

The Borders of the Western Boyko Land

Abstract

By reminding the criteria of separation of Boyko Land as a cultural and historic territory and the Boykos as an ethnographic group the author aims to convince that we are not dealing with history of exploring the ethnographic areas, but the history of inventing them. Talking about the Boykos in Boyko Land is synonymous with commitment to a number of ideas from the history of science, the old concepts of culture, folk culture, ethnicity, cultural-historical school and anthropogeography, physical anthropology, and physiognomies, folklore and ethnography. Contrary to Boyko Land researchers the author claim that since the beginning of the nineteenth century to the present day in Ukraine they deal not with a great ethnic group – the Boykos, but with many local communities of Ruthenian mountaineers – the ethnographic groups. The old and popular in the north-eastern Carpathians depreciating words related to the alien, such as “Boyko” or “Lemko”, were released from the meaning by the intellectuals who were engaged in science, literature and politics in order to apply them to name the groups and their territories.

Keywords: Boykos, Boyko Land, ethnographic group, mythologisation

The borders of the Western Boyko Land were set by Jan Falkowski and Bazyli Pasznycki and “finally terminated” by Roman Reinfuss (Olszański 1991). Supplemented and improved by Jerzy Czajkowski, they were “accepted by academic research institutions”, “have come to be recognised as part of the main body of academic knowledge” and “have come to be the Sanok Museum of Folk Architecture’s official stance on the matter” (Ossadnik, Radwański 2008: 348).

Maintaining the border, persistently trying – with the precision of a land surveyor or census taker – to make it even more precise (Within the present borders of Poland, there were 124 Boyko localities, 31 Boyko-Dolyna localities, where “homes” and “lives” can be counted (Czajkowski 2006; Ossadnik, Radwański 2008) means respecting the principle: “We act the way our ancestors did”, and therefore it can be described a traditionalist activity, an obvious case of acade-

mism. However, this border existed and still exists only in the minds of those who invented it and those who believed in it. Advocating for “the Boykos in the Boyko Land” means being attached to many ideas in the history of science, to old theories of culture, folk culture, ethnic group, anthropogeography and the cultural and historical school, to physical anthropology, physiognomics, characterology, ethnology and ethnography..., mechanically adopting scientific and practical (political) principles and objectives, setting the territories of ethnographic, dialectological, anthropological, ethnic, religious, statistical groups....

Reminded of the criteria for separating the Boyko Land as a historical and cultural territory (and the Boykos as an ethnic group), one should believe that what we are talking about is not the history of discovering ethnographic units, but rather the history of inventing such units. At the same time, this illustrates the fact that academic projects reproduced for a longer period of time come to be recognised as part of the main body of knowledge and as such – properly disseminated and popularised – are adopted by academic circles in related academic disciplines (where, in most cases, they are essentialised) and non-academic circles (where they are easily modified and combined – for various purposes – with social and political ideologies). As time goes on, they may reach the right social groups that can use these products as part of their own traditions. Academic projects, even the most fantastic ones, sometimes bring real effects, which is best confirmed by society’s response to the ethnographic groups and maps created as a result. Finally, there is my general tendency: setting cultural borders in space is as problematic as setting time borders in history – in setting such cultural borders today, “the Boyko Land” and “the Boykos” cannot be ignored.

One of the first most influential and long-lasting theories of identifying separate ethnographic areas and groups was anthropogeography. Before it was recognised as a science, anthropogeography was part of ethnology. The principal and simple theses of the anthropogeography of the 19th and 20th centuries are transformations, as part of subsequent philosophical and academic systems of the old and common topos of mythology and folklore, art and literature, medical doctrines (especially the humoral theory adopted by Hippocrates and Galen). Anthropological thinking was and still is part of pre-academic thinking – common and para-academic knowledge, as was the case with the literature of the 19th century. This explains the great role of descriptions of people in their relationships with nature in ethnology (Each monograph begins with such descriptions, e.g. O. Kolberg’s monograph), in history (J. Lelewel’s), in geography (and ethnography: W. Pol’s), in geology (and ethnography: J. Zejszner’s), in literature (E. Orzeszkowa was writing her *Nad Niemnem* with the help of H. Taine’s work), etc.

Therefore, the creation of ethnocultural identities with the use of geographical and natural determinants which are expected to strongly affect “particularly those cultures which are at a low level of development” (Kirtchiv 1983) can be found in the work of Ignacy Lubicz Czerwiński (where such determinants are

used intuitively and spontaneously), Wincenty Pol (who cites W. Humboldt and K. Ritter), Jak Falkowski and Roman Reinfuss (based on the anthropogeography of the then influential cultural and historical school in Poland), Czajkowski and his colleagues. Using the theses of anthropogeography, to a varying extent and degree, not always leads to setting ethnocultural borders. After all, these were not, contrary to the Ukrainian ethnographer's arguments (Hudasz 1983) a problem for Ignacy Lubicz Czerwiński, who did not look on the Boykos as a separate ethnographic group, nor did he imply the fact that the Dniester River marked the border of the Boyko Land in the early 19th century. Nor were they a problem for Yuri Levitsky, Paweł J. Szafarik, Ivan Vagilevich or Jarosław Gołowacki.

The borders of the Boyko Land were originally determined by the geographer and ethnographer Pol (1851, 1875–1878, vol. VI, 1966) thanks to, above all, his methodical use of anthropogeography (and with knowledge of the work of his predecessors, particularly Ivan Vagilevich). The anthropogeographical theses that "the divisions of nature set the limit for family (tribal) divisions", that "nature determines the main family characteristics, physiognomic, characterological and anthropological differences, that "nature dictates the way of living, differences in clothing, construction, customs..." resulted in Pol's ethnography being mainly concerned with the question of ethnographic group borders. "The influence of the local nature" determined Pol's first and most general description of the borders of the Boyko family: "in the north, its settlements do not go beyond the reaches of the rivers; in the west, its end is marked by a range of the mountain pastures of Sanok; only later across the inhabited Wallachian villages; in the east, the impenetrable Black Primeval Forest separates it from the adjacent Huculi" 1875–1878, vo. VI: 114). These findings by Pol, especially those regarding the western border of the Boyko Land, were repeated by August Bielowski (1857), adopted in *Słownik Geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego (Kingdom of Poland Geographical Dictionary)* (1881, vol. 1), but also questioned and corrected, based on, *inter alia*, the principles of antropogeography, by Izydor Kopernicki, Falkowski, Reinfuss, and Czajkowski.

During his expedition across the land of Ruthenian highlanders, Kopernicki (1889) discovered that the border between the land that is different from the land of the Lemkos is the village of Bukowsko, on the way to Baligród, and that the differences between the two lands become more distinct between Oślawa and Hoczewka, i.e. the first tributaries of the River San, even further in the mountains, right at the foothills of the Beskid Mountain Pastures, in the valleys of the Solinka and Wetlina rivers. The differences in the geography and natural environment of the two lands are accompanied by differences in the settlement of the lands, in buildings, clothes, physiognomy and character, and by anthropological differences. That is how Kopernicki described the Połoniniec people (the people inhabiting the area described above) as a separate ethnographic group. However, this group was classified by Stanisław Leszczycki (1935), similarly to Pol, as the Lemkos, while Falkowski and Paszyński classified them as the inhabitants of the border-

land area of the Lemkos and Boykos (1935). In contrast, Reinfuss classified them partially as the Boykos and partially as the Lemkos (1938, 1939, 1948–1949).

Geographical conditions: Mount Wielki Dział, Połonina Wetlińska and Połonina Caryńska, Bukowe Berdo, Szeroki Werch, and even small rivers affect the shape and survival of the western area of the Boyko Land, its border with the western area of the Lemko Land. This statement by Falkowski and Pasznyi (1935), too, repeats the strongly established belief, one that is older than Pol's writings (1851) and longer-lasting than the influence of Kazimierz Moszyński (1937): geography precedes ethnography, and ethnography is followed by history – folk culture can therefore be described as primeval, ancient, exotic.

Reinfuss (1936a, 1938, 1939, 1948/1949) rejected Pol's findings as fantastic and critical, and he was more favourably inclined to Falkowski's proposition than to Kopernicki's findings. However, as was the case with his predecessors and many of his contemporaries, Reinfuss made use of ethnogeography – strips of impenetrable forested mountains and the network of rivers are “a kind of border walls” – to set the borders of the entire Boyko Land and its internal divisions. According to Reinfuss, the land of the Boykos stretches from the forested ridge of Mount Wielki Dział, which separates the valley of the River Osława from the basins of the Tarnawa and Jabłonki rivers, as far as to the valley of the Bystrzyca Sołotwińska river, where the last Boyko villages can be found. Relatively densely populated is the area of the basin of the River Jasiołka, the valley of the San, Stryj and Opór rivers (and their tributaries), while the southern part of the Dolyna district is almost deserted. The land that is completely deserted is the area between the valley of the Wołosaty river and the upper reaches of the River San, on the borderland of the Leski and Turka districts.

