

The language behavior of Galician Russophiles during the interwar period

Языковое поведение галицких русофилов в межвоенный период

Michael Moser

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Abstract By the end of the First World War, the once powerful Russophile movement had almost completely disappeared from the intellectual sphere of Galicia. During the interwar period, Russophiles gradually reorganized their activities. As they did not reach a broader audience they developed several new strategies. One particularly intriguing strategy was a reshaped use of the language that in their view ‘did not, does not and cannot exist’ at all: the Ukrainian language. The major innovation compared to Russophile Ukrainian-language publications of the prewar period was the introduction of the ‘phonetic orthography’ that the Russophiles had traditionally rejected with utmost unanimity. The Russophiles argued that a ‘phonetic’ spelling was precisely what was appropriate for a ‘non-existent’ language. The Russophiles’ language behavior thus exceeded all limits of absurdity.

Аннотация До конца первой мировой войны русофильское движение, которое было довольно сильное во второй половине XIX столетия, почти полностью исчезло из интеллектуальной сферы Галичины. В межвоенный период русофилы восстановили свою деятельность. Поскольку они еще не убедили широкие массы, они развили несколько новых стратегий. Одна из наиболее интересных стратегий состояла в новом употреблении того языка, которого по мнению русофилов ‘не было, нет и не может быть’: украинского языка. Русофилы уже писали и говорили по-украински раньше. Важным инновационным элементом межвоенного периода было введение ‘фонетической правописи’, которую русофилы традиционно отклоняли с особым единогласием. Согласно русофилам, именно ‘фонетическая’ правопись соответствовала ‘несуществующему’ языку. Итак, языковое поведение русофилов переступило все пределы абсурда.

M. Moser (✉)
University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria
e-mail: michael.moser@univie.ac.at

M. Moser
Pázmány Catholic University, Budapest, Hungary

1 Historical background: Galician Russophiles on the eve and in the aftermath of WW I

Since the wave of 19th-century national movements reached the territories of Ukraine, two major national and linguistic identity models have been competing: 1. a Ukrainian model according to which ‘Little Russians or Ruthenians’ or, as they increasingly called themselves, ‘Ukrainians’ were a distinct Slavic people (along with Russians, Belarusians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, Bulgarians, etc.) who spoke a separate ‘Little Russian or Ruthenian’ (*малоруський* or *руський*) or Ukrainian language that was to be developed into a modern standard language as was the case for all other Slavic languages; and, 2. an ‘all-Russian’ (*всеруський*) model according to which ‘Little Russians or Ruthenians’ were part of ‘one single Russian people’ (*єдиний руський народъ*), which consisted of ‘Great Russians’, ‘Little Russians’ and ‘Belorussians’ and whose common language was ‘one single Russian literary language’ (*єдиний руський літературний языкъ*), which included ‘Great Russian’, ‘Little Russian’, and ‘Belorussian’ dialects.¹

Since the Modern Russian standard language was developed (since Peter I’s rule), it has gradually been disseminated among the societal elites of Russian-ruled Ukraine too (Moser 2009, 2011a, pp. 280–302). When Ukrainians began elaborating a full-fledged Ukrainian standard language in the mid-19th century the Russian imperial authorities severely oppressed that movement, as exemplified by the Ukrainian language bans of 1863 (Valuev Directive or Valuev Circular) and 1876 (Ems Ukaz) (Moser 2011c). Owing to a number of factors, particularly the weak development of the educational system in the Russian Empire, the overwhelming majority of Ukrainian speakers was however not russified during the ‘long 19th century’, so that after the dismissal of the language bans and particularly after the First World War, there was still room for the development and dissemination of the Modern Ukrainian standard language.²

Outside the Russian Empire, those intellectuals who nurtured ‘all-Russianist’ or ‘Russophile’ ideas³ faced a number of essential problems, including serious linguistic difficulties: First and foremost, these individuals usually did not know Russian well themselves, because they were not trained in that language. Secondly, even if some of them succeeded in acquiring a certain command of that foreign language that they wished to regard as their native one, the simple problem remained that their broader audience, the ‘Ruthenians’ or Ukrainians of the Habsburg Empire, simply did not understand them. Consequently, the Russophiles developed several more or less paradoxical strategies:

¹ As late as the interwar period, merely ethnonymic and glottonymic oversimplified arguments had not lost their importance for the propaganda of Galician Russophiles. The arguments of their most important leader Vasyly Vavryk still followed the traditional stereotypes: “Исходя съ научной точки зрѣнія, раздѣленіе Галицкой Руси на русскихъ и украинцевъ граничить съ абсурдомъ, такъ какъ народная масса, отъ незапамятныхъ временъ до нынѣшнихъ дней, называетъ себя русской. [...] Наоборотъ, украинскимъ галицкое население никогда, рѣшительно никогда, себя не называло, а „русинскимъ” тѣмъ паче” (Vavryk 1930, p. 3) / ‘From a scholarly point of view, the division of Galician Rus’ into Russians and Ukrainians is close to absurd, as the popular mass, from unmemorable times to date, has called itself Russian. [...] By contrast, the population of Galicia has never, expressly never ever, called itself Ukrainian, or ‘Rusyn’ even less so.’ Although Paul Robert Magocsi suggests that there is a need for further differentiation between Old Ruthenians and Russophiles (Magocsi 2002), one does not necessarily have to agree with his framework (Moser 2012, pp. 154–155).

² In this regard, I agree with Aleksej Miller (Miller 2003). In fact, Miller’s most important theses were already formulated in the 19th century by the Ukrainian Myxajlo Drahomanov.

³ On the history of Galician Russophiles see the excellent monograph Wendland (2002); as for some linguistic aspects that are of interest regarding this book, see Moser (2004).

Firstly, the Russophiles reshaped diglossic models of the past in that they juxtaposed a ‘Russian literary high variety’ (which replaced Church Slavonic in that role) with vernacular ‘low varieties’, which were to be used while communicating with ‘commoners’ (Moser 2012). The fact that the Russophiles themselves consequently used vernacular Ukrainian while addressing the ‘commoners’ occasionally led to ironic consequences. E.g., the Podolian Hryhorij Kostjuk reported in his autobiography that after the First World War, his teacher, a Ukrainian national activist, gave him two books:

Одна, невеличка, зветься “Синя книжечка”, а вгорі стоїть—Стефаник. Друга— більша і з малюнками. З малюнків бачу, що тут мова про пасічництво, садивництво, городництво. На обкладинці: видання о. Наумовича. Обидві, бачу, нашою мовою.

‘One of them, a small one, is called ‘The Little Blue Book’, and on top one reads ‘Stefanyk’. The other is larger with illustrations. From the illustrations I see that it deals with beekeeping, gardening, and horticulture. On the cover: an edition by Rev. Naumovyč. Both of them, as I see, are written in our language.’

(Kostjuk 1987, p. 18)

The two books gave young Hryhorij a convincing proof that Ukrainian could effectively be used in writing. This impressed him to such an extent that he soon became a Ukrainian activist. Neither he nor others cared that the larger of the two books was actually written by the most important intellectual leader of the Galician Russophiles, who in fact denied the very existence of a separate Ukrainian language. Nor was it important that Naumovyč consciously wrote in Galician dialectal Ukrainian and rejected the emerging Modern Ukrainian standard language with its predominantly non-Galician rules; for Hryhorij Kostjuk and others, Naumovyč’s regional Ukrainian was ‘Ukrainian’ enough.

Secondly, the ‘Russian’ high variety that the Russophiles actively used was usually not identical to standard Russian for several reasons. Firstly, again, most Russophiles did not have a good command of Russian (as particularly witnessed, e.g., by their letters to Russians or radical fellow Russophiles, where they often tried to write in correct Russian) (Moser 2011a, pp. 602–626, 2012). Secondly, some of the Russophiles even consciously used various ‘South Russian’ idioms that resembled standard Russian to various degrees despite the fact that they acknowledged the existence of ‘one Russian literary language’. They did so not only because they knew that genuine Russian was not comprehensible to their addressees, but also because they were not allowed to use genuine Russian in public, as Russian was, for understandable reasons, not acknowledged as an official language in the Habsburg Empire (in the Habsburg Monarchy, there was only a tiny Russian minority of Old Believers in the Bukovyna).

During the first decades after the Revolution of 1848, after the disappointments of the first Ukrainian ‘awakening’ that had set in in the ‘Vormärz’ period (see Moser 2011a, pp. 303–317), the Russophiles temporarily developed into a quite attractive societal force in Galicia, although they usually did not use standard Russian, only various idioms that often came quite close to it (‘Russo-Ruthenian’, see *ibid.*, pp. 602–626). After the Galician renaissance of the Ukrainian populist movement in the early 1860s, however, the Russophiles suffered several major defeats in a row: At the turn of the 1870s, the Galician Ukrainian ‘populists’ gained control over the schools in Galicia (Moser 2007, pp. 15–16). In 1882, after the inhabitants of the Galician village Hnilyčky declared their intention to adopt the Orthodox instead of the Greek Catholic faith, the Austrian authorities initiated a major trial against leading Galician Russophile activists, who were suspected of spying for the Russian Empire; although the defendants were generally not found guilty and imprisoned for only a few months for ‘causing

unrest' the trial and the anti-Russophile atmosphere of its aftermath significantly weakened the Russophile movement in Galicia (Moser 2012, pp. 165–169).

In 1893/1894, the so-called 'phonetic alphabet' was introduced both in the schools in Galicia and in the Ukrainian-language spheres of the administration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Moser 2011a, pp. 667–683). Regardless whether this language was called 'Ruthenian' or 'Ukrainian', it underscored at first sight that precisely Ukrainian and not any variant of the Russian language was in official use in the Habsburg Monarchy. The 'phonetic' orthography was precisely what the Russophiles detested and they shared their contempt for it with Russian imperial authorities, who had expressly banned the use of the 'Kulišivka' in the Ems Ukaz of 1876.

By the eve of the First World War, the Ukrainian movement had thus clearly overcome the Russophile one. In 1914, the Russophile 'Kačkovskij Society' "had 300 reading rooms, and the Ukrainophile Prosvita society had 2,944; the Russophile Ruthenian Audit Union oversaw 106 co-operatives, and the Audit Union of Ukrainian Co-operatives, 909. In the elections to the Galician provincial diet of 1913, 1 Russophile and 30 Ukrainophiles were elected" (Ripetsky and Sereda 2001[1993]).

As a reaction, leading Polish and Russian political players began collaborating against the Ukrainian movement at a Slavic Congress in Prague in 1908. This arrangement was even more surprising as in the previous decades, the Poles had constantly attacked the Ukrainians precisely for their allegedly notorious Russophilia (Moskvofil'stvo 2001, p. 52; Moser 2011b), and the Russians had constantly suspected the Ukrainians of their alleged collaboration with the Poles. The puzzling agreement was nonetheless only a prelude to the cooperation of the Poles with the Galician Russophiles during the interwar period, which can safely be regarded as one of the most paradoxical manifestations of the anti-Ukrainian 'divide et impera policy' in interwar Poland.

However, the Russophile activists further weakened their movement in 1909, when the radical so-called 'novokursniki',⁴ who openly propagated their program of the complete linguistic and national (and, in the long run, political) merger of 'Galician Russia' with tsarist Russia separated from the more moderate 'starokursnyky' (Moskvofil'stvo 2001, p. 54). In the same year, Semen Bendasjuk published a 'Grammar of the Russian literary (all-Russian) language for the Russian of Galicia, the Bukovyna and Hungary' (*Грамматика русского литературного (общерусского) [sic, not -ого] языка для русскихъ въ Галичинѣ, Буковинѣ и Угрии*) (Bendasjuk 1909),⁵ which gave another clear idea of what the 'new course' was to be.

