Przyjaciół domowy* 1-16 (1857); “Tereza Jadwiga. Wspomnienie z dni minionych 26. Września r. 1848,” [Tereza Jadwiga. Memories from Bygone Days] *Zorza* 7 (1902), 105-107.

⁶⁹ Mychajlo Hruševskýj, *Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy* Vol. 4, 282.

population, in return for a cessation of the siege, an act of long-awaited justice.⁷⁰ Thus the suggestion in 1905 of a commemoration of the siege was certain to stir up antagonisms within the local population and to make a clear political statement.

The proposal for the celebration came from the city: on October 5, 1905, a meeting of the Commemoration Committee, led by Lemberg Mayor Michał Michalski and comprising five members of the city council, was held in the president's office. The impressive program, which received immediate approval from City Council, concentrated on indoor activities: solemn masses in all the churches and a service in the synagogue; a lecture in the Town Hall by a leading local historian and director of the Lemberg archives, Aleksander Czołowski, ; the printing of two publications, one scholarly by Czołowski and one popular by Jaworski; and lectures in all the Lemberg schools.⁷¹ The Jewish community joined in with a brief brochure that simply quoted a municipal archival source of November 2, 1655, in which Lemberg Mayor Marcin Grossmajer recorded his position on the Jewish issue and on Lemberg inhabitants' solidarity against Chmelnyćkyj's troops.⁷²

The Ruthenians felt deeply hurt: the celebration was initiated by the Polish-dominated Municipality and, despite its indoor character, was to make use of a range of public buildings and printed material. The archival files of the 1905 celebration do not reveal the position of the most influential Ruthenian party, the National Democrats. However, fragments from the Russophile newspaper *Galichanin* and a Socialist pamphlet by Semen Wityk reveal a certain uniformity of attitudes. Calling the proposed celebration "a chauvinist demonstration against the memory of [our] hetman and against the idea that led him to go to war against Poland," the Russophile newspaper *Galichanin* appealed that "the truth" be uncovered and that the "Russian" (*russkoje*, i. e. Ruthenian) clergy be exempted from the celebration:

If the aforementioned members of the committee were familiar with history and if they would have had at least a bit of political tact and common sense, they would have left the upcoming 250th [anniversary] unnoticed, as they have left all previous

⁷⁰ "Osada Lvova Bohdanom Chmelnickim v 1655 r.," [The Siege of Lvov by Bohdan Chmelnicki] *Galicanin* 213-216 (1905).

⁷¹ CDIAU F. 146, Op. 8, Sp. 448, L. 56; CDIAU F. 101, Op. 1, Sp. 5, L. 35.

⁷² *Karta pamiatkowa obchodu rocznicy oblezenia miasta Lwowa przez hetmana kozaków Chmielnickiego i walecznej obrony mieszkańców w roku 1655* [Memory Book of the anniversary celebration of the 1655 siege

anniversaries [pass] without commemoration. Simple common sense should have led them to realise that such demonstrations could not be pleasant to Russian [i.e. Ruthenian] inhabitants and that it can neither support the peaceful relationship between the Russian [i.e. Ruthenian] and the Polish populations ..., nor even moderate the existing national and political antagonisms.⁷³

A document written in the Polish language by Semen Wityk,⁷⁴ a Ruthenian socialist and Austrian Parliament deputy of Marxist orientation, illustrates that the most level-headed and reasonable arguments against the celebration came from a party representative least affected by nationalism:

As a Ruthenian and as a citizen of this land, I hereby declare my solemn protest against the commemoration [...]. In the contemporary age, when both [Ruthenian and Polish] nations stand at the threshold of liberation, the festering of old wounds is a sign of politics lacking any sense and wisdom. The commemoration [...] can revive good memories neither for the Poles, nor for the Jews, nor for the Ruthenians-Ukrainians. Can a memory of the times when the noble republic fell into fire and chaos, torn apart by petty kings (*królewiat*), when your people suffered under the burden of serfdom [be a good one] for you, Poles? Jews cannot have a good memory of those moments either, as they were turned into a tool for the provocation of the worst racial instincts. And for us, the Ruthenians, those events are also not a bright page in our history. The peasant uprising was not a conscious struggle for freedom, but only a tragic revolt against national, social and religious discrimination. Chmielnicki [*sic*; Polish spelling] cannot be the Ruthenians' hero as

of Lwów by the Cossack hetman Chmielnicki and the armed resistance against it] (Izraelicka Gmina Wyznaniowa we Lwowie, Lemberg: nakł. A. Goldmana, 1905).

