



WŁODZIMIERZ OSADCZY

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9292-8313>

Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski

HOLY RUS — ON UKRAINIAN RUSOPHILISM

The so-called russophilism of Ukrainians is an important identity and geopolitical element in the context of Eastern Europe. It would be a too far-fetched simplification to explain it only by the imperial policy of russification. The territories of modern Ukraine were the centre of historical Rus. Tsarist Russia built its national mythology on the basis of its tradition. Enlightened Ruthenian or Ukrainian elites were the co-creators of this mythology. The tradition of the Orthodox Church, also known as the Ruthenian Church, is bound not only because of the doctrine of faith but also by external shapes: language, common saints, common names, etc. Under Russia's rule, russophilism was a kind of natural state of mind for Ukrainians. The emergence of a strong russophile unvironment under the rule of Austria and Hungary testified to the deep roots of this kind of understanding of one's own identity. Despite the fight against russophilia in the 20th century, it remained deeply rooted in the consciousness of some of the inhabitants of Ukraine. This explains the current situation in this country, the war, and the social crisis.

Keywords: Ukraine, Russia, Galicia, Russophilism, Kyiv, the Orthodox Church

THE BASES OF AWARENESS

According to the historical tradition, all nations belonging to the East Slavic group refer to the tradition of former Ruthenia, called Kyivan Ruthenia after the capital in Kyiv. This name came to public circulation from the nineteenth-century Russian historical tradition dividing the history of the Russian state into periods: Kyivan Ruthenia, Muscovite Ruthenia, and St. Petersburg Ruthenia. After the fall of the Russian superpower in the middle of the thirteenth century its individual parts were in the orbit of influence of neighboring countries: Lithuania, Poland, and Hungary, while independent and political life was released from the Mongolian domination and was organized around the center in Moscow. It is worth emphasizing that the term “Kyivan Ruthenia,” widely used in Ukraine, filled with “anti-Rus-

sian” content, intended to emphasize the otherness and separateness of Kyiv from Moscow, was introduced by Russian historians. Vasily Kluchevsky, considered to be a liberal Russian historian, divided Russian history into the Dnieper, Upper-Volga, and All-Russian periods. He called the Dnieper period Kyivan Ruthenia.¹

Despite political divisions, fundamental cultural elements remained common for all parts of former and new lands inhabited by Eastern Slavs. All of them used the name Ruthenia (or Russia) for national self-determination. All of them were aware of the common religious and political tradition deriving from the baptism of the state by Prince Vladimir the Great, the adopted alphabet based on Cyrillic, the awareness of belonging to a common ecclesial tradition referred to as the “Ruthenian Church,” the cult of common saints derived from the Kyiv tradition (St. Vladimir, St. Olga, St. Boris, and Gleb), historical consciousness promoted by church centers recalling semi-legendary rules of the Rurik dynasty which was a political reality in Muscovite Ruthenia until the beginning of the seventeenth century. Regardless of political divisions in different countries, “Ruthenianness” was a common religious and cultural feature of eastern Slavs. These relations were completely different from western and southern Slavs. Educated residents of the Polish Republic, Hungary, and Moscow referred to the same historical tradition or the foundations of civilization, which were the basis of what can be defined as national identity, they considered themselves “Ruthenian people,” professed “Ruthenian faith,” read “Ruthenian alphabet.” Then, the term “Ruthenian world” was introduced, promoted by the Russophile intelligentsia under the rule of the Habsburgs in Austria and Hungary. Stressing their unity with Russia and the Russian tsar, the Ruthenians in Galicia and Hungarian Rus wanted to emphasize their importance and power by opposing Polish and Hungarian domination. Currently, this term has acquired a political meaning and is associated with the domination of Russia.²

From the perspective of Western Europe, Eastern Slav lands were also perceived as a homogeneous, unrecognized exotic area inhabited by rather unknown peoples, the rulers of whom were called “reges Russiae” (Rusciae) or “reges Ruthenorum.” Both terms Russia and Ruthenia were used in relation to all Ruthenian lands, both

¹ В. Ключевский, *Курс русской истории*, т. 1, Мысль, Москва 1987, p. 93.

² W. Osadczy, *Święta Ruś. Rozwój i oddziaływanie idei prawosławie w Galicji*, Wydawnictwo UMCS, Lublin 2007, p. 209–210.

southern and northern.³ Ruthenians in the Polish-Lithuanian state began to pay attention to the political dimension of their community under the influence of Orthodox-Catholic religious polemics. The terms “Ruthenian people” and “Ruthenian land” started to be commonly used. They were identified with the sphere of influence of the Orthodox Church.