On the eve of the First World War, the Austro-Hungarian authorities were alarmed by the radicalization of the Russophile movement. Between late 1913 and mid-1914, they initiated two trials against Russophile activists who were suspected of spying for Russia in L'viv and in Sighetu Marmarței (Hung. *Máramorosziget*, Ukr. *Сигім-Мармароський*). Although none of the defendants was found guilty in the Galician trial (Moskvofil'stvo 2001, pp. 58–59; as opposed to the Transcarpathian trial) and although the Austro-Hungarian authorities apparently exaggerated the threat of Russophilia, there is no doubt that Russian institutions

⁴I consciously transliterate the *novokursniki* from Russian and the *starokursnyky* from Ukrainian, although both groups usually regarded the Russian standard language as a high variety of their own language.

⁵Many of the sources that are used in this study are rare prints that were however put online in the years after 2004 (the year of the 'Ukrainian Orange Revolution'), largely thanks to people who apparently question and fight the legitimacy of a separate Ukrainian national and linguistic identity themselves. Other rare sources have been collected by the team working on my FWF project Y-271 '1000 Years of Ukrainian Language History in Galicia' (in this particular case, my expression of gratitude goes to Dr. Philipp Hofeneder and Dr. Katarzyna Hibel).

enforced Russian nationalist agitation in Galicia especially on the eve of the First World War and that some Russophile leaders did collaborate with the Russian empire both before and during the war (*ibid.*, p. 61; Ripetsky and Sereda 2001[1993]).

In early August 1914, the Austro-Hungarian authorities not only arrested most leading Russophile activists; they also organized dozens of public executions of people suspected of Russophilia and exerted mass terror against the entire Ruthenian population of Galicia, who were collectively suspected of harboring sympathies for the enemy. When the Austro-Hungarian army was forced to retreat under pressure from the Russian army in the fall of 1914, the Austro-Hungarian authorities arrested more than ten thousand Galician and Bukovynian Ukrainians. Between September 1914 and May 1917 (when the camp was closed), about 30,000 people (85 % of them being Ukrainians with different national allegiances) were interned in several prisons. The most infamous of these places was the concentration camp Thalerhof near Graz in Austrian Styria, where the detainees were held in outrageous conditions (during the first months, they did not even have barracks); in the course of two and a half years, about 2,000–3,000 died (Moskvofil'stvo 2001, pp. 62–65; Suxyj and Lozyns'ka 2010). When the Austro-Hungarian army reannexed Galicia in 1915, another wave of repression was aimed at those who had collaborated with the Russian forces; many Russophiles fled with the Russian army, particularly to Rostov na Donu. Later, many of these migrants were disillusioned; some returned to Galicia as conscious Ukrainians (Ripetsky and Sereda 2001[1993]).

After the First World War, “the downfall of Tsarist Russia rendered political Russophilism virtually irrelevant; after the Bolshevik take-over, it became pointless” (Sorokowski 1991, pp. 192–193). Traditional Russophilia was conservative and based on the concept of a Holy Rus’ utopia; Bolshevik Russia and Bolshevik Ukraine were different. Throughout the inter-war period, the Russophiles, who continually used the pre-revolutionary Russian orthography if they used Russian in writing, gradually lost ground, except for the Lemko region in the westernmost Ukrainian-speaking areas of interwar Poland (*ibid.*, pp. 193–194).

Immediately after WW I, the remaining Russophiles of Galicia quickly established a ‘Russian Executive Committee’ and revived their periodical ‘Carpathian Rus’ ’ (*Прикарпатская Русь*, 1918–1920; see Snicarčuk 2007, pp. 42–43). During the brief existence of the Western People’s Republic (which was proclaimed on 1 November 1918) and in the first years of its aftermath, the Russophiles initially collaborated with the Ukrainians in opposing the Polish authorities and boycotting the elections to the Polish Sejm in 1922 (*ibid.*). The Russophiles quickly formed a political party (*Русская Народная Организация* i.e., the ‘Russian People’s Organization’ which, however, soon split into various factions and subfactions. A left-wing faction arose, which soon took up a Ukrainian orientation (*ibid.*). Its official organ, the weekly newspaper *Volja naroda* (1921–1928) ‘The People’s Will’, was initially published in the traditional Galician Russophile variant of Russian, but then, “probably on orders from the Comintern,” gradually switched to Modern Standard Ukrainian (Volja 2013[1993]).⁶ These Ukrainian-language publications of former Russophiles do not concern us here for the simple reason that they cannot be regarded as Russophile publications anymore.⁷

⁶I have at my disposal one issue dating from 10 February 1923 that still uses the etymological orthography, but is largely written in Ukrainian (*Volja naroda* 1923/103), and another issue dating from 18 March 1923 (*Volja naroda* 1923/114), which uses the phonetic orthography. After this issue, the editors largely switched back to the etymological orthography, but continually placed some texts written in phonetic orthography in between.

⁷“Gradually, [...] the newspaper was Ukrainized in an attempt to appeal to Ukrainian socialists in Galicia. In 1923 it appeared twice a week in Russian and once in Ukrainian, and from 1924 it appeared only in Ukrainian.

The conservative wing of the Russophiles was based around the ‘Russian People’s Organization’ (*Русская Народная Организация*) and edited the weekly *Russkij golos* ‘The Russian Voice’, which came out between 1922 and 1939 and was financed, inter alia, by Russian émigrés (Ripetsky and Sereda 2001[1993]; Snicarčuk 2007, p. 42).⁸ This newspaper had various supplements, such as ‘The Russian students’ messenger ‘Fires’’ (*Вѣстникъ русскаго студенчества ‘Огни’*, 1930–1932) and the biweekly journal for Russian children ‘The Little Air’ (*Колосокъ*, 1932–1933) (Snicarčuk 2007, pp. 42–43).⁹ In the course of the interwar period, the conservative Russophiles increasingly collaborated with the Polish government and thus gradually succeeded in renewing their institutions, often at the expense of the Ukrainian organizations: the ‘Kačkovskij Society’ (*Общество им. Качковскаго/Качковскаго*),¹⁰ the ‘People’s House’ (*Народный Домъ*) and the ‘Stauropelial Institute’ (*Ставропигийскій Институтъ*), both of which had fallen under Ukrainian control; the students’ organization ‘Friend’ (*Друзь*), the women’s organization ‘Russian Ladies’ Society’ (*Общество Русскихъ дамъ*), and, finally, various cooperatives and credit unions (Matjuško 2006; see also Vavryk 1930).¹¹ The Russophile conservatives also collaborated with Russian émigrés. Obviously, one of these ‘White’ émigrés was the journalist Ivan Bondarenko (whose texts are dealt with below).

The ‘Kačkovskij Society’ published the quarterly *Nauka* ‘Learning’¹² and popular calendars for peasant readers in various idioms that largely continued the Russophile prewar traditions (Snicarčuk 2007, pp. 42–43). In 1927, the ‘Kačkovskij Society’ published a collection of Ivan Naumovyč’s works; in 1931, an illustrated ‘History of Rus’ ’ appeared (Matjuško 2006).¹³ Aside from the Russophiles’ calls to preserve ‘the glory of Rus’ ’, the utilization of

From 1926 it was the organ of Sel-Rob. It criticized both Ukrainian nationalists and Russophile conservatives who opposed the USSR, but it did not support the Soviet Ukrainianization policy. The editors were Kuzma Pelekhaty and Kyrylo Valnytsky” (Volja naroda 2013[1993]).

⁸During the last year of its existence, the paper was published daily (Snicarčuk 2007, p. 42).

⁹For more Russophile periodicals see the same study. See also Vasyľ Vavryk’s (1930, pp. 13–16) list of Russophile publications of 1929.

¹⁰The Russophile ‘Kačkovskij Society’ numbered 2,969 members with 68 reading rooms in 1926 and 4,968 members with 209 reading rooms in 1929 (Matjuško 2006), while the Ukrainian ‘Prosvita Society’ had 14,800 members in 1930 (31,100 in 1935) with 3,100 reading rooms (3,071 in 1935) (Kravciv 1996[1970], p. 2366).

¹¹The Russophile ‘Russian Audit Union’ oversaw 250 co-operatives in 1939; its Ukrainian counterpart 3,455 (Ripetsky and Sereda 2001[1993]).

¹²Lidija Snicarčuk (2007, p. 44) reports the following on this journal: “Зазначимо також, що, врахувавши аудиторні особливості, редакція використовувала і російську, й українську мови в етимологічному написанні (до 1935 р.), і їхню дивну суміш, яка ще в другій половині XIX ст. була предметом обговорення багатьох українських часописів. ‘Наука’ виходила загальним накладом 1200 примірників і розповсюджувалася переважно безкоштовно. Зокрема, 1926 р. із 65 читальнь Товариства, які функціонували в Галичині, лише 28 оформили повну передплату на це видання.” ‘We also declare that with respect to the specific audience, the editors used the Russian and Ukrainian language in etymological spelling (up to 1935), and their strange mixture that had been the object of discussions for many Ukrainian journals in the second half of the 19th century. *Nauka* was published with a circulation of 1,200 copies and was primarily distributed at no charge. Particularly, in 1926 out of 65 reading rooms of the Society that worked in Galicia, only 28 took out a full subscription of this edition.’

¹³See the information from Nauka 1930 (p. 1), which is written in interwar ‘Russo-Ruthenian’: “Подобно, якъ въ прошлѣмъ роцѣ, такъ и въ семь будутъ выдаватися мѣсячнѣ книжочки подѣ общимъ заголовкомъ „Народная Библиотека“, съ приложеніемъ квартальника „Наука“. Отповѣдно до рѣшеніи Съѣзда делегатѣвъ, Календарь (на 1931 г.) для подписчикѣвъ „Народной Библиотеки“ войде уже въ кругъ мѣсячныхъ книжокъ, т.е. буде считатися за мѣсяцѣ липень, серпень, вересень. Въ книжочкахъ будутъ оброблятися темы (матеріялы) больше практичнѣ, необходимѣ для нашего села. Въ другѣй половинѣ року начне виходити отдѣльными книжочками иллюстрована *Исторія Руси*. Г. Малець.” ‘Like last

the Thalerhof war crime played a central role in their ongoing propaganda (notwithstanding the obvious fact that many Russophiles fell victim to Austrian war crimes during the First World War too). Between 1924 and 1932, the Russophiles published four volumes of the *Talergofskij al'manax* 'Thalerhof Almanach'. In 1928, they organized their first 'Thalerhof Convention', in 1934, a Thalerhof monument was erected in Lyčakiv cemetery in L'viv (Pašaeva 2001, p. 170).¹⁴

Aside from the Lemko area, however, the traditional Galician Russophile movement was doomed: "Despite their collaboration with the Poles the Russophiles' movement went into decline, and virtually all of its members joined the Ukrainian camp" (Ripetsky and Sereda 2001[1993]). In the following sections, I will investigate how the language behavior of interwar Galician Russophiles reflected these historical developments.