⁷³ "Polskaja demonstracyia v godovshchinu osady gor. Lvova Chmielnickim," [The Polish demonstration on the anniversary of siege of Lvov by Chmielnicki] *Galichanin* 213, (1905).

⁷⁴ Wityk, a parliament deputy from 1907 to 1914, was one of the founders of the marginal Social Democratic Party and one of the prominent agitators for socialism in Galician politics. During the short-lived Western Ukrainian Peoples Republic (ZUNR, in existence from November 1918 to June 1919), Wityk was a president-in-chief of the legislative body of the Ukrainian People's Council (Ukraińska Rada Narodowa) and the president of the Naphtha Commissariat in Drohobyč. Prior to publishing the booklet *Pokoj ludziom dobrej woli!*, [Peace to all peoples of good will] he was the author of yet another curious publication, *Precz z Rusinami! Za San z Polakami!* [Away with the Ruthenians! Across the San River with the Poles!] (Lemberg, 1903). After the collapse of ZUNR, he wrote very critically of the Red Army's suppression of Ukrainian socialism. See his article in the newspaper of the Hamburg Free Socialists-Anarchists *Alarm* (Nr. 28/1920). For a brief discussion of Wityk, see Janowski, *Inteligencja wobec wyzwań nowoczesności*, 66. On Ruthenian socialists, see Himka, 141-172, and Rudnytsky, 341.

an obscure personality [...] who gave Ukraine away to the rule of the Russian whip (*knut*).⁷⁵

The Ruthenian protest notwithstanding, the celebration was held according to the proposed program. Public officials, the guilds, a professional society (*Handwerksvereine*) and few workers (*spärlich versammelten*) attended the sermon at the Roman Catholic cathedral. Czołowski held his lecture in the Town Hall in the afternoon, where he described the Lemberg inhabitants' "decent conduct" (*wackere Haltung*) during the siege. Both Czołowski's and Jaworski's publications came out in print.⁷⁶ Seemingly a quiet celebration, the commemoration of November 1905 demonstrated that municipal and education institutions, together with the official press, had become mouthpieces for the official Polish understanding of history, and that municipal celebrations could now be organised irrespective of the Ruthenian position.

1905 was the first attempt at a large municipal commemorative event, and these aspirations were realised in full in 1910 with the commemoration of the 500th anniversary of the Grunwald battle, which took the form of an exhibition of Polish art. The program included the placing of a memorial plate onto Galician Savings Bank, designed by Julian Zachariewicz, the building at the intersection of Jagiellońska Street and the ring road; the laying of the foundation for a monument to King Jagiello, which was never built; the official opening of the exhibition; the festive illumination of the entire city and the burning of tar barrels on Castle Hill; a gala performance in the city theatre; smaller celebrations in each of the city districts, accompanied by lectures; and the printing of a publication intended for the province's population on the commemoration.⁷⁷ On the day of the commemoration, the start of the procession was signalled early in the morning from the Town Hall tower. After a solemn mass at the Roman Catholic Cathedral at 9 am, the procession headed from *Rynek* Square towards Jagiellońska Street. Then, after moving along May 3, Słowacki, and Kopernik Streets, and passing the Diet, the procession arrived

⁷⁵ Semen Wityk *Pokoj ludziom dobrej woli!* [Peace to people of good will!] (Lemberg: Drukarnia Udziałowa, 1905).

⁷⁶ CDIAU F. 146, Op. 8, Sp. 448, L. 56.