Russia which grew out of the Muscovite state took over the political and religious succession from the Kyiv Rurik dynasty and the Kyiv metropolitan capital, it retained sovereignty as the only part of the former Ruthenian state and in the eighteenth century, it transformed into a mighty empire. Imperial modernity was created on the basis of Europeanized “Ruthenian tradition” brought from Kyiv, and the Little Rus elite educated in the West became the driving force of Tsar Peter the Great’s reforms in the political, religious, and cultural spheres. Thanks to newcomers from Ukraine, a modern Russian church, Russian literature emerged, and also historical consciousness of cultural unity of all Ruthenian lands was strengthened.

No wonder, then, that in the period of the awakening of nationalism among eastern Slavs living in Russia and beyond its borders a desire to identify with Russian culture, as a common tradition whose roots reached ancient times, was discernible. Ukrainians, called Little Russians, as well as Belarusians and Russians, that is Great Ruthenians, were recognized in the light of the current scientific interpretation as a common Ruthenian ethnic space. One of the luminaries of Slavic science, professor Lubor Niederle, wrote:

They are very close in terms of language, very closely linked by historical fate, and over a long time have constantly had the same common religion and literature, thus we cannot regard all the groups together as one *Ruthenian* nation.⁴

The view did not raise objections from widely respected experts of Slavic studies such as Šafárik, and Palacky, it was reflected in textbooks and encyclopedias.⁵

³ F. Koneczny, *Dzieje Rosji*, Nakład Spółki Wydawniczej Warszawskiej, Warszawa 1917, p. 280–281.

⁴ У. Д. Биркбекъ, *Религіозное преслѣдованіе въ Галиціи (Австрійская Польша), Санктъ-Петербургъ*, пер. С. Тройкий, Синодальная типография, Санкт Петербург 1913, p. 66.

⁵ Т. Д. Флоринский, *Славянское племя. Статистико-этнографический обзор современного славянства*, Типография Императорского Университета св. Владимира. Акционерного общества печати и издательского дела Н. Т. Корчак-Новицкого, Київ 1907, p. 36–39.

Leaders of the so-called “Ukrainophile movement” also professed these views. Prof. Mykhailo Drahomanov pointed out that

[...] even the majority of Ukrainian linguists and ethnographers recognize that the relations between Ukrainians and Great Ruthenians are not the same as the relations, for example, between Ukrainians and Czechs, Serbs and others, and that these relations are closer, and the genealogy of Ukrainians among Slavs cannot be as follows: parents — Slavs, sons — Czechs, Poles, Serbs, Ukrainians, Great Ruthenians, etc. but: grandparents — Slavs, the sons of Slavs — Czechs, Poles, Serbs, Ruthenians, the sons of Ruthenians — Ukrainians, Belarusians, Great Ruthenians.⁶

DEVELOPMENT AND DETERMINATION

The territories of the Republic of Poland, inhabited by Ruthenians, and annexed to Russia, were considered eternally Russian, due to their connection with the first capital of Rus — Kyiv. Moscow and then Russian rulers advanced the thesis about “the legacy of St. Vladimir,” which had to be restored under the rule of the tsars. Russian imperial aspirations to “unify” all Ruthenian lands, i.e. the Russian lands, were then supported by Kyiv Orthodox clergy who came up with the initiative of uniting with Moscow Ruthenia — as the center of Orthodox life. Metropolitan Iov Boretskyi of Kyiv and Bishop Isaia Kopynskyi of Przemyśl sent messages or traveled personally to Moscow, asking the tsar to take their land and its inhabitants under his “mighty hand.”⁷ The first textbook on the history of Rus *Synopsis* (1674), prepared by Kyiv monk Innokenty Gizel, presented the history of the “Slavic-Russian” nation as the common heritage of Ruthenians and Muscovites. The textbook had 30 editions in the Russian state and until the end of the 19th century, it was an official set text in all schools in Russia. The author believed that the unification of the Cossacks’ lands with Moscow was an act of historical justice and the unification of a single nation. What was previously artificially divided “was again made whole.”⁸ Similarly, the Russian literary language was codified thanks to the involvement of “Kyiv” scholars from clerical circles. In 1629, Archbishop Meletius Smotrytsky wrote a grammar book of the Old

⁶ М. П. Драгоманов, “Чудацькі думки про українську національну справу,” Вибране (“...мій задум зложити очерк історії цивілізації на Україні”). М. П. Драгоманов, уряд. Р. С. Міщук, Либідь, Київ 1991, р. 556.