2 Galician Russophiles and their command and use of their 'native language'

To my knowledge, the language of the Galician Russophiles of the interwar period has not been studied yet. One of the few scholars who have commented on the Russophiles' language is the Russian historian Nina Pašaeva, who, in her (tendentious) study of 'The Russian Movement in Galicia' (Pašaeva 2001), remarked that by the interwar period, Russian had already become 'the Russian Galicians' native language' (ibid., p. 68).¹⁵ Pašaeva's statement is not correct in many respects. It is certainly reasonable to assume that several Russophile leaders of the interwar period knew Russian better than their predecessors; after all, they had been in contact with Russian speakers during the Russian occupation of Galicia in the First World War, many of them had even spent some time in Russian emigration, and some of them were in contact with émigrés from Russia. However, the assumption that Russian had turned into the 'native language' of these isolated intellectuals, let alone the native language of all 'Russian Galicians' (whoever this might have been), is obviously unfounded: Firstly, we know nothing about these leading Galician Russophiles who adopted Russian as a native language from their mothers or fathers. Secondly, the assumption that any interwar Galician adult had used Russian as an everyday language in childhood is unrealistic. Thirdly, if such individuals had in fact existed they would certainly have been praised in Russophile propaganda on a par with Dmytro Markov, who, at the age of 43, was the first radical Russophile to deliver a speech in the Austrian Parliament in Russian in 1907. Furthermore, even if the Russian language of some Russophile printed sources of the interwar period is correct, this does not allow for any conclusions regarding their authors' 'native

year, we will also edit monthly pamphlets under the general title 'People's Library', with the supplement of the quarterly *Nauka*. According to the decisions of the Delegates' Assembly, the 'Calendar' (for 1931) will be among the monthly pamphlets addressed to the subscribers of the 'People's Library', i.e., it will be provided for July, August, and September. These pamphlets will dwell upon more practical topics (materials) that are important for our village. From the second half of this year onward, an illustrated 'History of Rus' ' will be published in separate parts. G. Malec".

¹⁴Recently the Galician Russophiles and the Thalerhof discourse in particular have again become a politicized topic of anti-Ukrainian pro-Russian propaganda, see, e.g., the edition *Russkaja Galicija* (Smolin 2005) which, like Pašaeva's work, was published by 'Imperial Tradition' (*Imperskaja tradicija*) publishers, as well as several websites.

¹⁵"Просматривая издания русских галичан межвоенного периода, можно убедиться, что русский литературный язык стал для них родным языком" (Pašaeva 2001, p. 68). 'Taking a look at the editions by Russian Galicians of the interwar period, one can verify that the Russian literary language had become native to them.'

language'. Moreover, it does not even mean a lot regarding the authors' true command of Russian, because, as was mentioned, the Russophiles collaborated with Russian émigrés, who, then, beyond doubt edited those (relatively few) texts that were intended to be written in 'literary Russian'. The fact that the Russophiles themselves usually used standard Russian as a high style language only, that in many texts their language had a very bookish and often quite archaic touch, and that some characteristic mistakes remained in their language¹⁶ only supports the conclusion that Russian had definitely not become the 'native language' of Galician Russophiles, even if some of them had achieved a fairly good command of that foreign language.

Vasyl' Vavryk, a leading interwar Galician Russophile and a former Thalerhof detainee who had spent considerable time among Russians and in Russia before returning to L'viv in the mid-1920s, certainly knew Russian considerably better than most of his fellow Russophiles. Nonetheless, some of his less carefully edited texts reveal certain typical shortcomings or mistakes regarding the norms of Russian, too, cf. the following fragments:¹⁷

“Исходя съ [more common: *изъ*] научной точки зрѣня, раздѣленіе Галицкой Руси на русскихъ и украинцевъ граничить съ абсурдомъ, такъ какъ народная масса, отъ незапамятныхъ временъ до нынѣшнихъ дней, называетъ себя русской. [...] Наоборотъ [means: 'on the contrary' rather than 'by contrast'], украинскимъ галицкое население никогда, рѣшительно никогда, себя не называло, а „русинскимъ“ тѣмъ паче.” (Vavryk 1930, p. 3)

Культурная жизнь Русской Селянской Организациі группируется менѣе-болѣе [see Polish *mniej-więcej*, as opposed to Russian *болѣе или менѣе*, cf. German *mehr oder weniger*] вокругъ слѣдующихъ центровъ [...]. (ibid., p. 5)

Въ настоящее время Ставропигійскій Институтъ проявляетъ интензивную [instead of *интенсивную*, the spelling *интензуwny* instead of *intensywny* was as widespread in older Polish as was the voiced pronunciation of the alveolar spirant after *n*] дѣятельность посредствомъ своей типографіи [...]. (ibid., p. 6)

Слѣдуетъ отмѣтить, что галицко-русская кооперація развивается, безъ помощи [instead of *помощи*; the form *поміч, помочи* was widespread in Ruthenian sources] правительственныхъ учреждений, своими собственными силами. (ibid., p. 12)

[...] двинуть крестьянство изъ неграмотности, пьянства, суевѣрія и дать ему элементарное просвѣщеніе изъ истории, словесности, пѣсни [instead of *no истопіи*, cf. Polish *oświecenie z historii*] [...]. (ibid., p. 9)

Other shortcomings or mistakes in the same text are the following: *роботало* (9) as a simple, but quite revealing misspelling, or, perhaps more interestingly, *тогдашнія* (instead of *тогдашніе*) *писатели* (10) and *навязывать сношенія съ* (more common: *со*) *славянскими учеными и объединять* (instead of *объединять*) *всѣхъ карпато-русскихъ писателей* (10), *Кредытные* (with *ы* instead of *и*) *кооперативы* (12), or *матеріальное содѣйствіе* (12) and *инціятивной* (sic: with *ія* instead of *іа*) (ibid.).

¹⁶In the 'Thalerhof Almanach', e.g., one finds cartoons by a certain Dr. A. Helytovyč, where one reads in the traditional orthography: “одно изъ главнихъ [sic] занятій” ‘one of the major activities’; “въ больницу” ‘into the hospital’; “санитетъ” ‘sanitarian’, “вахтеръ” ‘guard’, “послѣ тифа” ‘after typhus’ (Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1932], p. 57; from: Записки о Талергофѣ свящ. о. Генриха А. Полянскаго ('Reverend Father A. Poljanskij's [Poljans'kyj's] Notes on Thalerhof')).

¹⁷Those texts that are of less immediate interest in terms of their content have not been translated.

Even Nina Pašaeva, despite her particular passion for ‘native Galician Russian’ things, acknowledges the fact that even during the interwar period, the Russophiles did not only use Russian in their publications. She identifies these non-Russian varieties as the ‘Galician Russians’ native dialect’, which they used in ‘popular little books and periodicals’, and she calls upon linguists to find out how close this language is to the Modern Ukrainian (standard) language (Pašaeva 2001, p. 168).¹⁸

However, this description is not quite correct from the outset. Even those interwar Galician Russophiles who had a good command of Russian in fact used this language more rarely than other varieties for the simple reason that the bulk of people whom they continually regarded as ‘Galician Russians’ did not understand Russian better than in the prewar period. Non-Russian varieties were not used only as an exception and in less important publications; they clearly prevailed even within the group of Galician Russophile publications. Moreover, these non-Russian varieties can certainly not merely be identified authentic dialects, but in fact represent a broad specter of artificial, genuinely written ad hoc varieties that oscillate between the Russian standard language on the one end and South Ukrainian traditional written varieties and dialects on the other. In Ukrainian linguistics, these varieties are usually labeled as ‘jazyčije’. Although there are many reasons to dismiss this label altogether as a ‘pseudo-term’ (Moser 2011a, pp. 641–666), the only varieties to which it might be applied with a certain justification are those that are neither Russian (or ‘Russo-Ruthenian’ varieties very close to it) nor clearly vernacular based and that were consciously used by the late Russophiles when they could not use Russian for one of the above-mentioned reasons.

A useful illustration of the basic Russophile dilemmas are the following fragments of two texts on the ‘Kačkovskij Society’ that were published in one and the same issue of the monthly *Nauka* in 1930 and only interrupted by a short Russian poem (that will be analyzed next). The text in the left column entitled ‘Join the members of the M. Kakovskij Society’ is written in a late variety of the traditional bookish ‘jazyčije’ mix, with a multitude of expressly non-vernacular forms being used: *просвіщати* ‘enlighten’, *просвіщення* ‘enlightenment’, *общество* ‘society’, *піддержувати* ‘support’, *об’єдиняти* ‘unite’, *защита* ‘protection’, *помощь* ‘help’, or *поприще* ‘area’, which is even provided with a gloss (as happens quite often in those texts), *но* ‘but’, *въ немъ* ‘in it’ (in texts like these, non-vernacular forms are in fact encountered on all linguistic levels). The text in the right column contains several fragments that are almost identical with those in the previous one regarding their content, and in general, the two texts convey the same messages. The text rendered in the right column was expressly addressed ‘to the Volhynian, Chełm (Ukrainian and Russian *Xolm*), Polissja (Russian Poles’e), and other Russian lands within the boundaries of the Polish Republic’, i.e. to the Ukrainians in those lands that had been under Russian control and were exposed to the impact of Russification prior to WW I. This text is basically written in Russian, but it features several peculiarities that are barely acceptable, or even unacceptable, from a Modern Russian standard perspective, such as the use of the Ukrainian interferences *житье* (instead of *жизнь*; both meaning ‘life’) or *ширити* (instead of *распространять*; both meaning

¹⁸“И в то же время на родном наречии выходили популярные книжки и периодические издания (лингвистам еще, наверное, предстоит решать, насколько этот язык близок к современному украинскому).” ‘And at the same time popular books and periodicals were edited in the native language (probably, linguists will have to decide how close this language is to contemporary Ukrainian).’

‘to disseminate’):

Поступайте въ члены Общества им.
М. Качковского.

[1] Цѣль Общества—нести просвѣщеніе и науку въ широкій народній, селянскій массы.¹⁹

[2] Оно мае бути доповнячою школою, высшою народною школою,—народнымъ университетомъ. [...]

Общество им. М. Качковского [...] мае не то́лько учить и просвѣщати народъ, но **[3:] также будити и по́ддержвати въ немъ русскаго духа, любовь до родной землѣ и русскій церкви, объединяти его силы для защиты своихъ правъ и для взаимной собѣ помощи на всѣхъ попрѣцахъ (дѣлянкахъ) народнаго житья. [...]** Г. Малецъ (Nauka 1930, pp. 2–3).

Къ Волинской, Холмской, Полѣсской и другимъ русскимъ Землямъ въ предѣлахъ Польской Республіки

[1:] Общество им [sic!] Мих. Качковского [...]

имѣеть цѣлю ширить [!] среди русскаго народа просвѣщеніе, науку, благочестіе, [3:] будить въ немъ гражданское сознание, любовь къ Родной Землѣ, учить и помогать ему въ борьбѣ за насущный хлѣбъ и свои права,—словомъ поднимать культурный, моральный и экономическій уровень его житья [!]. [...]

[2:] Словомъ Общество им. М. Качковского стремится быть всенароднымъ селянскимъ университетомъ, высшей народной школой. (Nauka 1930, pp. 6–7).

The Russophiles could have saved time and money if they had addressed all ‘Russians of the Polish Republic’ in one of the two different varieties, but they knew that this would have been to no avail. Alternatively, the Russophiles could have simply accepted that in the situation they were faced with the development of the Ukrainian standard language was the most promising option, as some of them in fact did.

Altogether, the Russophiles had no illusions regarding the fact that Russian had largely remained alien to the readers of the most popular Russophile publications such as *Nauka*.