Anthropogeography – together with the cultural and historical school, whose theories and methods were adopted by the Lviv ethnological school in determining the regional differences in the southeastern part of Poland – belongs to the history of ethnology. However, due to his attachment to the work of, above all, Reinfuss, anthropogeographic thought is still practised by Czajkowski (1993, 2006) and his colleagues. “We can talk of the natural borders of the Western Boyko Land by referring to its southern part (Pasma Graniczne (Border Strip) is both the main ridge of the Carpathian Mountains and the main Carpathian watershed), its western part (*Wysoki Dział – [Wołosai] 1071 metres above seal level*) and the group of *Hyrlata (1105 metres above sea level)* and *Rosocha (1091 metres above sea level)* form a huge mountain range that serves as a distinct geomorphological border), its eastern part (the River San along its 50 km section is the official border between Poland and Ukraine), and its northeastern part, where the *Żuków range (Holica, 762 metres above sea level)* is a distinct culmination. [...] The northern border does not run along culminations that form distinct and clear land reference marks. Instead, it runs along the broadly defined *Przedgórze Bieszczadzkie (Bieszczady Foreland)*, the southern edges of *Podgórze Leskie (Lesko Foothills)*”

(Ossadnik, Radwański 2008: 353). In contrast, in the Boyko-Dolyna zone, which stretches from Ustrzyki Dolne to Krościenko in the east, up to Czaszyn and Łukowe in the west, reaching the Osława river at this point, “[...] it is difficult to find natural land forms that could be considered as the natural borders of his subgroup” (Ossadnik, Radwański 2008: 358).

Anthropogeography was never a field to be practised independently, as it always required the support of other theories. Since, as it was said in the time of Pol, “physiognomy and the spirit of nature” determine the physiognomy and character of people, the natural way to confirm ethnic differences was physiognomics, as well as pathognomics and the humoral theory (both related to physiognomics). And without knowledge of physiognomics – referred to (by M. Żmigrodzka) as “the pseudoacademic gossip of the 19th century” based on the late-18th-century writings of the Swiss pastor and mystic Johan C. Lavater (who was the last great physiognomist, as his predecessors include Hippocrates, Aristotle, Della Porte, Paracelsus...) and subsequently “academicised” by combining it with Hegel’s aesthetics, Spencer’s psychologism, and even with Darwinism – one cannot understand the literature, ethnology and ethnography of the 19th century and the early 20th century (Libera 1995). For a physiognomist, the bodily features (mainly the face and head) of a person are influenced by the natural environment (but also by the person’s experiences and history, but this lies more within G. Lichtenberg’s pathognomics). Physiognomy treated as kind of a “book” of signs immediately refers us to what is secret and indiscernible: to one’s soul, character (physiognomic thus belonged to *ars semiotica*, but in the spirit of Paracelsus, for example). Such a (dualistic) anthropology was impossible without cosmology. After all, isn’t the whole world physiognomic (and, therefore, dualistic?) By investigating the body and soul, a physiognomist in fact investigated the whole world. He or she investigated the physiognomy of humans, the physiognomy of nature, landscapes, animals, the physiognomy of things, villages and towns, streets, squares and farmer’s markets, cottages, etc. and finally, the physiognomy and character of nations. After all, as is the case with individual people, families (tribes) and nations differ in body composition and structure. Except that the physiognomies of those who lead poor spiritual lives are not very distinctive (therefore, we are unable to find any differences in the appearance of, for example, two Kalmucks). The greatest differences in features can be found in the upper races. On the other hand, as Pol wrote (1966), physiognomies, concepts and such national features as clothes, cottages or the way of living are distinctive in the case of tribes separated by nature, particular groups of highlanders in the Carpathian Mountains (as the physiognomies and features of people living in lowland areas are vague).

The use of physiognomics, together with the beliefs of anthropogeography, in describing the character of the Boykos was initiated by Lubicz Czerwiński (1811: 148), who cited the common sense knowledge of his state: if it is true that the location and climate of a country affect the dispositions and customs of people,

then the moist of this area creates a stupid and indolent soul: "the very derisive surname of Boyko seems to approve the people's indolence, meaning "an ox", i.e. a sluggish Boyko". An explanation for Lubicz Czerwiński's reasoning can be found in humoral pathology: the excess moist in a person's environment is deposited in the person's body – in the person's brain (which itself produces its own moist, i.e. phlegm), the result of which is mental stupor. For this reason, the Boykos, classified according to humoralism, are phlegmatic, numb, ponderous, lazy, with an unpleasant body build; they are (but these are also the results of the local history, social relations, ways of living) envious and distrustful, vindictive, treacherous, ready for fighting, conservative (this is made easier by their isolation from the world) (Lubicz Czerwiński 1811). Many features of his original portrayal of the Boykos are repeated in the work of Łukasz Gołębiowski, Vagilevich, Pol, Kopernicki, Kuczera, and Ossendowski. Their work also contained descriptions of the people's new physiognomic and characterological features. However, these features were less the result of new observations than speculations about distinctive racial identity, their ethnogenesis, or their distinctive physiognomic and humoralistic qualifications (according to Julian Talko-Hryniewicz, 1913, the Ruthenians are sanguine in character and have something "Mongolian-Asian" in them, which is proved by the bloody history of Ukraine).

During his journey in the summer of 1888, Kopernicki (1889) had the impression of travelling across various "ethnic lands". Past the village of Bukowsko, in the first villages on the way to Baligród, one can see a land so greatly different from the land of the Lemkos, far more different between the Oślawa and Hoczewka rivers, where Ruthenian highlanders are different from the Lemkos in every respect: in speech, cottages, clothes, etc., in their physical type and physiognomy (his observations refer to the entire area, but are based on the area of Smerki near the village of Wetlina and from the area of Procisna on the River San): the majority of them are not very tall, their faces are round, their eyes bright, and "the women of this area are far more beautiful, slimmer and shapelier in movement than those in the Lemko Land". The Boykos inhabiting the right bank of the River San are different from the slow and apathetic Połoniniec people: "as country, as people" – they are fiercely passionate, more lively, determined in their anger and vindictive, cunning, reckless. From Dydowa, to the south of Lutowiska, the physical type of the Boykos becomes more distinctive: their bodies are strong and shapely, they are relatively often tall, and agile. Yet another land is inhabited by the Tucholcy people: their bodies are far better built, shapelier and they are taller than the Boykos, the Połoniniec people and the Lemkos; they are more impulsive, more quick-tempered, more impertinent, ready for fighting (some of these features may have been concluded from then popular Celtic-Slavic theory on the origin of the Boyko "race", on the Celtic origin of the name "boyko" from "*boj*" (meaning a warrior).

Physiognomics was used in the portrayal of people, things and places, but also in the description of particular tribes and nations, or even extensive natural

and geographical areas. While Kopernicki used physiognomics (in addition to anthropological measurements, ethnographic and landscape observations) in his description of the Boykos as such, thus in distinguishing them from the “tribes” of the Ruthenian highlanders related to the Boykos, Tadeusz Żuliński (1877: 110–111), using the same ability, observed the following:

It is very characteristic and interesting that in the land of Sanok, the people inhabiting the same area and being neighbours, or even as if they were living in a single village, are different not only in character, but also in customs, clothes, and they are two different types of people, so different that if one takes a closer look around the area, one can easily see – almost unerringly – from their appearance or clothes, and even from their facial features and manners, that this or that particular villager comes from this or that village. [...] When the people of Teleśnica and Solina make a pleasant impression on us with their appearance, gentle to a certain degree, or even noble, the people of the village of Horodczany make an unpleasant impression: we are involuntarily reminded of the black, weather-bitten Gypsy race, considerably gesticulating, offensively pestering us with requests, incantations and vows, in addition to their tendency to steal and cheat. [...] However, not only the people of Horodczany are so different from their neighbours. Certain differences in disposition and character can also be found between the people of Teleśnica Sanna, Teleśnica Oszwarowa, and Solinka. In the village of Teleśnica Sanna, the people are more indolent and less ready to work, but they are willing to go hunting and fishing. [...] In contrast, the people of Teleśnica Oszwarowa are more hard-working, but they are not so keen on hunting and fishing.

The Ruthenian people of Samborks are – as Kuczera wrote (1935–1937), citing physiognomics (and later the work of Czekanowski) – a separate physiognomic, anthropological and spiritual type: a Boyko’s soul was created by beautiful and sunny valleys set between ranges of forested gently sloped mountains. A Boyko is lively, optimistic and cheerful, has a great deal of innate intelligence (based on many centuries’ experience), is passionate and vindictive, a persistent warrior (after all, he fights against nature, as he once did against the tribes of Thracia and Romania, which he had absorbed in himself) – it is a Slavic type with Romanian elements.