⁷ P. R. Magocsi, *A history of Ukraine*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1996, р. 211.

⁸ A. Wilson, *The Ukrainians. Unexpected Nation*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London 2015, р. 55.

Church Slavonic language that generations of Russians and Ukrainians learned from. The symbiosis of Moscow and Little Rus became the civilization foundation of the future Russian Empire. At the same time, its elite created a Russian tradition that grew out of “Kyivan science,” reaching back to Orthodox and Old Russian sources rediscovered with the help of Western modernity.⁹

Representatives of the “Little Rus” elite organically entered the Russian state tradition and culture. For Razumovsky, Bezborodko, Gogol, and others creating a national community with the Russians was something completely logical and in line with historical tradition. Submission of the Cossacks to the superpower hand of the tsars, and then the occupation by Russia of subsequent Ruthenian lands as a result of the partitions of the Republic of Poland was for them the reunification of Ruthenia. Outstanding Ukrainian national activist Panteleimon Kulish wrote about it, it became the official narrative of Russian and then Soviet historiography. In 1874 Kulish published a monumental source book in three volumes *Исторія возсоединенія Руси*, which is a manifestation of the common historical fate of Russia and Ukraine.¹⁰ It suited the sensitivity and historical knowledge of a large part of the Ukrainian population.

Being in the orbit of Russian culture was a natural condition for the young Ukrainian intelligentsia. Love for the colorful folk tradition did not collide with the natural persistence in the orbit of Russian culture, Russian intellectual currents, or participation in the Russian social discussion on the repair of the state system. The greatest Ukrainian poet, considered a symbol of the national movement and an exponent of the people’s aspirations, Taras Shevchenko, along with beautiful poems referring to the best models of folk speech, left a considerable legacy in Russian, which he did not treat as foreign. The poet wrote his private diary in Russian too. From Russia’s perspective, Shevchenko’s poetry was perceived as regional, folk native literature, and not as a phenomenon of foreign literature. The Russian Nobel Prize winner, Ivan Bunin, wrote that Shevchenko’s poetry would forever remain the pride of Russian literature.¹¹ Being a Ukrainian in the

⁹ M. Heller, *Historia Imperium Rosyjskiego*, Książka i Wiedza, Warszawa 2005, p. 278–279.

¹⁰ Н. И. Ульянов, *Происхождение украинского сепаратизма*, Индрик, Москва 1996, p. 181–182.

¹¹ А. И. Миллер, *“Украинский вопрос” в политике властей и русском общественном мнении*, Издательство Алетейя, Санкт-Петербург 2000, p. 38.

Russian state did not equate to cutting off from “Ruthenianness” understood as “Russianness.”¹² Attachment to dumkas, the turbulent and colorful history of Ukraine, fascination with folklore, and even a sense of local patriotism was not incompatible with the feeling of belonging to the “great Ruthenian/Russian nation.” Ukrainians, in the light of the official state policy, belonged to the ruling nation, they did not differ from the Russians in a political sense, they did not experience any discrimination on the basis of their origin, as was the case with Jews or Poles. Polish writer Maria Dunin-Kozicka, mentioning social relations in Russia, emphasized that officially Poles were recognized as “foreigners of Polish origin,” while “Little Russians” were completely identified with Russians.¹³ After the introduction of civil liberties in Russia, the movement for the nationalization of the masses of the Little-Russian people proceeded too slowly. As the witnesses of the events recalled, national ideas were shared by part of the intelligentsia, while the folk people remained passive to Ukrainian propaganda. In one of the essays Ukrainian emigre historian Ivan Lysiak-Rudnicki described the celebrations of a ceremony in honor of Ivan Kotliarevsky, the founder of modern Ukrainian literature, in Poltava. A train carrying representatives of the Ukrainian intelligentsia went there from Kyiv. Later there was a joke saying that if the train had derailed, the Ukrainian movement would have been in a difficult situation because all the leaders had fitted in two cars.¹⁴

The Russophile movement began to develop with particular determination in Galicia and in Hungarian Russia under the rule of the Habsburgs in Austria and Hungary. Ruthenians belonging to the Eastern Church, generally the Uniate one, freed themselves of the cultural-political hegemony of Poles and Hungarians, with whom they had become close and largely assimilated over the centuries.

In Galicia, Russian intelligentsia coming from the Greek Catholic clergy environments, forced during the widespread revolutionary uprising in 1848 to determine its nationality, clearly distanced itself from Polishness. It defined itself as Ruthenian and manifested na-

¹² И. Лисяк-Рудницький, *Историчні есе*, Основи, Київ 1994, р. 147.