The text that is posited between the two versions of the appeal to support the Kačkovskij Society is the Russian poem ‘Springtime’ (*Весна*) by a certain Aleksej Iljukevicič:

Съ нѣжной солнечной улыбкой, / Вся въ пестрѣющихъ цвѣтахъ,
Къ намъ пришла весна златая / Съ пѣсней чудной на устахъ.
Все проснулось и ожило, / Всюда зелень и цвѣты,
Все растеть, благоухаетъ, — / Всюду царство красоты.
Снова птички прилетѣли / Изъ чужбины въ край родной;
Снова пѣсни зазвучали / Надъ опушкою лѣсной.

Алексе́й Иллюкевичъ (Nauka 1930, p. 6)

The most interesting thing about this text is that several words are explained in footnotes: *нѣжный* – *деликатный* (both meaning ‘delicate’), *улыбка* – *услѣхъ* (both meaning ‘smile’), *пестрѣющий*, *пестрый* – *сорокатый* (all meaning ‘colorful’), *благоухать* – *пахнуть* (both meaning ‘smell (good)’), *опушка* – *окраина*, *окраецъ* (all meaning ‘edge’) (ibid.). Although one might argue that five words are not that many, it should also be taken into account that the poem is quite simple and that most other Slavs would not have needed many more explanations than the Russophiles’ Ukrainian readers. Moreover, elsewhere in the same issue of *Nauka* one finds a somewhat less simple original Russian prose text by a certain Dmitrij Grigorovič (Dmytro Hryhorovyč), a Russian-Ukrainian writer who was born to a Ukrainian father and a French mother and who was introduced to the readers in a short biographical note with a portrait (Nauka 1930, pp. 34–36). In this prose text, the word stress was marked in each word as practiced in good editions of prose texts for learners of Russian

¹⁹Those passages that basically convey the same message are highlighted in bold print.

as a foreign language to date (this was of course not necessary in the poem, due to its simple metrics):

Д. В. Григоровичъ

Прохожій

Да, воистинѣ, это была страшная ночь!.. Много грѣбныхъ ночей застигло
прохѣжаго, много вьюгъ и непогодъ вынесла сѣдая голова егѣ,—но такой ночи
онъ никогда ещё не видывалъ [...]. (Nauka 1930, p. 37)

On each page of this text, one can find dozens of explanations of Russian words (many more word forms were perhaps comprehensible, but uncommon for the Galician Ukrainian readers). The following explanations are from the first page only:

Сѣдая – сива ‘grey’; сугробъ – купа снѣгу ‘heap of snow’, тщетно – даремно ‘in vain’, костыль – кошуръ ‘crutch’, смятеніе – замѣшанье ‘disarray, whirl’, напрасно – даремно ‘in vain’, плетень – полетеный, плоть ‘wattle fence’, третьяго дня – позавчера ‘the day before yesterday’; изба, избушка – хата, хатка ‘hut’; кровь – покровъ, дахъ; также приютъ ‘roof; also home’; ладонь – долонь, долоня ‘palm’; глазъ, глаза – око, очи ‘eye’ (Nauka 1930, p. 37)

Prose texts for entertainment that were regarded as comprehensible without any further explanations were written in a different language, as exemplified by the following fragment of a translated story. Despite some Russianisms (here: *на склонѣ* ‘at the slope’, *на площади* ‘on the place’, ... *тому назадъ* ‘ago’) or traditional elements (here: the short form participle *привязанъ* ‘tied’, the past active participle of the Ukrainian lexical stem *досягавшій* ‘one who has reached’), the language of ‘S.B.’ (who signed this text as a translation of this piece) was very far from Russian and at the same time, quite close to the (Galician) Ukrainian vernacular:

Преданіе

Атри дуже старинне мѣсточко въ Италиі. Розложилось оно на склонѣ горы и добратися до него трудно.

Много-премного лѣтъ тому назадъ король купивъ великій дзвѣнъ и приказавъ вытащити его на дзвѣнницу на площади мѣсточка. До дзвона бувъ привязанъ довгий шнуръ, досягавшій до самой землі, конецъ его по ней волочився такъ, що навѣтъ мала дитина могла его взяти и въ дзвѣнъ задзвонити.

– Нехай то буде дзвѣнъ справедливости! – приказавъ король [...]

Перев. С. Б.

(Nauka 1930, pp. 10–12)

Faced with texts like these, most Ukrainians who were not under the impact of Russophile ideologemes would have probably agreed upon the following conclusions:

1. The Russian language of Grigorovič’s/Hryhorovyč’s text is so remote from that of S.B.’s that any attempt to describe one of these languages as a dialectal variety of the other can only be the result of dogmatic aprioristic axioms; if one agreed, almost any two Slavic idioms were to be described as dialectal varieties of each other.
2. Although S.B.’s text looks old-fashioned from a modern perspective for several reasons (for instance, for the banal reason that it is written in etymological orthography), its language was in fact so close to the genuine vernacular that most Galician Ukrainians would have identified it as a variety of their true ‘native’ language, and most non-Galicians would have agreed (as Hryhorij Kostjuk agreed that Ivan Naumovyč’s book was written in ‘our language’).

3. While assessing the language of S.B.'s text, it has to be taken into account that as opposed to the mid-19th century (when many texts were written in such a language), it was published at a time when the standard Ukrainian had already largely been established both in and outside Galicia. The idioms used by S.B. and many others were so close to Modern Standard Ukrainian that it was barely understandable why they continually wrote in a variety that obviously had no future (even more so, in texts that did not convey any Galician 'local color').

The extreme difficulties that the Russophiles still faced regarding the use of the Russian language are nicely illustrated by the following intriguing report on the 'cultural ties' between Galician and Transcarpathian Russophiles (the report itself written in one of the typical Russophile 'Little Russian' varieties):

Культурная связь съ Прикарпатской [sic] Русью.

Свѣжо остався еще въ нашой памяти приѣздъ делегатѡвъ карпато-русского культурно-просвѣтительного Общества им. Ал. Духновича въ Ужгородѣ на Талергофскій съѣздъ и на Общее Собрание членѡвъ О-ва им. М. Качковского въ 1928 г. [...] Правленіе Общества им. Ал. Духновича, въ желанью пѡдчеркнути національне и культурне единство русского народа и запротестувати противъ насилія надъ нимъ, рѣшило войти въ тѣснѣйшу связь зъ нашимъ Обществомъ и выдавати вспѡльно где котрѣ книжечки якъ для своихъ членѡвъ, такъ для членѡвъ нашего Общества. Зъ другой стороны и наше Общество буде такъ поступати. [...]

Головною трудностію при вспѡльнѡмъ выданью книжечокъ есть языкъ.

Въ карпаторусскѡмъ явыцѣ [sic] нема полонизмѡвъ, вѡнъ безъ порѡвнанья чистѣйшій вѡдъ галицко-русского языка. Хотя въ нѣмъ и встрѣчаеся трохи мадьярскихъ слѡвъ, однако далеко меньше, якъ въ галицкѡмъ нарѣчію польскихъ слѡвъ. Карпато-русскому простонародію куда доступнѣйшій русскій литературный языкъ, якъ „украинска мова“, котру карпатороссы попросту называютъ польскимъ языкомъ, такъ якъ галицкихъ „украинцѣвъ“—поляками.

Для того, що Общество им. А. Духновича выдае свои книжечки на русскѡмъ литературнѡмъ явыцѣ, може наше Общество своимъ членамъ давати взоры все-русской, свѣтловой литературы. (Nauka 1930, pp. 67–68)

Needless to say, the claim that the 'Carpatho-Russian' ("Въ карпаторусскѡмъ явыцѣ") language was 'incomparably purer' than 'Galician Russian' ("[...]безъ порѡвнанья чистѣйшій вѡдъ галицко-русского языка") was as absurd as the statement that 'the Russian literary language' ("русскій литературный языкъ") was 'by far more comprehensible' to the 'Carpatho-Russian simple folk' ("Карпато-русскому простонародію куда доступнѣйшій") than Ukrainian. Obviously, the article was mere propaganda for the upcoming publications of 'all-Russian, world literature' ("все-русской, свѣтловой литературы"), which was to be imported from Transcarpathia for a variety of reasons: Most likely, their production in Galicia would not have been profitable, while the Transcarpathian Russophiles were probably in need of readers from outside Transcarpathia.

3 Ukrainian used in the 'Thalerhof Almanachs'

Among the most important Galician Russophile editions that were published in Russian were the four volumes of the 'Thalerhof Almanach'.

The Thalerhof detainees' eye witness accounts create an entirely unrealistic atmosphere in that they convey all direct speeches in standard Russian, which in fact was beyond doubt used extremely rarely in the Russophiles' everyday lives, if at all.²⁰

Ukrainian is however not completely absent from the 'Thalerhof Almanachs'. In the second volume (Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1925]), e.g., a certain Miša (*Миша*) sings a satiric 'Kolomyjka' (*Коломыйка*) song about the lice of Thalerhof and the Austrian Emperor's responsibility. It is obvious that the author consciously refrained from making his account even more unrealistic by letting Miša sing in Russian. The fact that the song evoked an outburst of laughter was not only based on its content, but also on its Ukrainian language:

И Миша спѣлъ слѣдующую коломыйку:
 Ой вы, воши, мои воши, / Проклятіи воши,
 Чого вы позаводили / Такіи дебоши?
 Чи вы, воши, показались, / Чи ви подурѣли,
 що вы мое бѣдне тѣло, / Якъ хмара, присѣли?
 Ой цѣсаре, цѣсароньку, / Цѣсароньку – панку,
 Ой выпиши, цѣсароньку, Въ Терезинѣ бранку. [. . .]
 Ними заорешь, засѣшь, / Ты свою державу,
 Они тобѣ принесутъ / Великую славу.
 Громъ хохота наполнил черную казарму.

(Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1925], p. 128, p. 130)

In the third volume, one of the detainees sings in Ukrainian, too, although the author allows him speak 'pure Russian'. Again, the song and the Ukrainian language evoke laughter:

9 ноября. – По площади ходитъ въ веселомъ настроении дядя и поеть: «Поѣдемъ нынѣ, о которой годинѣ, скажитъ менѣ добрыи люди, о которой годинѣ?» – и говорить окружающимъ: «Дядя пѣлъ бы вамъ, но горло просохло, надо его смазать смальцемъ.» Получивъ 26 геллеровъ отъ кого-то, говоритъ: «Дядя теперь, пожалуй, и споеть вамъ, а лишь смотрѣть, нѣтъ ли гдѣнибудъ караульныхъ.» Оглядываясь на всѣ стороны, поеть и танцуетъ. Всѣ смѣются. Напуганный этимъ громкимъ смѣхомъ, онъ вдругъ останавливается и пугливо озирается на всѣ стороны, не идетъ ли гдѣ караульный солдатъ.

Жебысте до Галичины поѣхали / И мене вспоминали
 Жебысти до Галичины поѣхали / И мене съ собой забрали.

Говорить эти слова, прощаясь съ нами.

(Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1930], pp. 35–36)

Only exceptionally—in one text from the fourth and last volume of the original 'Thalerhof Almanach'—does the Ukrainian language appear not in a humorous context. In that case, Ukrainian serves as a linguistic marker of the 'Mazepas', i.e., the Ukrainian separatists and traitors of Holy Rus'. Curiously enough, the author of the text even allows the Ukrainians to speak Russian as long as they pretend to be good people. But as soon as they demonstrate their genuinely evil and treacherous nature, he makes them speak Ukrainian:

²⁰This assumption is indirectly confirmed by an invitation for all 'Thalerhofians' to send their addresses with an eye to the preparation of the first Thalerhof Convention in the newspaper *Russkij golos*: "Упрашаея всѣхъ талергофцѣвъ о поданье своихъ адресовъ въ цѣли устроена създа талергофцѣвъ. Редакція 'Русского Голосу'." 'All Thalerhofians are requested to deliver their addresses with an eye to the organization of a Thalerhof conference'. The editors of 'The Russian Voice' (*Russkij golos* 1922, p. 4). The language of this invitation could not have been less Russian.

[Those detainees who adhered to a Ukrainian national identity were allowed to leave the Thalerhof camp. At that point, the following allegedly happened:] Стали мазепы въ телячьемъ восторгѣ намъ, русскимъ, на досаду, собираться къ отъѣзду. И ударилъ часть отбытія. Нѣкоторые изъ нихъ прашались съ нами даже словами: „дай Богъ и вамъ скоро отсюда выбраться“, но, когда вышли всѣ съ багажемъ за ворота, чтобы пѣшкомъ пойти на станцію Абтиссендорфъ, то и кликнули намъ громко съ дикимъ злорадствомъ. „А бодай-бысьте, москвофилы, всѣ тутъ пропали!“ Послѣ этого заплѣли они свое „Ще не вмерла Украина“... [...] въ этотъ день утромъ, когда я сталъ молиться меня проклялъ одинъ интеллигентъ (!) [! in the original] во всеуслышаніе: „А шлягъ бы тебе трафивъ за твою молитву!“ Вотъ до чего дошло это паденіе нравовъ.

(Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1932], p. 110, p. 113)²¹

Regarding the use of Ukrainian in the ‘Thalerhof Almanach’, it is noteworthy that when the Lemko-born American Russophile Peter S. Hardy (Petro Hardyj) sponsored a reprint of the four volumes in 1964 several Ukrainian-language supplements were added to the publication. In the introductory parts to the first volume, one finds a photograph of Vasyľ Vavryk dating from 1964 with the following caption: *Д-р Васи́лій Рома́нович Ваєрик, Талергофец, извѣстный [sic] общественный дѣятель и писатель* ‘Dr. Vasilij Vavrik [i.e., Vasyľ Vavryk], a Thalerhofian, a well-known civic activist and writer’ (Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1924], n.p.).²² In the appendix, one finds a photograph of the Thalerhof memorial in L’viv’s Lyčakiv cemetery titled *В память военныхъ мучениковъ* ‘In memory of the war martyrs’ (i.e., spelled according to one of the awkward late Ruthenian-based Russophile orthographies) and the following caption in modern Russian orthography (but in incorrect Russian!): *Талергофский памятник на Лычаковском кладбище во Львове, построен [instead of: построенный] в 1934 г.* ‘Thalerhof monument erected in Lyčakiv Cemetery in L’viv in 1934’ (ibid., n.p.). After two pages, there is a photograph of the original cemetery in which the Thalerhof victims were buried that includes the original German caption *Grabstätte in Feldkirchen für die im Flüchtlingslager Thalerhof Gestorbenen* ‘Tomb in Feldkirchen for those who died in the refugee camp Thalerhof’ (ibid., n.p.). A comment reproduces the short German inscription of the monument (with two typographic errors): ‘Fern von der Heimat hier ruhen 1.767 Manner [sic, instead of: Männer], Frauen und Kinder aus Galizien und Bukowina als Opfer des Weltkrieges [sic, instead of: Weltkrieges] 1915–1917)’ ‘Far from their homeland, 1,767 men, women and children from Galicia and Bukovyna rest in peace here as victims of the World War’ and continues in the following way:

Талергофское кладбище „Под соснами“ было ликвидировано в 1936 г. Кости мучеников перевезены были на кладбище в деревни [instead of: деревне] Фельдкирхен в братскую могилу. Согласно международному соглашению по охране

²¹ ‘The Mazepians began preparing for departure with ‘calf-like’ enthusiasm, which was annoying to us, the Russians. And the time for departure had come. Some of them even said goodbye to us with the following words, ‘May God let you give the opportunity to leave this place soon as well!’ However, as soon as they had passed through the gate with their baggage to walk to the Abtissendorf station they shouted at us loudly with wild glee. ‘And may you, Moscovophiles, all perish here!’ Subsequently they sang their ‘Ukraine has not yet perished’ ... [...] In the morning of that same day one intellectual (!) [! in the original] publicly damned me while I was preparing for my prayer, ‘Beshrew thee for your prayer!’ This was how far morals had fallen.’

²² Here, the Russian prerevolutionary orthography is largely preserved, with the exception of the obligatory spelling of jors in hard stem endings. Instantally, it is interesting to note that in the mid-1960s, the Soviet authorities had allowed Vavryk to collaborate with the American Russophiles.

военных могил, на братской могиле построено часовню [sic, instead of *была построена часовня*] и внутри помещено надпись [sic, instead of *была помещена надпись*]²³: „В дали [instead of: *вдали*] от Родины здесь покоятся 1,767 мужчин, женщин и детей из Галичины и Буковины [sic, without a comma] жертв мировой войны 1914–1917 гг.“

‘The Thalerhof cemetery ‘Under the pines’ was liquidated in 1936. The martyrs’ bones were transferred to the cemetery of the village called Feldkirchen into a mass grave. According to the international agreement regarding the protection of war tombs, a chapel was built on the mass grave, and an inscription was carved into it [that read]: ‘Far from their fatherland, 1,767 men, women, and children from Galicia and Bukovina, victims of the World War 1914–1918, rest in peace here.’

(Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1924], n.p.)

Finally, also in the introductory parts, one finds a photograph of the cemetery near Terezín fortress with the following caption in modern Russian (and in modern Russian orthography):

Кладбище возле Терезинской крепости. Здесь покоятся жертвы австро-венгерского террора времен 1914–1917 гг. и жертвы гитлеровских злодеяний²⁴ времен II-ой Мировой Войны.

‘The tomb near the fortress Terezín. Here the victims of Austro-Hungarian terror between 1914 and 1917 and the victims of Hitler’s war crimes in the Second World War rest in peace.’

(Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1924], n.p.)

Below, after the Russian title *Песнь Терезина 1914–1917 гг.* ‘Terezín song 1914–1917’, this song is reproduced in a variety of standard Ukrainian and in phonetic orthography (albeit with a few orthographic elements that were apparently added to distance the text from standard Ukrainian anyway, see the phonetically senseless soft sign in verbal forms of the second person singular forms and in the Russian loan *тюрьма* ‘jail’):

Ой, цісарю, цісароньку, / На що нас карбуєшь,
За яку провину в тюрмах / Мучишь і мордуєшь.
Ой, скажи нам, цісароньку, / Чим ми провинились,
За що в мурах і болоті / Ми тут опинились?

(Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1924], n.p.)

Another poem of the appendix to the first volume of the ‘Thalerhof Almanach’ was allegedly written by the peasant Omeljan (Emilijan) Perxun in 1934. The poem was obviously adopted from another edition: The types were different than in the rest of the volume, the alien pagination had not been removed, and the editors even introduced the obviously more appropriate Ukrainian spelling *-u* to a text that was again written in Ukrainian and in phonetic orthography despite the fact that it ardently rejected the very notion of ‘Ukraine’ („Україна“ [sic]) while praising ‘glorious Rus’’ (*славна Русь*):

сел. Еміліян Перхун.
О Рускій Народі! Ти в горю-печалі / І в слезах і смутку жизнь свою проводиш,
Від виродних братів своїх – яничарів / Терпиш і страдаєш, в струях крови
бродиш...
Преславний народі! Твердий і незломний! / Кругом Тебе лихо, роздор, перемі-
на, –

²³The syntax is Ukrainian.

²⁴The word is quite archaic in standard Russian, see unmarked *преступлений* ‘crime’.

Хотят ізмінити Тебе, православний, / Вмісто славной Руси кажут „Україна“ . . .
[. . .]

Но з той крові встане покоління славне / І як ясне сонце в славі засяє,
Тогди підоймешся, отреш гіркі сльози, / Закличеш, що славна Русь все побіджає!

...

с. Ріннев, 1934

(Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1924], n.p.)

Other poems that were later added to volumes 3 and 4 of the ‘Thalerhof Almanach’²⁵ confirm the above-made observations: Even during the First World War and the interwar period, Ukrainian still served as the major medium of communication for the same Russophiles who regarded it as an integral part of their ideology that the Ukrainian language as such did not and should not exist. As opposed to the impression that the first editors of the ‘Thalerhof Almanach’ wanted to make, the reprint of 1964 confirms that even in the most ardent Russophile context, Ukrainian was definitely not only a language to make fun of or a language that was used by the treacherous political opponents; it was in fact the most intimate language of the Russophiles themselves (none of the above-cited songs originated in the milieu of 1960s U.S. Russophiles). Finally, it is noteworthy that the reprint featured several poems and songs that were written not only in Ukrainian, but also in phonetic orthography. While this is indeed noteworthy, the following observations are even more interesting against the background of traditional Russophile ideologemes.

4 Ukrainian in interwar Galician Russophile prose texts

As has been demonstrated, the Galician Russophiles were practically forced to publish a great deal of their works in non-Russian varieties, because their Russian-language publications were not received well even by their Russophile readership. It thus comes as no surprise that Vasyly Vavryk’s bibliography of Galician Russophile publications from 1929 featured a number of positions that were written in non-Russian, more or less Ukrainian-based varieties. One of the most interesting facts about them was that regarding these prose editions, too, their varying orthographies extended from traditional etymological orthographies to several variants of the phonetic orthography (some of them even included the use of the letter *ι*, but apparently none included *ι*):

„Земля и Воля“ независима селянска газета. Выходит під неділю. Рік II. відві-
чальний редактор М. Мацан. [. . .] // Кооперативний Вістник. Орган „Русского
Ревійзійного Союзу“ во Львові. Выходит раз на місяць. Рік III. Адрес редакції і
адміністрації „Русскій Ревіз. Союз“ ул. Рутовского 22. Відповідальний редак-
тор Евгений Трешневскій. [. . .] // Др. Адріан Копыстьянскій. „Стара княжа Русь в
народних піснях-билинах“. 1 карта 11 ілюстрацій. За червень, липень і серпень
1929 г. [. . .] стр. 188 вь 16°. Додаток: князь Ляборець. // И. С. Ходорович:

²⁵See the following poem: “В память военных мучеников: Кобы вітры не вяли, / То бы тут не бы-
ли, // Коб не люты вороженькы, / Мы бы ся любили. // Кажут люде, што суд буде, / А суда не буде, // Бо
без суда нас связали, / Поламали груди” (Thalerhof Almanach 1964[1930], Vol. 3, n.p.; introductory part);
“Appendix: n.p. Сел. Иван Тернопольскій: Від Бродщини до Карпат (В двадцяті річницю мук Галицької
Руси.) [4 pp!]: Ген далеко – на край світа / Думками сягаю // В двадцяті [sic] роковини / Мук рідно-
го краю. // И своїми думоньками / Стрілю літаю / Над тобою мій ти любий, / Дорогий мій раю. [. . .]
[Ending:] Чого плачеш, рідна Мамо. / Тут над нами, над вмерцями, // В чужині, в краю проклять? / Иди
Русе-Мать єдина, / Роди нові покоління / Від Бродщини до Карпат!” Пониква, 10 липня 1934 р.” (Thaler-
hof Almanach 1964[1932], n.p.; appendix).