The remarks about the physiognomy of different peoples, including the Boykos, exist next to or are mixed with anthropological observations. These, too, were among the first and more influential criteria in identifying separate territories of ethnic groups, as long as strong personal, institutional and theoretical relations existed between physical anthropology and ethnography.

At its academic origins, anthropology was, as in the Cracow school of Józef Majer and Kopernicki (1890), characterised by the belief that racial features, i.e. ethnic features according to the then terminology, are inherited and/or environmentally conditioned. In consequence, morphological features, such as height, can be considered as ethnographic features). The problem of anthropological types (as a combination of morphological features) was at the time reduced to ethnic types.

Anthropological theories coincided with the territories of ethnographic groups; especially when such territories are socially and culturally homogeneous, they are also homogeneous morphologically. These relations are simple, if isolated groups at the same level of development are considered. Hence the primary importance, for anthropology and ethnography, of research into the Ruthenian and Polish highlanders – in the Eastern and Northern Carpathian Mountains, the primeval people have survived, pure anthropological types (because differences in anthropological features of the people inhabiting the lowlands have already been eliminated, so anthropological criteria must replace dialectological and ethnographic ones). This anthropology was characterised by ethnographism and anthropographism, thus the explicit or implicit belief that inherited or environmentally conditioned anthropological forms, if they are primeval and pure, determine the primitivism (primeval character) of the material and spiritual culture of peoples (the Slavs, the Ruthenian highlanders, the Boykos, etc.), as vague (mixed) concepts, beliefs, customs, etc. are present in mixed races (in which case, the homogeneity of a particular group is determined not by “blood ties”, but only by language and culture, until they are destroyed by civilisation) (Talko-Hryncewicz 1913).

In the research carried out by the Anthropological Committee of Polska Akademia Umiejętności (Polish Academy of Learning), as well as previously in Pol's work and later in the work of Fyodor Volkov, in the anthropological research carried out by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in the 1960s (Czekanowski 1939, 1948; Dyatchenko 1983), the thesis was adopted on the anthropological homogeneity of the Ruthenian highlanders who are not significantly different from the people inhabiting other parts of the former Eastern Galicia and from other Slavs. Kopernicki (Majer, Kopernicki 1890, Kopernicki 1889) shared the then popular view that ethnic groups were originally homogeneous anthropologically and ethnographically and that morphological differences between the tribes of Polish and Ruthenian highlanders developed under the influence of anthropogeographical and historical factors. The racial features shared by them (and considered as Slavic) were still short-headedness and darker skin pigmentation (these were supposedly the features of the Indo-Europeans from the mountains of Asia which were retained by the highlanders of the Carpathian Mountains, as was the case with their “relatives”, i.e. the highlanders from the Alps, the ancestors of the Celts). This way, the Podhale and the Eastern Carpathian Mountains came to be considered as the relics of the former Slav lands). This was used by Kopernicki as the basis for his examination of the differences and similarities between tribes and of the tribal varieties among the Ruthenian highlanders. The tallest highlanders with the best body build are the Huculi highlanders. The Tucholcy people are shorter and less impressively-looking, less beautiful. However, the Boykos, the Połoniniec people and the Lemkos have a weaker body build compared to the Tucholcy. Similar results were later found by Volkov (1908), which carried out a great deal of anthropological measurement research in 1904–1906 (participated in by Franko

and Zenon Kuzejla) among the Ruthenian highlanders, covering the areas from Nowy Sącz to Bukowina: in anthropological terms (such measurement areas are not identical with language and ethnographic areas), these people are not significantly different from one another or from the other Ukrainians and from the southwestern Slavs. However, Slavic features are most clearly visible in the Huculi people, as these are the tallest, short-headed, with dark skin pigmentation. The Boykos and the Lemkos are less short-headed, shorter and with slightly lighter pigmentation, while the Tucholcy people are the shortest.

The anthropological research related to the problems of ethnic groups was accompanied by genetic inquiries. The Cracow anthropological school, represented by, for example, Vagilevich, Holovatzky, Franko and others, promoted the theory of Celtic-Slavic origin of the Ruthenian highlanders (according to this theory, the Celts and the Slavs shared the same origin, the features of short-headedness and darker skin pigmentation, while the Germans were long-headed, with light skin pigmentation and were not classified as Indo-Europeans, and they were said to have the same origin as the Finns, the Balts and the Teutons). But this is a topic for another occasion. Franko, Holovatzky and Father Toronsky believed, after Szafarik, that the Ruthenian tribes came from the White Croats (Skorik 1931, Telwak 1996, Bilous 2000). This theory was also repeated by Ossendowski (2007), in addition to some other ideas suggesting that the Boykos came from the Traks or the Urovs and the Pietchyngs (according to Vagilevich, whose work was the basis for the work Gołębiowski and Pol after the “Galicia massacre” of 1846). According to such speculations by some other authors, the primeval people of the Eastern Carpathian Mountains were ruthenised and they later absorbed some Tartar, Magyar and Wallachian elements (the local peasants come from the Tartars, as members of “petty mobility” (*drobna szlachta*) came from the Wallachians – Dąbkowski 1936, or from the Roman knights that had settled in Wallachia – Pulnarowicz 1929). All the inquiries regarding the non-Slavic origin of the Ruthenian highlanders are considered by Ukrainian scholars as “manorial-and-clerical and, subsequently, bourgeois-nationalistic” ethnography and historiography (Boltarovich 1976). They accept only those statements by Pol, Kopernicki or Franko about the Slavic/Ukrainian origin of the Ruthenian highlanders whose immediate ancestors were the people of the Kievan Rus, which ultimately causes them to describe the Boykos, the Lemkos and the Huculi people as autochthons and to consider the Poles – in addition to the Germans, Jews, Slovaks, Czechs, Romanians... – as non-autochthons, and to set the Boyko Land even in the prehistoric times (Gurkiewicz 1931).

The 19th-century anthropology, infected with ethnographism and anthropogeographism, provided descriptions of the morphological features of ethnic groups without indicating the importance of the differences (according to anthropological research carried out by the anthropological community of Lviv (Czekanowski 1939 and 1948, Klimek 1932 and 1939)), reduced anthropological areas to ethno-

graphic borders, while extensive anthropological territories cross in the Carpathian Mountains, which determines the racial composition of the Boykos, the Huculi people and the Lemkos, which are further divided into several anthropological groups. Among these, a separate area is the eastern border of the Lemko Land and the western border of the Boyko Land, as well as the areas of the city of Przemyśl. Przemyśl is an area broken as a result of late colonisation (migration) processes and belongs to archaic areas – according to Jan Czekanowski – with Laponoid components prevailing. In the area near Turka and Sambor, Nordic components prevail, yet with a still strong Laponoid addition. In the eastern Boyko Land, especially in the Huculi Land, a high percentage of Armenoid components can be found (which cannot be found in the Boykos from the slopes of Sambor) and Mediterranean components (these are less common in the Sambor Boykos). The Ruthenian highlanders are generally rich in Nordic and Armenoid components (a higher percentage of Nordic and Laponoid components can be found in the Poles). The result of the mixture of these components is short-headedness and dark skin pigmentation – the Dinaric type, typical of, in particular, the Huculi people, which Volkov noted but found erroneous; Jan Czekanowski (1939) considered it as typical of the Ukrainians or even of the old Slavs.

Attempts to find the causes of folk culture differences and to distinguish between ethnographic territories and groups normally began with common-sense observations of differences between neighbouring localities, parishes or districts (In the same as there are no two identical people, as O. Kolberg wrote, there are no totally two similar localities). In addition to these criteria, one can also find elements that can be combined into larger ethnographic units by means of a certain set of criteria applied spontaneously, less often methodically, without agreement as to which of them are more important and more “objective”. When some of these failed, e.g. the anthropological ones, they were immediately replaced with linguistic, ethnographic or historical, anthropological etc. criteria, adhering to the old and new state, administrative or ownership divisions (Węglarz 1997), and the same set of criteria allowed for applying different scales of generalisation. While Falkowski investigated and described the borders of the lands of the Lemkos and Boykos, between the Boykos and the Huculi people, as well as other borders of the Huculi Land (1936a, 1936b, 1937, 1938), his patron, Adam Fischer, described southeastern Poland as culturally homogeneous (1939).