⁷⁷ "Program uroczystości grunwaldskiej" [Program of the Grunwald Anniversary] (CDIAU F.165, Op. 5, Sp. 50).

at the monument to Mickiewicz, where speeches were made. Thereafter it headed to the exhibition grounds.⁷⁸

The situation was quite different with Ruthenian national celebrations that, until the early twentieth century and to a large extent until the Monarchy's collapse, remained limited to religious and cultural organisations, notably the *Seminarium*, the *Narodnyj Dom*, and the *Prosvita* society (the latter having acquired the prestigious Lubomirski Palace building on *Rynek* Square in the early 1900s).⁷⁹ The events of 1905 shed light on why this was the case; the authorities had grounds to fear the unusual unity of the Ruthenians this time. According to a police report, the complete spectrum of Ruthenian national organisations (*sämtliche Ruthenen ohne Unterschied der Parteien ... beiderlei Geschlechtes und verschiedener Stände*), numbering altogether over two thousand people, was present at a meeting on November 13, 1905, in the *Narodnyj Dom*. National Democrats, Social Democrats, students of the *gimnasium* and the University made up the majority of those present. After a standard program was completed,⁸⁰ Ruthenian National-Democratic newspaper (*Dilo*) editor Jevhen Levyčkyj called the Polish celebration “an act of chauvinist ingratitude (*Undankbarkeit*),” and invited the participants to “finish the siege that Chmelnyčkyj had begun two hundred fifty years earlier.”

As a consequence, a column formed on the street and headed through *Teatralna* Street towards *Rynek* Square to demonstrate in front of the Town Hall. “According to a confidential source,” continues the police report, “they were determined to throw stones through the Town Hall windows.”⁸¹ The police met them at *Trybunalska* Street, and prevented them from entering the main square. The crowd attacked with cobblestones; the police used force. After one gunshot from the crowd, the police scattered the demonstration before it could access *Rynek* Square.⁸² The Polish official indoor celebration of Lemberg's historic loyalty to the Polish crown, and its inhabitants' heroism against the Cossack siege, continued undisturbed. *Rynek* Square remained quiet and the Town Hall windows safe, thus

⁷⁸ The wearing of special costumes was also envisioned (*Ibid.*).

⁷⁹ See CDIAU F. 146, Op. 7, Sp. 4215; F. 146, Op. 7, Sp. 3685; F. 146, Op. 7, Sp. 4254. On the Lubomirski Palace, see CDIAU F. 55, Op. 1, Sp. 191, L. 56-58, 95-96.

⁸⁰ With Teodor Boháčevskyj presiding, Diet deputy Levyčkyj gave a lecture on the unfortunate political situation of the Ruthenians under Polish rule, and interpreted the siege as an act of national liberation and Chmelnyčkyj as a great hero (CDIAU F.165, Op. 5, Sp. 50, L. 57).

⁸¹ CDIAU F.165, Op. 5, Sp. 50, L.57.

⁸² *Ibid.*, L. 58.

confirming in practice the Polish version of Lemberg's past and the Ruthenian inability to change it.

Constructing Union Mound

In the decades after the successful first celebration of the Union of Lublin of 1869 and the public commemorative event of 1871, the organisation of a mass public celebration – even with “public” understood on Smolka's peculiar terms particular – required different skills and tactics than those required to obtain construction work commitments. The story of the long subsequent construction reveals aspects of Lemberg *fin-de-siècle* society that are difficult to trace through the analysis of public celebrations. While local Polish historians such as Schnür-Peplowski and Jaworski reported and commented on the celebrations of 1869, 1871 and 1874, they remain silent on the construction process which seriously complicated Smolka's success story. During the decades following the 1869 event, neither the organisers, nor the wider public seem to have been particularly enthusiastic about the actual outcome. As recorded by Kazimierz Chłędowski,

later nobody gave money for this purpose [of constructing the Mound] because the Ruthenians laughed at this Polish fantasy. ... Smolka was, however, a stubborn man and he donated much of his earnings to the construction ..., disregarding the needs of his children. ... One laughed at him, was amused by him, but Smolka would not give up the task he had once started.”⁸³