¹³ M. Dunin-Kozicka, *Burza od Wschodu*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Volumen”, Warszawa 1990, р. 27.

¹⁴ И. В. Матухина, *Украинский вопрос в России (конец XIX — начало XX века)*, РАН, Институт славяноведения, Москва 2003, р. 81–82.

tional unity with the Little Rus population in Russia. In later times, many of the signatories of this political declaration also recognized the broader cultural-civilizational community of “All Russia” as its natural national space.¹⁵

The lack of the tradition of the state stored in the memory left no specific reference points, which could be referenced in the reconstruction of nationality. For rousers of Ruthenians, the folk and church traditions, which clearly separated them from the Poles and Hungarians, were material for the creation of the foundations of national identity. During the construction of the so far non-existent official-literary language, shortages in the vocabulary were complemented with resources of the Church and Slavonic language. The construct created in this way began to be identical to the literary Russian language.

During the Convention of Russians Scholars convened at the time of the so-called Spring of Nations 1848 — a special forum where clerical Russian intellectuals were to work out the foundations of the national life of Ruthenians in Galicia — reverend Antin Petrushevych spoke about the development of the literary language: “Russians started from the head, and we will start from the legs, sooner or later we will meet and connect in the heart.”¹⁶

The manifestation of the cultural community with the inhabitants of Russia in Galicia and in Hungary required restraint and limitations due to political conditions. Both authorities in Vienna and local administration managed by Poles and Hungarians unfavorably perceived cultural identification of their Ruthenian subjects with hostile Russia. For mostly rural Ruthenian population in Austria-Hungary the awareness of unity with the mighty superpower, as a center of their culture and national identity, was the basis of pride and emancipation against hostile Poles and Hungarians having their developed political and social structures.

Conducting educational activities among the people, Russophile activists used the local tongue, which they regarded as a local variant of the Ruthenian language. At the same time, they taught the literary Russian language — as common to all Ruthenian tribes in Russia and abroad. Numerous reading rooms of the Russophile Kachkovs’kyi

¹⁵ P. R. Magocsi, *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographic Guide*, Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute by University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1983, p. 125.

¹⁶ “Изъ автобіографіи Николая Л. Устияновича,” *Литературный Сборникъ издаваемый Галицко-Русскою Матицею*, 1885, вып. I, p. 46.

Society conducted educational activities in this spirit; at the beginning of the twentieth century, there were 1,424 of them. Describing the design of one such reading room in Zabolotce village, the witness recalled that in the middle of the room, there was a bust of Ukrainian poet Shevchenko, and on the walls, there were portraits of Russian writers and poets Pushkin, Gogol, Dostoevsky, and local Russophile leader Naumovich.¹⁷

National literature developed on the basis of etymological spelling used in Russia referring to the tradition of the Old Church Slavonic language. The words written in accordance with these principles sometimes sounded differently in Russian and Ukrainian pronunciations, but graphically they look identical. The maintenance of etymological spelling was considered a priority matter in cultivating the cultural unity of the whole “Russian world.” Journalist Bohdan Didycki issued a guide for farmers “How a Little Russian can learn to read Great Ruthenian within an hour.” Basic differences occurring between the Russian and the Ukrainian languages comprised a different way of reading four letters. For example, ѣ sounded in Russian as “ye” and in Ukrainian as “I”. Thus the word “хлѣбъ” could be pronounced “chleb” and “chlib”. Some other regularities could be discerned, after mastering which texts written in Russian could be easily read in the Ukrainian style.¹⁸

THE ALTERNATIVE OF THE UKRAINIAN DIRECTION

The Russophile direction of development of the national movement of Ruthenians in Galicia referred to conservative cultural principles rising from the ecclesial tradition and rigid rules of the archaic spelling. Its representatives were prominent church activists and scholars, and higher Greek Catholic clergy. They were called the “old Ruthenian party”. Among its activists, there were: the father of historiography Denis Zubrytsky, reverend professor Yakov Holovatsky, rector of Lviv University and Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, historian and curator of cultural monuments reverend professor Antin

¹⁷ В. А. Бобринской, *Пражский Съездъ. Чехія и Прикарпатская Русь, Типографія Т-ва «Свѣтъ»*, Санктъ-Петербургъ 1909, р. 75.

¹⁸ *Своежитъевые записки Богдана А. Дьдицкого*, ч. I, *Где-що до исторіи саморозвитія языка и азбуки Галицкой Руси*, Печать Савропигійского Института, Львовъ 1906, р. 9–12, 21–24.