There was constant agreement that no sufficient and reliable data was available to determine, with certainty, the territories occupied by the Ruthenian highlanders. Kopernicki (1889) asked for corrections of and supplements to (based on a questionnaire prepared by himself) his findings about the areas inhabited by and the characteristics of the Lemkos, the Poloniniec people, the Boykos, the Tucholcy people and the Huculi people, which he considered only as temporary and general. Therefore, Khnyazinsky (1931), Falkowski (1935, 1936a) and Fischer (1936), followed by Reinfuss (1936a, 1936b, 1936e, 1939) could claim that although re-

searches had been interested in the Boykos, the Lemkos and the Huculi people since the first decades of the 19th century, the exact borders of their territories were still unknown, with the least information being available on the border between the Lemkos and the Boykos. This and the other borders of the Boykos (and the Huculi people, the Lemkos) cannot be determined based on the available literature, as claimed by Falkowski and Reinfuss, as almost every author differently describes their territories: as too wide, e.g. Szafarik, or as too narrow, e.g. Vagilevich, Pol or Kolberg (Kolberg based his description mainly on the work of Lubicz Czerwiński), Kopernicki, Holovatzky and others. At the end of the 19th century, Polish and Ukrainian ethnologists, ethnographers, historians, linguists began to consider the River San as the border between the Boykos and the Lemkos (Khnyazinsky 1931, Babicz 1966, Goszko 1983).

Therefore, the only solution to this problem was to be ethnographic research. The methods used by Falkowski and Reinfuss were not significantly different from those used by Kopernicki in gathering data. Kopernicki needed 4–5 weeks to visit the Ruthenian highlanders inhabiting the areas from the Poprad River to Chermosh River. Falkowski and Pasznycki spent 30 days in the villages of the western Boyko Land, in unfavourable weather conditions. Reinfuss travelled there many times in the late 1930s. Travelling from one village to another, they could record only dialectal and ethnographic data, as other information was obtained by them from the local Greek-Catholic clergymen, village teachers and village officials. That is why they emphasised that their ethnographic data collections lacked significant information, claiming that they only provided a temporary and general description of the borders of the Boykos and the Lemkos.

Falkowski and Reinfuss tried to accentuate the differences in their approaches to the border between the Lemkos and the Boykos and to emphasise their theoretically methodological and empirical innovation compared to their predecessors. However, in their presentations of ethnic groups and territories, Falkowski and Reinfuss, like their predecessors, used ethnographic and ethnohistorical methods and, as auxiliary methods, also linguistic ones. They argued that ethnic groups should be considered as historically-cultural units, as the result of long-lasting migration and settlement processes in certain geographical environments. This thesis was developed by Fischer (1939) as follows: the Lechite settlements between the River San, the River Bug and the River Dniester in the 9th century were “covered” by Ruthenian settlements after those lands had been occupied by the Kievan Rus in the 10th century; the uninhabited or desolate areas were later (from the 14th to the 16th centuries) colonised by Wallachian, German and, to a large degree, Polish people, who were ruthenised over time. As a result, separate groups of Ruthenian highlanders developed in certain geographical conditions: the area from the eastern part of the Lesko district up to the Łomnica River was inhabited by the Boykos (and up to the Solinka River, by the Lemkos). This approach to explaining the creation of ethnographic groups and territories was developed by Reinfuss

(1948–1949, 1990) after his patron, Kazimierz Dobrowolski. For many years, this approach has been used by Czajkowski (1993, 2006), except that he claims (unlike Pol, Kopernicki, Fischer, and – particularly – unlike Ukrainian scholars) that the Wallachians (romanised people who stayed in Dacia after this historical region was left by the Romans) play a much greater role in the history of settlement; Czajkowski claims that the complicated migration and settlement processes in which different nations participated, particularly between the 14th and 16th centuries, or even until the 18th century in the former Polish-Ruthenian borderland, led to the development of ethnic and cultural borders between the Huculi people, the Boykos and the Lemkos “on the basis of Ukrainian ethos” (because Polish ethnographic groups developed “on the basis of Polish ethos”), which actually existed until the Second World War: the transitional area between the Lemkos and the Boykos ran along the road from Lesko to Ustrzyki Dolne, therefore the area of the Western Boyko Land is limited to the High Bieszczady Mountains and the Sanok-Turka Mountains (but without their foothills).

If – like Falkowski and Fischer, Reinfuss and Czajkowski – one adopts such theories of an ethnic group with its characteristic culture as a complex of material social and spiritual elements, and if these elements are treated as features for classification purposes, then the main task is to identify old, new and foreign “native” units and to investigate their presence in accordance with the principles of ethnographic methods. For ethnologists, this task is fairly easy. Falkowski and Reinfuss noticed increasingly evident changes in economic, social and political relations, as well as civilisational changes (these were noticed by all researches from the early days of ethnology and the study of the Boykos: Lubicz Czerwiński, Kopernicki, Franko...) which resulted in changes of ethnographic areas (Falkowski and Pasznycki: today, the River San is no longer a border, as was the case, say, 50 years ago, because “the Lemkos or, in fact, Lemko features, are disappearing here”; Reinfuss: the Boyko Land used to cover the valley of the Bystritsa Solotvinska River (today it is part of the Huculi Land) and the valley of the Oślawa River, in the vicinity of Kulaszne and Karlikowo – soon the entire district of Lesko will be part of the Lemko Land; certain areas of the Eastern Lemko Land will disappear as a result of massive deforestation, the establishment of sawmills and narrow-gauge railways, the arrival of strangers). However, they were interested in “interesting forms of life”, “preserved like a fly in an amber stone” – the antiquity and primitivism of the western Boykos still defending themselves against the influence of civilisation in the inaccessible Bieszczady Mountains, in places away from the “equalising influences of urban culture”. “The villages of today are changing faster and faster – from the geographical point of view – for worse” (Falkowski 1938: 9). “Traditional culture in the Boyko Land is disappearing”, but “it continues to be absolutely the most interesting part of the Carpathian Mountains for ethnographic research” (Reinfuss 1939: 40, 41). It continues to be seen as such, if researchers are looking for “proto-Slavic relics” (Kutelmach 1996) and “living ethnographic museums” (in Libuchor).

However, in solving problems such as the borders of the Boyko Land, the scales of the cultural extent and borders must be much smaller than in the case of research into ethnographic differences, as in the work of K. Moszyński, or in the work of German ethnologists. However, neither spiritual nor social culture was used for these purposes because, as explained by Falkowski (whose view was shared by Reinfuss), it is difficult to relate spiritual and social culture to ethnic borders (the descriptions in monographs should, according to Falkowski, 1936, present a group “as a certain whole, a whole that lives and acts”), and only selected elements of material culture were used. It is these elements that best allow for ethnocultural divisions, since, as recommended by the cultural and historical school, attention is placed on quantitative differences and, to an even larger extent, qualitative differences between artefacts, with their precise typologies and chronology. The effectiveness of this method was conditional upon a thorough knowledge of the material cultures of the Boykos and the Lemkos, and of the Huculi people, in order to identify, in the borderland areas, elements shared and not shared by the bordering cultures, to separate the “clean” areas – “the relatively cleanest Boyko culture has survived till this day in the southern borderlands of the Western Boyko Land (Wetlina, Ustrzyki Górne, Berechy Górne, Smerek)” (Reinfuss 1939: 40). Falkowski and Reinfuss both agreed that although these groups were not “homogeneous organisms”, each of these “clearly crystallised groups” was characterised by a predominance of the shared features (supposedly, the Boykos were a more close-knit group). Nonetheless, Falkowski (1935, 1936a, 1937, 1938) selected different Boyko features on the borderland with the Eastern Lemko Land than he did on the Boyko-Huculi borderland; Reinfuss (1936a, 1936b, 1939, 1948–1949) used, for each borderland section of the Lemko Land, separate groups of features – “small differences” in clothing, construction, etc., and when these were insignificant, he pointed out linguistic and religious differences.

It is not the methods of ethnology, but the choice of particular elements as Boyko or Lemko features that led to disagreement between Falkowski and Reinfuss. They accused each other of superficiality in their ethnographic research and, therefore, inappropriate choice of criteria, which resulted in inappropriate descriptions of the border between the Lemkos and the Boykos. Falkowski’s criticism (1936a, 1936b, 1937) was more violent and aggressive: he accused Reinfuss, a beginner in ethnographic research, of being naive, careless, cheeky, ignorant about the subject matter, methods and objectives of ethnology (although “he has demonstrated some improvement in recent years”). Finally, however, the ethnographic border determined by Reinfuss (1948–1949) “after this short exchange of arguments with Falkowski was adopted even by the Reinfuss’s opponents”.