A police report of July 30, 1869, mentioned the sorry sum that the committee had at its disposal and sarcastically concluded, “[i]t appears from this that the initial project has not been particularly well supported by the people.”⁸⁴ The committee needed to seek approval from different administrative offices and to use legal manoeuvres to be able to continue the project. One such manoeuvre was the legal self-dissolution of the initial committee for the commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the Union of Lublin on August 11. In its place, Smolka organised a new and larger, standing (*nieustający*) committee for Union Mound.⁸⁵

⁸³ Kazimierz Chłędowski, *Pamiętniki* [Memoirs], vol. 1, Galicja (1843-1880) (Cracow, 1957), 279, quoted in Sierżęga, 189.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, L. 38.

⁸⁵ Apart from Smolka, the committee included Henryk Schmidt, Julian Szemolowski, Karol Widman, Władysław Smolka, Platon Kostecki, Dr. Ignacy Czemerzyński, Alfred Bojarski, Antoni Bogdanowicz,

Another manoeuvre was a deal struck with the local prison and the Municipality to have prisoners construct the road to the site of the future mound in 1869 and later.⁸⁶ Moreover, the committee needed to marginalise the Ruthenians' voice, which was explicitly negative, and to commit its own "nation" to the idea.

Smolka complained to the Municipality as early as September 8, 1869, that, "because the public is not willing to be convinced and so to become involved in this pressing (*konieczna*) work," he had repeatedly asked the municipal Building Department to provide workers, "or maybe prisoners" for the project.⁸⁷ There was the usual shortage of finances and public commitment. The former problem Smolka attempted to solve at the level of the provincial administration as early as August 1869, mentioning to the authorities the possible expenses, while still unaware that some quarters, especially that of historic preservation, would deal him more headaches than help in the future.⁸⁸ The Viceroy Administration was obviously not in a position to allow such an explicit public statement as Smolka proposed, nor did it have the intention of doing so.⁸⁹

Yet as time went by, the Municipality seemed to have fallen into a trap: through the interplay of various forces, it was now compelled to view the construction of the Lublin Union Mound as a *public* affair, and thus as one that required its support. In Smolka's explanatory response to the Police Department of August 11, 1869, we read that, by that time, he had already obtained municipal permission for the construction of the Mound on Castle Hill.⁹⁰ Nothing could occur at the building site thereafter without the Municipality's knowledge and approval. As the road leading from the city to Castle Hill was being widened and renovated by local prisoners,⁹¹ the Viceroy Administration's Presidium

Antoni Halski, Feliks Piatkowski, Wincenty Zaak and Tadeusz Romanowicz (*Dziennik lwowski* 199 (August 17, 1869). See also CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 53).

⁸⁶ Sierżęga, 175.

⁸⁷ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 76-77.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, L. 59-60.

⁸⁹ The *Statthaltereis*' decision was negative; the committee was not allowed to collect public donations (*Ibid.*, L. 55).

⁹⁰ "*Do sypania Kopca zyskałem pozwolenie właściciela gruntu* [I have been granted permission for the construction of the Mound by the owner of this parcel]" (*Ibid.*, L. 46).

⁹¹ Thirty to forty prisoners from the provincial prison were employed in that project (*Ibid.*, L. 39). Responding to an inquiry from the Viceroy Administration's Presidium, the Municipality reported that the prisoners "belong among those who are being lent (*wynajmowany bywają*) from the local criminal office to the Municipality for use in public works. Those [prisoners] were assigned by the Municipality to its Building Department for the aforementioned works ("Odezwa od Prezydium Sądu krajowego karnego do Prezydium

ironically commented in an inquiry to the Police Director that “such an undertaking ... would be difficult to explain ... in the light of the prohibition of the entire celebration, and ... the act on assembly.”⁹²