„Гроши, історія ихъ настаня и розвитку: ихъ примѣненнїи и значеннє“. Мѣсяць вересень 1929 г. [...] стр. 36 въ 16°. // В. Р. Ваврикъ: „Народная словесность, и селяне-поэты. Мѣсяцы жовтень и падолисть 1929 [...] стр. 60 въ 16°, снимки. (Vavryk 1930, pp. 13–14)

Faced with the bitter reality that the use of Russian made little sense even among Galician Russophiles, Vavryk himself delivered a speech during a meeting of Russophiles in Sanok on 1 November 1937: *Реферат виголошений д-ром Васи́лем Романовичем Вавриком на Торжественнім Загальнім Собранію членів Общества ім. Михаїла Качковського, відбутім в Сяноці, дня 1 листопада 1937 р.* ‘Speech delivered by Dr. Vasiliy Romanovič Vavrik at the festive general assembly of the Kačkovskij Society members held in Sanok on 1 November 1937’ (Manifestacija 1938, pp. 23–31). In a Kačkovskij Society publication, this speech was later rendered as follows:

Як-же не до пізнання за войну люди і часи змінились! Перехід Галицької Русь [sic] під владу Польщі і велика революція на сході не остались без впливу на перетворене психіки нашого чоловіка. До війни він гнувся в три погібели перед грозним австрійським жандармом і перед яким-будь сурдудом. [...] Підчас війни доводилось ему видіти чужі краї, інші порядки і чути кличі про свободу, братство і рівність всіх людей і призыви, що земля належится трудящимся на ній селянам. Він випрямив свій хребет, почув в собі гідність чоловіка. Скинувши австрійсько-німецьке ярмо, він надіявся жити широким, вільним і славяно-руським житем на своїй рідній землі.

А що сталось? Чи потребує говорити? О землю, посаду, школу, язик так трудно і тяжко, що годі видержати. (Manifestacija 1938, p. 29; emphasis in the original)

Vavryk’s speech was clearly written in Galician Ukrainian. Just like other Russophiles (see below), Vavryk did not only consistently avoid Modern Ukrainian standard forms of the type *пізнання*²⁶ ‘cognizance’, *руський* ‘Ruthenian’ or ‘Russian’, *йому* ‘him’ etc., which even many Galicians with a Ukrainian national and linguistic identity did not use until the interwar period, so that the forms of the type *пізнанє*, *руський*, *ему* were in fact characteristic of the Galician variant of Modern Standard Ukrainian.²⁷ In addition, Vavryk also used only the traditional Galician dialectal hard endings in third person present tense forms (in this fragment, he writes *належится* ‘belongs’, not *належитьсья*, elsewhere one finds the more telling forms *мусит* ‘must’, *лежит* ‘is lying’; Manifestacija 1938, p. 30), which the Galicians had already replaced with the (basically, non-Galician) Modern Standard Ukrainian soft endings since the early years of the second populist movement (Moser 2007, pp. 222–223). Regarding these forms, Vavryk and other Russophiles thus seemingly continued local Galician popular traditions better than the Ukrainians, who increasingly dismissed typically Galician features for the sake of a unified Modern Ukrainian standard language. The adherence to Galician dialects was, however, obviously not the major reason for the Russophiles to avoid the Ukrainian forms. Shortened forms of the reflexive particle *-сь* (or, in other publications, shortened infinitives endings *-ть*) were not Galician Ukrainian either (although they

²⁶The highlighting in boldface is mine, M.M.

²⁷The use of isolated word forms that deviate from Modern Standard Ukrainian such as *война* ‘war’ without the Ukrainianizing effect of *i < o* does not mean a lot. The spelling *война* instead of *війна* was quite typical of texts that were written in Ukrainian by authors with a Ukrainian identity too; some of these Ukrainian authors would even still use *вольний* instead of *вільний* ‘free’, as encountered in Vavryk’s fragment.

were well known from ‘Great Ukrainian’, i.e., the central and east Ukrainian sphere); however, this did not prevent Vavryk from using such forms, obviously because they coincided with Russian.

Vavryk’s speech was published in a volume titled ‘Manifestation of the Rus(s)ian Spirit’ that featured several texts written in a similar language, although they occasionally featured (sometimes partly Ukrainianized) Church Slavonic and Russian elements, e.g.: *Торжественне Загальне Собраніє* (Manifestacija 1938, p. 3), *працю над піднесенем національної сознательности і культурного урoвня* (ibid.), *руського просвіщенія* (ibid.); *освічувало царившу над Галичиною тьму світочем рускої культури* (ibid.), *вслідствіє ріжнородних причин* (ibid., p. 2), *обсуджене* (ibid., p. 2) [here the adaption of the Church Slavonic *жд* as *дж* is noteworthy], *заслуженним патріотом* (ibid.), *в прошілїм – 1938 – роцї* (ibid.), *протестувати* [some Ukrainian texts of the time occasionally still had *-овати* instead of *-увати* too, M.M.] *перед центральними властями* (ibid., p. 12), *вопреки постановленьям обовязуючих законів* (ibid.), *чужї, непонятні нашому народу слова і вираженя* (ibid.), *національну сознательність* (ibid.), *требувати відкриття руских шкіл, народних і середних* [the hard stem in *середний* instead of *середній* is typically Galician, M.M.] (ibid., p. 13), *на перших порах* (ibid.; as a loan translation of *на первых порах*), *учебників руского язика* (ibid.). What is particularly interesting is the fact that in such publications, even loanwords from western languages, were often written according to the Galician traditions, as in *пляни* ‘plans’ (ibid., p. 2) or *ініціятива* ‘initiative’ (ibid.).²⁸

Other texts from the volume Manifestacija (1938) were written in varieties that were considerably closer to Russian, and some isolated short texts were simply written in Russian (in prerevolutionary orthography, of course).²⁹

Vavryk’s speech was not an isolated case. Other interwar Russophile publications, even key texts of a programmatic character that were not prevalently designed for oral presentation, were written in a variety of Ukrainian and in phonetic orthography too, although they were often filled with Church Slavonic and Russian elements.

One of these publications is the pamphlet ‘Galicians and the all-Rus(s)ian Culture’ (*Галичане і всеруска культура*) that was published under the pseudonym ‘V.S.’ (‘B.C.’). A bit of

²⁸Ironically, those who are not familiar with the history of these forms might therefore have come to the (erroneous, of course) conclusion that the Galician Russophiles were sympathizers of the orthographic rules for Ukrainian which had been introduced in 1927/1928 in Soviet Ukraine before they were abandoned during the Stalinist terror of 1933.

²⁹The Russophile priest Volodymyr Venhrovyč used a language that was close enough to Russian that it might be compared to the ‘Russo-Ruthenian’ publications of the second half of the 19th century (Moser 2011a, pp. 602–626), see the following fragment from *Вступительное слово произнесенное при открытии Торжественнаго Общаго Собранія членовъ Общества им. Михаила Качковскаго 1 ноября 1937 г. председателемъ сяночкoй филии Общества, свящ. Владиміромъ Венгриновичемъ, настоятелемъ прихода въ Короликъ Волошскомъ* ‘Introductory speech delivered during the opening of the Festive General Assembly of the Качkovskij Society members on 1 November 1937 by the President of the Sanok branch of the Society, Reverend Vladimir Vengrovič, the priest of the parish in Korolik Vološskij [i.e., Królik Włoski, in the Beskid area of Poland, M.M.]’: “И Тебе Народу рускій, Васъ, Братя и Сестры дороги и представители обществъ и организаций народныхъ, въ сію памятную ювлейну хвилю, коли Вы ізъ дальшихъ и ближжихъ сторонъ Прикарпатя такъ численно прїѣхали къ намъ, чтобы вмѣстѣ съ нами роздѣлитися чувствами патріотическими и поддержиати насъ въ нашихъ лучшихъ намѣренїяхъ, привѣтствуютъ ширимъ русскимъ сердцемъ и складаю Вамъ земный поклонъ, заявляючи Вамъ отъ имени филии нашу великую благодарность” (Manifestacija 1938, p. 22). At the end of the ‘Manifestation of the Rus(s)ian Spirit’, several greetings to the convention are published. The greetings of the leading Russophile institutions (the Stauropogial Institute and the Central Thalerhof Committee, the ‘Galician-Russian ‘Matica’’, the ‘Russian School Society’, etc.) are all kept in pure Russian (Manifestacija 1938, p. 36).

research reveals the true author of this publication: It is Мухайло Онышкевич, who after WW II became a leading Ukrainian linguist (the pamphlet is listed in Онышкевич's bibliography in *Včeni 1998*: s.v. *Онышкевич*).³⁰ Онышкевич's pamphlet dating from 1938 was originally published in 'Land and Freedom' (*Земля и воля*);³¹ this is a quite characteristic fragment from the text (typically Russian word forms—as for *создае*, stems—are highlighted in bold print):

Вопрос, що дала наша Галичина общерускій культурі, які цінности внесли сини Галича в скарбницю общеруского духа, нас галичан повинен сильно і всесторонно цікавити і интересовати;³² але у нас рідко говориться і пишеться на згадану тему, що, **в свою очередь, создае** свідоме чи несвідоме переконане, що Галичка Русь нічого не внесла в скарб общерускої культури. Думати так, однак, було **ошибочно** і несправедливо. (Онышкевич 1938, p. 2)

It must remain a secret who, in the late 1930s, could have been enthusiastic about such a language in a publication that argued for the need to develop 'all-Russian nationalism'.

5 A strange explanation from an insider

In some instances, the Galician Russophiles moved in a different direction: An examination of selected issues of the newspaper *Russkij golos* reveals that while the first issue is written in the traditional Russophile 'Little Russian language' ('jazyčije'), the issues from 1927 use standard Russian in prerevolutionary orthography, while the issues from 1932 adhere to the prerevolutionary orthography, but do not use jors in hard stem endings. The following Russian-language article reflects the difficult situation of the Galician Russophile press:

Печать и национальное сознание.

Мы неоднократно помѣщали статьи, замѣтки и призывы, посвященные дѣлу нашей печати. Увы, они не встрѣтили достаточного понимания и отклика, несмотря на то, что значение печати, особенно для недержавнаго народа, понятно, кажется, для каждого.

³⁰Nina Pašaeva states that the publication was written in the 'local dialect' and characterizes its content in a highly tendentious way: "[...] маленькая брошюра 'Галичане і всеруска культура', оттиск из газеты 'Земля и воля', вышедшая в 1938 г. на местном наречии и подписанная криптонимом В.С. Автор останавливается на духовных ценностях галицко-русской культуры в прошлом и настоящем и приходит к убеждению, что писателей, ученых, артистов Державной Руси интересовали социальные и государственные вопросы, и они боролись за права человека вообще, не обращая внимания на национальные вопросы, которые были им чужды" '[...] a small pamphlet 'Galicians and all-Russian Culture', an offprint of the newspaper 'Land and Freedom' that came out in 1938 in the local dialect and was signed with the cryptonym V.S. The author dwells upon the spiritual values of Galician-Russian culture in the past and present and comes to the conclusion that the writers, learned men, and artist of State Rus' [sic, M.M.] were interested in social issues and problems of the state, and that they fought for human rights in general without paying attention to national issues that were alien to them' (Pašaeva 2001, p. 171). In fact, Онышкевич describes the (alleged) lack of 'nationalism' in the Russian state as a major disadvantage. He argues that Galicians have always made a contribution to the development of 'all-Russian nationalism', because they have always been forced to withstand their 'enemies'. Pašaeva was not aware of the author's true identity yet.