In fact, it is possible to determine ethnographic borders without any methodology, as admitted by Falkowski and Reinfuss in their erudite disputes: it is easy to arrive at true results only by following one’s common sense, distinguishing between Boyko and Lemko features with the naked eye. They agreed that differences in,

particularly, clothing and construction (this was not obvious to Lubicz, Czerwiński and Pol) are the most important ethnographic criteria. However, they disputed over which elements were important and which were secondary and unimportant. According to Falkowski, the Boykos stand out with their dark brown tight-long sleeveless jackets called *lejbik*'s, blue with red embroidery; Lemko women wear grey bodices and decorate their *lejbiks* with small brass buttons, embroidering their scarves, aprons and skirts with colourful ribbons. According to Reinfuss, Falkowski and Pasznycki failed to notice the most important features: the Boykos wear white outfits, while the Lemkos wear colourful clothes; the Boykos wear long shirts set in their trousers (in the summer), while the Lemkos wear short shirts fastened round the neck, set in their trousers, with small brass buttons being their new feature. Falkowski's response was this: since they can be found in the Lemkos and cannot be found in the Boykos, they are a Lemko feature. The Boykos' cottages are in the colour of natural wood or painted white, while the Lemkos paint theirs with red clay, according to Falkowski and Pasznycki. Reinfuss's response was this: the custom of painting cottages is found only in the districts of Sanok and Lesko; an important feature of Boyko cottages was their hipped roofs, while the roofs covering Lemko cottages were pitched roofs. For Reinfuss, the Boyko clothing and construction features were present in areas running up to the geographical areas of their land, i.e. Mount Wielki Dział. "Mount Wielki Dział was not the border between the Boykos and the Lemkos as far as construction was concerned," Falkowski claimed. They disagreed about yet other principal features of the Boykos and the Lemkos (e.g. Orthodox churches). They only agreed that the Lemkos wore waistcoats with red embroidery, which was a feature not found in the Boykos.

Given "the flagrant ethnographic details", the ethnographer's experience of fieldwork (in the time of his exchange of arguments with Falkowski, Reinfuss was a beginner in ethnography) covered with the knowledge and methodology of ethnology (Reinfuss became an authority on, in particular, the Lemkos as early as in the late 1930s and, as such, he worked with the Institute for German Work in the East (Institut für Deutsche Ostarbeit), they proposed different solutions to the problem of the border between the Lemkos and the Boykos.

The solutions proposed by Falkowski and Pasznycki were recognised by the Boyko Land Academic Society and its body called Boyko Land *Litopys* as "interesting methodologically" (Dobryanski, 1935), because they did not determine linear borders (this would only be done by an amateur, Falkowski wrote to Reinfuss), but they determined a transitional strip between the Ośława River and the River San – an area where the mutual influences of the Boyko and Lemko features crossed (based on the same cultural and linguistic grounds). They supported the results of research into ethnographic ranges with the results of their own linguistic research (they found that the influence of the Lemko language was found not farther than the River Wołosaty) and of Zilynsky's research (1914, 1938) as well as Khnyazinsky's (1931) and J. Szemlej's (1934).

Reinfuss (1936a, b, c, 1939, 1948–1949) rejected these findings as being in conflict with the reality and with his own ethnographic observations. Based on ethnogeographical criteria, Reinfuss determined the eastern border at Mount Nowy Dział and the Chryszczata Mountain Range. He moved the northern border from the Nowosielce line to Sanok (as written by Falkowski and Pasznyi) to the south of Sieniawa, Sękowa, Bukowsko, Mokre, Czaszyn, Brzozowiec (thus separating the Dolyna people from Hyrniaki people “forever”). He pointed out two small transitional islands (near Żubracze and to the southeast of Bukowsko) separating the indigenous Lemkos from the Boykos. These, according to Reinfuss, were consistent with the findings of dialectologists: Zilynsky (1938), Szemlęj (1934) and Rabyeyovna (1935). They were allegedly confirmed by the bordered indicated by the Boykos and the Lemkos themselves.

In fact, based on common sense reinforced with ethnographic experience, covered with the knowledge and methods of ethnology, they constructed their ethnographic maps which were supposed to confirm selected findings in the work of linguists (linguists at the time disagreed as to the features of the dialects used by the Boykos or the Lemkos). Looking at the borders of the Eastern Lemko Land and the Eastern Boyko Land, as determined by Falkowski, Reinfuss and Stieber, Szemlęj, Rabyeyovna, Kałużniacki, Khnyazinsky and others, great differences between them can be seen.

Their determination of the borders is based not only on academic views, but also on the researchers' political opinions. It is important to be aware of the participation of the “great Boykos”: Wagilewicz's participation in the “Holy Trinity”. It is important to remember Franko's ethnological and sociopolitical activities (an ethnographic expedition to the Boyko Land, participated in by Vagilevich and by Volkov of Paris, Kuzelya of Vienna, Ryabkov of Russia, was supported by Shevtchenko Academic Society and by an Austrian ethnography society). It is also important to remember the academic and non-academic activities of Yuri Kmita, about Michail Zubritzky's, Volodimir Rabey's activity among the Boykos (Gorin 1996), and about the participation of Fischer, Falkowski, Reinfuss (and almost all leading ethnologists, historians, anthropologists, linguists, etc. in the work of the Eastern Land Research Committee). Falkowski and Pasznyi (1935) observed that Boyko regionalists had a tendency to expand the area of the Western Boyko Land at the expense of the Eastern Lemko Land. He himself, according to Józef Babicz (1966: 61) gave in to the political pressure of adherents of Piłsudski who wanted “to move the eastern border of the Lemko Land as far as possible towards the River San in order to provide the grounds for separating the largest possible area from the area influenced by Ukrainian political agitators and for including the area within the Greek Catholic apostolic administration created for the Lemko Land in Sanok” in 1934.

Equating ethnic groups with cultural circles (a key term in the language used by the cultural and historical school popular during the interwar period in Po-

land), treating these groups as representatives of the right type of culture, distinguishing between ethnographic areas on the basis of the existing differences in culture are all activities to be pursued by collectors, “objective” classifiers, with the final outcome being distorted “ethnographic” maps. Such an approach to the problem of determining borders between ethnic groups, an approach popular at the time, is wrong. One of such unfortunate examples is a book by Falkowski and Pasznycki, entitled *Na pograniczu lemkowski-bojkowskim* (On the Lemko-Boyko Borderland). This criticism was expressed by Józef Obrębski in his reviews, speeches and published work in the late 1930s (reprinted in 2005), arguing that divisions of ethnic groups and territories may not be based on data taken from different scientific systems. Ethnic groups and territories are not the result of locating people, artefacts and sociocultural content in space, but rather a product of social awareness. Therefore, the borders between them do not exist objectively, but rather they are imagined, expressed with a sense of what is native and what is foreign in relation to the neighbouring groups. An ethnic group is a product of imagination (a subjective product) and not a concrete (objective) one. Therefore, he divides large sociological units, such a people, into a number of local groups, casual groups (without any internal organisation) which always describe themselves – in relation to others, to their neighbours – using selected and socially important elements taken from their own cultural world: differences (according to stereotypical beliefs) in language, physiognomy and character, clothes, occupations, customs, etc.

This approach to the problem of ethnic groups and territories, an approach that, at the same time, serving as criticism against regionalistic research by the Lviv Ethnological Centre, was ignored by Falkowski (1936a) as inappropriate for ethnology. He argued that the approach was sociological, marked by subjectivism, and which, if used as the main criterion, would lead to bizarre results, which puts Obrębski’s work “in line with the revelations of various dilettantes” – “the question about which group the people studied are part of is a question asked by beginner ethnographers”. Falkowski’s method was defended by Fischer (1937): determining the Lemko-Boyko-Huculi borders “on the basis of objective criteria is the only appropriate approach, as taking differences into consideration is a good approach only in investigating nations, but not ethnic groups (exactly the same difference between “tribe” and “nation” was described by Pol), because the Lemkos, the Boykos and the Huculi people “store their cultures unconsciously, or even deny being part of their own culture)”.

The objectives and methods of the ethnology practised by Falkowski, Fischer or Moszyński belong to the history of the discipline. Reinfuss, who “skillfully selected detailed criteria” and took into consideration also linguistic awareness (a sense of what is native and what is foreign) in his ethnogeographical investigations, is considered as “more modern” than Falkowski (Babicz 1966; Olszański 1991). His work (particularly that on the Lemkos, from after the war) is an example to be

followed in group analysis (Czajkowski 1998). However, in the late 1930s, he remained faithful to the ideas expressed by Jan Stanisław Bystron (1925) and even close to the ideas expressed by Pol (Babicz 1966), who claimed that these groups should be determined on the basis of maps of cultural features, and if these objective criteria fail, one may use the group's self-descriptions or, alternatively, descriptions of the group by its neighbours. He only superficially included the ideas expressed by Obrębski. Reinfuss knew Obrębski's work on the ethnic problems of Polesie and used it, to an increasingly large extent, in his own work published after the war. At that time, Reinfuss was the closest to Kazimierz Dobrowolski's integral method. Dobrowolski was the supervisor of Reinfuss's PhD thesis entitled "The Lemkos as an ethnographic group" (in 1946, Reinfuss, 1948–1949). Reinfuss considered the method as a way to reconcile the methods of ethnography (producing maps of ranges of cultural features) and sociology (the "native-foreign" criterion) with those of anthropology and history, while Obrębski discounted the possibility of determining ethnic groups using, at the same time, the ethnosociological method and the methods of ethnogeography and history. Reinfuss first determined the Lemko-Boyko borders according to the criteria of ethnography, dialectology and anthropogeography; for the objective differences between the Lemkos and Boykos, he found confirmation in the subjective sense of what is native and what is foreign: the inhabitants of the areas to the west of Mount Wielki Dział contemptuously refer to their eastern neighbours as "*Luch's*", considering them as mentally and culturally inferior; those living in the areas of Baligród laugh at those *Zadilan's*. (Reinfuss 1938).