Smolka, the city’s deputy to the Provincial Diet, enjoyed good relations with the Municipality. As the turn of the century approached, the latter became increasingly Polish in composition and indeed some of its members viewed the construction of the Mound as a pressing national issue. Members of the Municipal Council attended the ground breaking ceremony on August 11, 1869. By this time, an official from the municipal Building Department, Alfred Bojarski, had become an active member of the executive committee for the construction of the Mound.⁹³ In light of this, the municipal authorities were left with either the option of refraining from any activity connected with the Mound’s construction, or of supporting it openly and publicly as its own project. The first option, although attractive to the old Neo-Absolutist generation of Galician officials, would have left the Municipality to watch how, after permission to develop the land had been obtained, Union Mound would rise as a monument to an alternative political agenda. Thus, even if its construction would be long and difficult – as it indeed proved to be – choosing to support the Mound’s construction provided a way out of the deadlock: the political authorities could preserve their legitimacy and engage in an activity they traditionally favoured, urban planning.

Even those public officials who would oppose the idea, such as the police director, acknowledged that the construction of Union Mound was a *public* enterprise:

Since the construction of the Mound is taking place in in full view of the government (*w obliczu rządu*), since [it] is connected with various large expenses, and since the committee has begun this activity without the government’s permission – an activity which, even if we do not view it as a demonstration against Austria, is nonetheless a political demonstration designed to have a different

Dyrekcji policyi we Lwowie [Appeal by the Presidium (committee) of the Provincial Criminal Court to the Presidium of the Lemberg Police],” *Ibid.*, L. 44).

⁹² *Ibid.*, L. 40, 43.

⁹³ Bojarski’s duty was to catalogue and store in one place all the excavated relicts until they would be delivered to heritage specialists (*Ibid.*, L. 69).

trajectory [than Austrian patriotism] – consequently, the government possesses the means to prohibit this illegal act.⁹⁴

The police department and the Gubernial Administration in general remained hostile to the proposal, while the Municipality grew more and more enthusiastic about it. In the early 1870s, yet another opponent entered the picture, one whose professional opinion it was difficult to ignore.

Beginning in March 1872, Juliusz Hochberger, the Municipal Building Department director, personally inspected the Mound's construction and kept a close eye on any activity that might have compromised either good architectural taste or any existing historic monuments. The ruins of the medieval castle stood in close proximity to the building site. Few as the supporters for the construction of Union Mound were, they were deeply convinced of their professional authority. Opinions clashed in 1872, when it emerged that the committee had unilaterally decided to demolish the ruins in the centre of the Mound – as it believed it was in a position to decide which portion of the ruins was valuable and which was not. Hochberger replied to this decision harshly:

One is to oppose this proposed action as strongly as possible, since, first, such a dear national monument that, moreover, does not obstruct anyone's way should not be demolished (*pamiętki takiej ojczystej, która nikomu nie zawadza ... burzyć nie należy*). Second, those ruins add much to the picturesque quality of the area ... I am convinced that quite a few of those who are today in support of the demolition of those ruins will feel their absence in the future.⁹⁵

The committee seemed not to take notice, and the Municipality rather unwillingly joined rank with its Building Department director and on December 4, 1872, warned of its intent to limit the committee's rights to develop the site:

The Municipality watches with great pain (*ubolewanie*) that the honourable Committee continues to demolish historic monuments that are so rare here. [The Municipality] decisively (*stanowczo*) urges [you] to stop all demolition work, as well as the planning work for the site where the castle walls are situated – in the

⁹⁴ “Sprawozdanie c. k. Dyrektora policji z dnia 21. września 1869 [Report of the police director of 21 September 1869].” (Ibid., L. 62-63).

opposite case, the Municipality will feel urged (*widzialby sie znaglonym*) to use adequate [legal] means to limit the scope of the Committee's activity.⁹⁶

Despite Hochberger's concern for the historic ruins, the Municipality remained passive out of political and administrative concerns. It was easier to let Smolka's committee develop the ground for the scandalous project that had been initially rejected at the provincial level than protest its work at this late stage. On the administrative side, it was unclear to what extent the Municipality could indeed interfere.⁹⁷ Smolka himself was not willing to allow the work to stop simply because one individual thought that the ancient castle ruins deserved greater care.⁹⁸ It was only in September of 1875, when reports began to circulate that the Mound had started to deteriorate due to a poorly laid foundation,⁹⁹ that the city finally decided to intervene.