Petrushevych, writer, political activist, social worker and folk activist reverend Ivan Naumovich, journalist Bohdan Didycki, representatives of the Greek Catholic Chapter and many other noble and widely respected national activists.

In the 70s of the nineteenth century a movement represented by the so-called “new Ruthenian party” — advocates of total separateness of Ukrainians, including Ruthenians in Galicia and Hungary, from Russians — became visible. This environment consisted mainly of young people popularizing the speech of the people, renouncing the archaic forms of the church culture, and referring to the secular, folk elements. They conducted educational activities in the folk tongue, for which they invented special phonetic spelling breaking with archaic grammar derived from the Old Church Slavonic tradition. Russophiles considered them ignorant and traitors of the national cause.¹⁹

Until the 80s of the nineteenth century, Russophiles dominated unbeatably the cultural-national life of Galicia and Hungarian Ruthenia. In the previous decade, they established 160 reading rooms, while Ukrainophiles only 6. Clerical leaders were respected by the peasantry. During the general election to the Austrian Parliament Russophiles won record 16 seats. They owned “Народный Домъ” (the National House) — the land for which Emperor Franz Joseph I gave to Ruthenians after the events of 1848, “Ставропигійській Інститутъ” (the Stauropegion Institute) deriving from the famous Orthodox fraternity founded in 1559, “Галицко-Русская Матица” (the Galicia-Ruthenia Matrix) — an educational organization existing since 1848. Moreover, a political organization “Русская Рада” (the Ruthenian Council) was established in 1870 referring its name to the Supreme Ruthenian Council from the time of the Spring of Nations. The views voiced by the Moscowphile party were elucidated by a large part of the Ruthenian press, including the most popular daily “СЛОВО.”²⁰

As nationalism grew, the gap between national “Russophile” and Ukrainian orientations widened. Rusophilism among the inhabitants of Galicia and Hungarian (Subcarpathian) Ruthenia was becoming more and more similar to official Russian nationalism. All “half meas-

¹⁹ W. Osadczy, *Święta Ruś...*, p. 93–94.

²⁰ J. Gruchała, *Rząd austriacki i polskie stronnictwa polityczne w Galicji wobec kwestii ukraińskiej (1890–1914)*, Uniwersytet Śląski, Katowice 1988, p. 27; O. Субгелний, *Україна. Історія*, Львів, Київ 1991, p. 281.

ures” were removed from public life. Taking advantage of their civil rights in the liberalizing Austro-Hungarian monarchy, supporters of the Russian national orientation proclaimed their national identity with the Russians, and even abandoned the Uniate Church and converted to Orthodoxy.²¹ Among the followers of the Russophile direction, the number of clergies decreased, for whom it was difficult to abandon their formal attachment to Catholicism in the Greek Catholic rite, and the representation of the secular intelligentsia increased. The Russian National Party, established at the beginning of the 20th century, published its magazines in Russian, printed the works of Russian writers, and even put forward demands to introduce the Russian language as the language of instruction at the University of Lviv. Russophile activists announced that they were no longer some “Ruthenes” without concrete awareness, but real Russians.²²

THE ELIMINATION OF RUSSOPHILISM

The Russophile orientation of the national revival of Ruthenians aroused concern, and even resentment and hostility of Austria’s political authorities and Polish ruling circles in Galicia. The Habsburgs were afraid of Russia’s growing activity among the Slavic peoples conducted within the framework of the pan-Slavic ideology. Poles harbored anti-Russian sentiments after the defeat of the January Uprising of 1863 and perceived Russia as the main threat to the Polish aspirations for independence. After the apostasy of one of the Galician Greek Catholic villages to Orthodoxy in 1882, a campaign against Russophiles and their elimination from political life began.²³ Metropolitan Archbishop Joseph Sembratovych, tolerating Moscow-ophile sentiments, was forced to resign. Representatives of the Ruthenian Russophile elites lost their state jobs and were moved to the Polish part of Western Galicia. In lawsuits, Russophiles were charged with the responsibility for high treason.

Formally in Galicia, as a Polish-Ruthenian province in terms

²¹ W. Osadczy, “Wszechruska’ idea w Galicji. Źródła rozwoju orientacji moskalfilskiej wśród Rusinów galicyjskich.” *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 2009(CXVI), p. 51–69.

²² О. А. Мончаловский, *Житъе и дѣятельность Ивана Наумовича*, Типография Ставропигійского института, Львовъ 1899, p. 61.