Ethnology and cultural anthropology were influenced by Obrębski's propositions, such as those much later formulated by Fredrik Barth and his colleagues (1969). It is based on the opinions expressed by contemporary ethnology and cultural anthropology that I argue here that "the Boykos in the Boyko Land" never existed realistically, but they are rather an imaginary product of the old ethnography. To make the above even more convincing, it is enough to focus one's attention on marginal and auxiliary remarks – made by Pol, Wagilewicz, Kopernicki, Franko, Falkowski or Reinfuss – about internal ethnographic differences of the alleged Boykos, on the "initial questions" that a beginner ethnographer asks about their proper names.

Falkowski and Reinfuss, as well as many other researchers before them and after them, emphasised that the problem of ethnographic borders was a difficult issue and always a contentious one, that it is difficult to select precise and unquestionable criteria for determining the Lemko-Boyko border because the area between the River San and the River Łomnica is not homogeneous geographically, dialectologically, in terms of settlement, and ethnographically (as is the Lemko Land and the Huculi Land); the Sanok land alone is an ethnographic and linguistic mosaic. For these reasons, the Boyko Land (as well as the Lemko Land) can be divided into a western part and an eastern part (Falkowski, Pasznycki 1935), or into a western

part (from the Lemko border to the Wołosaty River and the River San), a middle part (from the springs of the River San, the upper reaches of the River Stryj and the River Opór) and an eastern part (the valleys of the rivers and streams from Sukiel and Mizunka to the Bystritsa Solotvinska River). Further divisions are also possible, but these would make the overall picture of the internal differences of the Boyko Land complicated (Reinfuss 1939). It may seem and be believed that there are as many different groups of Boykos as there are settlements in the channels of the Carpathian rivers (Franko 1982) or it may even be noted that the neighbouring villages (not necessarily divided by forested mountains), or even one village, are characterised by differences in physiognomies, characters, clothes, cottages and homesteads, Orthodox churches and occupations (Żuliński 1877).

Contrary to the ideas expressed by experts on the Boykos, I am of the opinion that what they investigated from the early 19th century to the mid-20th century, or even until today on the Ukrainian side, was less a large ethnic group, i.e. the Boykos, than several local communities – ethnogeographic groups, which differed according to the “native-foreign criterion”, as Reinfuss once had to admit about the Lemkos (1948–1949, 1990). Boykos’ neighbours referred to the inhabitants of Cisna, Dołżyca, Liszna and Krywe as “Lemkos”. On the right side of the River Ośława, Reinfuss distinguished between 8 mixed Lemko-Boyko villages that were referred to as Lemko villages by their eastern neighbours. In the valley of the Ośława River, from the Hoczewka River, only the village leaders and teachers referred to the locals as the Lemkos, and the others referred to them as the Boykos. According to many of the people inhabiting the valley, the “Lemkos” live somewhere far in the east, while the people of the village of Vorokhta referred to the Boykos arriving there from near Sambor as “Lemkos”. The peasants of Koroliwszczyna, i.e. in the former royal villages in the basin of the upper reaches of the Ośława River and the Ośławica River and in the upper reaches of the valley of the Wisłok River, opposed their neighbours, i.e. the Lemkos, the Boykos and the Dolyna people, whom they were highly contemptuous of. They claimed to be highly different from them in terms of language, clothes, construction, occupations, customs, etc. The Dolyna people and the Boykos met with aversion and hostility in the markets in Sanok, Lesko or Baligród. The Dolyna people from near Sanok, Lesko and Ustrzyki Dolne opposed the Hyrniak people of Czaszyn, Baligród, Solina, Czarna, Strubowisko, Jaworcie, Lutowiska, Smerek and Wetlina (these people were divided by Reinfuss into Lemkos and Boykos). The name Hyrniaky was used to describe the people living in Cisna, Ustrzyki Górne, Komańcza (as well as the people living near Stryj). The people of Dołżyca and Cisna did not describe themselves as the Hyrniak people, as they used this name to refer to the people of Strobuwiska, Jaworcie, Smerek and Wetlina. The latter described themselves as the Wierchowynski people, as was the case in the valleys of the Tuchla River and the Tuchołka River, on the slopes of Sambor (Falkowski, Pasznycki 1935, Falkowski 1936a, 1937, Fischer 1936, Reinfuss 1936a, 1936c, 1938, 1939, 1948–1949).

It is known that the names “Boyko”, “Boykos” and “Boyko Land” (as well as “Lemkos”, “Lemko Land”, and – previously – “Huculi” and “Huculi Land”) were, for a large part of the 19th century, not used to refer to a particular ethnic group or to ethnogeographic groups settled between the River San and the River Łomnica (“Boyko” and words derived from this were used as rude names and surnames not only in the northeast Carpathian Mountains, but also far beyond Ukraine – Lukan 1934a and 1934b). For the people inhabiting lowlands and foothills, with a sense of cultural superiority, the name “Boyko” meant a person from the mountains, a wild herdsman, but it was also used to refer to “people from near Lviv” and, generally, to a person as dull and indolent as a “Boyko” – an ox (“they love oxen, just like the Huculi people love horses”), rude in language, clothes, occupation, customs – a person who “has never seen the world” (Khnyazinsky 1931, Skorik 1931, Rudnicki 1935, Kolberg 1976, Hudasz 1983, Olszański 1993). The offensive meaning of this word, of the “You, Boyko” expression, was well known on the borderlands described by Falkowski or Reinfuss, where – when used – it triggered feelings of shame, humiliation, offence and violent reactions – from an argument to a fight. In the village of Smerek, near Wetlina Mountain Pasture, the name “Boykos” were contemptuously used to refer to all those living somewhere there near Łupkowska Mountain Pass; the “you stupid Boyko” was used in arguments and fights among the people of the village (Czajkowski 2006). “During the research, in the interwar period, the researchers, moving from the north to the south, were told by the people of the different villages, that the Boykos lived right next to this or that village (mainly towards the “Hungarian” border), but not there yet, and only near the main mountain of the Carpathian Mountains, the informer – with his back to the wall – would admit: “it’s us, the stupid Boykos” (Atlas gwar bojkowskich (Atlas of Boyko dialects), 1991: 33).

The old deprecating words popular in the northeast Carpathian Mountains and used to refer to strangers, such as “Boyko” or “Lemko”, meaning someone who “lemks” (or speaks poor Russian) (“not our language”), were freed from these meanings by educated people engaged in science, literature or politics, in order to use the words to refer to the right groups and their territories. At the time when the inhabitants of the Bieszczady Mountains did not know the rude meaning of the word “Boyko”, not to talk of its ethnographic meaning, “the great Boyko” – Franko (1982) treated this new meaning, i.e. Boyko Land, symbolically. In the late 1930s, Falkowski or Reinfuss heard declarations such as “I am a Boyko” or “We are Boykos”. This, however, was the result of – as in Jasień (a village lived by Huculi people, but – according to Falkowski – strongly influenced by the Boykos) – agitation by Vagilevich and Józef Schneider (whose ethnographic research was remembered in those areas for a long time) (Falkowski 1937). In the district of Sambork and the Turka district, thanks to the activity of the Boyko Land Academic Society (founded in 1929) and its body called Boyko Land *Litopys* (where Falkowski and Father Kmit, among others, published their work and who also together gathered ethnographic materials in

Wołosate in 1934 – Falkowski 1934, Kmit 1935), thanks to the Boyko Land Museum in Sambor (founded in 1934) and to the regional, ethnological and sociopolitical activity of Greek-Catholic priests and local educated people (some of them published their work in Boyko Land *Litopys*: "Materials for Ukrainian-Russian Ethnology" or "Ethnographic Resource", and established, for example, youth football teams called "Boyko", etc). (Lyuznak 1996, Gorin 1996).