A variety of other voices joined the discussion. Polish intellectuals of diverse backgrounds who had professional interests in historic preservation were, by virtue of their profession, opposed to the Mound's construction. Some, such as Count Mieczysław Potocki, had strict professional affiliation with the Austrian state and worked as regional curators of historic sites. Others, like Antoni Schneyder, were public activists committed to preserving local historic architecture. Here the issue of defining national heritage came to play a leading role.

In the conservators' opinion, the abandoned remains of the medieval castle were at least as, if not more, important as the construction of Union Mound. Potocki and his deputy Stanisław Kunasiewicz followed conservative imperial values and maintained a deep belief in the Austrian state's good intentions and its ultimate authority on conservation issues.¹⁰⁰ As it happened, they had sound reasons to assume that the Polish Democrats committed to

⁹⁵ Ibid., L. 97. When Hochberger repeated his two-fold argument in a letter addressed to the Committee nine months later, on November 19, 1872, he wrote of the preservation of the ruins as "national monuments" (*pamiatki narodowe*) and by this clearly meant that the ruins should be under state protection (Ibid., L. 102).

⁹⁶ Ibid., L. 102.

⁹⁷ When it was reported in June of 1875 that the ruins were still being used as a foundation for the artificial mound, Hochberger noted: "The Building Department has informed the Municipality [about this], while at the same time it has not suggested any technical solution since it is at all not clear to what extent, from the administrative point of view, the city's intervention would be desired" (Ibid., L. 119).

⁹⁸ Ibid..

⁹⁹ CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L. 115.

¹⁰⁰ "Do Prezydium Rady miasta i Magistratu kr. stól. miasta Lwowa, Stanisław Kunaszewicz, zastępca konserwatora budowli i pomników krajowych Galicyi Wschodniej, 17. Sierpnia 1869, [To the Presidium of

the Mound's construction would not preserve the old medieval ruins in full, which could clearly serve as a better building material than sandy soil. A week after the ceremony of 1869, Kunasiewicz complained to the Municipality that "the hills are being dug out as [construction] material" and that "diverse artefacts of varying quality," found during the works, were either being shattered on the spot or reaching the hands of antique collectors."¹⁰¹ A month after the celebration, Potocki appealed to the Municipality in connection to the organisers' continuing careless attitude toward the old walls and requested that efforts be made to preserve this "national monument" (*narodowa pamiatka*). The city should, he reasoned, "under no circumstances allow the erection of a new monument in the place of an old one, and a much more valuable one at that."¹⁰²

Backed by support from conservation enthusiasts and possessing clear evidence that Smolka's committee could neither accomplish its work qualitatively – that is, technically – nor quantitatively – that is, given the chronic work delays and lack of manpower – the Municipality finally took initiative in 1876. Union Mound was deteriorating – most notably on the side of the triumphal arch, through which all official ceremonies had to pass– and further building work was prohibited.¹⁰³ In light of the pressing situation, given its annually allocating a sum to fund the Mound's construction, and with *pro forma* recognition of Smolka's efforts,¹⁰⁴ in September of that year the Municipality finally made their position clear:

In order not to overburden unreasonably the fund for the construction of the Mound, ... the Commission's opinion is that it would be natural that the expenses of the Mound's construction and that the technical control of it be undertaken by the Lemberg Municipality. ... While Mr. Smolka's involvement in the building works

the City Council and the Municipality of Lemberg, by Stanisław Kunaszewicz, the Conservator in Chief of Building and Provincial Monuments of Eastern Galicia, 17 August 1869]" (Ibid., L. 65).

¹⁰¹ Ibid., L. 65-66.

¹⁰² Ibid., L. 72-73; 82-83. Potocki's tone becomes even more harsh on March 15, 1872, when he wrote that, "the ruins of the old castle will be completely demolished as well as covered with soil" (Ibid., L. 96-97).