²³ І. Чорновол, *Польсько-українська угода 1890–1894 рр.*, Львівська академія мистецтв, Львів 2000, p. 133–153.

of ethnicity, government subsidies were granted only to Ukrainian cultural and educational circles. Russophiles were deprived of support. The government began to introduce changes in the cultural life of Ruthenians strengthening the Ukrainian identity of the population. A phonetic version of the alphabet was adopted which cut off Ruthenians from the cultural roots common with Russians. The name "Ukraine" instead of the traditional "Ruthenia" was increasingly promoted, and the adjective "Ruthenian" sounding identical to "Russian" was replaced by adjectives "Russo-Ukrainian" or "Ukrainian."²⁴

On the eve of World War I Russophiles in Galicia and Hungary were seen as a fifth column of Russian policy in the monarchy. Indeed, quite indifferent to strong pro-Russian sentiments in the second half of the nineteenth century, Russia began to treat its "brothers" in "enslaved Ruthenia" as natural allies in the confrontation with the central states. One of the postulates encouraging Russia to take part in the war was the "end of the work of reunification of Ruthenian lands," that is the incorporation of the Austro-Hungarian lands inhabited by Ruthenians into the empire. Hence, the beginning of World War I became a veritable ordeal for Russophile activists in Galicia and in Hungarian Ruthenia. Thousands of people were interned in camps in Thalerhof in Austria and in Terezin in Czechia, and many of them died martyr's death for the professed worldview position.

After the constitution of the new order after World War I the Russophile national option was completely eliminated from Soviet Ukraine. Communist authorities supported the "progressive" Ukrainian national movement as one of the elements of combating monarchic-conservative Russophilism. In the lands of the reborn Polish Republic Russophilism remained in residual forms in Volyn and Polesie. Eastern Lesser Poland was the center of development of the Ukrainian movement and once powerful Russophile sentiments closed in a few organizations. On the other hand, in Carpathian Ruthenia in Czechoslovakia Russophilism was still an important trend of national life among local Ruthenians. The inhabitants of Subcarpathian Ruthenia in Czechoslovakia and the Lemko people in Poland expressed particularly strong Russophile sentiments. Reception of the Ukrainian consciousness was quite negligible, while

²⁴ Н. И. Ульянов, *Происхождение украинского сепаратизма...*, p. 233–234.

HOLY RUS...

attachment to the old archaic forms was to be a guarantee of the survival of Ruthenian nationality under the rule of Czechs, Poles, and Romanians. The elimination of the name “Ruthenia,” “Ruthenian” and “Ruthenians” by the Polish government was vehemently opposed by the former Ruthenian institutions in Lviv and other cities of former Galicia.²⁵

THE AFTERMATH

The political situation in the twentieth century did not favor the development of Russophilism both in the Soviet Union which was demolishing the foundations of the former order and its ideological assumptions, as well as in national countries, such as Poland, with traditionally strong anti-Russian sentiments. Nevertheless, even in the unfavorable political situation Russophile circles were able to mobilize and unite organizationally. In Galicia, in the final period of the existence of Austria-Hungary a temporary renaissance of Russophilism took place. According to Polish Slavist Professor Marian Zdziechowski at that time Galician Ruthenians represented the only nation in Europe, whose intelligentsia was divided in beliefs to which nation it belonged: Russian or Ukrainian.²⁶

To a large extent, the victory of this or that direction depended on the current political situation. During the Russian occupation in 1914 the leader of Ukrainophilism Metropolitan Archbishop Andrey Sheptytsky declared his Russophile views in a servile letter addressed to Russian Tsar Nicholas II. He called the Russian occupation of Galicia historical justice and the ideal union of Holy Rus.²⁷

Ukrainian bishop Hryhoriy Khomyshyn from Stanyslaviv, who described himself as a representative of the Ukrainian national option, directly accused Metropolitan Sheptytsky of Russophilism. He charged him with wanting to come closer to Russian spirituality in order to carry out a mission in Russia and to create a union in the Russian Church. According to Bishop Khomyshyn, Archbishop Shep-

²⁵ И. Лемкин, *История Лемковины*, Юнкерс. Издание Лемко-Союза в С.Ш.А. и Канади, New York 1969, p. 133–234.

²⁶ W. Osadczy, *Święta Ruś...*, p. 96.