It can be expected that contemporary Ukrainian regionalists will eventually popularise "the Boykos in the Boyko Land" by establishing new academic societies with the "Boyko Land" words as part of their names (in Drohobycz), journals (in Turka, Dobromyśl, etc.) with their titles such as "Boyko News", "Boyko Thought" or "Boykos", and by organising Boyko culture and folklore festivals (as in Turka) etc. Meanwhile, the Boykos as an ethnic group and the Boyko Land as a historical and cultural territory are still not popular, except with small groups of Ukrainian educated people. To see this for oneself, it is enough to visit a village – where I have carried out ethnographic research in recent years – near Stryj, Skol or Turka, to as far as Korczyno, Kruszelnica, Komorniki, Matkowa or Libuchora. "During my stay in Libuchora, I visited the village twice in 2006 and 2008. I never heard anyone calling themselves "Boyko". What is more, this name is very often totally unknown to the inhabitants of the region – it is known only to the local educated elite". (Koziura 2009: 5).

For ethnographers, the Boykos never became an ethnic group, as they lived in areas where ethnographic, ethnic, religious and linguistic relations were among the most complicated and dynamic relations in Europe until the mid-20th century – it was impossible to determine cultural borders because these would divide even families (Krysiński 1936, Hryciuk 2003a and 2003b). Last century, they fairly easily and quickly gave in to Ukrainian nationalism, thus moving "the locals" straight to a sense of Ukrainian nationality. Many of the experts on the Boykos participated in promoting that nationalism. They always treated "the Boyko tribe as a component of the large Ukrainian nation" (Dantchin 2005 – the Boyko Land Museum in Sambork has for a dozen or so years housed an exhibition dedicated to the great Boykos – the Ukrainians of UPA, OUN, UGWR, Zakerzonnia, ZUNR). The western Ruthenians came to be called Lemkos. At the very beginning, the name "Lemkos" had a political meaning, not an ethnographic one. It was associated with Old-Ruthenians, muscophils, who opposed Ukrainian influence (Reinfuss 1948–1949, 1990; see: *Lemkowie...* 1997).

The Boykos were and are mainly characters from books. The reason was perhaps the fact that regionalism turned out, in this case, to be weaker than nationalism, and ethnographic turned out to be weaker than politics. The fiction described (of the world presented) by the experts on the Boykos should not be confused with the real world in order to avoid mythologising, or – in other words – not to equate signs with things, as Prospero (in Shakespeare's *Storm*) did, for whom the world of books was the only real world.

Literature

Atlas gwar bojkowskich,

1991 written under the supervision J. Rieger, Vol. 7. Part 2, Wrocław.

Babicz J.,

1966 *Wstęp (Uwagi nad materiałami do etnografii północnych stoków Karpat Wincen-tego Pola)* [in:] Pol W., *Materiały do etnografii północnych stoków Karpat*, Wrocław, s. 5–79.

Barth F. (ed.),

1969 *Ethnic groups and boundaries*, Oslo.

Bielowski A.,

1857 *Pokucie*, Kraków.

Bilous W.,

2000 *Etnograficzni doslidzennja na zachidnoukrajniskich zemljach w tretij czwerti XIX st.*, Lviv.

Bołtarowicz Z.E. [Boltarovich],

1976 *Ukrajina w doslizennjach polskych etnografii XIX st.*, Kiev.

Bystroń J.St.,

1925 *Ugrupowania etniczne ludu polskiego*, Kraków.

Czajkowski J.,

1993 *Historyczne zasiedlenie zachodniej Bojkowszczyzny*, „Płaj”, Issue 6, s. 12–24.

1998 *Od Wydawcy* [in:] Reinfuss R., *Łemkowie jako grupa etnograficzna*, Sanok, s. 96.

2006 *Historyczne, osadnicze i etniczne warunki kształtowania się kultur po północnej stronie Karpat*, „Zeszyty Sądecko-Spiskie”, Vol. 1, s. 18–49.

Czekanowski J.,

1939 *Struktura antropologiczna Polski południowo-wschodniej*, Lviv.

1948 *Zarys historii antropologii polskiej*, Kraków.

Danczin R.,

2005 *Naukowo-wydawnicza dijalnist' Towarystwa „Bojkiwszczyna” u Sambori (1928–1939 rr.)*, „Litopys Bojkiwszczyny”, G. I, Part 1, s. 4–23.

Dąbkowski P.,

1936 *Szlachta zaściankowa w Korczynie i Kruszelnicy nad Stryjem*, Lviv.

Djaczenco W.D. [Dyachenko],

1983 *Antropologiczna charakterystyka* [in:] *Bojkiwszczyna. Istoryko-etnograficzne doslidzennja*, red. J. Hoszko, Kiev, s. 37–38.

Dobrzański K. [Dobryanski],

1935 (recenzja) *J. Falkowski, B. Pasznyi, Na pograniczu łemkowsko-bojkowskiem*, „Litopys Bojkiwszczyny”, G. V, Part 6, s. 31–32.

Falkowski J.,

1934 *Selo Wołosate Liskoho powitu*, „Litopys Bojkiwszczyny”, G. IV, Part 5, s. 14–28.

1936a *Jeszcze o granicy łemkowsko-bojkowskiej*, *Dodatek Literacko-Naukowy*, „Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny”, Issue 10 (9 III), s. 10–11.

1936b *Ze wschodniego pogranicza Huculszczyzny*, Lviv.

1937 *Zachodnie pogranicze Huculszczyzny*, Lviv.

1938 *Północno-wschodnie pogranicze Huculszczyzny*, Lviv.

- Falkowski J., Pasznyi B.,
1935 *Na pograniczu lemkowski-bojkowskim*, Lviv.
- Fischer A.,
1936 *Na granicy lemkowski-bojkowskiej*, „Dodatek Literacko-Naukowy”, „Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny”, Issue X (17 I), s. 10.
1937 *Przedmowa* [in:] Falkowski J., *Zachodnie pogranicze Huculszczyzny*, Lviv.
1939 *Polska południowo-wschodnia*, Lviv.
- Franko I.,
1982 *Etnograficzna ekspedycja na Bojkowszczyźnie*, „Żowten” 8 (s. 113–118), 9 (s. 137–143).
- Hałas B.,
2004 *Bojkowska narodna leksyka w zapyskach W. Dawydjaka* [in:] *Bojkowszczyzna. Naukowy zbirnyk. T. 2. Materiały naukowoji konferenciji „Bojkowszczyzna: wira, kul’tura, cywilizacija”, pryswjaczenoji 75-riczczja towarystwa „Bojkowszczyzna”, Drohobycz-Truskawec’ 28–29 weresnia 2002 roku*, red. L. Sikorśkyj, Drohobycz–Truskawec’, s. 237–243.
- Hnatjuk M.,
1996 *Iwan Franko w literaturo-memuarnij spadszczyni Iwana Fylypczaka* [in:] *Bojkowszczyzna. Istorija ta suczasnist*, red. B. Czajkowski, R. Syłecy, W. Iwanowski, Lviv, s. 51–52.
- Horin G.,
1996 *Rol silskogo duchowenstwa w kulturii Bojkowszczyni* [in:] *Bojkowszczyzna. Istorija ta suczasnist*, red. B. Czajkowski, R. Syłecy, W. Iwanowski, Lviv, s. 52–53.
- Hoszko J.H. [Goszko],
1983 *Etnohraficzni mezi* [in:] *Bojkowszczyzna. Istoryko-etnograficzne doslidzennja*, red. J. Hoszko, Kiev., s. 25–28.
- Hryciuk G.,
2003a *Zmiany ludnościowe i narodowościowe w Galicji Wschodniej w latach 1931–1939* [in:] *Przemiany narodowościowe na Kresach Wschodnich II Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1931–1948*, red. S. Ciesielski, Toruń, s. 93–126.
2003b *Zmiany ludnościowe i narodowościowe w Galicji Wschodniej w latach 1939–1948* [in:] *Przemiany narodowościowe na Kresach Wschodnich II Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1931–1948*, red. S. Ciesielski, Toruń, s. 149–240.
- Hudasz M.L.,
1983 *Problema pochodzennja nazwy „bojky”* [in:] *Bojkowszczyzna. Istoryko-etnograficzne doslidzennja*, red. J. Hoszko, Kiev, s. 44–47.
- Hurkiewicz W.,
1931 *Perednie slowo*, „Litopys Bojkowszczyzny”, G. I, Part 1, s. 27–31.
- Huzar Z.,
2004 *Iwan Franko i pytannja krajeznawstwa ta turystyki*, *Bojkowszczyzna* [in:] *Naukowy zbirnyk. T. 2. Materiały naukowoji konferenciji „Bojkowszczyzna: wira, kul’tura, cywilizacija”, pryswjaczenoji 75-riczczja towarystwa „Bojkowszczyzna”, Drohobycz-Truskawec’ 28–29 weresnia 2002 roku*, red. L. Sikorśkyj, Drohobycz–Truskawec’, s. 201–202.
- Kyrcziw R.,
1983 *Fyzyko-heohraficzna charakterystyka* [in:] *Bojkowszczyzna. Istoryko-etnograficzne doslidzennja*, red. J. Hoszko, Kiev, s. 29–32.