By June 28, 1875, a special municipal commission had come into existence (comprised of Baumgarten, Gostkowski, Horwath, Spalke and Zbrożko), though municipal involvement was not yet clear. On August 23, 1875, the Municipality allocated a sum of 200 zlr for the engineering work. It turned out that a plan for the construction of Mound did not yet even exist (Ibid., L. 121).

¹⁰⁴ Smolka continued to receive his yearly payment for work on the Mound at least as late as 1886. (Ibid., L. 133, 142).

deserves recognition, due to the lack of funding and, separately, his other, time-consuming public duties, the progress of the works has often been delayed.¹⁰⁵

Thus Smolka's initiative finally became the priority project of the Municipality and remained so even after Smolka's death in 1899. Yet it proved impossible, even for the professional city civil engineers, to save Union Mound from deterioration. Municipal funds were insufficient to undertake an evaluation of the ground, or to employ an adequate number of experts or, finally, to complete the memorial, for which there initially had been little official interest and public commitment.

The Municipality struggled with the project for nearly forty years and finally gave up in 1907, when strong summer rains caused new deformations to the Mound. Lamenting the Mound's "catastrophic condition" on June 15, 1907, the Municipal Presidium, headed by Vice-Mayor Tadeusz Rutowski, appealed unsuccessfully to the public once more, employing strong national rhetoric.¹⁰⁶ Yet, as in previous years, the expected national commitment only materialised in written form, while the general public remained indifferent to issues other than popular attractions. The written commitment came from Teofil Merunowicz, a notorious deputy to the Provincial Diet and a chance participant in the ceremony of August 11, 1869,¹⁰⁷ in an open letter of June 18, 1907, to the city's newly elected Mayor Stanisław Ciuchciński.

This letter appears to have been a polemical response to an article in the newspaper *Dilo* which had simply paraphrased a popular proverb sarcastically and asserted that Union Mound would soon be "blown away by the winds," just as the Polish-promoted idea of the "friendly union of nations" that it personified had been.¹⁰⁸ Merunowicz's letter asserted municipal responsibility for the maintenance of the Mound, appealed again to the "entire nation" for support for the project, and, ironically, blamed the "modern hajdamaky," i.e. Ruthenians, for the Mound's deterioration.¹⁰⁹ Ironically however, the metaphor worked

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., L. 128-133.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., L. 150.

¹⁰⁷ Merunowicz was the first Galician politician to attempt to establish an anti-Semitic political party and advocated anti-Jewish legislation in the Galician Diet in the 1880s.

¹⁰⁸ See Ibid., L. 152.

¹⁰⁹ Teofil Merunowicz, "List otwarty do JWPana Stanisława Ciuchcińskiego prezydenta Lwowa [Open letter to Mr. Stanisław Ciuchciński, the President of Lemberg]", *Gazeta narodowa* 138 (June 19, 1907), also see CDIAU F. 165, Op. 5, Sp. 110, L.152.

well: it was precisely the Mound's foundation that had been badly constructed.¹¹⁰ Having destroyed much of the medieval ruins, the initiators of the project had failed to construct a proper, lasting monument to the liberal values represented in the Act of the Union.

In the early 1900s the issue became a matter of political dispute yet again: from a matter of the great unity of the three "Polish" nations, the deteriorating Mound was transformed into a metaphor for the troublesome Polish-Ukrainian relations of the early twentieth century. The pathos of the debates in the press demonstrated how deep an emotional issue the Lublin Union Mound was for local intellectuals in the late 1900s and, at the same time, how reluctant they were to provide assistance for its actual completion. The Municipality remained reluctant to re-conceptualise its notion of public space as a heterogeneous one, one where many more actors could and should play. As a result, the city was forced to view the problematic project as its own and so to dedicate sums to the poorly begun, technically troubled, and yet emotionally charged memorial atop *Franz-Joseph-Berg*. Thus instead of attesting to the victory of liberal values and to the greatness of the modern Polish national project in Central Europe, the Mound became a run-of-the-mill municipal worry that would last throughout the remaining years of Habsburg rule, the interwar period and the Soviet era.