²⁷ Andrey Sheptytsky, Archbishop A. Sheptytsky's letter to Tsar Nicholas II, Kyiv, 10 September 1914, the original, handwritten by the metropolitan, Российский государственный исторический архив, F–821, Op. 12, D. 150, 22.

tytsky's fondness for Russia resulted from his Polish aristocratic origin and fascination with Russian noble culture, striving to unite the entire "Russian world" under the spiritual power of Rome. Sheptytsky was a Russophile, Bishop Khomyshyn writes, because

[...] his intention was the conversion of Russia by bringing our Greek Catholic rite closer to or even unifying it with the Synodal-Russian rite, which was tantamount to Russophilism, which we hated very much. And that is why the Metropolitan played a role of more than 100% Ukrainian, in order to hide his Russophilism and to gain permanent trust among the Ukrainian community, among secular patriots, and among the clergy, so that they would blindly accept what he did and introduced.²⁸

The Russophile outlook on life in more neutral colors was deeply rooted in the lands of Soviet Ukraine. Its natural centers had always been the southern and eastern regions of the republic using mostly the Russian language. In official humanities, Russophile interpretation of history and culture camouflaged in communist rhetoric remained. The Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate referred unreservedly to the idea of the Holy Rus as a common cultural and religious space of all Ruthenian nations.

The current Ukrainian crisis is largely a continuation of the old ideological dispute, which has also become a tool for the confrontation of powers on a global scale. This fact was pointed to by Samuel Philips Huntington, emphasizing the complex identity of contemporary Ukraine. He described this country as "clef" in terms of civilization. According to this author, Ukraine is in the orbit of the influence of Western civilization and the so-called "Orthodox" civilization. The connection with Orthodox Russia is of a civilization nature, shaped over the centuries, deeply rooted in the consciousness of the inhabitants of the East and South of Ukraine.²⁹ It was Orthodoxy with its reference to the idea of "Holy Rus," next to the Russified post-Soviet culture, that became a strong foundation for the persistence of Russophilia among Ukrainians in the present conditions.

²⁸ I. Pelechatyj, W. Osadczy (ed.), *Dwa Królestwa. Błogosławiony Męczennik Grzegorz Chomyszyn Biskup Stanisławowski*, transl. M. Siudak, Wydawnictwo AA, Kraków 2017, p. 212–213.

²⁹ S. P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*, Simon & Schuster, New York 1996, p. 166.

REFERENCES

- Birkbek Uil'yam D. *Religioznoye presledovaniye v Galitsii: (Avstriyskaya Pol'sha)*. Transl. Troiykiy, Sergey. Sankt Peterburg: Sinodal'naya tipografiya, 1913 [Биркбек Уильям Д. *Религиозное преследование в Галиции: (Австрийская Польша)*. Пер. Тройкий, Сергей. Санкт Петербург: Синодальная типография, 1913].
- I. Pelechatyj, W. Osadczy (ed.), *Dwa Królestwa. Błogosławiony Męczennik Grzegorz Chomyszyn Biskup Stanisławowski*, Transl. Siudak, Michał. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo AA, 2017.
- Bobrinskoy, Vladimir A. *Prazhskiy s'yezd. Chekhiya i Prikarpat'skaya Rus'*. Sankt Peterburg: Svet, 1909 [Бобринской, Владимир А. *Пражский съезд. Чехия и Прикарпатская Русь*. Санкт Петербург: Свет, 1909].
- Chornovol, Ihor. *Pol's'ko-ukrayins'ka uhoda 1890–1894 rr.* L'viv: L'viv's'ka akademiya mystetstv, 2000 [Чорновол, Ігор. *Польсько-українська угода 1890–1894 рр.* Львів: Львівська академія мистецтв, 2000].
- Didyts'kyu, Bohdan. *Svoezhyt'evy zapysky*. Ch. 1: *Hde shcho do istoriy samorazvytiya yazyka y azbuky Halytskoy Rusy. L'vov'*, 1906 [Дідицький, Богдан. *Своежытьевьи записки*. Ч. 1: *Где что до истории саморазвития языка и азбуки Галицкой Руси*. Львовъ, 1906].
- Drahomanov, Mykhaylo P. "Chudats'ki dumky pro ukrayins'ku natsional'nu spravu." *Vybrane* ("...mий задум zlozhyty ocherk istoriyi tsyvilizatsiyi na Ukrayini"). R. S. Mishchuk. Ed. Kyiv: Lybid' 1991 [Драгоманов, Михайло П. "Чудацькі думки про українську національну справу." *Вибране* ("...мій задум зложити очерк історії цивілізації на Україні"). Р. С. Мішук. Ред. Київ: Либідь 1991].
- Florinskiy, Timofey D. *Slavyanskoeye plemya. Statistiko-etnograficheskiy obzor' sovremennago slavyanstva*. Kiyev: Tipografiya Imperatorskogo Universiteta sv. Vladimira. Aktsionernogo obshchestva pechati i izdatel'skogodela N. T. Korchak-Novitskogo, 1907 [Флоринский, Тимофей Д. *Славянское племя. Статистико-этнографический обзор современного славянства*. Киев: Типография Императорского Университета св. Владимира. Акционерного общества печати и издательского дела Н. Т. Корчак-Новицкого, 1907].
- Gruchala, Jan. *Rząd austriacki i polskie stronnictwa polityczne w Galicji wobec kwestii ukraińskiej (1890–1914)*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 1988.
- Heller, Michail. *Historia Imperium Rosyjskiego*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 2005.
- Klyuchevskiy, Vasiliy. *Kurs russkoy istorii*. T. 1. Moskva: Mysl', 1987 [Ключевский, Василий. *Курс русской истории*. Т. 1. Москва: Мысль, 1987].
- Koneczny, Feliks. *Dzieje Rosji*. Warszawa: Nakładem Spółki Wydawniczej Warszawskiej, 1917.
- Lemkin, Ivan. *Istoriya Lemkoviny*. Yunkers, Novyy York: Izdaniye Lemko-Soyuza v S.Sh.A. i Kanadi, 1969 [Лемкин, Иван. *История Лемковины*. Юнкерс, Новый Йорк: Издание Лемко-Союза в С.Ш.А. и Канаді, 1969].
- Magocsi, Paul Robert. *A History of Ukraine*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert. *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographic Guide*. Toronto: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute by University of Toronto Press, 1983.
- Matukhina, Irina V. *Ukrainskiy vopros v Rossii (Konetskikh — nachalo XX veka)*. Moskva: RAN, Institut slavyanovedeniya, 2003 [Матухина, Ирина В.