- Klimek S.,
1932 *Terytoria antropologiczne*, Lviv.
1939 *Rasa w zjawiskach społecznych*, Lviv.
- Kmit J.,
1935 *Szcze pro Wołosatij*, „Litopys Bojkiwsczyny”, G. 5, Part 6, s. 1–9.
- Kniażynskij A. [Khnyazynskij],
1931 *Meži Bojkiwsczyny*, „Litopys Bojkiwsczyny”, G. I, Part 1, s. 47–59.
1933 *Z bojkivsko-łemkiwśkoho pohraniczczja*, „Litopys Bojkiwsczyny”, G. IV, Part 3, s. 1–11.
- Kolberg O.,
1976 *Dzieła wszystkie*, Vol. 56: Ruś Czerwona, Part 1, Poznań.
- Kopernicki I.,
1889 *O góralach ruskich w Galicji*, „Zbiór Wiadomości do Antropologii Krajowej”, T. XII, s. 1–34.
1890 *Charakterystyka fizyczna górali ukraińskich*, „Zbiór Wiadomości do Antropologii Krajowej”, T. XIII, s. 1–54.
- Koziura K.,
2009 *Opowieści z wnętrza karpackiej wioski... Słów kilka o regionie etnograficznym Bojkowszczyzny*, „Siwerniak. Biuletyn Informacyjny SKPB Lublin”, Issue 39, s. 2–5.
- Krysiński W.,
1936 *Rozwój stosunków etnicznych na Rusi Czerwonej w Polsce Odrodzonej*, Warsaw.
- Kuczera A.,
1935–1937 *Samborszczyzna*, vol. 1–2, Sambir.
- Kutelmach K.,
1996 *Prasłowjanski relikt w kalendarnich obrzędach bojków, łemków, huculów* [in:] *Bojkowszczyzna. Istorija ta suczasnist*, red. B. Czajkowski, R. Syłecki, W. Iwanowski, Lviv, s. 31–32.
- Leszczycki S.,
1935 *Zarys antropogeograficzny Łemkowszczyzny*, Cracow.
- Libera Z.,
1995 *Lud ludoznawców: kilka rysów do opisanja fizjognomii i postaci ludu naszego, czyli etnograficzna wędrówka po XIX wieku* [in:] *Etnologia polska między ludoznawstwem a antropologią: materiały z konferencji, Poznań 26–27 maja 1994 r. (zorganizowanej przez Komitet Nauk Etnologicznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk i Instytut Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza)*, red. A. Posern-Zieliński, Poznań 1995, s. 137–152.
- Liuzniak M. [Lyuznak],
1996 *Popularyzacja historyko-kulturowej spuścizny periodycznym wydawnictwem Bojkowszczyzny* [in:] *Bojkowszczyzna. Istorija ta suczasnist*, red. B. Czajkowski, R. Syłecki, W. Iwanowski, Lviv, s. 48–50.
- Lubicz Czerwiński I.,
1811 *Okolica Zadniestrzańska między Stryjem a Łomnicą*, Lviv.
Łemkowie i łemkoznawstwo w Polsce,
1997, red. A. Zięba, Cracow.

- Lukan R.,
1934 *Prizwyszczca i nazwy Bojnewych, Bojki, Bojkiw, Bojkiwci, Bojko etc.*, „Litopys Bojkowszczyzny”, G. IV, Part 4, s. 12–20.
1935 *Bojkiwsky prizwyszczca i nazwy*, „Litopys Bojkiwsczyzny”, R. V, Part 5, s. 32–35.
- Majer J., Kopernicki I.,
1890 *Charakterystyka fizyczna ludności galicyjskiej*, „Zbiór Wiadomości do Antropologii Krajowej”, Vol. XIII, s. 3–181.
- Moszyński K.,
1937 *Niektóre przyczyny zróżnicowania kultury ludowej w Polsce*, „Lud Słowiański”, Vol. IV, Sheet 1, s. 65–117.
- Obrębski J.,
2005 *Dzisiejsi ludzie Polesia i inne eseje*, oprac. A. Engelking, Warsaw.
- Olszański T.A.,
1991 *Nota od wydawcy* (to be reprinted) J. Falkowski, B. Pasznyi, *Na pograniczu łemkowsko-bojkowskim*, Warsaw, s. 129–130.
1993 *O nazwie Bojków*, „Płaj”, Issue 6, s. 5–11.
- Ossadnik H., Radwański A.,
2008 *Obszar badawczy Muzeum Budownictwa Ludowego w Sanoku (Bojkowie, Dolinianie, terytoria przejściowe, zmiany nazw)*, Part 1, „Materiały Muzeum Budownictwa Ludowego w Sanoku”, Issue 37, Sanok, s. 347–370.
- Ossendowski F.A.,
2007 *Karpaty i Podkarpacie* (reprinted edition), Rzeszów.
- Pol W.,
1851 *Rzut oka na północne stoki Karpat*, Cracow.
1875–1878 *Dzieła*. Vol. I–X, Lviv.
1966 *Prace z etnografii północnych stoków Karpat*, published, introduction and commentary by J. Babicz, Wrocław.
- Pulnarowicz W.,
1929 *U źródeł Sanu, Stryja i Dniestru (historia powiatu turczańskiego)*, Turka.
- Rabiejówna Z. [Rabyeyovna],
1932 *Dialekt Bojków*, „Sprawozdania z czynności i posiedzeń Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności”, vol. 37, 6, s. 15–29.
- Reinfuss R.,
1936a *W sprawie granicy łemkowsko-bojkowskiej*, „Dodatek Literacko-Naukowy”, „Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny”, Issue 7 (17 III), s. 14–15.
1936b *Wschodnia granica łemkowszczyzny*, „Dodatek Literacko-Naukowy”, „Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny”, Issue 28 (13 VI), s. 9–10.
1936c *Doły Sanockie. Lud ruski z okolic Sanoka*, „Dodatek Literacko-Naukowy”, „Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny”, No. 111 (12 X), s. 7–8.
1936d *Łemkowie (opis etnograficzny)*, Cracow (reproduced from „Wierchy”, R. XIV, 1936).
1936e *Etnograficzne granice łemkowszczyzny*, Cracow (reproduced from „Ziemia”, Issue 10–11, 1936).
1938 *Problem wschodniego zasięgu etnograficznego łemkowszczyzny*, Warsaw.
1939 *Ze studiów nad kulturą materialną Bojków*, Warsaw.

- 1948–1949 *Łemkowie jako grupa etnograficzna*, „Prace i Materiały Etnograficzne”, Vol. 7, s. 77–210.
- 1990 *Śladami Łemków*, Warsaw.
- Rudnyćkyj J. [Rudnicki],
1935 *Do bojkiwsko-nadnistrjanskoji mownoji mezi*, „Litopys Bojkiwszczyny”, G. V, Part 1, s. 9–14.
- Skoryk M. [Skorik],
1931 *Pro nazwu „Bojki”*, „Litopys Bojkiwszczyny”, G. I, Part 1, s. 32–46.
- Słownik Geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*,
1881, vol. 1, Warsaw.
- Szemlej J.,
1934 *Z badań nad gwarą łemkowską*, „Lud Słowiański”, R. III, Sheet 2, s. 169–178.
- Talko-Hryncewicz J.,
1913 *Człowiek na ziemiach naszych*, Cracow.
- Telwak W.,
1996 *M.S. Hruszewskij pro pochoždennja Bojkiw [in:] Bojkiwszczyna. Istorija ta suczasnist*, red. B. Czajkowski, R. Syłećkyj, W. Iwanowskyj, Lviv, s. 63–64.
- Wołkow (Wowk) F. [Volkov],
1908 *Antropometriczni doslidy ukrajinskoho naseleennja Halyczyny, Bukowyny i Uhorszczyny*, „Materiały do ukraińskiej-ruskiej etnologiji”, Vol. X, s. 5–37.
- Węglarz S.,
1997 *Tutejsi i inni*, Łódź.
- Ziłyński J.,
1914 *Proba uporiadkoannja ukainskich howoriw*, „Zapysky Naukowoho Towarystwa im. Szewczenka”, Vol. 117–118, Lviv.
- 1937 *Pytannia pro łemkiwsko-bojkiwsku mownu hranycju*, „Lud Słowiański”, vol. IV, Sheet 1, s. A. 75–110.
- 1938 *Hranyci bojkiwskoho howoru*, „Litopys Bojkiwszczyny”, G. VIII, Part 10, s. 75–87.
- Żuliński T.,
1877 *Kilka słów do etnografii Tucholców i mieszkańców wsi wołoskich w Ziemi sanockiej na pogórzcu Karpackim*, „Zbiór Wiadomości do Antropologii Krajowej”, Vol. I, s. 108–112.