Historians have been all too eager to label imperial celebrations as staged from above, restrictive of popular public expression, and thus not representative of general public opinion. In analysing the politics around the construction of the Union of Lublin Mound and other public celebrations connected to Castle Hill, the staged character of street nationalism, as well as its heavy borrowing from the imperial project, become clear. After the change in political climate and the concomitant shifts in the concept of public space during the years following the 1867 *Ausgleich*, the provincial and municipal authorities in Lemberg could no longer make unilateral decisions on the reconfiguration of public space. The authorities needed not only to legitimize their symbolic domination of the streets, but also to position themselves in relation to the increasing demands of Polish – and later Ruthenian – intellectuals for alternative national commemorations. Most importantly, the

¹¹⁰ The Mound's condition sparked fears in the interwar period and was finally stabilized using modern, post-war technology under socialism in the 1970s-1980s.

liberal democratic Polish political camp, and especially Smolka, understood the use of public space for the symbolic expression of national self as a citizen's right.

The Union of Lublin Mound, a man-made structure built on Lemberg's highest hill to commemorate the establishment of the historic Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, came to represent Polish presence in the city, as well as the liberal, inclusive and democratic claims of Polish nationalism. The 1869 conflict over Union Mound serves as a fine example of a number of key political changes that were taking place in the late 1870s. The Mound was proposed by Democrats who opposed the central state administration, a political stance that would have been unthinkable a few years earlier. Just as significant, however, was the split that emerged within the government on how to respond to Smolka's project for this monument. Predictably, the Viceroy's administration and police reacted negatively to the idea of the Mound, even though many of the officials in these institutions were by now of Polish nationality. The municipal government, however, was supportive and eventually assumed responsibility for the project, a move that illustrated the shift in power from the central administration to municipal authorities reflected in the local autonomy law of 1870.

Smolka appropriated Lemberg's traditional royal street ceremony – previously adapted from its medieval form to welcome visits by the Habsburgs – for a different, national celebration. The double re-invention of a medieval practice, its first reconfiguration having been its transformation for official use in the late eighteenth century, made the new celebration appear much more natural in the local context of 1869, and the celebration was gradually adopted by the broader public. Key elements of this street-based event – the signaling of its start from the Town Hall tower, the street procession, the illumination of Castle Hill and public buildings, and the gala performance in the theatre – have remained integral to Polish celebrations in the city ever since. Thus shaped by a variety of individuals and institutions, Lemberg's public space lost the homogeneity imparted to it by official Habsburg uses and imperial symbols. Over the course of the late nineteenth century, various celebrations were reinvented in the local context and surrounded with their particular *butaforia*.

As early as 1905 the public was clearly too involved with specifically local national historical arguments to be able to pay adequate attention to the Habsburg project. Yet prior

to the first days of the World War I that broke all previous conventions, the success of the “Polish Lwów” national project, as a viable alternative to “Habsburg Lemberg,” was still not obvious. National narratives about Lemberg’s development often overlook a significant aspect of the city’s heterogeneous public space, namely the attitudes of the greater public during commemorative practices. On several occasions, such as the 1874 celebration initiated by war veteran and supposed Democratic Party member Jan Pawulski, various local, national and imperial symbols were employed in an even more creative and inclusive manner than in contemporary celebrations organized by professional, political and ethnic elites. The attitudes of the general public, which demonstrate that public commitment fell short when the celebrations were concluded, appear to have eluded the nineteenth-century national historians who stood alone in their view that symbolism in architecture exclusively referenced national histories.

Markian Prokopowych authored the book Habsburg Lemberg: Architecture, Public Space and Politics in the Galician Capital, 1772-1914 and a series of publications on the history of Lviv, Budapest, and Central Europe. He headed the Lviv Interactive project sponsored by the Center for Urban History of East Central Europe from 2006-2010. Currently he lectures at the Institute for Eastern European History at the University of Vienna.