³¹This newspaper is apparently not identical with the organ of the Communist Party of Western Ukraine, which has the same title and which had completely switched to standard Ukrainian during the 1920s.

³²The verb *интересовати* 'interest' is not acceptable in standard Ukrainian, but in interwar Galicia it was widely used (usually with *-уваму*) apart from any Russian impact, see Polish *interesować*.

Русское население в Польшѣ бѣдно и многим из наших людей дѣйствительно непосильно выписывать ежедневную газету. В таких условиях у нас должны бы процвѣтать еженедѣльные газеты, подписка на которыя доступна почти каждому. Таких газет должно быть у нас около десятка и каждая из них должна бы быть прекрасно поставленной, обладая десятками тысяч подписчиков.

В дѣйствительности же мы имѣем только двѣ политическія еженедѣльные газеты: одну на русском языкѣ („Русскій Голос“) и одну на малорусском языкѣ („Земля і Воля“). Притом не одна из этих газет не обладает таким количеством подписчиков, чтобы ее можно было поставить на должную высоту.

Как ни как, а это настоящій скандал, который, принимая во вниманіе количество русскаго населенія в Польшѣ, позорнѣйшим образом свидѣльствует о національном нерадѣніи русской общественности.

‘The Press and National Consciousness

We have repeatedly placed articles, notes and appeals devoted to our press issue. Oh dear! They have not been met with sufficient understanding and feedback, regardless of the fact that the significance of the press, especially re regarding a stateless people, is apparently obvious to anyone.

The Russian population in Poland is poor, and it is in fact impossible for many of our people to subscribe to a daily newspaper. Under these circumstances weekly newspapers should flourish among us, [as] the subscription to these is accessible to almost anyone. We should have about ten such newspapers, and each of them should be in a wonderful position, with tens of thousands of subscribers.

However, in reality we have only two political weekly newspapers: one in the Russian language (“The Russian Voice”) and one in the Little Russian language (“Land and Freedom”). None of these papers has a number of subscribers that would suffice to place it at an appropriate level.

Be it as it may, this is a genuine scandal that with respect to the mere size of the Russian population in Poland testifies to the national indifference of the Russian society in a shameful way.’

(Russkij golos 1932, p. 1)

The Russian language used in ‘The Russian Voice’ was generally correct, because émigrés from the Russian Empire collaborated with the newspaper. Judging by his non-Galician name, one of them was a certain Ivan Bondarenko, about whom I unfortunately know nothing except for the fact that he contributed several articles to *Russkij golos*, including a biographical note on Osyp Nazaruk, a Thalerhof detainee, in ‘The Russian Voice’ in 1938 (Alfavitynj ukazatel’ 2013[1971]: position 5463), and a favorable assessment of the Stalinist terrorist ‘fight’ against ‘Little Russian’ and ‘White Russian separatism’ (‘Bolshevism and Ukrainianness’ (*Большевизм и украинство*) in 1934.³³

³³“Внутренняя политическая жизнь СССР протекает, в последнее время, под знаком борьбы с сепаратизмом, особенно малорусским и бѣлорусским. [...] Эксперименты большевиков в національной политикѣ, их пренебрежительное отношеніе к малорусскому началу, потворствованіе украинству и гоненіе на сепаратизм, что равносильно насажденію украинства одной рукой, а другой—угнетенію его, могут привести к тому, что Русь окажется настолько разсоренной, что в отвѣтственный историческій момент не придется и говорить об единствѣ Россіи. [...] Иван Бондаренко” ‘The internal political life in the USSR has been under the sign of the fight against separatism, particularly Little Russian and White Russian [i.e., Belarusian, M.M.] [separatism]. The Bolshevik experiments in national policy, their spiteful attitude toward the Little Russian principle, the indulgence in Ukrainianness and the push toward separatism that is equal to the plantation of Ukrainianness on the one hand and its oppression on the other may lead toward a situation where Rus’ will be estranged to such an extent that at the appropriate historical point, one will not

It was the non-Galician Bondarenko who, in a pamphlet titled ‘One Rus’ – One Rus(s)ian Language’ (*Одна Русь – один русский язык*; Bondarenko 1930), offered a very intriguing explanation for the fact that the Galician Russophiles had decided to increasingly use ‘Little Russian’ written in the ‘phonetic alphabet’.

Firstly, Bondarenko of course reiterated the all-Russianist credo that ‘the Rus(s)ian people’ (“русский народ”) represents ‘one single people with one soul, one language and one history’ (“один народ, с одною душою, одним общим (загальним-огóблнум) языком і одною історією”), and that the Ukrainian movement was nothing but ‘a horrible disease’ (“зла пошесть”), the disease of separatism. Then he continued in a similar vein that whereas the Ukrainians justified their separatism with the difference between ‘the Great Russian and Little Russian dialects’ (in fact, between the Russian and the Ukrainian languages, M.M.) (“оправдуют свій сепаратизм різницею между великорусским і малорусским нарiччями”), ‘Little Russians’ and ‘Great Russians’ simply ‘do not speak different languages, but merely differently pronounce’ the same words (“говорят не на розличних языках, а тільки різно виговоряють одні і ті же слова”). In his view, these differences were less significant than among other peoples of Europe (in the following fragments of this section, only those forms are emphasized that were expressly non-Ukrainian; this does not mean that all other forms were acceptable in standard Ukrainian):

Коли ми взглянем на географічну карту рускої землі і призадумаємося над історією руского народу, его языком і битом, нам сразу стане ясным, що русский народ, на всім просторі своєї землі, – один народ, с одною душою, одним **общим** (загальним-огóблнум) языком і одною історією. [...] Однак, не ззираючи на то, що **умовія** рускої природи **весьма** (дуже) **благоприятні** (сприяючі = sprzyjające) для обєдинення всеї Руси, могучий організм руского народу гложє і підриває черв сепаратизма, зла пошесть самостійництва. Откуда же взялась на Руси та страшна **болізнъ** (хороба = chogoba), раз не **боліють** нею і такі наші сосіди, як поляки і німці, у котрих в язиці, і в історії, і в обычаях **куда більше розличій** (ріжниць-го́зніс), **чим** у руських? Українці **найчаще** оправдуют свій сепаратизм різницею **между** великорусским і малорусским нарiччями. Но, вони скривають, що малороси і великороси і великороси і великороси говорять не на розличних языках, а тільки різно виговоряють **одні і ті же** слова. Крім того, і в виговорі у руских людей розличя менші, **чим** у других народів. (Bondarenko 1930, pp. 3, 6)

Through his translations of some isolated stems that were not used in Ukrainian, Bondarenko obviously wanted to suggest that almost all lexical morphemes that differed from Russian and that he replaced with Russian-like forms were Polonisms (apparently, Bondarenko did not add Polish *dużo* ‘many’ after Ukrainian *дуже* ‘very’ because of its different meanings; Polish *bardzo* ‘very’ would not have helped him). Bondarenko did not mention that although he often adopted Russian idiomatic expressions and occasionally copied Russian grammatical constructions, even the awkward language that he used in this text was in fact basically Ukrainian not so much because anyone who wanted to read it appropriately inevitably had to follow the phonetic and phonological rules of Ukrainian, but rather because the inflectional morphology was Ukrainian, too, as were a number of word stems (in this fragment, for instance, *на просторі* ‘on the space’, not **на пространстві*, in the following fragment it is *має* ‘has’, etc.).

be able to even speak about the unity of Russia. [...] Ivan Bondarenko’ (Bondarenko 1934). Bondarenko was not the only person who thus assessed these developments, see Roman Jakobson’s infamous article of 1934 in *Die slavische Rundschau* (Jakobson 1934).

But why did Bondarenko, who obviously nourished a very negative attitude towards Ukrainian, basically use it anyway? Bondarenko offered an intriguing explanation: He made sure that in his view, only Russian was the ‘book language’ (“книжний язык”) of ‘all educated Rus(s)ian people’ (“образовані рускі люди во всій Русі”) (in his view, this ‘Russian people’ of course included ‘Little Russian’ and ‘Belorussians’), but in those territories where ‘foreign powers’ (“чужа власть”) had not allowed the introduction of it into schools, it had not been possible to establish the Russian standard language. Bondarenko further argued that any ‘book language’ was necessarily characterized by an ‘etymological orthography’ (“етимологічне правописаніє”). However, the use of the ‘phonetic orthography’ (“фонетичного правописанія”) as such could sometimes prove useful in that it allowed to ‘convey to the people the words and idioms of the book language to defend the popular language against the domination of words and idioms of a foreign language that penetrate into it’ (“средство передачі народу слів і оборотів книжного языка, щоби таким способом оборонити народний язык от засіяя проникающих в него слів і оборотів чужого языка”) (i.e., words such as *хороба* ‘illness’ [in Modern Standard Ukrainian: *хвороба*] or *загальний* ‘general’, which Bondarenko simply viewed as Polonisms because Polish does have similar words):³⁴

Руский народ має один **общеруский** книжний язык. На нім говорят **образовані** рускі люди во всій Русі, крім тих руских земель, де чужа власть не розршала і не позволяє учити рускому книжному языку, щоби накинати рускому народу чужий язык і таким способом довести его до ренегатії.

В кождім книжнім язичі обязує етимологічне правописаніє, котре передає історичний процес **образования** (повстаня-*powstania*) слова, **но** не передає его звука. **В виду** того на книжнім язичі інаше пишут, а інаше говорят. [...] Если, однако, ми желаєм передати природний звук народного языка, то ми можем наилучше **достигнути** того **посредством** фонетичного правописанія, т.е. коли ми будем писати, як говорит народ. **Особенно** для підяремного народа, у котрого ніт (нема-ніема) рідної і свобідної школи, фонетика може мати велике і благотворне значене. Бо она прекрасно може служити як **средство передачі** народу слів і **оборотів** книжного языка, щоби таким способом оборонити народний язык от засіяя **проникающих** в него слів і оборотів чужого языка.

(Bondarenko 1930, pp. 9–10)³⁵

To be sure, the genuine Modern Standard Ukrainian Language certainly was not and is not identical with the varieties that were used in Bondarenko’s or Onyškevyč’s pamphlets (Vasyl’ Vavryk’s speech printed in *Manifestacija 1938* was considerably closer to it, its Galician peculiarities notwithstanding). Nonetheless, the Russophiles who used such idioms and who even gave up the etymological orthography, which was in fact the most important bastion of traditional western Russophilia, took a major risk: Faced with the reality that they would not reach their readers if they wrote in Russian, the interwar Galician Russophiles increasingly used varieties that were very close to Modern Standard Ukrainian, but had no future and were not even meant to have one, because they were merely destined to pave the way for Modern Standard Russian. However, it is not difficult to imagine that most readers who were exposed

³⁴ It is interesting that neither Bondarenko nor anyone else offered another explanation that might have made sense if the Galician Russophiles had actually acquired a good command of Russian by that time. The use of the phonetic orthography might then have reflected the fact that Galician Russophiles had already got used to identifying ‘etymological’ spelling with Russian and its orthoepic rules.

³⁵ I did not highlight *наулучши* ‘best’, e.g., because the form is not alien to Galician dialects; nor did I highlight *благотворні* ‘beneficial’, a Church Slavonic form that might occasionally be used in Ukrainian too, etc.

to such idioms and compared them to Modern Standard Ukrainian inevitably came to the conclusion that it was useless to deal with the void Russophile linguistic experiments, while the Ukrainian language already functioned as a standard language and offered according perspectives.