- Украинский вопрос в России (конец XIX – начало XX века)*. Москва: РАН, Институт славяноведения, 2003].
- Miller, Aleksey I. *“Ukrainskiy vopros” v politike vlastey i russkom obshchestvennom mnenii*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo Aleteyu, 2000 [Миллер, Алексей И. «Украинский вопрос» в политике властей и русском общественном мнении. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Алетейя, 2000].
- Monchalovskiy, Osip” A. *Zhiťye i deyatel’nost’ Ivana Naumovicha*. L’vov”: Tipografiya Stavropigiyskogo instituta, 1899 [Мончаловский, Осипъ А. *Житъе и дѣятельность Ивана Наумовича*. Львовъ: Типография Ставропигийского института, 1899].
- Osadczy, Włodzimierz. “Wszechruska idea w Galicji. Źródła rozwoju orientacji moskalofilskiej wśród Rusinów galicyjskich.” *Kwartalnik Historyczny* CXVI, 2009, 2: 51–69.
- Osadczy, Włodzimierz. *Święta Ruś. Rozwój i oddziaływanie idei prawosławie w Galicji*. Lublin: UMCS, 2007.
- Sheptytsky, Andrey. *Archbishop A. Sheptytsky’s letter to Tsar Nicholas II*. Kyiv, 10 September 1914. The original, handwritten by the metropolitan. Российский Государственный Исторический Архив, Ф-821, Оп. 12, Д. 150, 22.
- Sheptytsky, Andrey. *Archbishop A. Sheptytsky’s letter to Tsar Nicholas II*. Kyiv, 10 September 1914. The original, handwritten by the metropolitan. Российский Государственный Исторический Архив, Ф-821, Оп. 12, Д. 150, 22.
- Subtel’nyu, Orest. *Ukrayina. Istoriya*. Kyiv: Lybid’, 1991 [Субтельний, Орест. Україна. Історія. Київ: Либідь, 1991].
- Ul’yanov, Nikolay I. *Proiskhozhdeniye ukrainskogo separatizma*. Moskva: “INDRIK”, 1996 [Ульянов, Николай И. *Происхождение украинского сепаратизма*. Москва: «ИНДРИК», 1996].
- Ustyanovich, Nikolay L. “Iz avtobiografii Nikolaya L. Ustyanovicha.” *Literaturnyy Sbornik” izdavayemyy Galitsko-Russkoyu Matitseyu*. .Issue I. L’vov”: Tipografiya Stavropigiyskogo instituta, 1885: 41–47 [Устиянович, Николай Л. “Из автобиографии Николая Л. Устияновича.” *Литературный Сборник издаваемый Галицко-Русскою Матицею* Вып. I. Львовъ: Типография Ставропигийского института, 1885: 41–47].
- Wilson, Andrew. *The Ukrainians. Unexpected Nation*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2015.