6 Outlook

After the Second World War, when all western Ukrainians ended up either under Soviet rule or in one of the Soviet satellite states, traditional Galician and Transcarpathian Russophilia persisted only in small émigré circles in North America. As for Galicia and Transcarpathia, it might appear at first glance that the Russophiles suffered a total defeat in that both the Ukrainian nationality and the Ukrainian language were officially recognized in the Soviet Union and any all-Russian theories were ultimately outdated. If one looks under the surface, the Russophile defeat was considerably less obvious: Along with Soviet power, the Russian language was increasingly promoted and disseminated in the officially Ukrainian territories of Galicia and Transcarpathia considerably more successfully than ever before, and the official recognition of the Ukrainian nation and language on the part of the Soviet regime was clearly counterbalanced by the ongoing Soviet ambitions to further the ‘merger’ (*слияние*) of nations and languages on a Russian basis (notwithstanding the fact that particularly in Galicia, this happened to a lesser degree than elsewhere).

After the breakup of the Soviet Union, a certain revival of the traditional Russophile ideology has occurred, especially in obscure Russian neo-imperialist environments. The only positive consequence of this development is the fact that these activists have recently brought to light and made accessible several publications that were otherwise rare or were barely noticed. For linguists, these publications are particularly interesting with regard to the use of varieties of Ukrainian and Russian and with regard to the concrete shape of these varieties, which may considerably differ from both standard languages. Apparently, traditional histories of the Russian and Ukrainian languages are unable to explain the puzzling language behavior of Galician Russophiles, because they tend to tell us teleologically constructed histories of standard languages. Linguistic reality may be much more complicated, as exemplified by the Galician Russophiles of the interwar period.

Literature

- Alfavitnyj ukazatel' (2013[1971]): Alfavitnyj ukazatel' žertv avstro-mad'jarskogo terrora vo vremja pervoj mirovoj vojny 1914–1918 gg. na oblastjax Galickoj i Bukovinskoj RUSI s biografičeskimi i bibliografičeskimi dannymi. Tret'ja, značitel'no popolnennaja redakcija. Posvjaščajetsja 50-letnej godovščine Talergofskoj tragedii Prikarpatškoj Rusi (sostavil R. D. Mirovič). L'vov 1971. Retrieved from http://talergof.org.ua/alfavitnyi_ukazatel3-n.html (3 July 2014).
- Bendasjuk, S. Ju. (1909). *Grammatika ruskogo literaturnogo (obščeruskogo) jazyka dlja ruskix v Galičine, Bukovine i Ugrii*. L'vov.
- Bondarenko, I. (1930). *Odyn narod – odyn jazyk*. L'viv.
- Bondarenko, I. (1934). Bol'shevizm i ukrainstvo. *Russkij golos*, 643, 2.
- Jakobson, R. (1934). Slavische Sprachfragen in der Sowjetunion. *Slavische Rundschau. Berichtende und kritische Zeitschrift für das geistige Leben der slavischen Völker*, Jg. VI, 324–343.
- Kostjuk, H. (1987). *Zustriči i proščannja. Kniha perša. Spohady*. Edmonton.
- Kravic, R. M. (1996[1970]): Kravic, B., R. M. [redakcijnij material]. Prosvita. In V. Kubijovič (Ed.), *Encyklopedija ukrajinoznavstva. Slovnykova častyna. Tom 6*. L'viv. Retrieved from <http://litopys.org.ua/encycl/euii06.htm> (22 July 2014).

- Magocsi, P. R. (2002). Old ruthenianism and russophilism: a new conceptual framework for analyzing national ideologies in late-nineteenth-century Eastern Galicia. In P. R. Magocsi, *The roots of Ukrainian nationalism: Galicia as Ukraine's Piedmont* (pp. 99–118). Toronto.
- Manifestacija (1938): *Manifestacija ruskoho duxa* (sostavyy R. L. L'viv. Nakladom Obščestva im. Myxaila Kačkovskoho). L'viv.
- Matjuško, L. I. (2006). *Halyc'ke moskvofil'stvo mižvojennoho periodu* (Avtoreferat dysertaciji na zdobuttja naukovoho stupenja kandydata istoričnyx nauk. L'vivs'kyj nacional'nyj universytet imeni Ivana Franka, L'viv). Retrieved from <http://www.lib.ua-ru.net/diss/cont/238494.html> (28 July 2014).
- Miller, A. (2003). *The Ukrainian question. The Russian Empire and nationalism in the nineteenth century*. Budapest, New York.
- Moser, M. (2004). Review of: A. V. Wendland (2002). Die Russophilen in Galizien. Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Rußland 1848–1915. Wien. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, 63(1), 237–247.
- Moser, M. (2007). „Ruthenische“ (ukrainische) Sprach- und Vorstellungswelten in den galizischen Volksschullesebüchern der Jahre 1871 und 1872. Wien.
- Moser, M. (2009). Russisch, Ukrainisch und Suržyk des 18. Jahrhunderts in der Privatkorrespondenz ukrainischer Frauen. In J. Besters-Dilger & F. Poljakov (Eds.), *Die russische Sprache und Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert: Tradition und Innovation. Gedenkschrift für Gerta Hüttl-Folter* (pp. 289–322). Frankfurt.
- Moser (2011a): Moser, M., *Pryčynki do istoriji ukrajins'koji movy*. Vynnyca.
- Moser, M. (2011b). Ausbau, Aufklärung und Emanzipation – Zu den Grundlagen und Ideologemen des polnisch-ruthenischen (ukrainischen) Sprachenkonflikts im österreichischen Galizien. In R. Reutner (Ed.), *Die Nationalitäten- und Sprachkonflikte in der Habsburgermonarchie* (Sprachtheorie und germanistische Linguistik. Eine internationale Zeitschrift, Supplement 2, pp. 25–61). Münster.
- Moser (2011c): Moser, M., *Ukrajins'kyj P'jemont? Deščo pro značennja Halyčnyj dlja formuvannja, rozbudovy i zberezennja ukrajins'koji movy*. L'viv, Kyjiv.
- Moser (2012): Moser, M., *Deščo pro movnu spadščynu halyc'kyx moskvofiliv* (na pryklady tvoriv Ivana Naumovyča). In A. Danylenko & S. Vakulenko (Eds.), *Studien zu Sprache, Literatur und Kultur bei den Slaven. Gedenkschrift für George Y. Shevelov aus Anlass seines 100. Geburtstages und 10. Todestages* (Die Welt der Slaven, 42, pp. 154–180). München, Berlin.
- Moskvofil'stvo (2001): Makarčuk, S. (Ed.). *Moskvofil'stvo: dokumenty i materialy* (vstup. st., koment. O. Suchoho). L'viv.
- Nauka (1930): *Nauka. Iljustrovanyj kvartal'nik dlja naroda*. Izdanie Obščestva Mix. Kačkovskogo vo L'vove. Nr. 1.
- Onyškevyč (1938): *B. S. Halyčane i vsruska kul'tura* (Vidbytky z Zemli i voli) (pp. 25–28). L'viv.
- Pašaeva, N. M. (2001). *Očerki istorii russkogo dviženja v Galičine XIX–XX vv.* Moskva. Retrieved from http://www.ukrstor.com/ukrstor/paszaeva_oczerk-x.html (28 July 2014).
- Ripetsky, S., & Sereda, O. (2001[1993]). Russophiles. In *The Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. [Originally in: *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, Vol. 4, 1993]. Retrieved from <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages\R\U\Russophiles.htm> (28 July 2014).
- Russkij golos (1922): *Russkij golos. Nezavisimaja politično-ekonomičeskaja tyžnevaja gazeta*. Četverg, 29 (17.) červnja 1922 g.
- Russkij golos (1932): *Russkij golos. Organ russkoj obščestvennoj mysli*, 3(544). L'viv.
- Smolin, M. B. (Ed.) (2005). *Russkaja Galicija i 'mazepinstvo'*. Moskva.
- Snicarčuk, L. V. (2007). Moskvofil'ska presa v Halyčyni mižvojennoho periodu: tematyko-typolohični aspekty. *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu žurnalistyky*, 29, 41–46. Retrieved from http://library.univ.kiev.ua/ukr/host/viking/db/ftp/univ/nz_ij/nz_ij_2010_41.pdf (28 July 2014).
- Sorokowski, A. D. (1991). *The Greek-catholic parish clergy in Galicia, 1900–1939* (Doctoral thesis). The University of London School of Slavonic and East European Studies, London. Retrieved from <http://www.history.ac.uk/history-online/theses/thesis/greek-catholic-parish-clergy-galicia-1900-39> (28 July 2014).
- Suxyj, O. M., & Lozyn'ska, I. G. (2010). Stanovyšče ukrajins'koho naselennja v Halyčyni na počatku Peršoji svitovoji vjny ta represiji avstrijs'koji vlady. *Naukovi pracj istoričnoho fakul'tetu Zaporiz'koho nacional'noho universytetu, MXXVIII*, 151–155.
- Thalerhof Almanach (1964[1924]): *Talergofskij al'manax. Propamjatnaja kniga avstrijskix žestokostej, izu-verstv i nasilij nad karpato-russkim narodom vo vremja vseмирnoj vojny 1914–1917 gg. Vypusk pervyj: Terror v Galičine v pervyj period vojny 1914–1915 gg.* L'viv.
- Thalerhof Almanach (1964[1925]): *Talergofskij al'manax. Propamjatnaja kniga avstrijskix žestokostej, izu-verstv i nasilij nad karpato-russkim narodom vo vremja vseмирnoj vojny 1914–1917 gg. Vypusk vtoroj: Terror v Galičine. Terror v Bukovine. Otvzuki pečati. Terezin, Gmind, Gnas i dr. Belletristika.* L'viv.
- Thalerhof Almanach (1964[1930]): *Talergofskij al'manax. Propamjatnaja kniga avstrijskix žestokostej, izu-verstv i nasilij nad karpato-russkim narodom vo vremja vseмирnoj vojny 1914–1917 gg. Vypusk tretij: Talergof. Čast' pervaja.* L'viv.

- Thalerhof Almanach (1964[1932]): *Talergofskij al'manax. Propamjatnaja kniga avstrijskix žestokostej, izu-verstv i nasilij nad karpato-russkim narodom vo vremja vseмирnoj vojny 1914–1917 gg. Vypusk četvertyj: Talergof. Čast' vtoraja.* L'vov.
- Vavryk, V. R. (1930). *Spravka o russkom dviženii v Galičine s bibliografiej za 1929 god.* L'vov.
- Včeni (1998): Motornyj, V. (Ed.). *Včeni kafedry slov'jans'koji filohiji. Bibliohrafija včenyx universytetu* (ukladač L. Paniv). L'viv. Retrieved from http://library.lnu.edu.ua/bibl/images/Vudanna_WEB_pdf/2Biobibliografija_vchenuch/Slavisty.pdf (22 July 2014).
- Volja (2013[1993]): *Volia naroda (Will of the People).* *The Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine.* Retrieved from <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages\V\O\VolianarodaIT.htm> (22 July 2014).
- Volja naroda (1923/103): *Volja naroda. Čislo 103. Rok III.* L'vov, subota, 10. ljutoho 1923.
- Volja naroda (1923/114): *Volja naroda. Čislo 114. Rik III.* L'viv, nedilja, 18. marta 1923.
- Wendland, A. V. (2002). *Die Russophilen in Galizien. Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Rußland 1848–1915.* Wien.